The New International

Dictionary of New Testament Theology Vol. 3

Editor: Colin Brown

6th printing

The New International

Dictionary of New Testament Theology Vol. 3

Editor: Colin Brown

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL DICTIONARY OF NEW TESTAMENT THEOLOGY is, first, a basic translation, and then an extensive revision and considerable enlargement, of a German work entitled *Theologisches Begriffslexikon Zum Neuen Testament.* On its first publication in German this was recognized as a major work of reference, and has since become more and more widely acclaimed as an important tool for understanding the theology and message of the Bible. Its translation and publication in this new English edition, together with the extensive revisions and extensive additions, have enlarged it so as to make it a unique source of information, invaluable to ministers, teachers, and anyone interested in the study as well as the teaching of the Bible.

What the reviewers say:

"This Dictionary had already proved its worth in its original German form, and the present revised and enlarged English edition will make it a much appreciated companion to the New Testament for students, preachers, and teachers throughout the English-speaking world." *(F. F. Bruce, University of Manchester)*

"Indispensable for advanced theological students and scholars as well as for ordinary Bible students." *(Christianity Today)*

"The ministry of any pastor would be enriched immeasurably if he would keep this dictionary on his desk for constant reference during the time of sermon preparation. . . . it is perhaps the best buy of the year." *(Eternity)*

"It is an excellent work. . . . I am impressed with the significance of this dictionary. It is characterized by the most thorough scholarship." *(Donald W. Burdick, Conservative Baptist Theological Seminary)*

(continued on back flap)

ISBN 0-310-21910-8

(continued from front flap)

COMPANION TEXTS FOR NEW TESTAMENT STUDIES

A Critical Lexicon and Concordance to the English-Greek New Testament (Bullinger)
A Dictionary of New Testament Greek Synonyms (Berry)
A Grammar of Septuagint Greek (Conybeare/Stock)
A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature (Bauer, Arndt, Gingrich, and Danker)
A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature (Blass and Debrunner, Funk)
A Linguistic Key to the Greek New Testament (Rienecker, Rogers)
A Reader's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament (Kubo)
A Shorter Lexicon of the Greek New Testament (Gingrich)
Do It Yourself Hebrew and Greek (Goodrick)
Greek and English Lexicon to the New Testament (Greenfield, Green)
Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament (Thayer)
New Testament Greek Primer (Marshall)
The Analytical Greek Lexicon Revised (Houlton)
The Englishman's Greek Concordance of the New Testament (Wigram)
The Englishman's Greek New Testament (Newberry)
The Greek New Testament Slidaverb Conjugation Chart (Peterson)
The Interlinear Greek-English New Testament (Berry)
The Interlinear Greek-English New Testament (Marshall)
The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology (Brown)
The NIV Interlinear Greek-English New Testament (Marshall)
The RSV Interlinear Greek-English New Testament (Marshall)
The Zondervan Parallel New Testament in Greek and English (Marshall)

The Editor

In its English form THE NEW INTERNATIONAL DOCTIONARY OF NEW TESTAMENT THEOLOGY was edited by Colin Brown, who holds the B.D. from the University of London, the M.A. from the University of Nottingham, and the Ph.D. from the University of Bristol. His publications include *Karl Barth and the Christian Message* and *Philosophy and the Christian Faith.* Before becoming Professor of Systematic Theology at Fuller Theological Seminary, Dr. Brown was Vice-Principal of Tyndale Hall. He has been Visiting Professor at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, Illinois, and at Regent College, Vancouver.

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL DICTIONARY OF NEW TESTAMENT THEOLOGY is a unique source of information, invaluable to ministers, teachers, and anyone interested in the study as well as the teaching of the Bible.

Some of its main features are:

- Concise discussion of the major theological terms of the Bible
- Arranged in English alphabetical order; does not demand prior knowledge of Greek or Hebrew
- Discusses the use of each key word in classical and secular Greek, the Old Testament and Rabbinic writings, the New Testament usage and reference
- English edition based on *Theologisches Begriffslexikon zum Neuen Testament*, extensively revised and enlarged
- Glossary of Technical Terms giving concise definitions of specialist expressions and usage in Vol. 1
- Index of Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek, and theological subjects (Vol. 1 and 2 separately indexed, Combined Index to all three Vols. in Vol. 3)
- Full and up-to-date bibliographies
- International team of contributors

Editor:
Colin Brown

The New
International

Dictionary of New Testament Theology Vol. 3

Pri~Z

ZONDERVAN

The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology

The New International Dictionary of

Companion Volume

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL
DICTIONARY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH

Volume 3: Pri-Z

New Testament Theology

Colin Brown
GENERAL EDITOR

Translated, with additions and revisions, from the German

THEOLOGISCHES BEGRIFFSLEXIKON
ZUM NEUEN TESTAMENT

Edited by Lothar Coenen, Erich Beyreuther *and* Hans Bietenhard

ZONDERVAN PUBLISHING HOUSE
OF THE ZONDERVAN CORPORATION
GRAND RAPIDS, MICHIGAN 49506

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL DICTIONARY OF NEW TESTAMENT THEOLOGY, VOL. 3
Originally published in German under the title,
THEOLOGISCHES BEGRIFFSLEXIKON ZUM NEUEN TESTAMENT

© 1971 by Theologischer Verlag Rolf Brockhaus, Wuppertal. English Language edition copyright © 1978, The Zondervan Corporation, Grand Rapids, Michigan, U.S.A., and The Paternoster Press, Ltd. Exeter, Devon, U.K.

Sixth printing 1981

All rights in this work are reserved by the publishers, and no part may be reproduced without written permission, except for brief quotations in reviews.

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Main entry under title:

The new international dictionary of New Testament theology.

"Translated, with additions and revisions, from the German Theologisches Begriffslexikon zum Neuen Testament, edited by Lothar Coenen, Erich Beyreuther, and Hans Bietenhard."

"Companion volume: The new international dictionary of the Christian Church."

Includes bibliographical references and indexes.

1. Bible. N.T.—Theology—Dictionaries. 2 Bible. N.T.—Dictionaries. I. Brown, Colin.

BS2397.N48 230'.03 75-38895

ISBN 0-310-21910-8

Printed in the United States of America

Contents

PREFACE 7

TABLE OF ARTICLES IN VOLUME 3 11

CONTRIBUTORS TO VOLUME 3 21

ARTICLES 27

COMBINED INDEXES TO VOLUMES 1–3:

HEBREW AND ARAMAIC WORDS 1219

GREEK WORDS 1233

GENERAL INDEX 1274

Preface

ALMOST ALL OUR WISDOM, CALVIN OBSERVED, CONSISTS OF TWO PARTS: THE knowledge of God and of ourselves (*Institutes of the Christian Religion*, 1, 1, 1). But, as Calvin's subsequent reflections make clear, neither part of this knowledge exists in a vacuum. The two are closely intertwined, and the Word of God which makes this knowledge possible touches every aspect of life. It was this awareness of the range and relevance of biblical thinking which prompted the editors and publishers of the German original of this dictionary to conceive the project of compiling a lexicon of New Testament terms seen against the background of the Old Testament and the ancient world. Their aim was to produce a reference work which would be compact and yet scholarly, a book which would be of service to preachers, teachers, pastors, Christian workers, students and lay people who wished to study biblical thinking in depth.

The publication of this third and final volume of the English edition sees the culmination of nearly a quarter of a century of work. In the course of time the dictionary has grown considerably. The original German articles have all been revised and enlarged to take into account more recent literature and scholarly research of interest to English-speaking readers. The present volume contains 104 main articles, of which 32 are completely new. In all 237 key Greek terms are treated here; of these 87 appear for the first time. A special feature of this English edition are the survey articles which discuss topics arising out of New Testament thought. This third volume contains 10 such articles ranging from *The Resurrection in Contemporary Theology* to *Jesus and Revolution*, and from *The Genealogies of Jesus Christ* to *Language and Meaning in Religion. Prepositions and Theology in the Greek New Testament* are given separate treatment in an extensive appendix.

As in the previous volumes, the main entries are arranged under the alphabetical order of the English terms which serve as a focus for the articles on key Greek words. These are further sub-divided as follows:

CL Discussion of the word in secular Greek. Uses of the word are illustrated by reference not only to classical literature but also to inscriptions and papyri. In view of the expressly theological interest of the dictionary discussion here is kept to a minimum.

OT Discussion of the word and related terms in the OT. The language of the church in the NT era was Greek, and the Old Testament Scriptures used by the church were largely the Greek translation of the Hebrew known as the Septuagint (LXX The discussion is therefore based on the terms as they occur in the LXX, but comparing the LXX throughout with the corresponding Hebrew Masoretic text. This section also takes account of terms as used by Philo, Josephus, the Dead Sea Scrolls and rabbinic writers.

NT Discussion of the word and related terms in the NT, noting statistical occurrences, usage in relation to the background, and the specific emphases of individual writers and writings.

For further discussion of the layout and scope of the dictionary the reader is referred to the Introduction to Volume I. A list of abbreviations and a key to the transliteration of Hebrew, Greek and Arabic words will be found in Volume I, pp. 31–47. Volume I, pp. 49–72, also contains a Glossary of Technical Terms which defines many of the terms currently used in theological discussion. This third volume contains a Combined Index to all three volumes, dealing with Hebrew and Aramaic words, Greek words, and subjects generally. In this connexion it is important to point out that, because of the inter-relation of ideas, relevant material on any given topic is not confined to the articles listed in the table of contents. There is, for example, an article on *Blood* in Volume I, but there is also a discussion of blood in relation to atonement in the article on *Reconciliation* in Volume III. Similarly, the treatment of *Divorce* in Volume I is supplemented by the discussions under *Discipline* in the same volume, under *Marriage* in Volume II, and under *Separate* in Volume III. For this reason it is important to make full use of the indexes in order to explore the range of ideas of any topic under study.

The work has been planned as a dictionary and not an encyclopedia. Its aim is not to say the last word on every subject, but to provide an introduction and the tools to enable the reader to make his own way into the field of study. For this reason the bibliographies at the end of the articles have been revised and enlarged to make them useful to an international readership. The bibliographies are normally divided into two sections: (a) works in English, and (b) works in other languages. The separation of the sections is designed to enable readers to see at a glance which works are relevant to their particular needs. Most English-speaking readers will naturally wish to consult the works in the first section. On the other hand, it was decided to include titles not available in English to meet the needs of the more specialist student. Even so, the works included represent only a fraction of the total volume of printed scholarly research. For the reader who wishes to take his studies still further, attention may be drawn to the following specialist bibliographical works: B. M. Metzger, *Index to Periodical Literature on Christ and the Gospels, New Testament Tools and Studies* 6, 1962; A. J. Mattill, Jr. and M. Bedford Mattill, *A Classified Bibliography of Literature on the Acts of the Apostles, New Testament Tools and Studies* 7, 1966; B. M. Metzger, *Index to Periodical Literature on the Apostle Paul, New Testament Tools and Studies* 1, 1970[2]; the massive *Elenchus Bibliographicus Biblicus* published annually by the Biblical Institute Press, Rome, under the editorship since 1949 of Peter Nober; the *Book Lists* of the Society for Old Testament Study (those for 1946–56 republished in *Eleven Years of Bible Bibliography*, 1957, those for 1957–66 in *A Decade of Bible Bibliography*, edited by G. W. Anderson, 1967, and those for 1967–73 in *Bible Bibliography*, 1974, edited by P. R. Ackroyd), and *New Testament Abstracts: A Record of Current Literature* published by Weston School of Theology, Cambridge, Massachusetts, in cooperation with The Council on the Study of Religion. Those who wish to keep abreast of German books should consult *Das Evangelische Schrifttum: Ein systematisches Verzeichnis für Wissenschaft und Praxis*, published annually by the Vereinigung Evangelischer Buchhändler, and *Das Katholisches Schrifttum*, published by the Verband Katholischer Verleger und Buchhändler. Also helpful are: J. L. Sayre and R. Hamburger, *An Index of*

Festschriften in the Graduate Seminary Library of Phillips University, 1970, and *An Index of Festschriften in Religion, New Titles 1971–1973, in the Graduate Seminary Library of Phillips University*, 1973; the *Index to Religious Periodical Literature* published by the American Theological Library Association; and the review of journal articles in *Themelios*, currently compiled by Professor R. P. Martin. Most major libraries contain the *Catalogues* of the Libraries of Congress and the British Museum, together with catalogues of unpublished theses and theses available on microfilm.

The translation of the original German articles as they appeared in the *Theologisches Begriffslexikon zum Neuen Testament* was prepared by a team of scholars which included Professor G. H. Boobyer, the Rev. Dr. Colin Brown, Mr. H. L. Ellison, the Rev. M. C. Freeman, the late Rev. Dr. George Ogg, Mr. John D. Manton, the Rev. Dr. A. J. M. Wedderburn. The magnificent indexes are the work of the Rev. Norman Hillyer, assisted by Mrs. Ruth Hillyer. The unrelenting work of proof reading which extended over five months was shared with the Editor by three people to whom the Editor and the dictionary are immeasurably indebted: the Rev. Norman Hillyer, Professor F. F. Bruce of the University of Manchester and Mrs. Olive Brown. Each has read the entire work in galley and page proof. In addition to the detection of printing errors, each of them has made a significant contribution to the finished text. On numerous points of detail the Editor has benefited from the advice and comments of many friends and colleagues, especially in his teaching at Trinity College, Bristol, and Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena. The Rev. Dr. A. C. Thiselton of the University of Sheffield has kindly commented on the drafts of various bibliographies, and Professor D. W. Burdick of the Conservative Baptist Theological Seminary, Denver, Colorado, on the text in galley proof.

The article on Resurrection contains a synoptic table of events in the resurrection narratives based on the table given by Professor G. E. Ladd in his book *I Believe in the Resurrection of Jesus*, 1975, published in Britain by Hodder and Stoughton and in the United States by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company. This is reproduced by kind permission of the author and publishers.

It goes without saying that no work of scholarship is ever final. New books are being published all the time, and existing work is always open to revision. As and when it becomes necessary to reprint any of the volumes of *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*, it is the editorial policy to include any supplementary material as an appendix to each volume, with appropriate cross references in the text of the existing articles. This supplementary material will be made available separately to purchasers of the first editions of the dictionary.

Table of Articles in Volume III

Title	Key Greek Words		Author	Page
Pride	ὕβρις	*hybris*	E. Güting	27
	ὑπερήφανος	*hyperēphanos*	E. Güting, C. Brown	28
Priest, High Priest	ἱερεύς	*hiereus*	J. Baehr	32
Proclamation, Preach, Kerygma	ἀγγέλλω	*angellō*	U. Becker, D. Müller	44
	κηρύσσω	*kēryssō*	L. Coenen	48
	The Structure and Content of the Early Kerygma		C. Brown	57
Promise	ἐπαγγελία	*epangelia*	E. Hoffmann	68
Prophet	προφήτης	*prophētēs*	C. H. Peisker, C. Brown	74
Punishment, Vengeance	δίκη	*dikē*	U. Falkenroth, C. Brown	92
	κόλασις	*kolasis*	C. Brown	98
Pure, Clean	ἁγνός	*hagnos*	H. Baltensweiler	100
	καθαρός	*katharos*	H.-G. Link, J. Schattenmann	102
Quench	σβέννυμι	*sbennymi*	R. K. Harrison, C. Brown	109
	ἄσβεστος	*asbestos*	R. K. Harrison	110
Quiet, Rest, Silence, Sound, Voice, Noise	ἡσυχία	*hēsychia*	M. J. Harris	111
	ἦχος	*ēchos*	M. J. Harris	112
	φωνή	*phōnē*	M. J. Harris	113
Rabbi	ῥαββί	*rhabbi*	H. L. Ellison	115
Ready, Prepare, Gird	ἕτοιμος	*hetoimos*	S. Solle	116
	κατασκευάζω	*kataskeuazō*	F. Thiele	118
	ζώννυμι	*zōnnymi*	F. Selter	120

Reason, Mind, Understanding	*νοῦς*	*nous*	G. Harder	122
	σύνεσις	*synesis*	J. Goetzmann	130
Recompense, Reward, Gain, Wages	*ἀποδίδωμι*	*apodidōmi*	P. C. Böttger	134
	κέρδος	*kerdos*	B. Siede	136
	μισθός	*misthos*	P. C. Böttger	138
	ὀψώνιον	*opsōnion*	O. Becker	144
Reconciliation, Restoration, Propitiation, Atonement	*ἀποκατάστασις*	*apokatastasis*	H.-G. Link	145
	ἱλάσκομαι	*hilaskomai*	H.-G. Link, C. Brown	148
	καταλλάσσω	*katallassō*	H. Vorländer, C. Brown	166
Redemption, Loose, Ransom, Deliverance, Release, Salvation, Saviour	*λύω*	*lyō*	W. Mundle, C. Brown	177
	λύτρον	*lytron*	W. Mundle, C. Brown	189
	ῥύομαι	*rhyomai*	J. Schneider, C. Brown	200
	σώζω	*sōzō*	J. Schneider, C. Brown	205
	σωτήρ	*sōtēr*	J. Schneider, C. Brown	216
Remain	*μένω*	*menō*	K. Munzer, C. Brown	223
	ἀδιάλειπτος	*adialeiptos*	C. Brown	229
Remember, Remembrance	*μιμνήσκομαι*	*mimnēskomai*	K. H. Bartels, C. Brown	230
Remnant, Leave	*λεῖμμα*	*leimma*	W. Günther, H. Krienke	247
Rest	*ἀνάπαυσις*	*anapausis*	R. Hensel, C. Brown	254
Resurrection	*ἀνάστασις*	*anastasis*	L. Coenen, C. Brown	259
	ἐγείρω	*egeirō*	L. Coenen	279
	The Resurrection in Contemporary Theology		C. Brown	281
Revelation	*ἀποκαλύπτω*	*apokalyptō*	W. Mundle	309
	δηλόω	*dēloō*	W. Mundle	316
	ἐπιφάνεια	*epiphaneia*	B. Gärtner, C. Brown	317
	χρηματίζω	*chrēmatizō*	C. Brown	324
	Revelation in Contemporary Theology		C. Brown	325

Revile, Blaspheme, Slander	*βλασφημέω*	*blasphēmeō*	H. Währisch, C. Brown	340
	καταλαλέω	*katalaleō*	W. Mundle	345
	λοιδορέω	*loidoreō*	H. Währisch	346
Right, Worthy	*ἄξιος*	*axios*	E. Tiedtke	347
	ἄρτιος	*artios*	R. Schippers	349
	ὀρθός	*orthos*	R. Klöber	351
Righteousness, Justification	*δικαιοσύνη*	*dikaiosynē*	H. Seebass, C. Brown	352
Rob, Steal	*ληστής*	*lēstēs*	N. Hillyer	377
	συλάω	*sylaō*	N. Hillyer	379
	ἀποστερέω	*apostereō*	N. Hillyer	379
	ἀνδραποδιστής	*andrapodistēs*	N. Hillyer	380
	σπήλαιον	*spēlaion*	N. Hillyer	380
Rock, Stone, Corner-stone, Pearl, Precious Stones	*πέτρα*	*petra*	W. Mundle, C. Brown	381
	γωνία	*gōnia*	W. Mundle	388
	λίθος	*lithos*	H.-G. Link, E. Tiedtke, C. Brown	390
	μαργαρίτης	*margaritēs*	N. Hillyer	394
	Precious Stones in the Apocalypse		N. Hillyer	395
Rule, Standard, Measure	*κανών*	*kanōn*	J. Guhrt, H.-G. Link, C. Brown	399
	μέτρον	*metron*	C. Brown	402
Sabbath, Lord's Day	*σάββατον*	*sabbaton*	W. Stott	405
	κυριακή	*kyriakē*	W. Stott	411
Sacrifice, First Fruits, Altar, Offering	*ἀπαρχή*	*aparchē*	H.-G. Link, C. Brown	415
	θύω	*thyō*	F. Thiele, C. Brown	417
Sadducees, Herodians	*Σαδδουκαῖοι*	*Saddoukaioi*	J. J. Scott, Jr.	439
	Ἡρωδιανοί	*Hērōdianoi*	N. Hillyer	441
Salt	*ἅλας*	*halas*	N. Hillyer	443
Samaritan, Samaria	*Σαμαρίτης*	*Samaritēs*	K. Haacker	449
Satan, Beelzebul, Devil, Exorcism	*διάβολος*	*diabolos*	H. Bietenhard, C. Brown	468
	ἐξορκιστής	*exhorkistēs*	J. Stafford Wright	473

Scribe	*γραμματεύς*	*grammateus*	N. Hillyer	477
Scripture, Writing	*γραφή*	*graphē*	R. Mayer, C. Brown	482
Seal	*σφραγίς*	*sphragis*	R. Schippers	497
Secret, Mystery	*μυστήριον*	*mystērion*	G. Finkenrath	501
	The Messianic Secret		C. Brown	506
See, Vision, Eye	*ὁράω*	*horaō*	K. Dahn	511
	κολλούριον	*kollourion*	W. L. Liefeld	518
	ἀναβλέπω	*anablepō*	W. L. Liefeld	519
	ἐμβλέπω	*emblepō*	W. L. Liefeld	519
	ἀτενίζω	*atenizō*	W. L. Liefeld	520
	θέατρον	*theatron*	W. L. Liefeld	520
Seed, Plant, Grass, Flower, Harvest	*σπέρμα*	*sperma*	B. A. Demarest, C. Brown	521
	θερισμός	*therismos*	B. A. Demarest	525
Seek, Find	*εὑρίσκω*	*heuriskō*	B. Gärtner	527
	ζητέω	*zēteō*	H.-G. Link	530
	ἐραυνάω	*eraunaō*	M. Seitz	532
Separate, Divide	*χωρίζω*	*chōrizō*	M. J. Harris, C. Brown	534
	σχίζω	*schizō*	M. J. Harris	543
Serve, Deacon, Worship	*διακονέω*	*diakoneō*	K. Hess	544
	λατρεύω	*latreuō*	K. Hess	549
	λειτουργέω	*leitourgeō*	K. Hess	551
Shadow	*σκιά*	*skia*	H.-C. Hahn	553
Shake	*σείω*	*seiō*	N. Hillyer	556
	σαλεύω	*saleuō*	N. Hillyer	558
	ἐκτινάσσω	*ektinassō*	N. Hillyer	560
Shame, Respect	*αἰδώς*	*aidōs*	H.-G. Link, E. Tiedtke	561
	αἰσχύνη	*aischynē*	H.-G. Link	562
Shepherd	*ποιμήν*	*poimēn*	E. Beyreuther	564
Show, Proof, Demonstrate	*δείκνυμι*	*deiknymi*	C. Brown	569
	ἀπόδειξις	*apodeixis*	G. T. D. Angel	570
	τεκμήριον	*tekmērion*	G. T. D. Angel	571
Simplicity, Sincerity, Uprightness	*ἁπλότης*	*haplotēs*	B. Gärtner	571

Sin	ἀδικία	*adikia*	W. Günther	573
	ἁμαρτία	*hamartia*	W. Günther	577
	παράβασις	*parabasis*	W. Günther	583
	παράπτωμα	*paraptōma*	W. Bauder	585
Sit	κάθημι	*kathēmi*	R. T. France	587
Slave, Servant,	αἰχμάλωτος	*aichmalōtos*	H.-G. Link, R. Tuente	590
Captive,	δέσμιος	*desmios*	H.-G. Link	591
Prisoner,	δοῦλος	*doulos*	R. Tuente	592
Freedman	Λιβερτῖνος	*Libertinos*	G. T. D. Angel	598
Smell	ὀσμή	*osmē*	O. Flender, C. Brown	599
Snatch, Take Away, Rapture	ἁρπάζω	*harpazō*	E. Tiedtke, C. Brown	601
Solomon	Σολομών	*Solomōn*	D. F. Payne	605
Son, Son of God,	παῖς θεοῦ	*pais theou*	O. Michel, I. H. Marshall	607
Son of Man, Servant of God,	ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου	*ho hyios tou anthrōpou*	O. Michel, I. H. Marshall	613
Son of David	υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ	*hyios tou theou*	O. Michel, I. H. Marshall	634
	υἱὸς Δαυίδ	*hyios Dauid*	O. Michel, I. H. Marshall	648
	The Genealogies of Jesus Christ		N. Hillyer	653
	The Virgin Birth		J. Stafford Wright	660
Song, Hymn,	ὕμνος	*hymnos*	K. H. Bartels	668
Psalm	ψαλμός	*psalmos*	K. H. Bartels	670
	ᾠδή	*ōdē*	K. H. Bartels	672
Soul	ψυχή	*psychē*	G. Harder, C. Brown	676
Spirit, Holy Spirit	πνεῦμα	*pneuma*	E. Kamlah, J. D. G. Dunn, C. Brown	689
Stir up, Trouble, Agitate	ταράσσω	*tarassō*	H. Müller	709
Strength,	βία	*bia*	G. Braumann	711
Force,	ἰσχύς	*ischys*	G. Braumann	712
Horn,	κέρας	*keras*	H.-G. Link, J. Schattenmann	714
Violence, Power	κράτος	*kratos*	G. Braumann	716

Suffer	πάσχω	paschō	B. Gärtner	719
Suffice, Satisfy	ἀρκέω	arkeō	B. Siede	727
	ἱκανός	hikanos	W. von Meding	728
Sun,	ἥλιος	hēlios	D. A. Hagner	730
Moon,	σελήνη	selēnē	D. A. Hagner	733
Stars	ἀστήρ	astēr	D. A. Hagner	734
Swear, Oath	ὀμνύω	omnyō	H.-G. Link	737
Take,	δέχομαι	dechomai	H.-G. Link	744
Receive	λαμβάνω	lambanō	B. Siede	747
Tax,	λογεία	logeia	M. J. Harris	751
Tax Collector	στατήρ	statēr	C. Brown	752
	τέλωνιον	telōnion	N. Hillyer	755
Teach,	διδάσκω	didaskō	K. Wegenast	759
Instruct,	διδάσκαλος	didaskalos	K. Wegenast	765
Tradition,	διδασκαλία	didaskalia	K. Wegenast	768
Education,	κατηχέω	katēcheō	K. Wegenast	771
Discipline	παραδίδωμι	paradidōmi	K. Wegenast	772
	παιδεύω	paideuō	D. Fürst	775
Temple	ναός	naos	W. von Meding	781
	τὸ ἱερόν	to hieron	C. Brown	785
	τὸ ἐσώτερον	to esōteron	D. H. Madvig	794
	τὸ καταπετάσμα	to katapetasma	D. H. Madvig	794
	τὸ μεσότοιχον	to mesotoichon	D. H. Madvig	795
	στῦλος	stylos	D. H. Madvig	795
	γαζοφυλάκιον	gazophylakion	D. H. Madvig	795
	νεωκόρος	neōkoros	D. H. Madvig	796
	πτερύγιον	pterygion	D. H. Madvig	796
Tempt, Test, Approve	πειρασμός	peirasmos	W. Schneider, C. Brown	798
	δόκιμος	dokimos	H. Haarbeck	808
Tent, Tabernacle	σκηνή	skēnē	M. J. Harris, C. Brown	811
Thank, Praise,	αἰνέω	aineō	H. Schultz	816
Eucharist	εὐχαριστία	eucharistia	H.-H. Esser	817
Think,	διαλογίζομαι	dialogizomai	D. Fürst	820
Mean,	δοκέω	dokeō	D. Müller	821
Consider, Reckon	λογίζομαι	logizomai	J. Eichler	822
Time	αἰών	aiōn	J. Guhrt	826
	καιρός	kairos	H.-C. Hahn	833
	χρόνος	chronos	H.-C. Hahn	839

	ὥρα	*hōra*	H.-C. Hahn	845
Tithe	*δεκάτη*	*dekatē*	G. F. Hawthorne	851
Torment	*βάσανος*	*basanos*	W. Mundle	855
	κολαφίζω	*kolaphizō*	W. Mundle	857
	ὠδίνω	*ōdinō*	R. K. Harrison	857
	ταλαιπωρέω	*talaipōreō*	R. K. Harrison	858
Touch	*ἅπτω*	*haptō*	R. Grob	859
Transfigure, Transfiguration, Transform	*μεταμορφόω*	*metamorphoō*	W. L. Liefeld	861
	μετασχηματίζω	*metaschēmatizō*	W. L. Liefeld	864
Tree, Plant, Root, Branch	*δένδρον*	*dendron*	E. M. Embry	865
Tribe	*φυλή*	*phylē*	N. Hillyer	870
Trumpet	*σάλπιγξ*	*salpinx*	M. J. Harris	873
Truth	*ἀλήθεια*	*alētheia*	A. C. Thiselton	874
Turn Away	*ἀποτρέπω*	*apotrepō*	M. J. Harris	902
Type, Pattern	*τύπος*	*typos*	H. Müller	903
Unanimity	*ὁμοθυμαδόν*	*homothymadon*	E. D. Schmitz	908
Vessel,	*κεράμιον*	*keramion*	W. L. Lane	910
Pot,	*ὀστράκινος*	*ostrakinos*	W. L. Lane	913
Potter,	*πηλός*	*pēlos*	W. L. Lane	915
Mix	*φύραμα*	*phyrama*	W. L. Lane	917
Vine, Wine	*ἄμπελος*	*ampelos*	C. Brown	918
Virtue,	*ἀνέγκλητος*	*anenklētos*	H. Währisch	923
Blameless	*ἀρετή*	*aretē*	H.-G. Link, A. Ringwald	925
	Haustafeln		R. P. Martin	928
Walk,	*ἀναστρέφω*	*anastrephō*	G. Ebel	933
Run,	*ὁδός*	*hodos*	G. Ebel	935
Way,	*περιπατέω*	*peripateō*	G. Ebel	943
Conduct	*πορεύομαι*	*poreuomai*	G. Ebel	945
Wall,	*τεῖχος*	*teichos*	N. Hillyer	948
Hedge,	*φραγμός*	*phragmos*	N. Hillyer	950
Palisade	*χάραξ*	*charax*	N. Hillyer	951
Want, Lack,	*ὕστερος*	*hysteros*	W. L. Lane	952

Need	χρεία	*chreia*	W. L. Lane	956
War, Soldier, Weapon	πόλεμος	*polemos*	C. Brown, J. Watts	958
	Jesus and Revolution		M. Langley	967
Water,	θάλασσα	*thalassa*	O. Böcher	982
Lake,	πηγή	*pēgē*	O. Böcher	985
Sea,	ὕδωρ	*hydōr*	O. Böcher	988
Well,	κατακλυσμός	*kataklysmos*	R. K. Harrison	991
River	Ἰορδάνης	*Iordanēs*	R. K. Harrison	991
	λίμνη	*limnē*	R. K. Harrison	992
Weakness,	ἀσθένεια	*astheneia*	H.-G. Link	993
Sickness,	νόσος	*nosos*	H.-G. Link	996
Disease,	μαλακία	*malakia*	R. K. Harrison	999
Paralysis	παραλυτικός	*paralytikos*	R. K. Harrison	999
Weather	ἀστραπή	*astrapē*	L. L. Morris	1000
Wilderness,	ἔρημος	*erēmos*	O. Böcher	1004
Desert,	ὄρεινος	*oreinos*	W. L. Liefeld	1008
Lay Waste,	τόπος πεδινός	*topos pedinos*	W. L. Liefeld	1009
Mountain, Plain	ὄρος, ὑψηλός	*oros, hypselos*	W. L. Liefeld, C. Brown	1009
	Σινά	*Sina*	C. Brown	1013
Will,	βούλομαι	*boulomai*	D. Müller	1015
Purpose	θέλω	*thelō*	D. Müller	1018
Wisdom,	μωρία	*mōria*	J. Goetzmann	1023
Folly, Philosophy	σοφία	*sophia*	J. Goetzmann, C. Brown	1026
	φιλοσοφία	*philosophia*	H. Weigelt	1034
Witness, Testimony	μαρτυρία	*martyria*	L. Coenen, A. A. Trites	1038
Woe	οὐαί	*ouai*	N. Hillyer	1051
Woman, Mother,	γυνή	*gynē*	H. Vorländer, C. Brown	1055
Virgin,	μήτηρ	*mētēr*	E. Beyreuther	1068
Widow	παρθένος	*parthenos*	O. Becker, C. Brown	1071
	χήρα	*chēra*	S. Solle	1073
Word,	γλῶσσα	*glōssa*	H. Haarbeck	1078
Tongue, Utterance	λόγος	*logos*	G. Fries, B. Klappert, C. Brown	1081
	ῥῆμα	*rhēma*	O. Betz	1119

	Language and Meaning in Religion		A. C. Thiselton	1123
Work,	*ἐργάζομαι*	*ergazomai*	H.-C. Hahn	1147
Do,	*ποιέω*	*poieō*	F. Thiele	1152
Accomplish	*πράσσω*	*prassō*	H.-C. Hahn	1155
Yoke	*ζυγός*	*zygos*	H.-G. Link, C. Brown	1160
Zeal	*ζῆλος*	*zēlos*	H.-C. Hahn	1166
	σπουδή	*spoudē*	W. Bauder	1168
Appendix: Prepositions and Theology in the Greek New Testament			M. J. Harris	1171

Contributors

Editors and Advisors

Editor of the English edition	Colin Brown
General Editor of the German edition	Lothar Coenen
Greek philology, philosophy and classical background	Gerhard Fries
Old Testament and Septuagint	Horst Seebass
Qumran	Reinhard Deichgräber
Rabbinics	Hans Bietenhard
New Testament philology and theology	Hans Bietenhard
Church history and historical theology	Erich Beyreuther
Bibliographical consultant to the German edition	Werner Georg Kümmel
Indexes	Norman Hillyer

Contributors to Volume 3

In the following list the author's work is denoted by the Greek words or sub-title which follow the title.

Gervais T. D. Angel, M.A., M.Ed., Dean of Studies, Trinity College, Bristol
Show, Proof, Demonstrate, *apodeixis*, *tekmērion*; Slave, Servant, Captive, Prisoner, Freedman, *Libertinos*

Jürgen Baehr, Langlingen über Celle
Priest, High Priest, *hiereus*

Heinrich Baltensweiler, Dr. theol., Professor, Basel
Pure, Clean, *hagnos*

Karl-Heinz Bartels, Dr. theol., Niderbieber
Remember, Remembrance, *mimnēskomai* (part); Song, Hymn, Psalm, *hymnos*, *psalmos*, *ōdē*

Wolfgang Bauder, Cologne
Sin, *paraptōma*; Zeal, *spoudē*

Oswald Becker, Bonn
Recompense, Reward, Gain, Wages, *opsōnion*; Woman, Mother, Virgin, Widow, *parthenos* (part)

Ulrich Becker, Dr. theol., Professor, Hanover
Proclamation, Preach, Kerygma, *angellō* (part)

Otto Betz, Dr. theol., Professor, Tübingen
Word, Tongue, Utterance, *rhēma*

Erich Beyreuther, Dr. theol., Feldkirchen, Munich
Shepherd, *poimēn*; Woman, Mother, Virgin, Widow, *mēter*

Hans Bietenhard, Dr. theol., Professor, Steffisburg
Satan, Beelzebul, Devil, Exorcism, *diabolos* (part)

Otto Böcher, Dr. theol., Dr. phil., Professor, Mainz
Water, Lake, Sea, Well, River, *thalassa*, *pēgē*, *hydōr*; Wilderness, Desert, Lay Waste, Mountain, Plain, *erēmos*

Paul Christoph Böttger, Dr. theol., Rheydt
Recompense, Reward, Gain, Wages, *apodidōmi*, *misthos*

Georg Braumann, Dr. theol., Billerbeck
Strength, Force, Horn, Violence, Power, *bia*, *ischys*, *kratos*

Colin Brown, M.A., B.D., Ph.D., Professor of Systematic Theology, Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, California
Pride, *hyperēphanos* (part); Proclamation, Preach, Kerygma, *The Structure and Content of the Early Kerygma*; Prophet, *prophētēs* (part); Punishment, Vengeance, *dikē* (part), *kolasis*; Quench, *sbennymi* (part); Reconciliation, Restoration, Propitiation, Atonement, *hilaskomai* (part), *katallassō* (part); Redemption, Loose, Ransom, Deliverance, Release, Salvation, Saviour, *lyō* (part), *lytron* (part), *rhyomai* (part), *sōzō* (part), *sōtēr* (part); Remain, *menō* (part), *adialeiptos*; Remember, Remembrance, *mimnēskomai* (part); Rest, *anapausis* (part); Resurrection, *anastasis* (part), *The Resurrection in Contemporary Theology*; Revelation, *epiphaneia* (part), *chrēmatizō*, *Revelation in Contemporary Theology*; Revile, Blaspheme, Slander, *blasphēmeō* (part); Righteousness, Justification, *dikaiosynē* (part); Rock, Stone, Corner-stone, Pearl, Precious Stones, *petra* (part), *lithos* (part); Rule, Standard, Measure, *kanōn*, *metron*; Sacrifice, First Fruits, Altar, Offering, *aparchē* (part), *thyō* (part); Satan, Beelzebul, Devil, Exorcism, *diabolos* (part); Scripture, Writing, *graphē* (part); Secret, Mystery, *The Messianic Secret*; Seed, Plant, Grass, Flower, Harvest, *sperma* (part); Separate, Divide, *chōrizō* (part); Show, Proof, Demonstrate, *deiknymi*; Smell, *osmē* (part); Snatch, Take Away, Rapture, *harpazō* (part); Soul, *psychē* (part); Spirit, Holy Spirit, *pneuma* (part); Tax, Tax Collector, *statēr*; Temple, *to hieron*; Tempt, Test, Approve, *peirasmos* (part); Tent, Tabernacle, *skēnē* (part); Vine, Wine, *ampelos*; War, Soldier, Weapon, *polemos* (part); Wilderness, Desert, Lay Waste, Mountain, Plain, *oros*, *hypsēlos* (part), *Sina*; Wisdom, Folly, Philosophy, *sophia* (part); Woman, Mother, Virgin, Widow, *gynē* (part), *parthenos* (part); Word, Tongue, Utterance, *logos* (part); Yoke, *zygos* (part)

Lothar Coenen, Dr. theol., Wuppertal
Proclamation, Preach, Kerygma, *kērysso*; Resurrection, *anastasis* (part), *egeirō*; Witness, Testimony, *martyria* (part)

Karl Dahn, Dozent, Frankfurt am Main
See, Vision, Eye, *horaō*

Bruce A. Demarest, M.A., Ph.D., Associate Professor, Conservative Baptist Theological Seminary, Denver, Colorado
Seed, Plant, Grass, Flower, Harvest, *sperma* (part), *therismos*

James D. G. Dunn, M.A., B.D., Ph.D., Lecturer in New Testament, University of Nottingham
Spirit, Holy Spirit, *pneuma* (part)

Günther Ebel, Speyer
Walk, Run, Way, Conduct, *anastrephō*, *hodos*, *peripateo*, *poreuomai*

Johannes Eichler, Frankfurt am Main
Think, Mean, Consider, Reckon, *logizomai*

Henry Leopold Ellison, B.A., B.D., Dawlish, Devon
Rabbi, *rhabbi*

E. Margaret Embry, B.A., B.D., Lecturer, Trinity College, Bristol
Tree, Plant, Root, Branch, *dendron*

Hans-Helmut Esser, Dr. theol., Professor, Horstmar bei Münster
Thank, Praise, Eucharist, *eucharistia*

Ulrich Falkenroth, Dr. theol., Braunschweig
Punishment, Vengeance, *dikē* (part)

Günter Finkenrath, Burscheid-Hilgen
Secret, Mystery, *mystērion*

Otto Flender, Villigst
Smell, *osmē* (part)

Richard Thomas France, M.A., B.D., Ph.D., Warden of Tyndale House, Cambridge
Sit, *kathēmi*

Gerhard Fries, Director of Studies, Duisburg
Word, Tongue, Utterance, *logos* (part)

Dieter Fürst, Director of Studies and Student Pastor, Bayreuth
Teach, Instruct, Tradition, Education, Discipline, *paideuo*; Think, Mean, Consider, Reckon, *dialogizomai*

Burkhard Gärtner, Hamburg
Revelation, *epiphaneia* (part); Seek, Find, *heurisko*; Simplicity, Sincerity, Uprightness, *haplotēs*; Suffer, *paschō*

Jürgen Goetzmann, Essen
Reason, Mind, Understanding, *synesis*; Wisdom, Folly, Philosophy, *mōria*, *sophia* (part)

Rudolf Grob, Obermeilen, Zürich
Touch, *haptō*

Walther Günther, Dr. theol., Stuttgart
Remnant, Leave, *leimma* (part); Sin, *adikia*, *hamartia*, *parabasis*

Eberhard Güting, Dr. theol., Cappel bei Marburg
Pride, *hybris*, *hyperēphanos* (part)

Joachim Guhrt, Bentheim
Rule, Standard, Measure, *kanōn* (part); Time, *aion*

Klaus Haacker, Dr. theol., Professor, Kirchliche Hochschule, Wuppertal
Samaritan, Samaria, *Samaritēs*

Hermann Haarbeck, Schwelm
Tempt, Test, Approve, *dokimos*; Word, Tongue, Utterance, *glossa*

Donald A. Hagner, B.A., B.D., Th.M., Ph.D., Associate Professor, Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, California
Sun, Moon, Stars, *hēlios*, *selēnē*, *astēr*

Hans-Christoph Hahn, Bad Boll
Shadow, *skia*; Time, *kairos*, *chronos*, *hōra*; Work, Do, Accomplish, *ergazomai*, *prassō*; Zeal, *zēlos*

Günther Harder, Dr. theol., Dr. jur., Professor, Berlin
Reason, Mind, Understanding, *nous*; Soul, *psychē* (part)

Murray J. Harris, M.A., B.D., Ph.D., Professor of New Testament, Bible College of New Zealand, Henderson, Auckland
Quiet, Rest, Silence, Sound, Voice, Noise, *hēsychia, ēchos, phōnē*; Separate, Divide, *chōrizō* (part), *schizō*; Tax, Tax Collector, *logeia*; Tent, Tabernacle, *skēnē* (part); Trumpet, *salpinx*; Turn Away, *apotrepō*; Appendix: Prepositions and Theology in the Greek New Testament

Roland K. Harrison, B.D., M.Th., Ph.D., D.D., Professor of Old Testament, Wycliffe College, Toronto
Quench, *sbennymi* (part), *asbestos*; Torment, *ōdinō, talaipōreō*; Water, Lake, Sea, Well, River, *kataklysmos, Iordanēs, limnē*; Weakness, Sickness, Disease, Paralysis, *malakia, paralytikos*

Gerald F. Hawthorne, A.B., A.M., Ph.D., Professor of Greek, Wheaton College, Illinois
Tithe, *dekatē*

Robert Hensel, Dr. theol., Dekan, Bad Bergzabern
Rest, *anapausis* (part)

Klaus Hess, Nuremberg
Serve, Deacon, Worship, *diakoneō, latreuō, leitourgeō*

Norman Hillyer, B.D., S.Th., formerly Librarian, Tyndale House, Cambridge
Rob, Steal, *lēstēs, sylaō, apostereō, andrapodistēs, spēlaion*; Rock, Stone, Corner-stone, Pearl, Precious Stones, *margaritēs, Precious Stones in the Apocalypse*; Sadducees, Herodians, *Hērōdianoi*; Salt, *halas*; Scribe, *grammateus*; Shake, *seiō, saleuō, ektinassō*; Son, Son of God, Son of Man, Servant of God, Son of David, *The Genealogies of Jesus Christ*; Tax, Tax Collector, *telōnion*; Tribe, *phylē*; Wall, Hedge, Palisade, *teichos, phragmos, charax*; Woe, *ouai*

Ernst Hoffmann, Vevey, Switzerland
Promise, *epangelia*

Eberhard Kamlah, Dr. theol., Professor, Mainz
Spirit, Holy Spirit, *pneuma* (part)

Bertold Klappert, Dr. theol., Göttingen
Word, Tongue, Utterance, *logos* (part)

Rolf Klöber, Bayreuth
Right, Worthy, *orthos*

Hartmut Krienke, Wuppertal
Remnant, Leave, *leimma* (part)

William L. Lane, Th.D., Professor, Department of Philosophy and Religion, Western Kentucky University, Bowling Green, Kentucky
Vessel, Pot, Potter, Mix, *keramion, ostrakinos, pēlos, phyrama*; Want, Lack, Need, *hysteros, chreia*

Myrtle Langley, B.A., B.D., Ph.D., Lecturer, Trinity College, Bristol
War, Soldier, Weapon, *Jesus and Revolution*

Walter L. Liefeld, Th.B., A.M., Ph.D., Chairman and Professor of New Testament, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, Illinois
See, Vision, Eye, *kollourion, anablepō, emblepō, atenizō, theatron*; Transfigure, Transfiguration, Transform, *metamorphoō, metaschēmatizō*; Wilderness, Desert, Lay Waste, Mountain, Plain, *oreinos, topos pedinos, oros, hypsēlos* (part)

Hans-Georg Link, Dr. theol., Cologne
Pure, Clean, *katharos* (part); Reconciliation, Restoration, Propitiation, Atonement, *apokatastasis, hilaskomai* (part); Rock, Stone, Corner-stone, Pearl, Precious Stones, *lithos* (part); Rule, Standard, Measure, *kanon* (part); Sacrifice, First Fruits, Altar, Offering, *aparchē* (part); Seek, Find, *zēteō*; Shame, Respect, *aidōs* (part), *aischynē*; Slave, Servant, Captive, Prisoner, Freedman, *aichmalōtos* (part), *desmios*; Strength, Force, Horn, Violence, Power, *keras* (part); Swear, Oath, *omnyō*; Take, Receive,

dechomai; Virtue, Blameless, *aretē* (part); Weakness, Sickness, Disease, Paralysis, *astheneia*, *nosos*; Yoke, *zygos* (part)

Donald H. Madvig, A.B., B.D., Th.M., M.A., Ph.D., Professor of Biblical Literature, Bethel Theological Seminary, St. Paul, Minnesota
Temple, *to esōteron*, *to katapetasma*, *to mesotoichon*, *stylos*, *gazophylakion*, *neōkoros*, *pterygion*

I. Howard Marshall, M.A., B.D., Ph.D., Reader in New Testament Exegesis, University of Aberdeen
Son, Son of God, Son of Man, Servant of God, Son of David, *pais theou* (part), *ho hyios tou anthrōpou* (part), *hyios tou theou* (part), *hyios Dauid* (part)

Ralph P. Martin, M.A., Ph.D., Professor of New Testament, Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, California
Virtue, Blameless, *Haustafeln*

Reinhold Mayer, Dr. theol., Wiss. Rat, Tübingen
Scripture, Writing, *graphē* (part)

Wichmann von Meding, Winsen/Aller
Suffice, Satisfy, *hikanos*; Temple, *naos*

Otto Michel, Dr. theol., formerly Professor of New Testament, Tübingen
Son, Son of God, Son of Man, Servant of God, Son of David, *pais theou* (part), *ho hyios tou anthrōpou* (part), *hyios tou theou* (part), *hyios Dauid* (part)

Leon L. Morris, B.Sc., Th.L., B.D., M.Th., Ph.D., Principal of Ridley College, Melbourne
Weather, *astrapē*

Dietrich Müller, Marburg
Proclamation, Preach, Kerygma, *angellō* (part); Think, Mean, Consider, Reckon, *dokeō*; Will, Purpose, *boulomai*, *thelō*

Heinrich Müller, Dr. theol., Bleicherode
Type, Pattern, *typos*

Hermann Müller, Dr. phil., Hilchenbach
Stir Up, Trouble, Agitate, *tarassō*

Wilhelm Mundle, Lic. theol., Professor, Marburg
Redemption, Loose, Ransom, Deliverance, Release, Salvation, Saviour, *lyō* (part), *lytron* (part), Revelation, *apokalyptō*, *dēloō*; Revile, Blaspheme, Slander, *katalaleō*; Rock, Stone, Corner-stone, Pearl, Precious Stones, *petra* (part), *gōnia*; Torment, *basanos*, *kolaphizō*

Karlfried Munzer, Gauting
Remain, *menō* (part)

David F. Payne, M.A., Head of the Department of Semitic Studies, The Queen's University of Belfast
Solomon, *Solomōn*

Carl Heinz Peisker, Dr. theol., Mühlheim, Ruhr
Prophet, *prophētēs* (part)

Karl Heinrich Ringwald, Tübingen
Virtue, Blameless, *aretē* (part)

Johannes Schattenmann, D. theol., Ottobrun
Pure, Clean, *katharos* (part); Strength, Force, Horn, Violence, Power, *keras* (part)

Reinier Schippers, Dr. theol., Professor, Free University of Amsterdam
Right, Worthy, *artios*; Seal, *sphragis*

Ernst Dieter Schmitz, Wuppertal
Unanimity, *homothymadon*

Johannes Schneider, D. theol., Dr. theol., Professor, Berlin
Redemption, Loose, Ransom, Deliverance, Release, Salvation, Saviour, *rhyomai* (part), *sōzō* (part), *sōtēr* (part)

Walter Schneider, Hanover
Tempt, Test, Approve, *peirasmos* (part)
Helmut Schultz, Marburg
Thank, Praise, Eucharist, *aineō*
J. Julius Scott, Jr., B.A., B.D., Ph.D., Professor of New Testament, Wheaton Graduate School, Wheaton, Illinois
Sadducees, Herodians, *Saddoukaioi*
Horst Seebass, Dr. theol., Professor, Münster
Righteousness, Justification, *dikaiosynē* (part)
Manfred Seitz, Dr. theol., Professor, Heidelberg
Seek, Find, *eraunaō*
Friedel Selter, Rheinkamp-Repelen
Ready, Prepare, Gird, *zōnnymi*
Burghard Siede, Coburg
Recompense, Reward, Gain, Wages, *kerdos*; Suffice, Satisfy, *arkeo*; Take, Receive, *lambanō*
Siegfried Solle, Darmstadt
Ready, Prepare, Gird, *hetoimos*; Woman, Mother, Virgin, Widow, *chēra*
Wilfred Stott, B.A., B.D., B.Litt., D.Phil., formerly Principal of St. Paul's Theological College, Limuru, Kenya
Sabbath, Lord's Day, *sabbaton*, *kyriakē*
Friedrich Thiele, Dr. theol., Kassel
Ready, Prepare, Gird, *kataskeuazō*; Sacrifice, First Fruits, Offering, *thyō* (part); Work, Do, Accomplish, *poieō*
Anthony C. Thiselton, B.D., M.Th., Ph.D., Lecturer in Biblical Studies, University of Sheffield
Truth, *alētheia*; Word, Tongue, Utterance, *Language and Meaning in Religion*
Erich Tiedtke, Frankfurt am Main
Right, Worthy, *axios*; Rock, Stone, Corner-stone, Pearl, Precious Stones, *lithos* (part); Shame, Respect, *aidōs* (part); Snatch, Take Away, Rapture, *harpazō* (part)
Allison A. Trites, M.A., Ph.D., Acadia Divinity College, Acadia University, Wolfville, Nova Scotia
Witness, Testimony, *martyria* (part)
Rudolf Tuente, Bremerhaven
Slave, Servant, Captive, Prisoner, Freedman, *aichmalotos* (part), *doulos*
Herwart Vorländer, Dr. phil., Professor, Ludwigsburg
Reconciliation, Restoration, Propitiation, Atonement, *katallasso* (part); Woman, Mother, Virgin, Widow, *gynē* (part)
Hans Währisch, Rheydt
Revile, Blaspheme, Slander, *blasphēmeō* (part), *loidoreo*; Virtue, Blameless, *anenklētos*
John D. W. Watts, B.A., Th.M., Ph.D., Associate Professor of Old Testament, Fuller Theological Seminary
War, Soldier, Weapon, *polemos* (part)
Klaus Wegenast, Dr. theol., Professor, Lüneburg
Teach, Instruct, Tradition, Education, Discipline, *didasko*, *didaskalos*, *didaskalia*, *katēcheō*, *paradidōmi*
Horst Weigelt, Dr. theol., Professor, Erlangen
Wisdom, Folly, Philosophy, *philosophia*
J. Stafford Wright, M.A., formerly Principal of Tyndale Hall, Bristol
Satan, Beelzebul, Devil, Exorcism, *exhorkistes*; Son, Son of God, Son of Man, Servant of God, Son of David, *The Virgin Birth*

Pri

Pride

ὕβρις

ὕβρις (*hybris*), insolence, arrogance, insult, ill-treatment; ὑβρίζω (*hybrizō*), act arrogantly, ill-treat; ὑβριστής (*hybristēs*), violent, insolent man; ἐνυβρίζω (*enhybrizō*), despise, insult.

CL & OT *hybris* is a very ancient compound (E. Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik*, I, 1953², 495), formed from *y* (Cypriot, Rhodian equivalent of *epi*) and *bri* (cf. *briaros*, weighty; *brithō*, weigh, be heavy). Originally it meant excess weight, excess power; sometimes more concretely, ill-treatment, abuse, insult; sometimes more abstractly, arrogance, insolence, brutality. The word is frequently used in the *Odyssey*, to denote Penelope's suitors (e.g. 1, 227; 24, 352). *hybris* appears objectively as an infringement of the order of justice established by Zeus, which enabled community-life in the Greek polis to be maintained. It is the opposite of *eunomia*, good order, to the observance of which the gods pay close attention (as early as Homer, *Od.* 17, 487) and of *noos theoudēs*, the attitude that fears the gods. Classical tragedy contrasted *hybris* to *sōphrosynē*, modesty, which respects the limits laid down for men. Therefore *hybris* is not, strictly speaking, directed against the gods (J. J. Fraenkel, *Hybris*, 1942, 73). What the malefactor harms is good order. In the 5th century B.C. *hybris* became the classical expression of "numinous fear, i.e., of the Greek sense of sin from the religious standpoint" (G. Bertram, *TDNT* VIII 297; cf. Soph., *Trach.* 280; *OT.* 873). But in Euripides human norms replace those set by fate (*Heraclidae* 388; *Or.* 708).

There are many derivatives as early as the language of Homer; *hybrizō*, to act arrogantly, ill-treat, insult (after Homer: of animals, to be uncontrollable; of plants, to grow luxuriantly; as a legal term to inflict bodily harm); *ephybrizō*, insult; *hybristēs*, violent, dissolute, insolent man (after Homer: of animals, uncontrollable, restive; also of things, e.g. new wine). Of the numerous more recent formations the adj. *hybristikos* is important: arrogant, wanton, insolent (Plato onwards).

The OT material is dealt with under → *hyperēphanos*.

NT 1. It is remarkable that, in contrast with the OT, the abstract use of *hybris* in the sense of pride is completely absent from the NT. In 2 Cor. 12:10, where it is used alongside *diōgmos*, persecution, the word clearly means ill-treatment. The same is true of 1 Tim. 1:13, where Paul describes himself as one who formerly was a blasphemer, persecutor and a violent, insolent man (*blasphēmon kai diōktēn kai hybristēn*). In Acts 27:10, 21 it refers to hardship, damage and disaster caused by the elements (cf. Pindar, *Pyth*, 1, 140; Josephus, *Ant.* 3, 133; Arndt, 839). Similarly the vb. *hybrizō* regularly has the meaning of ill-treat: 1 Thess. 2:2 and Acts 14:5 of

the persecution of Paul and his companions; in the parable of Matt. 22:6 of the death of the servant; in the prediction of suffering in Lk. 18:32 of the passion. In Mk. 11:45 it means to insult.

2. The noun formed from this vb., *hybristēs*, violent, insolent man, occurs twice (Rom. 1:30; 1 Tim. 1:13). According to O. Michel on Rom. 1:30 a *hybristēs* was "originally a man who paid no attention to the wrath of God and committed an offence against the property or the honour of God (1 Tim. 1:13)" (*Der Brief an die Römer*, *KEK* 4, 1967[13], 61 f.). But the words which occur in the context suggest in the first instance evil conduct in the world and inter-personal relationships, rather than open enmity towards God. The catalogue of vices listed in Rom. 1:29 f. is adduced by Paul as itself the outcome of idolatry and as a judgment by God (cf. 1:28). Thus RSV translates *hybristas* here as "insolent". Similarly, *theostygeis*, which is a pass. form, is best translated as "hated by God", bearing the same sense that it has in cl. Gk., although it can have an act. meaning ("haters of God"). It would be preferable, therefore, to interpret 1 Tim. 1:13 also in the light of the use of the vb. *hybrizō*; although *hybristēs* comes most near in meaning to *hyperēphanos*, one can scarcely trace the idea of pride in it.

3. The compound *enhybrizō*, to insult, outrage (with "the Spirit of grace" as its object) occurs in Heb. 10:29, in parallel with *katapateō*, to trample underfoot, to treat outrageously ("the Son of God"; suggesting arrogant outrage; cf. LXX Dan. 8:10; and possibly Jerusalem in Zech. 12:3 LXX) and *koinon hēgeisthai*, to treat as profane ("the blood of the covenant by which he was sanctified"). In the use of the word the distinction made in OT and rab. Judaism between deliberate and involuntary sin (v. 26) is taken up and expounded (Heb. *hēzîḏ*, to act arrogantly, maliciously). Religious apostasy was regarded as an unforgivable sin at Qumran (1QS 2:13 f.; 3:4; cf. F. F. Bruce, " 'To the Hebrews' or 'To the Essenes'?", *NTS* 9, 1962–63, 224 ff.; *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, *NLC*, 1964, 256–64). In dealing with unforgivable → sin the present passage makes explicit allusion to Isa. 26:11; Deut. 17:2–6; 32:35 f.; and Exod. 24:8, arguing *a fortiori* from instances of judgment in the OT. *E. Güting*

ὑπερήφανος *ὑπερήφανος* (*hyperēphanos*), proud; *ὑπερηφανία* (*hyperēphania*), pride; *ἀλαζών* (*alazōn*), boastful; *ἀλαζονεία* (*alazoneia*), boastfulness.

CL 1. The part. *hyperēphaneontes* is the oldest attestation of the word group (Homer *Il.* 11, 694). Its etymology is not clear; it is perhaps connected with *katēphēs*, cast down. Along with *hyperēnoreōn* it means proud. Other intrans. verbal forms used in the same sense occur in the LXX and later. From Polybius onwards the vb. is also used transitively: to treat arrogantly, despise. The adj. *hyperēphanos* (Hesiod onwards) usually means arrogant, proud; occasionally, prodigal. It also has a positive use (e.g. in Plato): magnificent. The writers of the classical period also used the noun *hyperēphania* in the sense of pride, arrogance, contempt.

2. The *alazōn*, the wandering charlatan or braggart, was a favourite comedy character (Cratinus, Eupolis, Aristophanes, Alkaios, Menander). The wandering sophist was also scornfully nicknamed *alazōn*. The word (occurring as an adj. from Herodotus) is derived either from the Thracian folk-name *Alazōn* (Bonfante,

Frisk) or from *alaomai*, to wander (Boisacq, Hofmann). Its later meaning is generally braggart, show-off; and that of the corresponding abstract noun *alàzoneia* boastfulness, imposture. Similarly, likewise the vb. *alazoneuomai* (Aristophanes onwards) means to make false representations, to brag.

OT In the OT a central theme of the prophetic message (e.g. Isa. 13:11), and also of the Wisdom literature, is that God's judgment destroys all man's pride. Along with the four words mentioned above, many others occur which are not taken up by the NT (e.g. *agerōchia*, arrogance, *meteōros*, haughty, and especially those formed with *megal-* and *hyps-*, *hypsēlo-*). *hybris*, in particular, occurs frequently in senses not attested in the NT: pride, arrogance, and also insult, mockery (and, as in the NT, ill-treatment). Although the number of Heb. equivalents for which these words stand is large, more than half the occurrences stand for derivatives of the root, *gā'âh*, be exalted.

hybris stands for formations from *gā'âh*, be high, arrogant, at Lev. 26:19; Job 35:12; 37:4; Prov. 8:13; 14:3; 16:18 f.; 29:23; Hos. 5:5; 7:10; Amos 6:8; Nah. 2:2(3); Zeph. 2:10; 3:11; Zech. 9:6; 10:11; Isa. 9:9(8); 13:11; 16:6; 23:9; 25:11; 28:1, 3; Jer. 13:9; 48(31):29; Ezek. 30:6, 18; 32:12; 33:28. It also stands for *ġēwâh*, arrogant speech at Jer. 13:17; for *zāḏôn*, insolence, presumptuousness at Prov. 11:2; 13:10; Jer. 50(27):32; Ezek. 7:10; for *lāṣôn*, boasting prattle, at Prov. 1:22; for *'allîz*, wanton, presumptuous, at Isa. 23:7; and *rûm*, haughtiness, at Isa 2:17. It is without Heb. equivalent at Est. 4:17; Job 15:26 f.; 22:12; Prov. 14:10; 19:10, 18; 21:4; Wis. 2:19; 4:18; Sir. 10:6, 8; 21:4; Mic. 6:10; Isa. 10:33; Jer. 13:9; 1 Macc. 3:20; 2 Macc. 8:17; 3 Macc. 2:3, 21; 3:25; 6:12. *hybrizō* stands for formations from *gā'âh* at Isa. 13:3; Jer. 48(31):29; for *'ālaz*, exult, at Isa. 23:12; for *qālal* in hiph., treat with contempt, at 2 Sam. 19:44(43); and is without Heb. equivalent at 2 Macc. 14:42; 3 Macc. 6:9. *hybristēs* stands for *gē'* (Isa. 16:6) and *gē'eh* (Job 40:11[6]; Prov. 15:25; 16:19; Isa. 2:12), both words meaning haughty; for *rûm* at Prov. 6:17; and is without equivalent at Prov. 27:13; Jer. 51(28):2.

hyperēphania(-eia) stands mainly for formations from *gā'âh*, be high, arrogant: Pss. 17(16):10; 31(30):18, 23; 36(35):11; 59(58):12; 73(72):6; Prov. 8:13; Amos 8:7; Isa. 16:6; Jer. 48(31):29; Ezek. 7:20; 16:49, 56; Dan. 4:34 (Theodotion). It also stands for *beṣa'*, profit, at Exod. 18:21; *zāḏôn*, insolence, at Deut. 17:12; 1 Sam. 17:28; Obad. 1:3; for *rûm* at Num. 15:30; and is without equivalent at Est. 4:17; 8:13; Pss. 74(73):3; 101(100):7; Wis. 5:8; Sir. 10:7, 12 f., 18; 15:8; 16:8; 22:22; 48:18; 51:10; Dan. 4:19; 1 Macc. 1:21, 24; 2:47, 49; 2 Macc. 1:28; 5:21; 7:36; 9:7 f., 11; 3 Macc. 2:5, 17. The vb. *hyperēphaneuomai* stands for *gā'âh* at Ps. 10:2 (9:23); Job 22:29; and *zûḏ*, act presumptuously, at Neh. 9:16; Dan. 5:20 Theodotion; and for *gā'âh* again at Sir. 10:9. *hyperēphanos* stands for *zēḏ*, insolent, presumptuous, at Ps. 119(118):21, 51, 69, 78, 122; *gē'eh* or *ga'ªyôn*, haughty, arrogant, Job 40:12(7): Pss. 94(93):2; 123(122):4; 140(139):5; *gāḇōah*, that which is high, exalted, Ps. 101(100):5; *lûṣ*, deride, scoff, scorn, Prov. 3:34; Isa. 29:20; *'ārîṣ*, master, Isa. 13:11; *rahaḇ*, insolence, Ps. 89:11(88:10); and *rûm*, Job 38:15; Ps. 18(17):27; Isa. 2:12. It is without Heb. equivalent at Wis. 14:6; Sir. 3:28; 11:30; 13:20; 21:4; 23:8; 25:2; 27:15, 28; 32(35):12; 51:10; Zeph. 3:6; Isa. 1:25; 2 Macc. 9:12; 3 Macc. 1:27; 5:13; 6:4; 4 Macc. 4:15; 9:30.

The adv. *hyperēphanōs* (1 Macc. 8:34, 47; 2 Macc. 9:4, 12) has no Heb. equivalent.

alazoneia has no Heb. equivalent (Wis. 5:8; 17:7; 2 Macc. 9:8; 15:6; 4 Macc. 1:26; 2:15; 8:19). *alazoneuomai* stands for *hāḏar*, dignify oneself, at Prov. 25:6; but has no equivalent at Wis. 2:16. *alazōn* stands for *šaḥaṣ*, pride, Job 28:8; *yāhîr*, presumptuous, haughty, Hab. 2:5; the Heb. is uncertain at Prov. 21:24.

The fact that *hybris* and *hyperēphaneia* are used virtually as synonyms suggests that the LXX translators saw no fundamental distinction between them.

In the Wisdom literature the *hyperēphanoi* form a distinct group, contrasted with the righteous and the humble (→ Righteousness; → Humility) within but also outside Israel. *hyperēphanos* is never used of Israel. Behind this lies the fundamental conviction that "God resists the proud, but gives grace to the humble" (Prov. 3:34 LXX). Just as the → fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom, departure from the Lord is the beginning of pride (Sir. 10:12). Therefore, the one who prays cleanses himself from the suspicion of pride (Est. 4:17 LXX) and indicates his own lowliness in expectation of God's help (Jud. 6:19). The prophetic message, on the other hand, accuses Israel himself of pride (e.g. Amos 6:8; 8:7; Hos. 5:5; 7:10; Jer. 13:9; Ezek. 7:10, 20; 16:56; Zeph. 2:10; cf. Lev. 26:19) and thus takes up a position in the sharpest opposition to deeply ingrained conceptions. There is no negative implication in the use of *alazōn* in Job 28:8; *hyperēphanos* in Est. 4:17; and *hybris* in Job 37:4.

NT 1. *hyperēphania* occurs only in Mk. 7:22 and *hyperēphanos* in Lk. 1:51; Rom. 1:30; 2 Tim. 3:2; Jas. 4:6 (quoting Prov. 3:34); 1 Pet. 5:5 (also quoting Prov. 3:34).

The context of Lk. 1:51 is poetic. It occurs in the Magnificat (Lk. 1:46–55): "He has shown strength with his arm, he has scattered the proud [*hyperēphanous*] in the imagination of their hearts." The verse appears to echo Ps. 89:10: "Thou didst crush Rahab like a carcass, thou didst scatter thy enemies with thy mighty arm" (where the LXX has *hyperēphanon* [88:11]). The Magnificat takes its name from the Lat. vb. with which this psalm opens which in EVV is translated by "magnifies". E. E. Ellis comments: "A lyrical poem modelled upon Old Testament (and Qumran?) psalms, it has special affinity with the Song of Hannah (1 Sam. 2.1–10; cf. Lk. 1.38; P. Winter, *BJRL*, 37, 1954, 328–47). It expresses Mary's joyous gratitude for her personal blessing (46–48), God's graciousness to all who reverence him (49–50), his special love for the lowly (51–53) and for Israel (54 f.). The last half of the poem describes God's victory in terms of a national deliverance from human oppression. This is a recurrent note in pre-Christian messianism. The New Testament writers do not deny it, but they redefine it and transfer it to Messiah's *parousia*" (*The Gospel of Luke*, *New Century Bible*, 1966, 72). On the psalm see further R. Laurentin, *Structure et Théologie de Luc I–II*, 1964[4].

The remaining instances occur mainly in contexts which have a paraenetic function. They are strung together in so-called catalogues of vices which were used in early Christian catechesis. The sole instance of *hyperēphania* occurs in the things which Jesus declares to come from the → heart which must be dealt with at that level and cannot be cured by mere external ablutions: "For from within, out of the heart of man, come evil thoughts, fornication, theft, murder, adultery, coveting,

wickedness, deceit, licentiousness, envy, slander, pride, foolishness. All these evil things come from within, and they defile a man" (Mk. 7:21 ff.). H. Anderson is representative of a cross-section of form-critical approach when he writes: "The list is without parallel in the teaching of Jesus. Similar catalogues occur in the *Manual of Discipline* from Qumran (1QS 4:9–11) and in Rom. 1:29–31; Gal. 5:19–23 (cf. 1 Tim. 1:9–10; 2 Tim. 3:2–5); they betray the influence of Hellenism and are characteristic of the Hellenistic world generally" (*The Gospel of Mark*, *New Century Bible*, 1976, 188). On the other hand, the concept of Hellenism as distinct from Palestinian Judaism is not as clear cut as was widely believed until recently. Whilst lists of virtues and vices were popular among the Stoics, they are also found in intertestamental literature (cf. Wis. 14:25 f.; Gr.Bar. 4:17; 8:5; 13:4; Test.Reub. 3:3–6; Test.Jud. 16:1; Sl.Enoch. 10:4 f.). And the existence of a parallel from Qumran confirms that such a list was not entirely foreign to Jewish soil. It is possible that Jesus himself was making use of an existing Jewish catechetical list in his debate with the → Pharisees over washing in order to show that merely external ritual cannot deal with man's deepest problems (→ Baptism; → Hand). Christian catechesis continued the tradition of OT → wisdom, stringing together almost proverbial sayings which were otherwise loosely connected. (For further lists see Rom. 1:29 ff.; 13:13; 1 Cor. 5:10 f.; 6:9 f.; 2 Cor. 12:20; Gal. 5:19 ff.; Eph. 4:31; 5:3 ff.; Col. 3:5, 8; 1 Tim. 1:9 f.; 2 Tim. 3:2–5; Tit. 3:3; 1 Pet. 4:3.) Prov. 3:34 is cited twice in paraenetical passages in the NT exhorting → humility: "But he gives more grace; therefore it says, 'God opposes the proud [*hyperēphanois*], but gives grace to the humble' " (Jas. 4:6); "Likewise you that are younger be subject to the elders. Clothe yourselves, all of you, with humility toward one another, for 'God opposes the proud, but gives grace to the humble' " (1 Pet. 5:5; cf. Num. 15:30 LXX). The former passage is concerned with worldliness; the latter with relationships within the church in the wider context of living in the end times.

In Rom. 1:30 the word occurs in a catalogue of the vices which Paul sees as the outcome of idolatry which is itself an expression of God's judgment. "They were filled with all manner of wickedness, evil, covetousness, malice. Full of envy, murder, strife, deceit, malignity, they are gossips, slanderers, haters of God, insolent [*hybristas*], haughty [*hyperēphanous*], boastful [*alazonas*], inventors of evil, disobedient to parents, foolish, faithless, heartless, ruthless" (Rom. 1:29 ff.; → *hybris*, NT 2). In 2 Tim. 3:2 it occurs in a list describing the characteristics of godless men in the last days: "For men will be lovers of self, lovers of money, proud [*alazones*], arrogant [*hyperēphanoi*], abusive, disobedient to their parents, ungrateful, unholy." Timothy is urged to "Avoid such people" (2 Tim. 3:5).

2. Jas. 4:16 takes up the thought of Jas. 4:6 (noted above): "As it is, you boast in your arrogance [*en tais alazoneiais hymōn*]. All such boasting is evil." The plur. here may suggest the numerous instances of confidence in one's cleverness, luck, strength, or skill which may have brought material advantage (cf. J. B. Mayor, *The Epistle of St. James*, 1897², 75, 147). The context deals with laying plans for material gain without regard to God. Jas. counters this with a twofold remedy: "Instead you ought to say, 'If the Lord wills, we shall live and we shall do this or that'. . . . Whoever knows what is right to do and fails to do it, for him it is sin" (Jas. 4:15, 17). The only other instance of the abstract noun is in 1 Jn. 2:16: "For

all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh and the lust of the eyes [*hē epithymia tēs sarkos kai hē epithymia tōn opthalmōn*] and the pride of life [*hē alazoneia tou biou*], is not of the Father but is of the world." The contrast with → desire of the flesh and of the eyes suggests that "the pride of life" means lust for advantage and status. The threefold use of terms is not so much a classification of kinds of evil that stem from the world, i.e. fallen humanity. It aims, rather, to lay bare the world's characteristically self-centred, grasping structure, which can only be overcome by love: "Do not love the world or the things of the world. If any one loves the world, love for the Father is not in him" (1 Jn. 2:15).

The noun *alazōn* occurs twice. It occurs in the catalogues in Rom. 1:30 and 2 Tim. 3:2, both of which passages include *hyperēphanos* (see above, 1). "*alazōn* denotes the man who tries to impress others by making big claims. It was used of the braggart, the charlatan, the quack, the impostor. The word is probably used here with the graver end of its range of meaning in mind. We may think of the 'frantic boast and foolish word' of the heathen heart, the sort of thing which is reflected in Isa. 10.7–11, in fact all the presumptuous claims and ostentatious behaviour of men by which they seek to impress one another, and very often delude themselves" (C. E. B. Cranfield, *The Epistle to the Romans*, I, *ICC*, 1975, 132).

→ Boast, → Height, → Humility, → Virtue *E. Güting, C. Brown*

(a). K. Barth, *CD*, IV, 1, 413–78; G. Bertram, *hybris* etc., *TDNT* VIII 295–307; *hyperēphanos* etc. *TDNT* VIII 525–29; W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology*, 1955², 111–46; and "Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Flesh and Spirit", in K. Stendahl, ed., *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, 1957, 157–82 (reprinted in *Christian Origins and Judaism*, 1962, 145–78); E. R. Dodds, *The Greeks and the Irrational*, II, 1951, 28–63; B. S. Easton, "New Testament Ethical Lists", *JBL* 51, 1932, 1–12; D. Grene, *Man in his Pride: A Study in the Political Philosophy of Thucydides and Plato*, 1950; S. Ranulf, *The Jealousy of the Gods and Criminal Law at Athens*, I–II, 1934; H. G. Robertson, "*Dikē* and *Hybris* in Aeschylus' Suppliants", *Classical Review* 50, 1936, 104–9; O. J. F. Seitz, "Lists, Ethical", *IDB* III 137 ff.; P. Tillich, *Systematic Theology*, II, 1957, 56–59; J. A. Wharton, "Pride", *IDB* III 876.
(b). G. Bertram, "Hochmut und verwandte Begriffe im griechischen und hebräischen Alten Testament", *Welt des Orients* 3, 1964, 29–38; J. J. Fraenkel, *Hybris*, 1942; E. Kamlah, *Die Form der katalogischen Paränese im Neuen Testament*, 1964; M.-J. Lagrange, "Le Catalogue de Vices dans l'Épître aux Romains, 1.28–31", *RB* 8, 1911, 534–49; A. Vögtle, *Die Tugend- und Lasterkataloge im Neuen Testament*, 1936; F. R. Walton, "Hybris", *RGG*³ III 497 f.; S. Wibbing, *Die Tugend- und Lasterkataloge im Neuen Testament*, *BZNW* 25, 1959.

Priest, High Priest

ἱερεύς

ἱερεύς (*hiereus*), a priest; ἀρχιερεύς (*archiereus*), high priest; ἀρχιερατικός (*archieratikos*), high-priestly; ἱερωσύνη (*hierōsynē*), priestly office, priesthood; ἱερατεία (*hierateia*), priestly office; ἱεράτευμα (*hierateuma*), priesthood; ἱερατεύω (*hierateuō*), hold the office or perform the service of a priest; ἱερουργέω (*hierourgeō*), perform holy service, act as a priest with regard to something.

CL *hiereus*, a priest, and *archiereus*, high priest, like the nouns *hierōsynē*, priesthood, priestly rank, *hierateia*, priestly office, priestly attendance, and *hierateuma*, priesthood, are all formed from the adj. *hieros*, holy. The meaning of the words in the Gk.-speaking world is dealt with under → holy, art. *hieros*, CL.

It may, however, be added that, according to the Stoic Zeno (Stob., *Ecl.* 2, 67,

20) the priest, "versed in the sacrificial ordinances", in chastity and in godliness, must be "within divine nature", i.e. in concord and harmony with → nature here viewed as divine. For the Stoics "the wise man alone" is therefore a priest (cf. Origen, Commentary on Jn. 1:4: Diog. Laert., 8, 119). The wise man is also the just diviner (Stob., *Ecl.* 2, 114, 16).

OT 1. *The Priesthood in Israel.* The LXX uses *hiereus* to trans. Heb. *kōhēn*, priest, cognate with Arab. *kahin*, seer, soothsayer. The view that one takes of the development of the priesthood in the OT depends considerably upon the view that one takes of the dating of the various books and sources behind them. The following reconstruction represents a cross-section of scholarly opinion.

(a) The task of the priest in Israel was originally not sacrificial service, but oracular divination (cf. Jdg. 17:5; 18:5 f.; 1 Sam. 14:36–42) and instruction in the Torah (Deut. 27:9 f.; 31:4 ff.). The head of every family could offer → sacrifice (cf. Gen. 8:20; 31:54). Moses' father-in-law, Jethro the priest of Midian (Exod. 2:18 ff.; 3:1), offered burnt-offerings and sacrifices at Sinai. He held a fellowship-meal with the elders of Israel and advised Moses in the regulations of sacral law (Exod. 18:12 ff.).

(b) The levitical order probably goes back to a priestly clan based on Kadesh with which again Moses was closely related (cf. Arab. *laway*, to give an oracle). However, not every Levite was also a priest (Jdg. 19:1). The formula "the priests, the Levites" (e.g. Deut. 17:8) is first found in the Deuteronomic scheme. The Levites were in a particularly close relationship to Yahweh (Deut. 10:9; Jdg. 17:13), and claimed that they alone were called to the true priesthood (Exod. 32:25 ff.; Deut. 33:8 ff.; against this, polemically, Gen. 49:5 ff.). In point of law they stood close to aliens in possessing no land (Deut. 10:9; Jdg. 17:7; 19:1), but belonged to the tribal system, whose traditions of sacral law they cared for (Deut. 27:14–26; 31:24 ff.; 33:10). They claimed → Moses for themselves, declaring him to be a Levite (Exod. 2:1 f.). It is a different matter with Aaron. In Num. 12:11 f. he appears as an intercessor; in Exod. 17:8 ff. as a rival of Moses when giving the blessing; and in Exod. 32:1 ff. as a priest of the idolatrous calf. If one links this with 1 Ki. 12:28 ff., Aaron was probably the eponymous ancestor of the priesthood at the sanctuary of Bethel in the northern kingdom; they defended their legitimacy against levitical criticism by declaring Aaron a Levite (Exod. 4:13–16). But → further Levite.

(c) In the pre-monarchic period priests are found only in connexion with a sanctuary, e.g. the shrine of the Ephraimite Micah (Jdg. 17); this man's priest was a Levite who was carried off to Dan together with his cultic image (Jdg. 18). The priesthood of Dan is legitimized in Jdg. 18:30 by being traced back to Moses. At the sanctuary of the ark in Shiloh, Eli's family carried out the priestly duties, which consisted of the offering of sacrifices and burnt-offerings and of oracular prophecy (1 Sam. 1:3; 2:27 f.). After the decline of Eli's family at Shiloh members of the family are mentioned at Nob (1 Sam. 21:27; 22:9–23).

(d) The flourishing temple cult of the monarchy gave rise to organized priesthoods (1 Ki. 4:2 ff.; 12:26 ff.), which quickly gained recognition over against the local sanctuaries, since the monarchy and the court-priesthood entered into firm political alliances (2 Ki. 10:11, 19 ff.; 11:1–12). The priestly upper-classes which

were formed in this way were deported by the conquerors of both northern and southern kingdoms (2 Ki. 17:27 f.; 25:18). Josiah's reform (begun *c.* 622–1 B.C.) centralized the Yahweh-cult in the Jerusalem temple and lowered the rank of the priests of the local sanctuaries to that of *clerus minor* (2 Ki. 23:5–9). The levitically-influenced Deuteronomic literature now succeeded in demanding levitical origin for priestly office (cf. Deut. 17:18).

(e) In exilic times priestly law was codified. Since not all Levites could be priests, "priests and Levites" were constructed as two divisions of the tribe of Levi, which now became the priestly tribe pure and simple (Num. 18:1–7). Aaron became *the* "priest", and the priesthood belonged as of right to Aaron's descendants (Exod. 29:29 f.). Finally, according to Ezek. 44:15, the Zadokites put forward their claim to the high priestly offices. They derived their origin from Zadok, the pre-Davidic priest of Jerusalem, who was traced back through the family of Eli at Nob to that of Eli at Shiloh (2 Sam. 8:17; 1 Chr. 24:3).

(f) The post-exilic reconstruction demanded Zadokite origin for the chief priests, Aaronic descent for the ordinary priests and levitical parentage for the temple servants (1 Chr. 24). Since, as well as the sacrificial service, there now came in the care of the law of Yahweh, ordained by Ezra (Neh. 8), a body of experts in the scriptures grew up, which soon overshadowed the priesthood. This is reflected in Aboth 6:6: "Greater is [learning in] the law than priesthood and kingship"; B. Sanh. 59a: "A non-Jew who concerns himself with the Torah is as a high priest" (→ Israel, OT; Scripture).

(g) At the time of Jesus a social gap divided the chief priests from the ordinary priests. The latter formed twenty-four divisions of service in four to nine family-groups (1 Chr. 24; Josephus, *Ant.* 7, 365; cf. Lk. 1:5, 8). The divisions performed their service in the → temple in turn, a week at a time. For the rest of the time the priests carried out a profession in the surrounding land. In addition they could pass expert judgment on questions of ritual purity (Lev. 11–15) and often undertook the reading and exposition of the Torah in the worship of the synagogue. Priestly rank was hereditary. Strict regulations concerning purity and marriage were enforced for them (Lev. 21). The Levites were divided into temple musicians and temple servants (1 Chr. 6:16–33) and similarly formed twenty-four divisions of service. They had no access to the altar (Num. 18:3). According to Jos. 21, they lived in levitical cities.

(h) In the Qumran community the Zadokite priesthood, deprived of its powers by the Hasmonaeans, constituted itself as the priestly salvation-community of the last days (1QS 5:2, 9; 1QSa 1:2, 24; 1QSb 3:22; CD 3:21). Its founder, the "Teacher of Righteousness", was a priest of Zadok's line (4QpPs 37 2:16). Its opponent, the "Wicked Priest" (1QpHab 8:8), is probably to be identified with the high priest Jonathan (152–143 B.C.). The priests took precedence in the community: "Wherever there are ten men of the Council of the Community there shall not lack a priest among them" (1QS 6:3; cf. 2:19 f.; also 1QM, especially 7:10–9:9; 17; and 18). The chief priest of the last days is ranked above the messiah (1QSa 2:11–21; cf. also 1QpHab. 2:8 f.; 9:9 ff.; 1QS 4:11; 1QM 2:1; 7:12; 15:4). The purificatory prescriptions for priests were applied to all members of the community. Both the language and the conceptual world of the community breathe a priestly air throughout.

(i) Philo saw in the priest the symbol of the Logos (*Abr.* 198; *Cher.* 16 f.), and, when psychologizing, equated him with the conscience (*Deus Imm.* 131 ff.) or with the divine power of the soul in the reason of man (*Som.* 1, 215). Stoic influence betrays itself. The Levites are the picture of the true priesthood in renouncing the passions and in turning to the true Logos (*Ebr.* 76; *Fug.* 109). Everyone who no longer walks in the way of sin belongs to the priestly family (*Spec.Leg.* 1, 243).

2. *The High Priest. archiereus* occurs only 5 times in the canonical books of the LXX, but 41 times in the Apocrypha. The LXX translates the MT *hakkōhēn haggāḏôl*, the great priest, or *kōhēn hārō'š*, the chief priest, literally, or by simple *hiereus*.

(a) The post-exilic (life-long) office of high priest, which was traced back to Aaron, was until 172 B.C. in the possession of the Zadokites. Since the nation lacked an independent political head, political powers also devolved upon him. Out of this arose tensions, e.g., between the High Priest Eliashib and Nehemiah (Neh. 13:4–9:28), and tendencies towards Hellenistic customs (2 Macc. 4:12–15). Power struggles for the high-priestly office gave the Seleucid Antiochus IV (Epiphanes) several opportunities from 175 B.C. onwards for filling the position and intervening in the Yahweh cult. It was against this that the Maccabean uprising was directed. The son of the last legitimate high priest went to Egypt in 169 B.C. and founded a temple in Leontopolis which survived until A.D. 73. In Jerusalem the Hasmonean Jonathan (a member of an ordinary priestly family) usurped the high-priestly office in 152 B.C. (1 Macc. 10:20 f.). The Hasmoneans held it against the protests of the Pharisees until 37 B.C. Then Herod and, following him, the Romans arbitrarily installed and deposed twenty-eight high priests (of which twenty-five came from non-legitimate families) up till A.D. 67. Powerful families (Boethus, Hannas, Phabi, Kamithos) knew how to secure their high-priestly position by bribery. The last high priest before the destruction in A.D. 70 was once again a Zadokite. (See further Schürer, II, 1, 195–206.)

(b) At the time of Jesus the high priest was the highest representative of the people. Through his investiture with the magnificent eight-part vestments (Exod. 28) he received permanent sanctity (cf. Acts 23:4 f.). Every one of his robes carried atoning power for particular sins. The death of the high priest released the murderers in the cities of refuge (Num. 35). The high priest could take over the offering of the sacrifice at any time; he had the first choice of the parts of the sacrifice, the leadership of the priesthood and the chief seat in the Sanhedrin (→ Council). His greatest task was the absolution of the community on the Day of Atonement (Lev. 16; Mishnah Yoma). The prescriptions for the purity and marriage of the high priest were especially strict (Lev. 21:10 ff.). The plural denotes the holders of the high-priestly offices: the chief temple office, the heads of the weekly and daily divisions, the temple keepers and treasurers.

(c) The high esteem of the high-priestly office led to a widespread Jewish expectation of an eschatological priest or high priest alongside the kingly messiah (Test. Reub. 6:8; Test.Lev. 18:2; Test.Jud. 21:2; 24:1; 1QS 9:10 f.; 1QSa 2:12 ff.; 1QSb 4:23; 4QpPs 37 2:15; CD 12:23 f.). This was joined with angel speculations (Test. Dan 6:2, Eth.Enoch 89:76; Sl.Enoch 22:4 ff.; Ḥag. 12b, where Michael offers a spiritual sacrifice), and the myth of the primeval man. Adam (Gen. R. 20; Num. R. 4), Enoch, or Metatron (Jub. 4:25, Heb.Enoch 48C, 7; 48D, 1; Sl.Enoch

64:5A) and → Melchizedek all appear as incarnations of the primeval man or primeval priest.

(d) Philo's idea of the high priest is a unique synthesis of these motifs. Moses is, as high priest (*Rer. Div. Her.* 182) and chief head of the people, the first Logos of all, who stands on the border-line between creation and Creator (*Rer. Div. Her.* 205 f.), since he is no longer man, but divine Logos (*Fug.* 108). Everyone who lives according to the law is, according to Wis. 18:20 ff., a high-priestly Logos (*Spec.Leg.* 2, 164). As Logos, the high priest holds sway in the temple of the cosmos of which his vestments are an image. He himself becomes a "cosmos in miniature" (*Som.* 1, 214 f.; *Spec.Leg.* 1, 82–97; *Vit.Mos.* 2, 109–135).

3. Melchizedek (MT *malkî-ṣeḏeq*), who in Gen. 14:18 and Ps. 110(109):4 is called king of Salem and priest of *'ēl-'elyôn* (LXX "the Most High God"), is according to Josephus (*War* 6, 438; *Ant.* 1, 180 f.), the founder and first priest of → Jerusalem. The Melchizedek-fragment of Sl.Enoch ascribes to him an eternal priesthood in → paradise and titles such as "the great High Priest", "the Word of God", "the miraculous Power", holding sway as High Priest at the centre of the earth. For Philo, Melchizedek is "self-taught in knowledge of God" (*Congr.* 99) and image of "the reason of the King" and of the "Priest-Logos", who transports the soul aloft as in ecstasy to the vision of God (*Leg.All.* 3:79 ff.). Rabbinic literature sought to play down Melchizedek (frequently called Shem; cf. SB III 692 f.) as against Abraham. Because Melchizedek in Gen. 14:18 mentions Abraham's name before God's name, God removes the priesthood from him in Ps. 110:4 and hands it over to Abraham (Lev. R. 25; Ned. 32b). This was possibly anti-Christian polemic. An eschatological *kōhēn-ṣeḏeq* repeatedly stands alongside the messiah (Cant. R. on 2:13; Sukkah 52b; Ab.R.N. 34). Hippolytus (*Haer.* 7:36; 10:24) and Epiphanius (*Haer.* 55) report of a probably gnostic group of "Melchizedekians" who worshipped Melchizedek as a higher Logos than Jesus.

4. *hierōsynē*, only in 1 Chr. 29:22 in the LXX (for Zadok's priesthood), but several times in the Apocrypha (e.g. Sir. 45:24; 1 Macc. 2:54) goes back to the basic meaning of priestly office. Josephus (*Ap.* 1, 31) and Philo (*Ebr.* 65; 126) both testify to its high esteem. Josephus himself possesses the *hierōsynē* (*Ant.* 16, 187; *Life* 198).

5. *hierateia* is chiefly used for *kᵉhunnâh* (priesthood) in the LXX (Exod. 29:2; 40:15; Num. 3:10; 18:1, 7; 25:13; Jos. 18:7; 1 Sam. 2:36; 2 Esd. 2:62; Neh. 7:46; 13:29). It stands for *kāhan* (Hos. 3:4) and *'ēpôḏ* (Exod. 35:9; 39:19). It denotes in Num. 3:10 and 18:1 the priestly service, but more frequently simply the priestly office. By their investiture and anointing (Exod. 29:9 and 40:15) in accord with divine instruction (Num. 25:13; Neh. 13:29; Sir. 45:8), Aaron's descendants have an eternal *hierateia*, which, according to Test.Jud. 21:2, 4, is more than kingship. Josephus and Philo do not use the word.

6. Exod. 19:6 speaks of Israel as a *mamleḵeṯ kōhᵃnîm* "a kingdom of priests". This may be taken as "a kingdom [consisting] of priests", i.e. the heads of the families. But J. P. Hyatt takes it to mean that "the Israelites were all to have access to Yahweh, and the nation was to serve as priest for the rest of the nations of the world" (*Exodus, New Century Bible*, 1971, 200). A similar view is taken by B. S. Childs who insists that the term is to be understood in conjunction with the concept of "a special possession from all the peoples" and "a holy nation" (*Exodus*, 1974,

367). The LXX translates the phrase by *basileion hierateuma*, "kingly priesthood", and thus lays the stress on the priestly aspect. Israel is called from amongst the nations to priestly service for God (cf. Isa. 61:6). The idea also appears in Exod. 23:22 LXX, but this is probably an interpolation, as there is no Heb. equivalent. The Peshitta, Syro–Hexaplar, Targum Onkelos and Targum Jerusalem II split up the MT in Exod. 19:6 into "kingship and priesthood". 2 Macc. 2:17, Jub. 16:18; Test. Lev. Gk. Fragment 67 and Philo (*Abr.* 56; *Sobr.* 66) deal similarly with the LXX text and understand kingship and priesthood as distinguishing marks of Israel.

NT 1. In the NT *hiereus* refers mainly to the levitical priests; in Heb. also to Christ and in Rev. to Christians. The word occurs 31 times, of which 14 are in Heb., 3 in Matt., 2 in Mk., 5 in Lk., 1 in Jn., 3 in Acts, and 3 in Rev.

(a) According to the evidence of the Gospels, Jesus had strikingly few dealings with the priesthood. When he sent healed lepers to the priests for confirmation of their healing (Matt. 8:4 par. Mk. 1:14, Lk. 5:14; Lk. 17:14), he was respecting their authority and acting in accordance with the law (cf. Lev. 13:49; 14:2 f.). It was also a challenge to recognize Jesus' authority. The healing of the → Samaritan leper (who would not normally have gone to the Jewish priest) brings into sharp focus the question of Jesus' authority and the status of the Jews and Samaritans. Lk. 10:31 is reminiscent of the prophetic critique of a merely external cult (but see further J. D. M. Derrett, "The Parable of the Good Samaritan", in *Law in the New Testament*, 1970, 208–27). In Matt. 12:1–8 par. Mk. 2:23–28, Lk. 6:1–5, Jesus declared his eschatological freedom over against cultic precepts. In the light of Lev. 24:9; Num. 28:9 f.; Deut. 23:25; 1 Sam. 21:1–6 and Hos. 6:6, not only is plucking grain on the sabbath permitted, but Jesus as the Son of man is Lord of the sabbath. Only in Lk. 1:5, 8 and Acts 6:7 are priests found in a positive relationship to the salvation event. In the figure of Zechariah the priesthood is taken into the service of the immediate preparations for salvation, and seen to be dependent on faith. Lk. 1:8 provides the sole NT instance of *hierateuō* which is found in late Gk. including Josephus, *Ant.* 3, 189; 15, 253; 1 Clem. 43:4. The addition of a large number of priests from the lower classes to the Jerusalem congregation (Acts 6:7) does not appear incredible, in view of the social contrast with the priestly aristocracy.

(b) In Rev. 1:6 and 5:10 (cf. 20:6) Christians are called "kings and priests" and thus picked out from humanity for the service of God. The promise of Exod. 19:6 is thus fulfilled, but the new order no longer knows any → temple since God himself is now the temple (Rev. 21:22; cf. also 20:6).

(c) The thought of Exod. 19:6 is also taken up in 1 Pet. 2:9 "But you are a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, God's own people, that you may declare the wonderful deeds of him who called you out of darkness into his marvellous light" (cf. Exod. 23:22 LXX). This concept of priesthood embraces the idea of access to God in intimate knowledge and the prophetic rôle of priesthood in proclaiming the knowledge of God. It complements the earlier idea of offering spiritual sacrifices: "and like living stones be yourselves built into a spiritual house, to be a holy priesthood, to offer spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ" (1 Pet. 2:5). In both cases the priesthood of all believers is seen to supersede that of the Jewish priesthood. And this is, in fact, the concept of Exod.

19:6. In addition to this, E. Best draws attention to other terms from the levitical cultus which are appropriated for Christian activity: "sprinkled" and "washed" come from the ritual consecration of priests (Heb. 10:22; cf. Exod. 29:21; Lev. 8:6, 30; → Baptism); "firstborn" recalls the Levites as the first born of Israel (Heb. 12:23; → First, art. *prōtotokos*); in Heb. 13:10 Christians have an "altar" (cf. *I Peter, New Century Bible*, 1971, 103; and E. Best, "Spiritual Sacrifice: General Priesthood in the New Testament", *Interpretation* 14, 1960, 280–90; J. H. Elliott, *The Elect and the Holy, Supplements to NovT* 12, 1966, 50–128).

(d) In Rom. 15:16 Paul describes his gracious calling "to be a minister [*leitourgon*] of Christ Jesus to the Gentiles in the priestly service of the gospel of God [*hierourgounta to euangelion tou theou*], so that the offering of the Gentiles [*hē prosphora tōn ethnōn*] may be acceptable, sanctified by the Holy Spirit." The context suggests that Rom. itself is a summary of this priestly ministry (cf. Rom. 15:15). In the light of Rom. 15:8 f., 13, D. W. B. Robinson writes: "Romans is both an exposition of the gospel of hope and at the same time Paul's *apologia* for his 'priesthood' in that gospel" ("The Priesthood of Paul in the Gospel of Hope", in R. Banks, ed., *Reconciliation and Hope: New Testament Essays on Atonement and Eschatology presented to L. L. Morris*, 1974, 232). On this verse see also C. Wiéner, "*Hierourgein* (Rom. 15.16)", *Stud.Paulin.Congressus, II, 1961*, 1963, 399–404. The theme of Rom. is God's saving purposes for both the Jewish nation and the Gentiles. The concern to show that the ground of salvation has always been grace received by faith (chs. 1–7) demonstrates that Jew and Gentile are on the same footing with regard to salvation. Chs. 9–11 consider God's purposes for the Jewish nation. The thought of the self-offering of the individual's life (Rom. 12:1) is paralleled by that of the Gentiles. Just as the OT priest presented the sacrifice to Yahweh, so Paul, as the apostle to the Gentiles (cf. Rom. 1:5; Gal. 2:8 f.; Acts 9:15; 22:21; 26:17 f.), is the one who has the special task of bringing them to God. This offering which would otherwise be unclean is made acceptable by the sanctifying work of the Holy Spirit (cf. Rom. 15:16 with 8:2–27). In the background of Paul's thought may be Isa. 66:20 where the Jews of the Diaspora are an offering (MT *minḥâh*; LXX *dōron*) which the Gentiles will bring to Jerusalem (SB III 153). Here, however, the rôles are reversed. In Phil. 2:17 the rôles are again reversed. Paul is in prison and awaiting possible execution (cf. Phil. 1:12 ff.; 17–26) and can envisage his own death as an offering for the sake of the church: "Even if I am to be poured out as a libation upon the sacrificial offering of your faith, I am glad and rejoice with you all."

(e) Although the words priest and high priest do not occur in it, Jesus' prayer in Jn. 17 is sometimes referred to as Jesus' high priestly prayer. The chapter represents Jesus' prayer for his people prior to his arrest and execution. Discussions include O. Michel, "Das Gebet des scheidenden Erlösers", *ZSTh* 18, 1941, 521–34; and E. Käsemann, *The Testament of Jesus: A Study of the Gospel of John in the Light of Chapter 17*, 1968. In Jn. 17:19 Jesus says: "And for their sake I consecrate myself, that they also may be consecrated in truth." The vb. *hagiazō* which is used here is also used for the sanctifying of priests (e.g. Exod. 28:41; 29:1, 21) and of sacrifices (e.g. Exod. 28:38; Num. 18:9) (→ Holy, art. *hagios*). The act of consecration through death for the sake of the people may reflect the Day of Atonement ritual carried out by the high priest (Lev. 16).

2. *archiereus* occurs only in the Gospels (Matt. 25 times, Mt. 22 times, Lk. 15 times, Jn. 22 times), Acts (22 times) and Heb. (17 times). In the Gospels and Acts it refers to the high priests chiefly in opposition to Jesus; in Heb. it has a christological and soteriological significance in that Jesus is depicted as the true high priest.

(a) In the Gospels and Acts the high priest is mentioned as the president of the Sanhedrin in the trials of Jesus and his followers (e.g. Matt. 26:62 par. Mk. 14:60; Acts 5:21, 27; 23:1 ff.; → Council). The frequent plurals (denoting the holders of the higher priestly offices) stand similarly in these contexts (e.g. Matt. 21:45 f. par. Lk. 20:19; Matt. 26:3 par. 14:1, Lk. 22:2; Jn. 12:10; 19:6, 15; Acts 5:24; 25:2). The priestly aristocracy thus appears as a closed group who staged persecutions and condemnations. Their combined act with the "elders" (→ Bishop, art. *presbyteros*, NT 2 (a)) and the → "scribes" is interpreted as being ordained by God (Matt. 16:21 par. Mk. 8:31, Lk. 9:22; Matt. 20:18 par. Mk. 10:33, Lk. 18:31; → Necessity, art. *dei*). Looking at it historically, it may well have been primarily the cleansing of the temple by Jesus (Mk. 11:18 par. Lk. 19:47; cf. Matt. 21:12 f.; Jn. 2:13–17) as an attack on the carefully preserved temple administration of the chief priests, which was the decisive factor in their hostility against him. Perhaps their arrangement with the occupying power also aroused their fears that the Romans might take measures against Jesus and his followers on their own account (Jn. 11:48). The remark in Jn. 11:51 that Caiaphas, in his office of high priest, prophesied Jesus' death recalls the rabbinic accounts of heavenly voices and visions which various high priests are supposed to have received while sacrificing on the Day of Atonement (Sotah 33a; Yoma 53b). On the other hand, 1QpHab. 10:9 suggests that the prophetic gift of the high priest was disputed at Qumran. Josephus also said that John Hyrcanus was credited with having prophetic powers (*Ant.* 13, 299; cf. 11, 327). He even claimed a measure of prophetic foresight himself in view of his priestly descent, although his main emphasis fell on knowledge of prophetical books (*War* 3, 352). There was a Jewish belief that prophecy was often unconscious (SB II 546). Jn.'s observation is an ironical comment on what to Caiaphas was sheer political realism: " 'You know nothing at all; you do not understand that it is expedient for you that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation should not perish.' He did not say this of his own accord, but being high priest that year he prophesied that Jesus should die for the nation, and not for the nation only, but to gather into one the children of God who are scattered abroad. So from that day on they took counsel how to put him to death" (Jn. 11:49b–53). In Jn. the concern of the chief priests and Pharisees was occasioned by the signs of Jesus (the most recent being the raising of Lazarus) and Jesus' popularity: "If we let him go on thus, every one will believe in him, and the Romans will come and destroy both our holy place and our nation" (11:48).

Caiaphas is mentioned in the NT at Matt. 26:3, 57; Lk. 3:2; Jn. 11:49; 18:13 f., 24, 28; Acts 4:6. Josephus (*Ant.* 18, 35; 18, 95) says that he was made high priest by the Procurator Valerius Gratus (A.D. 18) and was deposed by the Procurator Vitellius (A.D. 36). His successor was "Jonathan the son of Ananus" who is commonly identified with the Annas of the NT. According to Jn. 18:13, he was the son-in-law of Annas who had been deposed as high priest in A.D. 15 by Valerius Gratus. Lk. dates the public ministry of John the Baptist "in the high-priesthood

[*epi archiereōs*] of Annas and Caiaphas" (Lk. 3:2). Whereas some scholars see this as a mistake, others see this as a reflection of the real situation. As head of a powerful family, Annas continued to exert considerable influence which is evidenced by the fact that he procured appointment to the office for five of his sons. This may be the explanation of the fact that he is named as high priest in Acts 4:6. Annas is also mentioned in Jn. 18:3, 24. (For further discussion see S. Sandmel "Caiaphas", *IDB* I 481 f.; D. E. Hiebert, *ZPEB* I 683 ff.) The late Gk. adj. *archieratikos* is used in the NT only at Acts 4:6 when "Annas the high priest and Caiaphas and John and Alexander, and all who were of the high-priestly family [*ek genous archieratikou*]" were gathered to deal with Peter and John. Schürer suggests that the term high priest embraced not only present and former ones but also members of the privileged families from which the high priests were taken (Schürer, II, 1, 203–6).

Acts 22:30–23:10 depicts Paul's interrogation before the Sanhedrin at which the high priest Ananias commanded that Paul should be struck on the mouth. "Then Paul said to him, 'God shall strike you, you white-washed wall! Are you sitting to judge me according to the law, and yet contrary to the law you order me to be struck?' Those who stood by said, 'Would you revile God's high priest?' And Paul said, 'I did not know, brethren, that he was the high priest; for it is written, "You shall not speak evil of a ruler of your people" ' " (Acts 23:3 ff.; cf. Exod. 22:28). On Paul's remark → Black, White, Red, art. *leukos*. His failure to recognize the high priest has been ascribed to failing eyesight (on Paul's thorn in the flesh → Fruit, art. *skolops*), a change of high priest since Paul's last visit to Jerusalem, or irony (i.e. that one who spoke like that could not possibly be the high priest). However, the latter seems incompatible with the allusion to Exod. 22:28. The interrogation broke up in disorder when Paul played off the Pharisees and Sadducees against each other. Ananias appeared in person to support the renewed charges before Felix at Caesarea five days later (Acts 24:1). Ananias was appointed high priest by Herod, king of Chalcis in A.D. 48 (Josephus, *Ant.* 20, 103). He was sent to Rome in A.D. 52 by Quadratus, legate of Syria, to answer charges of cruelty, but was acquitted by Claudius through the efforts of Agrippa the younger (*Ant.* 20, 131 ff.).An unscrupulous man (*Ant.* 20, 205 ff.), he was a typical powerful Sadducee. Because of his collaboration with the Romans he was hated by the nationalists, and was murdered at the outbreak of the Jewish war in A.D. 66 (*War* 2, 441).

(b) Whilst high priestly functions are attributed to Christ in the NT outside Hebrews, such as intercession (Jn. 17:19; Rom. 8:34; 1 Jn. 2:1), and the opening of the way of access to God (Rom. 5:2; Eph. 2:18; 1 Pet. 3:18), only Hebrews offers a fully developed high-priestly christology. The writer interprets the suffering and the present work of Christ as a high-priestly service. Alongside the title *archiereus*, Christ also, on the basis of Ps. 109:4 (LXX), bears the title *hiereus*. But the interest is really focused on the high-priestly rank of Christ. The writer had probably already found this high-priestly title of Christ in confession-like liturgical tradition (Heb. 3:1). His scheme of thought appears to be influenced, not only by the Jewish expectation of the priest of the last days, but also by the motif of heavenly intercession (taken from angel speculations; cf. 1:5–14), and possibly elements of the gnostic myth of the primeval man. Acquaintance with these ideas

could have been mediated through the Alexandrian-Jewish doctrine of the Logos. The thought of the high-priestly self-sacrifice is nevertheless new (even Sifre Num. 131 does not speak of a cultic self-sacrifice of the high priest). The writer develops his interpretation of the priesthood of Christ as the antitype of the levitical priesthood, and does so in respect of structure, scriptural basis, bearer, service, place and time.

(i) Structure. Every high priesthood, as representative of men before God (Heb. 5:1), must be founded, on the one side, on its solidarity with men in their susceptibility to sin (Heb. 5:2), and on the other side, on divine calling (Heb. 5:4). Of the duties of the high priest Heb. is interested only in the sacrificial service (Heb. 5:1; 8:3), and primarily in his double service on the Day of Atonement (Heb. 2:17; cf. Lev. 16) – the slaughter of the sacrificial animal (Heb. 9:22) and his entry with the sacrificial blood into the most holy place (Heb. 9:7). The goal of the high priestly service is to render possible access to God by blotting out the guilt of their sins (Heb. 4:16; 7:18 f., 25; 10:1, 19, 22).

(ii) Scriptural basis. The fact and significance of the priesthood of Christ are grounded on Ps. 110:4 (cf. Heb. 5:6) and Gen. 14:17 ff. (Heb. 7:1 ff.). Following an exegetical tradition of Hellenistic Judaism, Heb. is not interested in the historical figure of → Melchizedek, but in the OT picture of his priesthood. It is not tied to any descent and is therefore eternal (Heb. 7:3) and superior to the levitical priesthood, since Melchizedek blessed Abraham, the ancestor of the Levites, and received a tithe from him (Heb. 7:5 ff.). All this is a prefiguration of the priesthood of the Son addressed in Ps. 110 (Heb. 7:3). It is grounded moreover on a divine oath (cf. the exegesis of the divine oath in Philo, *Leg.All.* 3, 203 ff. and elsewhere), whereas the levitical *hierōsynē*, the setting-up of this priesthood, rests on legal ordinance (Heb. 7:11, 20 f.). The "fleshly" law (Heb. 7:16), however, can only install men in their weakness as high priests (Heb. 7:23, 28). God's oath, by contrast, in which resides the "power of an indestructible life" (Heb. 7:16), entrusts to Jesus the Son of God, who has overcome all weakness, an unalterable *hierōsynē* (Heb. 5:7 ff.; 7:24, 28).

(iii) The bearer. The weakness of the levitical priesthood lies in its sinfulness (Heb. 5:3; 7:27). Although Jesus became like men in every respect (Heb. 2:17), he did not sin (Heb. 4:15; 9:14); and only such a high priest can act for us (Heb. 7:26), for he alone can atone. Behind this depreciation of the levitical high priesthood stands not so much the experience of its ethical decline in NT times as the dualistic moral doctrine of Hellenistic Judaism, and also the impression of the life of Jesus.

(iv) Service. The levitical priestly service is inadequate, since for an atoning sacrifice it must have recourse to animal → blood. This only effects an external "fleshly" purification, not the eradication of the guilt of sin from the conscience (Heb. 9:13 f.). On the contrary, it is only the necessity of continually renewed sacrifices which actuates a consciousness of sin (Heb. 10:1 ff.). But Christ, through his self-sacrifice, has effected once for all the liberation of the conscience from all sin (Heb. 9:14, 26) and thus opened the way to God (Heb. 10:19 ff.). Here Heb. takes up motifs of the prophetic critique of sacrifice, clothed in Hellenistic thought-forms (Heb. 10:5 ff.).

(v) Place. The levitical priestly service is imperfect, because its nature is earthly

and it takes place in an earthly sanctuary (Heb. 9:1). According to Exod. 25:40, it is the shadowy replica of the heavenly sanctuary in which Christ officiates as high priest (Heb. 8:2, 5; 9:11, 24). Heb. understands "earthly" and "heavenly" not so much apocalyptically and cosmologically as dualistically, comparable with the Platonic doctrine of Being. The heavenly sanctuary is perfect, "true", because it is "not of this creation" (Heb. 8:2; 9:11). To that extent not only Christ's entrance into heaven, but also the death he suffered on earth is essentially "heavenly" high-priestly service. The question of the commencement of his high-priesthood receives its answer from this point. He is a high priest for ever, but is first proclaimed as such on the basis of his sacrificial death (Heb. 5:10).

(vi) Time. The words → "covenant" and → "promise" (Heb. 8:6 ff.; 10:16 f.) bring a historical moment into the dualism of the earthly levitical high priesthood and the heavenly high priesthood of Christ. The latter sets the former aside (Heb. 7:18 f.). Moreover, the unique self-sacrifice of Christ the high priest marks the arrival of the end (already prophesied in the OT) of the cult as an atoning institution (Heb. 10:5 ff., 18). The new cult of Christians knows only the sacrifice of praise: confession and service (Heb. 13:15 f.).

(c) By way of summary, it must be stressed that the high-priestly christology of Heb. does not serve speculative but paraenetical interests. Heb. is directed to Christians who are tempted by the hiddenness of salvation in Christ, as against the very palpable salvation presented and represented in the cults of the surrounding world. Heb. wants to encourage them to hold fast to their confession by giving a new interpretation, both of Jesus' historical work and his present significance by means of the already previously handed down high-priestly title of Christ. Thus Jesus' death on the cross represents the high-priestly self-sacrifice of the eternal Son of God, surpassing all other sacrifices and valid once and for all. His exaltation is interpreted as the entrance of the perfect high priest into the heavenly and true sanctuary, and as his continual intercession for believers. Christ, therefore, as the eternal and heavenly high priest, now gives to those who hold firm to their confession of him a present guarantee of immediate access to God, and a future guarantee of entrance into the lasting heavenly world. Heb. thus represents salvation in Jesus Christ as the fulfilment of every cultic intention and so as the end of every cult (as a human endeavour of relationship with God), and exhibits this by using the methods of Hel. scriptural exegesis on the example of the OT cult. Alongside Paul, who proclaims Christ as the end of the law, then, comes an independent sketch of early Christian preaching of Christ as the end of the cult. *J. Baehr*

→ Bishop, → Council, → Levite, → Melchizedek, → Moses, → Prophet, → Sacrifice, → Temple

(a). G. C. Aalders, "Priests and Levites", *A Short Introduction to the Pentateuch*, 1949, 66–71; R. Abba, "Priests and Levites", *IDB* III 876–89; G. Allon, "On the History of the High-Priesthood at the Close of the Second Temple", *Tarbiz* 13, 1941, 1–24; W. Arndt, "A Royal Priesthood", *Concordia Theological Monthly* 19, 1948, 241–49; N. B. Barrow, *The High Priest*, 1947; J. R. Bartlett, "Zadok and his Successors at Jerusalem", *JTS* New Series 19, 1968, 1–18; E. Best, "Spiritual Sacrifice: General Priesthood in the New Testament", *Interpretation* 14, 1960, 280–90; F. F. Bruce, *The Teacher of Righteousness in the Qumran Texts*, 1957; and *The Epistle to the Hebrews, NLC*, 1964; D. R. Catchpole, *The Trial of Jesus: A Study in the Gospels and Jewish Historiography from 1770 to the Present Day, Studia Post-Biblica* 18, 1971; R. E. Clements, *God and Temple: The Idea of the Divine Presence in Ancient Israel*, 1965; A. Cody, *A History of Old Testa-*

ment Priesthood, Analecta Biblica 35, 1969; O. Cullmann, *The Christology of the New Testament*, 1963³, 83–107; A. Ehrhardt, "Jewish and Christian Ordination", *The Framework of the New Testament Stories*, 1964, 132–50; C. Eastwood, *The Priesthood of All Believers*, 1969; and *The Royal Priesthood of the Faithful*, 1963; A. Edersheim, "The Officiating Priesthood", *The Temple, Its Ministry and Services*, 1874, 58–78; J. H. Elliott, *The Elect and the Holy, Supplements to NovT* 12, 1966, 50–128; J. A. Emerton, "Priests and Levites in Deuteronomy", *VT* 12, 1962, 128–38; G. D. Fee, "Priest in the New Testament", *ZPEB* IV 849–52; C. L. Feinberg, "Priests and Levites", *ZPEB* IV 852–67; G. Fohrer, *History of Israelite Religion*, 1973; B. Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament: A Comparative Study in the Temple Symbolism of the Qumran Texts and the New Testament, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series* 1, 1965; F. Hahn, *The Titles of Jesus in Christology: Their History in Early Christianity*, 1969; M. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*, I–II, 1974; D. A. Hubbard, "Priests and Levites", *NBD* 1028–43; E. O. James, *The Nature and Function of Priesthood: A Comparative and Anthropological Study*, 1961; J. Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus*, 1969, 147–221; A. R. Johnson, *The Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel*, 1944; H.-J. Kraus, *Worship in Israel: A Cultic History of the Old Testament*, 1966; G. van der Leeuw, *Religion in its Essence and Manifestation*, 1964²; R. N. Longenecker, *The Christology of Early Jewish Christianity, SBT* Second Series 17, 1970; T. W. Manson, *Ministry and Priesthood: Christ's and Ours*, 1959; B. A. Mastin, "Scaeva the Chief Priest", *JTS* New Series 27, 1976, 405–12; H. W. Montefiore, *The Epistle to the Hebrews, BNTC* 1964; M. Noth, "Office and Vocation in the Old Testament", in *The Laws in the Pentateuch and Other Studies*, 1966, 229–49; J. Pedersen, *Israel: Its Life and Culture*, III–IV, 1940, 150–97; C. Rabin, *The Zadokite Documents*, 1958²; G. von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, I, 1962; II, 1965; H. Ringgren, *Israelite Religion*, 1966; D. W. B. Robinson, "The Priesthood of Paul in the Gospel of Hope", in R. J. Banks, ed., *Reconciliation and Hope: New Testament Essays on Atonement and Eschatology Presented to L. L. Morris*, 1974, 231–45; H. W. Robinson, "Revelation through the Priest", *Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament*, 1946, 199–230; H. H. Rowley, *The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 1952; and *Worship in Ancient Israel: Its Forms and Meaning*, 1967; H. H. Rowley, ed., *The Old Testament and Modern Study: A Generation of Discovery and Research*, 1951; K. H. A. Schelkle, *A Priestly People*, 1965; G. Schrenk, *hieros* etc., *TDNT* III 221–83; Schürer, II, 1, 195–298; W. M. F. Scott, "Priesthood in the New Testament", *SJT* 10, 1957, 399–415; M. H. Shepherd, Jr., "Priests in the NT", *IDB* III 889 ff.; J. Smith, *A Priest for Ever: A Study of Typology and Eschatology in Hebrews*, 1969; N. H. Snaith, "The Priesthood and the Temple", in T. W. Manson, ed., *A Companion to the Bible*, 1939, 418–33; R. A. Stewart, "The Sinless High-Priest", *NTS* 14, 1967–68, 126–35; A. Stöger, "Priest(hood)", *EBT* II 700–9; S. van Tilborg, *The Jewish Leaders in Matthew*, 1972; R. de Vaux, *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions*, 1961, 345–405; G. Vos, "The Priesthood of Christ in the Epistle to the Hebrews", *Princeton Theological Review*, 5, 1907, 423–47, 579–604; A. C. Welch, "The Priesthood", and "The Priests and the Levites", *Post-Exilic Judaism*, 1935, 172–84, 217–41; and *Prophet and Priest in Old Israel*, 1936; J. Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel*, (1878) 1957; Y. Yadin, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Epistle to the Hebrews", *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 4, 1957, 36–55.

(b). W. W. von Baudissin, *Die Geschichte des alttestamentlichen Priestertums*, 1889; E. Bammel, "*archiereus prophēteuōn*", *TLZ* 79, 1954, 308 ff.; J. Begrich, "Das priestliche Heilsorakel", *ZAW* 52, 1934, 81 ff. (reprinted in *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament, ThB* 21, 1964); and "Die priesterliche Tora" in *Werden und Wesen des Alten Testaments*, 1936, 63–88; J. Blinzler, "HIERATEUMA. Zur Exegese von I Petr. 2, 5 u. 9", *Faulhaber Festschrift*, 1949, 49–65; H. Bolewski, *Christos Archiereus*, Dissertation, 1939; G. Bornkamm, "Das Bekenntnis im Hebräerbrief", *ThBl* 21, 1942, 56 ff. (reprinted in *Studien zu Antike und Christentum*, 1963², 188 ff.); P. Dabin, *Le Sacerdoce Royal des Fidèles dans les Livres Saints*, 1941; M. Dibelius, "Der himmlische Kultus nach dem Hebräerbrief", *ThBl* 21, 1942, 1 ff.; G. Friedrich, "Beobachtungen zur messianischen Hohepriestererwartungen in den Synoptikern", *ZTK* 53, 1956, 265 ff.; J. Gabriel, *Untersuchungen über das alttestamentliche Hohepriestertum*, 1933; L. Gautier, "Prêtre ou Sacrificateur?", in *Études sur la Religion d'Israël*, 1927, 247–76; J. Gnilka, "Die Erwartung des messianischen Hohenpriesters in den Schriften von Qumran und im Neuen Testament", *Revue de Qumran* 2, 1960, 395 ff.; J. Goettsberger, "Das alttestamentliche Hohepriestertum und Ezechiel", in *Episcopus* (Faulhaber Festschrift), 1969, 1–18; E. Grässer, *Der Glaube im Hebräerbrief*, 1965; A. H. J. Gunneweg, *Leviten und Priester. Hauptlinien der Traditionsbildung und Geschichte des israelitisch-jüdischen Kultpersonals, FRLANT* 89, 1965; F. Hesse, "Priester, Priestertum", *EKL* III 322 ff.; G.

Hölscher, "Levi", Pauly-Wissowa, XII, 2, 2155–208; A. van Hoonacker, *Le Sacerdoce Lévitique dans la Loi et dans l'Histoire des Hébreux*, 1899; P. Honigsheim, K. Koch, B. Lohse, R. Prenter, "Priestertum", *RGG*³ V 569–82; E. Käsemann, *Das wandernde Gottesvolk*, *FRLANT* 37, 1961⁴; P. Ketter, "Das allgemeine Priestertum der Gläubigen nach dem 1. Petrusbrief", *Trierer Theologische Zeitschrift* 56, 1947, 43–51; F. Kühler, "Das priesterliche Orakel in Israel und Juda", in *Abhandlungen zur semitischen Religionskunde und Sprachwissenschaft* (Baudissin Festschrift), 1918, 285–301; E. Lohse, *Die Ordination im Spätjudentum und im Neuen Testament*, 1951; O. Michel, *Der Brief an die Hebräer*, *KEK* 13, 1966¹²; O. Moe, "Das Priestertum Christi im Neuen Testament ausserhalb des Hebräerbriefs", *TLZ* 72, 1947, 335 ff.; S. Mowinckel, *Religion und Kultus*, 1953; S. Nomoto, "Herkunft und Struktur der Hohepriestervorstellung im Hebräerbrief", *NovT* 10, 1968, 10 ff.; A. Oepke, *Das neue Gottesvolk*, 1950; W. Pesch, "Zu Texten des Neuen Testaments über das Priestertum der Getauften", in O. Böcher and K. Haacker, eds., *Verborum Caritas. Festschrift für Gustav Stählin*, 1970, 303–15; O. Plöger, "Priester und Prophet", *ZAW* 63, 1951, 157 ff.; E. Riggenbach *Der Brief an die Hebräer*, 1922³; K. Romaniuk, *Le Sacerdoce dans le Nouveau Testament*, 1966; F. J. Schierse, *Verheissung und Heilsvollendung*, 1955; G. Schille, "Erwägungen zur Hohenpriesterlehre des Hebräerbriefs", *ZNW* 46, 1955, 81 ff.; E. Schürer, "Die *archiereis* im Neuen Testament", *ThStKr* 44, 1872, 593–657; C. Spicq, *L'Épître aux Hébreux*, I–II, 1952–53; and *La Spiritualité sacerdotale d'après Saint Paul*, 1954; A. Stöger, "Der Hohepriester Jesus Christus", *Theologisch-Praktische Quartalschrift* 100, 1952, 309–19; F. Stummer, "Gedanken über die Stellung des Hohenpriesters in der alttestamentlichen Gemeinde", *Episcopus* (Faulhaber Festschrift), 1949, 19–48; A. Vanhoye, "Le Christ, Grand-prêtre selon Heb. 2, 17–18", *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* 91, 1969, 449–74; A. Wendel, "Hohepriester", *RGG*³ 427 f.; H. Wenschkewitz, "Die Spiritualisierung der Kultusbegriffe: Tempel, Priester und Opfer im Neuen Testament", *Angelos. Archiv für neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte und Kulturkunde* 4, 1932, 70–230; C. Wiéner, "*Hierourgein* (Rom. 15.16)", *Stud. Paulin. Congressus, II, 1961*, 1963, 399–404; H. Windisch, *Der Hebräerbrief*, *HNT* 14, 1931²; H. Wuttke, *Melchisedek, der Priesterkönig von Salem*, *BZNW* 5, 1927.

Proclamation, Preach, Kerygma

There are a number of different words in Gk. for the passing on of messages, reports and instructions. Leaving aside the groups of words dealt with under → Teach (*didaskō* and *katēcheō* for the communication of material to be learned, and *paradidōmi* for the passing on of tradition); *gnōrizō*, to make known, which is dealt with under → Knowledge; and also the verbs mentioned under → Confess and → Witness; the principal words which are dealt with below are *angellō* and *kēryssō* and their derivatives. The NT uses the whole range of this vocabulary, partly because of the variety of the forms of communication which it mentions, and partly in the simple interchange of practically synonymous expressions. Of the two groups of words dealt with under this heading, that connected with *angellō* has more of the character of an offer of information or encouragement, while *kēryssō* indicates a public and authoritative announcement which demands compliance. See also → Gospel.

ἀγγέλλω

ἀγγέλλω (*angellō*), announce; ἀγγελία (*angelia*), message; ἀναγγέλλω (*anangellō*) and ἀπαγγέλλω (*apangellō*), report, announce, proclaim; διαγγέλλω (*diangellō*), make known, proclaim (far and wide); ἐξαγγέλλω (*exangellō*), proclaim, report; καταγγέλλω (*katangellō*), proclaim; καταγγελεύς (*katangeleus*), proclaimer; προκαταγγέλλω (*prokatangellō*), announce, proclaim beforehand, foretell.

CL The vbs. of this group are largely interchangeable. They are to be found in their principal sense, to bring tidings, notify, proclaim publicly, in some cases as early as Homer. *angelos*, messenger (→ Angel), is even attested in Mycenaean Gk. In Koine, as opposed to classical, Gk. the compounds are preferred: e.g. *an-* and *apangellō* take the place of the classical *angellō*. Nuances of meaning can of course be distinguished in the various compounds: *apangellō* is a more official word than *anangellō*. On the other hand, both words can be watered down to mean simply relate, speak. *di-*, *ex-* and *katangellō*, often indicate the elevated, ceremonious style of proclamation. *exangellō*, however, emphasises rather the unknown or secret nature of what is being told, sometimes even in the sense of gossip; while *katangellō* can, among other things, mean to make a claim concerning oneself. The noun *angelia* can mean either message or command. The one who conveys the message is the *katangeleus*, herald.

1. In their basic meaning these words always refer to the activity of the messenger who conveys a message which has been given to him either orally or in writing (Xen., *Anab.* 1, 3, 21), and who in this way represents the sender of the message himself. The content of the message may vary very considerably. It may be private family news (Soph., *Ajax* 1355), reporting good or evil fortune. Such news may especially concern political events: war (Plato, *Phaedrus* 262b), victory or defeat of an army (Plato, *Politicus* 1, 15, 11), the solemn proclamation of a ruler (cf. Xen., *Anab.* 2, 3, 19), the accession of an emperor. Good news (*angelia agathē*) is also called *euangelion* (→ Gospel).

2. Just as the messenger who brings the news stands under the special protection of the gods (→ Angel), so too his message can acquire a sacred significance. This is, of course, true particularly where it is associated with the cultic veneration of rulers and gods: e.g. where the messenger solemnly proclaims the successful completion of a sacrifice which brings blessing, or the approach of a ceremonial procession. He proclaims the manifestation of a god, the reign of a new god-king, or announces the mighty deeds of his god or emperor.

OT In the LXX *angellō* appears 5 times and means to announce. *an-* and *apangellō* by contrast occur frequently, chiefly to render the Heb. *nāḡaḏ* (hiph. or hoph.), in the sense of to report, announce (e.g. Gen. 9:22; 37:5; 2 Sam. 15:13), to proclaim (Pss. 19[18]:2; 51:15[50:17]), to speak out openly (e.g. Gen. 12:18; 1 Sam. 9:19), to direct or instruct (Deut. 24:8). *di-*, *ex-* and *katangellō* are seldom found in the LXX; *proangellō* and *katangeleus* do not appear at all.

The message of the OT and of rabbinic Judaism makes it quite clear that where the lordship of the divine Ruler is proclaimed, and his mighty deeds made known, no room is left for proclaiming the lordship of other gods. We ought therefore to ask whether the special meaning attached to these terms in the NT is not derived from OT and rabbinic usage. The might of God the Lord is declared to all the world (Exod. 9:16; Ps. 64[63]:9), his righteousness (Ps. 22[21]:30 f.), his faithfulness (Ps. 30[29]:9), his wondrous deeds (Ps. 71:[70]:17), his steadfast love (Ps. 92:2 [91:3]). He himself, the Lord, proclaims what is to come: "Behold, the former things have come to pass, and new things I now declare; before they spring forth I tell you of them" (Isa. 42:9; cf. 46:10). This is something idols cannot do (Isa. 44:7 ff.). It is above all the → prophets, the chosen messengers, who make known

the saving acts of God among his people and in all the earth (Isa. 12:5), who proclaim his will (Mic. 6:8) and announce what is to come. The latter idea, the announcement of eschatological events, is one that comes strongly into focus in intertestamental writings (cf. the Lat. *adnuntiare* of 2 Esd. Vulg.) One or two texts indicate that the prophets of the OT were even called *angeloi* (→ Angel), angels (Hag. 1:13; Mal. 3:1; Moses in Ass. Mos. 11:17 as the *magnus nuntius*). They make use of the same forms of expression as messengers in the surrounding world of the OT (e.g. the priests of Mari). Thus there is theological content in these expressions wherever in the LXX proclamation or announcement takes place at the behest of Yahweh or in the knowledge of his acts of salvation.

NT 1. In the NT *angellō* and *angelia* are only found twice each, and in each case in the Johannine writings (Jn. 4:51 *v.l.*; 20:18; 1 Jn. 1:5; 3:11). More frequently we find compounds with the same meaning: *anangellō* (13 times, 5 of which are Johannine and 5 in Acts); *apangellō* (46 times, 27 of these in Luke/Acts); and *katangellō* (18 times, of which 11 are in Acts and 7 in Paul). The other derivatives, as in classical Gk., are only found occasionally in the NT: *prokatangellō* (Acts 3:18); 7:52); *diangellō* (Lk. 9:60; Acts 21:26; Rom. 9:17); *exangellō* (1 Pet. 2:9) and *katangeleus* (Acts 17:18).

Statistical analysis shows that of the 88 occurrences, 48 are to be found in the Lucan writings, and 12 each in the Johannine literature and Paul.

As in classical usage, *an-* and *apangellō* can lose their full meaning and signify simply relate or speak (cf. e.g. Matt. 2:8; 28:11; Lk. 8:20; Acts 16:38). On the other hand, it is not always quite clear whether the etymological sense has been totally disregarded, e.g. in the typical ending of miracle stories (". . . and told [*apēngeilan*] it in the city and in the country", Mk. 5:14).

2. Usually the words of this group mean proclamation in a special, technical sense: the making known of God's activity, his will to save. This proclamation, the authority of which is derived from its ultimate source, enters deeply into the life of the messenger and makes total demands upon him. When used in this way, these terms can scarcely be distinguished in meaning from that word which is so central to the NT, *euangelizomai*, proclaim (good news) (→ Gospel). Thus, for example, 1 Jn. 1:5: "And this is the message [*angelia*] which we have heard from him and proclaim [*anangellomen*] to you, that God is light and in him is no darkness at all"; Lk. 9:60: "Leave the dead to bury their dead; but as for you, go and proclaim [*diangelle*] the kingdom of God."

(a) It is noticeable, however, that John uses the words of this group exclusively in a theologically pregnant sense, whereas *euangelizomai* and → *kēryssō*, a term frequently used in the Synoptic Gospels, Acts and Paul, do not appear in his writings at all. G. Friedrich is of the opinion that John has consciously avoided both expressions, because in contrast to *an-* and *apangellō* they emphasize strongly the dramatic, dynamic proclamation of the age of salvation, the heralding of a coming event, an idea which does not fit into John's realized eschatology (*TDNT* II 717; cf. III 703). John therefore prefers *martyreō*, to bear witness: what has already happened, and been seen or experienced, is the subject of → witness. If this is correct, it explains the peculiar nuance which, for instance, *anangellō* has in the Fourth Gospel: "when he [Messiah] comes, he will show [*anangelei*] us all things"

(Jn. 4:25); "and he [the Paraclete] will declare [*anangelei*] to you the things that are to come" (16:13; → Advocate); "he will take what is mine and declare [*anangelei*] it to you" (16:14). In these passages it is not so much a matter of a proclamation which will bring about its own fulfilment in the shape of an event, nor the announcement and heralding of a new age which is already dawning in the hidden messiah, as the revealing, the *reporting* of that "which was from the beginning" (1 Jn. 1:1). The believer may go forward with confidence into the darkness of the future, because the full truth of the word will one day be revealed to him by the Spirit. Similarly, in Jn. 16:25 *apangelō* ("I will tell you plainly") brings no new subject into view, "Rather, what was once said will become clear in the eschatological existence, for which it was spoken from the beginning" (R. Bultmann, *The Gospel of John*, 1971, 587).

The difference between this and the dynamic, dramatic announcement of the new age, which is conveyed by *kēryssō* and *euangelizomai*, is again made very clear in 1 Jn. 1:2 f.: "[we] proclaim [*apangellomen*] to you the eternal life which was with the Father and was made manifest to us – that which we have seen and heard we proclaim [*apangellomen*] to you, that you may have fellowship with us." That which has been heard is being said anew, not in order to say something new, but in order to make effective what has been heard. God is light (1 Jn. 1:5), and therefore the believer is not to walk in darkness (cf. 1:7); to be in the light means to be walking in love. "He who loves his brother abides in the light" (2:10). The content of the proclamation is both information, or "reminding" of the saving event, and commandment. *angelia* can be thus rendered as message (so RSV) or command in 1 Jn. 1:5: "This is the message [or "command", *angelia*] we have heard from him and proclaim [*anangellomen*] to you, that God is light and in him is no darkness at all"; and 1 Jn. 3:11: "For this is the message [or "command", *angelia*] which you have heard from the beginning, that we should love one another."

(b) Luke and Paul use the words in a variety of senses ranging from the simple, somewhat watered down sense of give notice (Acts 21:26, *diangello*), inform (2 Cor. 7:7, *anangellō*), and the more theologically significant give a report (e.g. Acts 14:27; 15:4), to the special meaning of command (Acts 17:30), confess (1 Cor. 14:25), proclaim, declare (e.g. Acts 4:2; 13:5; 26:20; cf. also 1 Pet. 2:9), and finally to the solemn, liturgical type of proclamation which results from the sacred celebration of the → Lord's Supper. "For as often as you eat this bread and drink this cup, you proclaim [*katangellete*] the Lord's death until he comes" (1 Cor. 11:26). The proclaiming here has been taken to refer to the symbolic action of the breaking of the bread (cf. Augustine, *In Ioannis Evangelium Tractatus* 80, 3) and the pouring out of the wine, but it probably also includes the recital of the passion narrative in the same way as the story of the exodus was recalled at the celebration of the Passover (cf. C. K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, *BNTC*, 1968, 270). The number of different words used in translation demonstrates that the words of our group do not acquire any technical application to a particular form of proclamation. Luke and Paul are, however, in contrast to John, dealing with the proclamation of a completed event or the announcement of a particular one in the future. The subject of the proclamation is new to the hearers (Acts 4:2; 16:17; 1 Cor. 9:14) and becomes operative by being proclaimed (Acts 13:38; 1 Cor. 2:1). If it is at all possible to draw a distinction

between this and *euangelizomai*, it is perhaps that the latter lays the emphasis more upon the *eu*, i.e. the good, on the God-sent intervention of something joyous into the human scene.

(c) The message of Christ is the message of the Risen One. *apangellō* becomes, in the resurrection narratives of all four Gospels, a technical term for witness to the resurrection (Matt. 28:8, 10 f.; Mk. 16:10, 13; Lk. 24:9; Jn. 20:18 *angellō*). The term is here used in its original sense: a messenger (→ Angel) conveys the news, which he has received directly beforehand from the sender of the message (the Risen One, Matt. 28:10; Jn. 20:18; angels, Lk. 24:6 ff.). It is no coincidence that Luke uses the same word in his account of the Transfiguration (9:36): the disciples do not pass on to anybody the message that they have seen Jesus transfigured, i.e. in his resurrection body.

(d) Jesus is proclaimed as the one in whom the prophetic promises (cf. *prokat-* and *katangellō* in Acts 3:18, 24) have found fulfilment. Paul opened the Scriptures to them and explained "that it was necessary for the Christ to suffer and to rise again from the dead, . . . saying 'This Jesus, whom I proclaim to you, is the Christ' " (Acts 17:3). It is not surprising, then, that the commission to proclaim is itself backed by a variety of OT quotations (e.g. Rom. 9:17, cf. Exod. 9:16; Rom. 15:21, cf. Isa. 52:15). In the two places where the quotation does not agree with the LXX, Matt. 12:18 ff. (Isa. 42:1–4) and Heb. 2:12 (Ps. 22:22), it is Jesus himself who is the messenger of God. Schniewind conjectures "the influence of Palestinian tradition, i.e. that the Messiah will be the prophet of Dt. 18:15, 18 and the *euangelizomenos* of Is. 52:7; cf. Jn. 4:25 *anangelei*, Hb. 3:1 *apostolos*" (J. Schniewind, *TDNT* I 67).

(e) Just as the use of these terms varies widely, so does the content of the proclamation differ from case to case. Sometimes the reference is to everyday information, sometimes to repentance (→ Conversion, art. *metanoia*), → faith → forgiveness of sins, to the totality of the Christian message (→ Word), or to other things.

U. Becker, D. Müller

κηρύσσω

κηρύσσω (*kērysso*), announce, make known, proclaim (aloud); κῆρυξ (*kēryx*), herald; κήρυγμα (*kērygma*) proclamation, announcement, preaching, kerygma.

CL 1. The words of this group derive from the noun *kēryx*, frequent in Homer; cf. Old High German *(h)ruod*, fame; Old Indian *kāruḥ*, singer; Old Persian *xrauš* (whence Aram. *kārôz*, Dan. 3:4; see OT 2). *kēryx* denotes the man who is commissioned by his ruler or the state to call out with a clear voice some item of news and so to make it known. Subsequently the vb. *kērysso* (first attested Homer, *Il.* 2, 438) was formed from the noun to describe the activity of the herald, but it is much less common than the noun. By the addition of *-ma* to the stem *keryk-* the noun *kērygma* was later formed (attested in Xen. and Eur.), which is used, like other words of the same form, to describe either the phenomenon of *kēryssein*, i.e. the ring of the herald's voice, the act of crying aloud (e.g. Xen., *Ages.* 1, 33), or, on the other hand, the content of the proclamation thus made, the announcement, edict (Hdt. 3, 52; Aristotle, *Oeconomica* 2, p. 1349b 36). This content may be anything from a mere report (Eur. *Iph. Taur.* 239) to an authoritative command (Aristotle, *Ath. Pol.* 4, 19).

2. The precise meaning of the terms depends upon the function of the *kēryx* in the historical period in question (cf. on this the very detailed and widely documented account of G. Friedrich, *TDNT* III 683–94).

(a) In Homer (e.g. *Il.* 3, 118, 248; 7, 276) *kēryx* is used of the attendants of a prince who perform duties which are in keeping with the rôle of senior court officials, whose task is to care for the personal well-being of the prince and of his guests (like cupbearer, adjutant, steward, e.g. *Od.* 1, 143 ff.). They are, however, raised above the status of the rest of the retinue by the respect accorded to them, and by a status similar to that of friends (*Od.* 19, 247; *hetairos*, companion, friend; → Brother). The herald's staff, a kind of sceptre, in their hands (*Il.* 18, 505; *Od.* 2, 38) makes it clear, as they carry out their commission (to inform or invite), that they are authorized by the prince.

(b) In the period of the *polis*, the democratic city-state (→ People), the institution was maintained, though it seems at first to have been lessened in significance by the multiplication of types of herald. The particular function of a herald was indicated by the addition of a qualifying adj. or noun in the genitive (thus, there were heralds of the city, of the archons, of the council, of the court, and even of the mysteries and of the gods). Despite the fact that it was sometimes difficult to find free men to do this job, and that some of them appear to have been disparagingly spoken of, the really important fact is the rôle in society which the heralds played. Formally they were servants (we would say messengers, or spokesmen) of certain authorities (Plato, *Politicus* 290b), whose chief qualification for office was a loud and clear voice; but it was the heralds also who called the soldiers to battle (Homer, *Il.* 2, 51, 437 ff.) and the full citizens to the assembly (cf. → Church, art. *ekklēsia* CL). They were responsible for good order in the assembly, and opened it with prayers and sacrifices and announced its end (cf. Aristophanes, *Thesmophoriazusae* 295 ff.; *Acharnenses* 45, 173). In public court hearings heralds announced the result of the drawing of lots for the judges, called on the judges to cast their votes, and beforehand asked the people whether anyone had objections to raise about the procedure of the statements of the witnesses. Thus they were, so to speak, responsible for the maintenance of the laws, and so for political and religious order generally. Their sacred, indeed sacrosanct position (Homer calls them *angeloi Dios*, *Il.* 1, 334 and *angeloi theioi*, divine messengers, *Il.* 10, 315), is even more evident from the fact that when the *kēryx* appeared, weapons were stilled, e.g. when heralds from one city invite all Greece to a festival in honour of the gods (Soph., *Aj.* 1240), and in the course of it they were responsible for the religious opening and the proclamation of victors and prizes. The herald who came to the enemy with a message in time of war must not be touched, since that would be to incur the wrath not only of the one who sent him, but also that of the gods, since it would be a gross *asebeia*, i.e. transgression of the religious and moral order (Dem., 12, 4; cf. the statement of Achilles in Homer, *Il.* 1,334). It is probably because of this position, guaranteed by the universally recognized moral and religious law, that heralds occasionally functioned as political ambassadors, or at least went out before them (Dem., 19, 163).

The following general characteristics may therefore be listed. The *kēryx* was always under the authority of someone else, whose spokesman he was. He himself was immune. He conveyed the message and intention of his master. He had,

therefore, unlike for example the *presbys*, envoy (→ Bishop), no liberty of his own to negotiate. His office had in every case an official character, even when he appeared in the market-place as a public middleman or auctioneer (e.g. Hdt., 6, 121). He was, therefore, also the announcer of judicial verdicts. What he announced became valid by the act of proclamation. The binding, commanding and settling nature of this proclamation distinguishes *kēryssō* and its cognates from → *angellō* and its compounds, which refer rather to the imparting of information, or making of an offer.

3. With the relaxation of the rigid order of the *polis*, the Stoics were provided with the opportunity for giving a quite different interpretation to the office of *kēryx*, after it had largely lost its significance for society. In addition to the political authorities, the Eleusinian mysteries already possessed their special heralds, who carried out liturgical functions in the cult, took over responsibility for the announcements, and together with the priests exercised great influence; and to Hermes had been attributed the function of a herald sent to men by the gods. Epictetus (*Dissertationes* 3, 22, 13 ff.) saw the real *kēryx* of his day in the Cynic philosopher, who moved around the country as a messenger of the gods and guardian of the moral order (*kataskopos*, *Dissertationes* 3, 22, 69). Without means of his own, and totally dedicated to his task, he came to denounce the way of life of his contemporaries and to call them to repentance, reformation of life, and concern about salvation. These preachers of → virtue, who deliberately dissociated themselves from every religious observance, laying all their emphasis upon integrity in everyday living and on an inner, higher peace (Epictetus, *Dissertationes* 3, 22, 9 ff.), dissolved religion, morality and philosophy into a single whole. They prepared the stage on which later the messengers of the gospel of Jesus Christ were to stand. How close the message of the latter could on occasion seem to Stoic preaching, both in language and in content, may be seen from the remarks which for instance Paul has to make in 1 Thess. 2:3 ff., in order to make the distinction clear.

OT 1. (a) In striking contrast to the generality of Gk. literature, the noun *kēryx* occurs only four times altogether in the LXX, and in three of these instances without a Heb. equivalent. Even here it never refers to a Jewish institution or person, but to foreign ones: in Gen. 41:43 (where the LXX has paraphrased the Heb. *qārâh* as *ekēryxen . . . kēryx*, a herald called out before him . . .), the reference is to the function of a servant of Pharaoh; in Dan. 3:4 it is Nebuchadnezzar's herald who calls the people to worship the image; in 4 Macc. 6:4 it is the herald of Antiochus IV; and in Sir. 20:15 the figure of a herald is used metaphorically for the raising of the voice. In Gen. 41 and Dan. the emphasis is upon the vb. *kēryssō*, which appears in addition to the noun.

All this is evidence that a figure comparable to the Gk. *kēryx* was unknown in Israel, and that it was clearly not appropriate to describe the → prophets in this way.

(b) As far as the vb. *kēryssō* is concerned, the picture is a little different. The LXX uses the word 29 times, usually to render the Heb. *qārâh*; but in Jon. 3:7 for *zā'aq*, to → cry; and in Hos. 5:8, Joel 2:1, Zeph. 3:14, Zech. 9:9, for the hiph. of *rûa'*, which refers to a loud cry (in the first two instances, the cry of alarm raised or

accompanied by instruments, both times on the mountain; in the other two, the triumphant battle-cry or shout of victory). In Exod. 36:6 and 2 Chr. 36:22, *kēryssō* is used for an announcement (Heb. *qôl*, voice) made throughout the camp by Moses, and throughout the kingdom by Cyrus, the Persian king.

Since, however, *qārâh* is found over 650 times in the OT and is usually translated in the LXX by *kaleō*, to → call, or *ekkaleō*, to call forth, we have to ask for what special kind of calling the vb. *kēryssō* is used in the translation. If we leave aside Zech. 9:9 and Zeph. 3:14, as being special cases, we may say that the word is used only for three classic functions of the herald: (i) for the proclamation of a cultic festival (Exod. 32:5; 2 Ki. 10:20; 2 Chr. 30:5; also Dan. 3:4 LXX, of the cultic call to worship made by the Babylonian herald; → Feast), or → fast (2 Chr. 20:3; Joel 1:14; 2:15; also Jon. 3:5, 7, by the citizens or the king of → Nineveh); (ii) for the orders of the military commander in the field, or a decree of the prince, which have to be proclaimed (Exod. 36:6; 2 Chr. 24:9; also the apocryphal passages 1 Esd 2:2, the decree of Cyrus that the Jews should return and the temple be rebuilt; and 9:3, Ezra's command to the Jews; 1 Macc. 5:49[51], Judas' command to attack Ephron); (iii) for the proclamation of → judgment (Hos. 5:8; Joel 3:9; Jon. 3:2, 4) or of Yahweh's day of judgment (Joel 2:1), or in Isa. 61:1 the announcement of liberty to captives; in this category also, following classical usage, belongs the proclamation of the rehabilitation of those accused (Mordecai, Est. 6:9, 11; Jonathan, 1 Macc. 10:63 f.).

Prov. 1:21, 8:1 and 9:3 belong in a special category of their own. These are the passages in which → wisdom cries out with a loud voice, in a way comparable with the Stoic use of the word. In Mic. 3:5 *kēryssō* is used to render the false prophets' proclamation of peace. The noun *kērygma* is found once in each of the above categories, describing the content of what is proclaimed (2 Chr. 30:5; 1 Esd. 9:3; Jon. 3:2; Prov. 9:3). Categories (i) and (ii) move within the familiar framework of orders given by human authorities; but all the prophetic passages mentioned under (iii) speak of the proclamation of a judgment of Yahweh. The number of references is, however, relatively small, a fact which confirms that the caution with which the OT makes use of the noun also applies to the vb. The latter never becomes a term of central importance in the OT's proclamation of salvation; this purpose is served by other vbs. (e.g. *angellō*).

2. In Jewish writings outside the OT, the noun *kārôz*, herald, public crier, probably a word borrowed from the Persian, is found frequently in the rabbis. Josephus' use of *kēryx* corresponds to the classical Gk. usage, when reference is made to the conveying of military commands, and to diplomatic missions (cf. *Ant.* 10, 75; *War* 2, 624; 3, 92). In Philo, on the other hand, the words are found only here and there, and then as a technical term for the utterances of the OT prophets (cf. K. Goldammer, *ZNW* 48, 1957, 80). In rabbinic literature both the noun and the vb. appear, where an announcement (e.g. Shabbath 15d, 38) or a judicial verdict (Sanhedrin 6:1; Sanhedrin 43a) is publicly proclaimed; and also for the public announcement of rabbinic decisions on doctrine when these are relevant to the keeping of the law (Rosh ha-Shanah 21a), and to describe the one who is commissioned by the rabbi to make known instructions for conduct during the synagogue service (Berakoth 7c, 59). Sometimes, the sound of the *baṯ-qôl*, the voice from heaven (→ Word, art. *phōnē*, OT 3), is linked with *kāraz*, call together,

call out, announce. On the whole, however, the term which is found relatively often, is used in a technical and formal way. It is used to introduce rabbinic decisions on doctrine, or the citation of scripture.

3. In the literature of Qumran the vb. *sāpar*, to tell, recount, which can sometimes come close in meaning to the Gk. *kēryssō*, occurs fairly frequently in the Hymns. Here, of course, it is used of the congregation's, or the individual worshipper's, act of witnessing and proclaiming in praise of God, recording the wonderful works of Yahweh (e.g. 1QH 3:20; 10:20), or his honour (1QH 11:6), majesty (1QH 12:30), patience and mercy (1QH 17:17; 18:14). Occasionally also God's own proclamation is spoken of, e.g., in his creation and his deeds (1QH 1:12; 13:11).

NT 1. The first noticeable feature in the NT is that, in keeping with the LXX, it uses the noun *kēryx* only 3 times, and that in later writings (1 Tim. 2:7; 2 Tim. 1:11; 2 Pet. 2:5). *kērygma*, too, is found relatively seldom: in Paul, for the message of Christ which he proclaims (Rom. 16:25, *kērygma Iēsou Christou*), or his preaching generally (in 1 Cor. 2:4; 15:14 with possessive pronouns; cf. 1 Cor. 1:21); more formalized in 2 Tim. 4:17 and Tit. 1:3; and finally in Matt. 12:41 par. Lk. 11:32, for the message of → Jonah to → Nineveh.

The vb. *kēryssō*, on the other hand, is found relatively frequently (61 times). It occurs 19 times in the Pauline epistles including Col., and 1 and 2 Tim.; 8 times in Acts; 9 times each in Matt. and Lk.; 14 times in Mk.; and once each in 1 Pet. and Rev. It is notable for its total absence in the Johannine writings, Heb. and Jas. An analysis of the grammatical object of the vb. reveals that in early passages of Paul (1 Thess. 2:9; Gal. 2:2; but cf. also Col. 1:23) and in some Marcan (Mk. 1:14; 13:10; 14:9) and Matthean (Matt. 4:23; 9:35; 24:14; 26:13) contexts the object is *to euangelion*, the → gospel; while in the Corinthian letters (1 Cor. 1:23; 15:12; 2 Cor. 1:19; 11:4), Phil. 1:15 and Acts 8:5; 9:20; 19:13 it is *Christos* (4 times), *Iēsous* (3 times) or Christ Jesus who is proclaimed. John the Baptist proclaimed the *baptisma metanoias eis aphesin hamartiōn*, "baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins" (Mk. 1:4; Lk. 3:3; cf. Acts 10:37; → Baptism). For Luke the *basileia*, → kingdom, is the object of proclamation (Lk. 8:1; 9:2; Acts 20:25; 28:31); for Matthew, too, the kingdom is the actual content of the gospel which is proclaimed (cf. Matt. 4:23; 9:35; 24:14).

2. (a) This evidence makes it quite clear that, no doubt deliberately, the NT witnesses, following other streams of Judaism, avoided identifying themselves or the messengers of Jesus with the Gk. institution of the *kēryx*, open as it was to such a wide variety of interpretation. Only in the later passages 1 Tim. 2:7 and 2 Tim. 1:11 (leaving aside the description of → Noah as a *kēryx* of righteousness in 2 Pet. 2:5), is the word introduced, and then in combination with *apostolos*, → apostle, which qualifies it. This is probably to be explained by the stronger tendency of the church to think in terms of institutions at a time when the eschatological aspect was diminishing in importance, and the church was adjusting herself to a permanent existence in the world. (On this whole question → Present: *The Parousia and Eschatology in the NT.*) But even these two texts still reveal the basic difference between the biblical viewpoint and that of the surrounding world: it is not the institution or the person to which importance is attached, but only the effective act of proclamation. This appears to be the reason why the establishment of a

definite, protected, official position was avoided by not using the noun which was ready to hand. This is confirmed by the fact that Jn., who in similar contexts prefers the vb. *martyreō*, to witness, uses the noun *martyria*, testimony, but not *martys*, a witness (→ Witness, NT 4). Even in the case of the unusual description of Noah as a *kēryx*, the writer is hardly thinking of an office but rather of the sign constituted by Noah's actions as a whole.

(b) A similar finding results from a study of the term *kērygma*, proclamation, in the NT. Where it is used, in Matt. 12:41 par. Lk. 11:32 for the *kērygma* of → Jonah, it undoubtedly includes also the content of Jonah's message to Nineveh. But the emphasis probably lies much more on the carrying out by Jonah of a divine commission: the delivery of a message containing not only a threat of judgment but also an invitation to repentance and salvation. Similarly Matt. 3:3 par. Mk. 1:3, Lk. 3:4 cites Isa. 40:3: "the voice of one crying [*boōntos*]. . ." (→ Cry, art. *boaō*). In the three texts accepted as Pauline (1 Cor. 1:21; 2:4; 15:14), this emphasis is even more obvious. Though it may not be clear where *dia tēs mōrias*, by the foolishness (1:21), refers to content or to means of delivery, it must be said that *ouk en peithois sophias logois*, "not in plausible words of wisdom" (2:4), goes further in the direction of describing the apostle's manner of speaking; and similarly that 15:14 has in mind the apostle's activity of preaching just as much as the content of his message. In Rom. 16:25 *kērygma*, message, is already becoming hypostasized: it is Christ-preaching, as carried out by Paul. Furthest of all along this line goes 2 Tim. 4:17. "But the Lord stood by me and gave me strength to proclaim the word fully [*hina di' emou to kērygma plērophorēthē*], that all the Gentiles might hear it." Here the *kērygma* is the actual act of proclamation, which has need of the particular messenger only in order, as it were, to complete it and give it concrete fulfilment (→ Fullness, art. *plēroō*). Tit. 1:3 is similar: "and at the proper time manifested in his word through the preaching with which I have been entrusted [*ton logon autou en kērygmati ho episteuthēn*] by command of God our Saviour."

(c) The nouns of this group are thus used in the NT generally to express the form of activity: *what* the *kērygma* is, what the content that it makes known, can be seen only from the context in each case. The NT is therefore as faithful to the original meaning of the word as is the OT. *kērygma* is the phenomenon of a call which goes out and makes a claim upon the hearers: it corresponds to the life and activity of the prophets. The idea that in terms of content it "can or must be as it were the 'evangelical' substance of the Christian message, the nuclear revelation after the mythical has been eliminated" cannot be established from the NT (K. Goldammer, *ZNW* 48, 1957, 96). The qualitative concept of *kērygma*, as it appears in the mid-twentieth-century theology of R. Bultmann and his school, is the product of theological reflection. It takes up the language of the NT, but uses the word in a sense which is at most marginally present in the NT. If we seek the origin of this usage, we may find it in the 4th cent. Athanasius, who, after centuries in which the word had been used in the most various of ways, was probably the first to use it in the full sense of Christian or church doctrine (*De Decretis Nicaenae Synodi* 26, 7; cf. K. Goldammer, ibid.)

3. (a) The NT's completely predominant conception of proclamation as a process and event, whose content can only be determined by closer definition, is

confirmed by the considerably greater frequency with which the vb. is used in comparison with the nouns. *kēryssō* is one of a number of formal verbs of telling and communication, which connote a certain means of communication but are not limited as to the content (e.g. *didaskō*, to teach; *angellō*, to report, together with its compounds; *legō*, to say; *homologeō*, to confess; *martyreō*, to bear witness, with its compounds; *euangelizomai*, to preach; *gnōrizō*, to make known; and others (cf. G. Friedrich, *TDNT* III 703). The wide range of words used in the NT indicates that none of the vbs. gained a position of clear dominance or was able to become a technical term.

Just how fluid the terminology was in seen from the fact that Paul in 1 Thess. 2:2, 9, describes his ministry in the same context as *lalēsai . . . to euangelion*, "to tell . . . the gospel", and as *ekēryxamen . . . to euangelion*, "we proclaimed . . . the gospel"; while in Phil. 1:18 he expresses this same act of proclamation by the vb. *katangellō*. Similarly, Luke in Lk. 4:43 (par. Mk. 1:38) and Lk. 9:6 (par. Mk. 6:12) replaces the Marcan *kērysso* by *euangelizō*. But in Lk. 8:1 he uses both vbs. synonymously side by side, and in Lk. 6:13 (par. Mk. 3:14) he appears to have subsumed the *kēryssein* which Mark expressly mentions into the term → apostle.

The nearest the NT comes to the classical figure of the herald is in Rev. 5:2, where the angel makes a proclamation with a mighty voice, and 1 Pet. 3:19, where the voice of the Crucified rings out in Hades (here the vb. is used on its own without an object). (For alternative interpretations of the latter passage → Flesh, art. *sarx*, NT 2 (a); → also Hell.) But Matt. 10:27 par. Lk. 12:3, where proclaiming from the roof-tops is a reference to the public revelation of what has hitherto been secret and hidden, ought also to be mentioned in this context.

(b) Traces of the original meaning of the word are also to be found here and there in Paul. In Rom. 2:21 he addresses those who make a demand that men should not steal, and yet do it themselves: "While you preach against stealing, do you steal [*ho kēryssōn mē kleptein klepteis*]?". Here *kēryssōn* may be compared with the Stoic sense of proclamation of a definite commandment which demands obedience. There is a similar thought in 1 Cor. 9:27. The call to a certain course of action or behaviour, though it is not here a matter of ethics, is also expressed by the vb. in Gal. 5:11, where Paul is dissociating himself from the continuing proclamation of circumcision, i.e. the propagation of conversion to Judaism as an expression of obedience to the only God.

Positively Paul sees himself as one who proclaims *to euangelion tou theou*, the → gospel of God (1 Thess. 2:9), among the Gentiles (Gal. 2:2), something which can be done only if it is accompanied by a total giving of his own person (1 Thess. 2:8). For Paul proclamation is not, as with Jonah, a once-for-all cry which might be compared with simply sticking up a poster. The proclamation of the message of Christ, as he understands it, requires unceasing pleading and wooing, with a love that seeks, and is accompanied by a constant care for the individual (cf. the labour and toil by day and night of 1 Thess. 2:9; cf. also 2 Cor. 5:18 ff.). It also involves exhortation (→ Exhort, art. *parakaleō*), warning (*parakalountes*), encouragement (→ Comfort, art. *paramytheomai*), and → witness. In such a context *kēryssein* appears as the central act of proclamation, which is needed, like the setting up of a signpost, if the → call of God (*tou theou tou kalountos hymas*, the God who calls you, 1 Thess. 2:12) is to be realized – as it is when the hearers

enter upon the kind of life which is worthy (*axiōs*) of the glory of God which is about to be revealed.

The basis for this invitation (i.e. its content and origin) may be discovered from those passages in his later epistles where Paul uses *kēryssō*, to proclaim. It is Christ, i.e. a person, whom Paul proclaims in this way (1 Cor. 1:23; 15:12; 2 Cor. 1:19; 4:5; Phil. 1:15; cf. 2 Cor. 11:4 *Iēsoun*, Jesus). It is in fact the crucified Christ (1 Cor. 1:23; cf. 2:2), that is the death of this Jesus, which is presented in this proclamation as the basis of life. It is the Christ in whom Paul sees all the previous → promises of God as being fulfilled and taking concrete form (2 Cor. 1:20). It is the Christ to whom Paul bears witness on the ground of the tradition handed down to him (→ Teach, art. *paradidōmi*), but also on the ground of his own experience (1 Cor. 15:3–8), as the one who appeared to his own after his death, as the Risen One (→ Resurrection). 1 Cor. 15:1 f. leaves no doubt that the → death of Jesus for the sin of others, and his presence and exaltation, made possible only by this means (cf. Phil. 2:8–11), formed the central content of what Paul preached as the saving and world-changing message (1 Cor. 15:12). According to 1 Thess. 4:13 ff., the promise of the general resurrection and of the *parousia*, i.e. the presence, of Jesus also form part of it (→ Present). W. Baird (*JBL* 76, 187) is probably right when he points out that (according to Gal. 1:11–17) it is not the facts and doctrines which had already been formulated in the pre-Pauline era which characterize Paul's proclamation, but the preaching of Jesus as the Son, raised to life, of which Paul had become convinced through revelation. If such a teaching be regarded as mythological, it will be difficult to disentangle the gospel from it completely without at the same time altering the gospel's content.

The act of proclamation is ultimately a prerequisite of → faith, inasmuch as it has as its goal not simply the imparting of information or a formal allegiance, but a faith which involves self-surrender and trust (cf. 1 Cor. 15:11). Therefore, Paul sees proclamation as legitimate and possible only where a commission and authority has been given (Rom. 10:8 ff.; cf. Rom. 10:15 with Acts 13:3 and Isa. 52:10). This means that Christ is not merely an object of proclamation, but also the subject, who has authority over it. He himself is the one who commands the proclamation, who at the same time wills to be present, and allows the hearers to experience him in and through such human proclamation (cf. Gal. 3:1).

(c) The Synoptic Gospels all use *kēryssō* for the activity of John the Baptist (Matt. 3:1; Mk. 1:4; Lk. 3:3), indicating, as the allusion to Isa. 40:3 also shows, that he is the last of the → prophets (→ Cry, art. *boaō*). Mk. sums up his preaching as that of a *baptisma metanoias eis aphesin hamartiōn*, "baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins." The phrase includes both the means and the end. Matt. and Lk. develop this further with some examples of his teaching. All three Gospels record, however, that the Baptist's preaching extended to the announcement of the coming Stronger One (*ischyroteros*), through whose Spirit-baptism a new order will begin (Matt. 3:11 par. Mk. 1:7, Lk. 3:16; cf. Jn. 1:26 f.).

(i) Matthew inserts at this point (Matt. 3:2), as the factor which legitimates and motivates John's *kēryssein*, the sentence *ēngiken gar hē basileia tōn ouranōn*, "for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." This means that John's call to repentance is set against the background of the promised lordship of Christ. This is why it is taken up by Jesus in exactly the same words (Matt. 4:17), and is emphasized at Matt.

10:7 as the centre of the message the disciples are to proclaim, which begins as they are sent out. Jesus himself thus moves into the area, as it were, between the Testaments, into the centre of time. Just as the prophets, represented by John, have pointed forward to his coming, before he himself establishes the signs of the *basileia* (cf. the summaries in Matt. 4:23; 9:35; 11:1), so the disciples bear witness to its dawning, as something that has already happened and is now present in their proclamation ("He who receives you, receives me", Matt. 10:40; cf. 24:12). The content of the *kēryssein* remains the same – a proclamation of the Lordship of Christ. But the form and perspective of the preaching is conditioned by its setting in history (and in the history of salvation).

It is to be observed that Matt. is the only evangelist to use the term *kēryssein* exclusively in reference to the ministry of John, Jesus, and the disciples expressly sent out by him. He thus underlines the binding, almost judicial and official character of the proclamation, which, in contrast to *didaskein*, to teach, takes place not only in the synagogues but also in the wilderness and the villages, in short even outside the traditional limits of the community and the places and meetings where it might be expected, even among the Gentiles (Matt. 24:14, throughout the whole inhabited world).

(ii) No such systematization can be found in Mark. Here too the line may indeed be followed from John (Mk. 1:4, 7), through Jesus (Mk. 1:38 f.), to the commissioned disciples (Mk. 3:14; cf. 6:12). Likewise the extension of the sphere of proclamation from Israel to the Gentiles is noted in the so-called "Little Apocalypse" (Mk. 13:10; cf. Matt. 24:14; on this → Present: *The Parousia and Eschatology in the NT*, 2 (a)). But Mk. emphasizes the inner power and the necessity of proclamation, rather than its official character. Even before the disciples have been commissioned, those who have been healed proclaim, despite being expressly forbidden to do so. What has happened to them is a result of their encounter with Jesus (Mk. 1:45; 5:20 par. Lk. 8:39; Mk. 7:36). Their encounter with Jesus, their experience of the mercy of God, their own recognition of the dawn of the new age in this Jesus (Mk. 7:37 echoes Isa. 35:5) are enough to compel them to tell others. Without any formal ratification this telling becomes proclamation.

(iii) Finally, Luke (Luke/Acts) taking up the prophetic words of Isa. 61:1 f. in Jesus' sermon at Nazareth (the place of proclamation is first of all the synagogue: Lk. 4:16, 44; cf. Mk. 1:39) and his declaration that the word has been fulfilled by his coming, describes Jesus as the one who both proclaims and carries through the work of God, and then sends out the disciples to proclaim it (Lk. 10:9 par. Matt. 10:7). When they speak of Christ, they proclaim by that very act the *basileia*, as God's new ordering of the things in the world, taking place in and through Jesus (cf. the activity of Philip in Samaria, Acts 8:5, with the description of the work of Paul in Acts 9:20; 20:25; 28:31). Conversely the proclamation of the *basileia* is tied up with the words and teaching of Jesus (Acts 28:31, *didaskōn ta tou kyriou Iēsou Christou*, "teaching the things of the Lord Jesus Christ"). Jesus is described as the Son of God (Acts 9:20), as the Risen One (e.g. Acts 2:32; 4:10), the guarantor of resurrection from the dead (Acts 4:2), in whose name alone the → forgiveness of sins which John proclaimed can be realized (Acts 2:38; cf. Lk. 24:47). Acts 15:21 ("from early generations Moses has had in every city those who preach him", i.e. the law) makes it clear that the proclamation to which *kēryssein* refers also lays

down binding principles of faith and life for the fellowship which it sets up and which is set up in accordance with it. In this respect the vb. goes beyond *euangelizomai*, a word which Luke uses in an otherwise synonymous sense.

4. We must now ask what is the particular nuance of *kēryssō* as compared with the other, synonymous words used for the passing on of the message of Christ. Both Luke and Paul prefer the vb. *euangelizō* when they want to describe the total activity of proclamation (in the case of Lk., *katangellō* also). But it may also be noted that *kēryssō* is particularly used when the message of the rule of God as it has dawned in Christ, and of his resurrection, is proclaimed in a particular instance by angels (Lk. 1:19; 2:10) or men (Lk. 3:18; 9:6; Acts 5:42; 8:4 ff.). Here the messengers are not bandying slogans. The proclamation in each case has a thoroughly personal character and the one who proclaims must stake his existence upon it. "If the word has precedence over the text, because the word intended is God's word, as it was heard and could be said in Jesus as God's 'yes' to man, faith has to proclaim this word by repeating Jesus. The task of proclamation is to repeat Jesus" (E. Fuchs, *Studies of the Historical Jesus*, *SBT* 42, 1964, 200). The vb. *kerykssō* characterizes the concrete proclamation of the message in a particular instance, with special reference to the claim that is being made, and its authority to set up a new order. It includes information, but is always more than mere instruction or a bare offer, and is equally distinct from the communication of philosophical teaching or general → wisdom. *kērykssō* sets a standard, to ignore which is not simply indifference but refusal.

At the same time the conveying of the message of Christ does not consist solely in *kēryssein*, as Matt., who has given the vb. its firmest position, makes clear. He describes the work of Jesus as *didaskōn . . . kai kerykssōn . . . kai therapeuōn*, "teaching . . . and preaching . . . and healing" (Matt. 4:23; 9:35). The description of the disciples' work follows the same pattern, albeit without *didaskōn* (Matt. 10:7 ff.; cf. Mk. 3:14 f.; 6:12 f.). For Matt. significantly, Jesus alone is the teacher, apart from the OT quotation in Matt. 15:9. The word does not appear in connexion with the disciples until the great commission of Matt. 28:20. All this is to say that the event of proclamation is surrounded by objective instruction and by events and actions which symbolically make known the dawn and the power of the new age. It is not only the proclamation of the new age, but it makes space for the latter to grow. This, and probably only this, provides the protection against blind fascination, on the one hand, and against spiritualization and idealization, on the other.

L. Coenen

The Structure and Content of the Early Kerygma

The subject of the kerygma has never been far from the forefront of critical discussion for the past half-century. It was virtually an axiom of Bultmann and his school that the primitive church was deeply interested in the Christ of the kerygma but cared little for the historical Jesus (cf. R. Bultmann, "The Significance of the Historical Jesus for the Theology of Paul", in *Faith and Understanding*, I, 1969, 220–46; *New Testament Theology*, I, 1952, 33–183; and "The Primitive Christian Kerygma and the Historical Jesus", in C. E. Braaten and R. A. Harrisville, eds., *The Historical Jesus and the Kerygmatic Christ*, 1964, 15–42). This was bound up

with two wider theological positions. On the one hand, there was the philosophical and dogmatic conviction that the knowledge of God is on a different plane from the knowledge of facts which, of course, include historical facts. On the other hand, it was related to a sceptical approach to form criticism which maintained that careful analysis of the literary forms detected within the NT writings showed a lack of interest in historical questions (cf. Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*, [1921] ET 1968²; M. Dibelius, *From Tradition to Gospel*, [1933] ET [1934] 1971; K. L. Schmidt, *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu. Literarkritische Untersuchungen zur ältesten Überlieferung*, [1919] 1964). It was argued that the first Christians were so absorbed by the thought of the Risen Christ and the parousia that they had no concern for biographical details of Jesus. Such an interest developed later on with second and third generation Christians.

W. Schmithals has argued that gospel traditions remained unknown or virtually apocryphal until the time of Justin Martyr ("Paulus und der historische Jesus", *ZNW* 53, 1962, 145 ff.). Within the ranks of Bultmann's disciples E. Käsemann signalled a return of interest in the historical Jesus in a lecture delivered in 1953 on "The Problem of the Historical Jesus" (*Essays on New Testament Themes*, *SBT* 41, 1964, 15–47). The considerable debate which followed focused on the question of the relationship between the kerygma and the historical Jesus and the adequacy of the existentialist interpretation of history. Moreover, interest in form criticism has given way to interest in redaction criticism and tradition criticism investigating the treatment of the hypothetical sources and traditions at various stages of alleged development. For discussions see J. M. Robinson, *A New Quest of the Historical Jesus*, *SBT* 25, 1959; J. Rohde, *Rediscovering the Teaching of the Evangelists*, 1968; N. Perrin, *Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus*, 1967; and *What is Redaction Criticism?*, 1970; R. H. Fuller, *The Foundations of New Testament Christology*, 1965; R. S. Barbour, *Traditio-Historical Criticism of the Gospels*, 1972; and more briefly G. N. Stanton, *Jesus of Nazareth in New Testament Preaching*, *Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series* 27, 1974, 1–12.

Käsemann contends that the Gospels are a (late) reaction to early Christian enthusiasm which at least partly overlooked the earthly Jesus ("Blind Alleys in the 'Jesus of History' Controversy", *New Testament Questions of Today*, 1969, 23–66). Others see a difference of interest in the separation of Gentile and Jewish Christianity, but with apparently contradictory results. G. Ebeling suggests that cultured Hellenistic circles would have appreciated a biographical presentation of Jesus especially as the presuppositions of OT thought and Jewish apocalypticism were less strong for them (*Theology and Proclamation*, 1966, 133). But U. Wilckens believes that the Hellenistic churches, including Paul, preached a Christ-kerygma which knew virtually nothing about the teaching and ministry of Jesus. The latter remained the preserve of Jewish Christians in Palestine; only later did the traditions about Jesus penetrate the Hellenistic churches ("Tradition de Jésus et Kérygme du Christ: La Double Histoire de la Tradition au Sein du Christianisme Primitif", *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses* 47, 1967, 1–20; "Hellenistisch-christliche Missionsüberlieferung und Jesustradition", *TLZ* 89, 1964, 518 ff.). Similar views have been argued by S. G. F. Brandon, *The Fall of Jerusalem*, 1951; P. Vielhauer, "Ein Weg zur neutestamentlichen Christologie?", *EvTh* 25, 1965, 24–72; and S. Schulz, "Die neue Frage nach dem historischen Jesus", in H. Balten-

sweiler and B. Reicke, eds., *Neues Testament und Geschichte. Historisches Geschehen und Deutung im Neuen Testament. Oscar Cullmann zum 70. Geburtstag*, 1972, 33 ff. It may be noted in passing that any thesis which posits a sharp cultural and religious difference between Palestinian and Hellenistic Judaism is likely to be subjected to increasingly sharp scrutiny in the light of the growing conviction that Hellenistic culture had pervaded Jewish life more early and more deeply than had been considered. Although the Hellenists formed a separate group in Acts, it is now highly questionable whether these two outlooks can be set in diametrical opposition in the NT period (cf. I. H. Marshall, "Palestinian and Hellenistic Christianity: Some Critical Comments", *NTS* 19, 1972–73, 271–87; M. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, I–II, 1974).

A somewhat different approach has been advanced by Scandinavian scholars. H. Riesenfeld argues that the origin of the gospel tradition goes back to Jesus' own messianic consciousness ("The Gospel Tradition and its Beginnings", *StudEv*, I, 1959, 43–65; reprinted as a separate paper, 1957, and also in *The Gospels Reconsidered: A Selection of Papers read at the International Congress on the Four Gospels in 1957*, 1960, 131–54; and *The Gospel Tradition*, 1970, 1–29). "Jesus is not only the object of a later faith, which on its side gave rise to the growth of oral and also written tradition, but, as Messiah and teacher, Jesus is the object and subject of a tradition of authoritative and holy words which he himself created and entrusted to his disciples for its later transmission in the epoch between his death and the parousia" (*The Gospel Tradition*, 29). Missionary preaching was not the *Sitz im Leben* of the gospel traditions (op. cit., 11; on this point he leans on the arguments of C. H. Dodd discussed below). Rather, "the recitation of the tradition about Jesus as the sacred word of the New Covenant was an essential constituent in Christian public worship" (op. cit., 21). The need for authorized transmitters of the text gave rise to the growth of the Christian ministry and in turn led to the production of the Gospels. Jesus himself adopted the methods of a Jewish rabbi, and taught his disciples to learn likewise. In other words, they learned by heart and the Gospels have their ultimate origin in the teaching of Jesus himself.

Riesenfeld's position has been extended by his pupil, B. Gerhardsson, in *Memory and Manuscript: Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity*, *Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis* 12, 1961; and *Tradition and Transmission in Early Christianity*, *Coniectanea Neotestamentica* 20, 1964 (in which he replies to criticisms of the earlier work). Gerhardsson made a detailed study of later rabbinic methods of transmitting teaching and suggested that they were employed by Jesus himself. His critics have accused him of reading into the NT period the methods of a later age. They also point out that the Gospels themselves admit of variations in the choice of what is given, the precise wording of common material and the paraenetic interest of the evangelists. However, whilst there are points of substance here and more work needs to be done on teaching methods, this approach at least has the merit of seeking to relate the teaching of Jesus to the life-setting of Jewish teaching. A somewhat different position has been argued by T. Boman in *Die Jesus-Überlieferung im Lichte der neueren Volkskunde*, 1967. In the light of recent study of the transmission of folklore tradition, he argues that the kerygma tradition proclaimed by the apostles was separate from the gospel traditions which were recounted by a special group of narrators who were subject

to the apostles and prophets. But it is not easy to find direct evidence for a separate class of narrators or believe that the two activities could be reserved for different functionaries.

A number of writers have suggested that interest in the life of Jesus in the early church grew out of the need to have an example for Christian conduct in order to supplement the missionary kerygma (cf. A. M. Ramsey, "The Gospel and the Gospels" in *StudEv*, I, and *The Gospels Reconsidered*, 99–106; and the discussions of E. J. Tinsley, *The Imitation of God in Christ: An Essay in the Biblical Basis of Christian Spirituality*, 1960; and "Some Principles for Reconstructing a Doctrine of the Imitation of Christ", *SJT* 25, 1972, 45–57; E. Larsson, *Christus als Vorbild*, 1962; H. D. Betz, *Nachfolge und Nachahmung Jesu Christi im Neuen Testament*, *BHTh* 37, 1967; → Disciple). But whilst there are traces of this motivation in the NT (cf. 1 Cor. 11:1; 1 Thess. 1:6), G. N. Stanton points out that Jesus did not encourage the disciples to follow him in the ethical sense (op. cit., 8). Rather, following Jesus in the Gospels is a matter of personal commitment to him and preparedness to share his fate (cf. Mk. 8:34; Matt. 10:38 par. Lk. 14:27). Moreover, the vb. to imitate (*mimeomai*) and the corresponding noun (*mimētēs*) are not found in the Gospels.

Throughout the debate there have always been those who rejected as a false choice Bultmann's alternative of a kerygmatic Christ and the historical Jesus. It was felt that an interest in the former to the exclusion of the latter was simply unrealistic and that those who responded to the kerygma of the crucified Christ and risen Lord would have wanted to know something of his life, what made him what he was, and how he came to be crucified (cf. E. B. Redlich, *Form Criticism: Its Value and Limitations*, 1939; D. M. Baillie, *God Was in Christ: An Essay on Incarnation and Atonement*, 1948, 30–58; A. M. Ramsey, op. cit.; P. Althaus, *The So-Called Kerygma and the Historical Jesus*, 1959; R. A. Bartels, *Kerygma or Gospel Tradition . . . Which Came First?*, 1961; C. F. D. Moule, "Jesus in New Testament Kerygma", in O. Böcher and K. Haacker, eds., *Verborum Veritas. Festschrift für Gustav Stählin*, 1970, 15–26). Moule takes up a suggestion of G. J. Paul that Mark was taken by Paul on his missionary journeys because his eye-witness reminiscences supplied an element in Paul's preaching which he himself could not supply. "He took, as it were, a 'gospel source' with him, in the form of a person acquainted with the facts" (op. cit., 25; cf. G. J. Paul, *St. John's Gospel: A Commentary*, 1965, 26). Similarly, the Fourth Gospel complements the Johannine Epistles, in that without it some might conclude that the circle from which the epistles emanated had no concern for the sort of material that the Gospel of Jn. contains. Thus for Moule it is a mistake to assume that the epistles constitute the total kerygma. It is the thesis of G. N. Stanton's work "that there is plenty of evidence which, taken cumulatively, indicates that the early church was interested in the life and character of Jesus and that the primary (though not the only) *Sitz im Leben* of that interest was the missionary preaching of the church" (op. cit., 9).

Although the distinction is commonly drawn between missionary proclamation (*kērygma*) and Christian teaching (*didachē*; → Teach), in practice the two were closely intertwined. It would appear that the confession of Jesus Christ as Lord was a very primitive response to the kerygma and may indeed have been part of

the baptismal profession of initiates (cf. 1 Cor. 12:3; Rom. 10:9; with Acts 11:17, 20; 16:31; Col. 2:6; and Acts 8:16; 19:5; 1 Cor. 6:11). At the same time the contexts in which these passages appear indicate that they were also used for teaching. (On the emergence of confessional formulae in the NT see O. Cullmann, *The Earliest Christian Confessions*, 1949; J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, 1950, 6–29; V. H. Neufeld, *The Earliest Christian Confessions, New Testament Tools and Studies* 5, 1963; and E. Stauffer, *New Testament Theology*, 1955, 235–57.) The following passages contain summaries of the gospel which may well be couched in rhythmical language relating specifically to beliefs about Jesus as the Christ: Rom. 1:3 f.; 8:34; 1 Cor. 15:3 ff.; Phil. 2:6–11; 1 Tim. 3:16; 2 Tim. 2:8; 1 Pet. 3:18 ff. Perhaps the following contain echoes of catechetical formulae: Gal. 1:4; 1 Thess. 4:14; 5:9 f. There may also be traces of a formula used in exorcism and healing in Acts 3:6 and 4:10. Two-part formulae which link Jesus with the Father occur in Rom. 8:24; 1 Cor. 8:6; 1 Tim. 2:5 f.; 6:13 f.; 2 Tim. 4:1.

The NT epistles contain a variety of phrases which suggest a corpus of teaching. Among those found in the later writings are: "the faith once delivered to the saints" (Jude 3); "your most holy faith" (Jude 20, implying a body of beliefs); "the pattern of sound words" (2 Tim. 1:13); "the healthy doctrine" (2 Tim. 4:3; Tit. 1:9); "the deposit [*tēn parathēkēn*]" and "the noble deposit" (1 Tim. 6:20; 2 Tim. 1:14); "the faith" (1 Tim. 1:19; Tit. 1:13); "the splendid teaching" (1 Tim. 4:6); "the confession" (Heb. 3:1; 4:14; 10:23); "the elementary doctrines" (Heb. 6:2); "the word of life" (1 Jn. 1:1, though this may refer to Christ rather than the proclamation, cf. Jn. 1:1; but cf. also Acts 5:20; Phil. 2:16). Whilst some scholars take such expressions as evidence of the crystallization of a tradition towards the end of the NT period, there is strong evidence that the process of formulating Christian truth began at a much earlier stage. Thus in one of the earliest of his epistles Paul could write: "hold fast to the traditions [*tas paradoseis*] which you have been taught" (2 Thess. 2:15). In Rom. Paul could speak of "the pattern of doctrine [*typon didachēs*]" (Rom. 6:17). To the Corinthians he could insist that his teaching on the Lord's Supper was no innovation: "For I received from the Lord what I also delivered to you, that the Lord Jesus on the night when he was betrayed took bread" (1 Cor. 11:23). But the element of tradition also extended to the content of Paul's kerygma: "Now I would remind you, brethren, in what terms I preached to you the gospel [*to euangelion ho euēngelisamen*], which you received [*parelabete*], in which you stand, by which you are saved, if you hold it fast – unless you believed in vain. For I delivered [*paredōka*] to you as of first importance what I also received, that Christ died for our sins in accordance with the scriptures, that he was buried, that he was raised on the third day in accordance with the scriptures, and that he appeared to Cephas, then to the twelve" (1 Cor. 15:1–5). The term "the gospel" also occurs in Rom. 2:16; 16:25; Gal. 2:2; cf. 1 Cor. 15:1). Paul speaks of "the preaching [*kērygma*]" and the "preaching of Jesus Christ" (Rom. 16:25), not in the sense of the activity of preaching but in that of its content. Similarly "the faith" (Gal. 1:23; Col. 2:7) denotes not simply the act of believing but also what is believed (cf. also Eph. 4:5). In various letters Paul refers to "the word of the cross" (1 Cor. 1:18) or the word of God and of the Lord (1 Cor. 14:36; Gal. 6:6; 1 Thess. 1:6; 2 Thess. 3:1; Phil. 1:14; cf. 1 Pet. 1:25). J. N. D. Kelly comments: "In contradiction to the view that St Paul was a daring doctrinal innovator, virtually

the inventor of Catholic theology, all the evidence goes to prove that he had a healthy regard for the objective body of teaching authoritatively handed down in the Church" (op. cit., 10; cf. A. M. Hunter, *Paul and his Predecessors*, 1940; G. Bornkamm, *Paul*, 1971; and J. W. Fraser, *Jesus and Paul: Paul as Interpreter of Jesus from Harnack to Kümmel*, 1974).

In various writings C. H. Dodd endeavoured to go beyond this and establish the structure of apostolic preaching. In "The Framework of the Gospel Narrative" (*ExpT* 43, 1931–32, 396–400; reprinted in *New Testament Studies*, 1953, 1–11) Dodd examined K. L. Schmidt's form-critical approach to Mk. which insisted that Mk. was a compilation of separate *pericopae* transmitted independently. The present arrangement was due to the evangelist himself. Support for this thesis was found by Schmidt in the absence of precise chronological and geographical data and the way in which Mk. regularly introduces episodes by such expressions as "And he . . .", "And they . . .". Whereas Schmidt maintained that Mk.'s editorial cement was historically worthless, Dodd put forward the thesis that, when the generalizing summaries were put together, they formed "a perspicuous outline of the Galilaean Ministry, forming a framework into which the separate pictures are set" (*New Testament Studies*, 8). Into this framework Mk. arranged his material combining a chronological with a typical order. Dodd then compared this with the summary outlines of Jesus embedded in the primitive teaching in the speeches in Acts (the fullest being Acts 10:37–41 and 13:23–31) and 1 Cor. 15:3–7 and 11:23 ff. (cf. M. Dibelius, op. cit.).

Dodd took the argument further in *The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments*, 1936, where on the basis of an analysis of certain speeches in Acts (2:14–39; 3:13–26; 4:10 ff.; 5:30 ff.; 10:36–43; 13:16–41) and of passages in Paul (Gal. 3:1, 3 f.; 4:6; 1 Thess. 1:10; 1 Cor. 15:1–7; Rom. 1:1–4; 8:34; 2:16; 10:8 f.) he sought to establish a basic pattern of apostolic kerygma. He observed that three points in the Pauline kerygma do not appear in the kerygma of the Jerusalem church. (i) In the latter Jesus was not called "Son of God"; he is called the holy and righteous servant, drawing on Isa. In Acts Paul is the first to call Jesus the Son of God (Acts 9:20; cf. Rom. 1:1–4), but Dodd suggests that the phrase "Son of God with power" means much the same as "Lord and Christ", both having a messianic significance (op. cit., 25). (ii) The Jerusalem kerygma did not explicitly say that "Christ *died for our sins*. The result of the life, death, and resurrection of Christ is the forgiveness of sins, but this forgiveness is not specifically connected with Christ's death" (ibid). (iii) "The Jerusalem *kerygma* does not assert that the exalted Christ intercedes for us" (ibid.). This may have originated with Paul (cf. Rom. 8:34), but it may be non-Pauline (Heb. 7:25; Matt. 10:32). Dodd concludes: "For the rest, all the points of the Pauline preaching reappear: the Davidic descent of Jesus, guaranteeing His qualification for Messiahship; His death according to the Scriptures; His resurrection according to the Scriptures; His consequent exaltation to the right hand of God as Lord and Christ; His deliverance of men from sin into new life; and His return to consummate the new Age. This coincidence between the apostolic preaching as attested by the speeches in Acts, and as attested by Paul, enables us to carry back its essential elements to a date far earlier than a critical analysis of Acts by itself could justify; for, as we have seen, Paul must have received the tradition very soon after the death of Jesus" (op. cit., 26).

Dodd went on to note a similar outline theology restated in Heb. and 1 Pet. (op. cit., 44 f.; cf. 1 Pet. 1:11, 20; 2:22 f.; 3:18–22; Heb. 2:10, 18; 4:15; 5:7; 9:12, 24; 10:1, 5–9, 20). This is due not so much to Paul's direct influence as to the fact that it reflects the primitive apostolic kerygma generally. But the structure of the apostolic kerygma also sheds light on the structure of the Gospels. Mk. is an expanded form of the kerygma in which the ministry of Jesus is narrated as a preface to the passion story and the passion story is set within a framework of fulfilment (op. cit., 47 ff.; cf. Mk. 1:1). Like the speeches in Acts, Mk. is concerned especially with the acts of Jesus. The teaching of Jesus is kept to a bare minimum in Mk. Matt. and Lk. modify the perspective, because they combine *didachē* with *kērygma* (op. cit., 52 ff.). They do, however, include the Davidic descent in their genealogies which Mk. omits (cf. Matt. 1:1, 17; Lk. 2:4; 3:31). "In the Fourth Gospel we can discern, no less clearly than in Mark, and even more clearly than in Matthew and Luke, the fixed outline of the historical section of the *kerygma* as we have it in Acts x and xiii: the ministry of John the Baptist, the 'anointing' of Jesus with the Holy Spirit, His teaching and works of mercy and power in Galilee; His ministry in Judea and Jerusalem, His arrest and trial before Pilate, His crucifixion, burial, and resurrection" (op. cit., 69). "It is in the Fourth Gospel, which in form and expression, as probably in date, stands farthest from the original tradition of teaching, that we have the most penetrating exposition of its central meaning" (op. cit., 75).

Independently of Dodd, M. Dibelius put forward a case for tracing the speeches in the opening chapters of Acts to primitive material though he ascribed much less historical value to them ("The Speeches in Acts and Ancient Historiography", in *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles*, 1956, 138–85). Dodd's whole line of approach has met with considerable opposition particularly among those who adopt a redaction-critical approach. E. Haenchen endorses without further argument the view that U. Wilckens "has proved against Dibelius and Dodd that Peter's speeches in the first part of Acts do not contain any old pattern of Jewish-Christian missionary preaching" (*The Acts of the Apostles*, 1971, 129 f.; cf. U. Wilckens, *Die Missionsreden der Apostelgeschichte*, 1963²). Rather Luke is here using his pattern of the Gentile Christian missionary preaching to present the early Christian mission. This criticism reflects the outlook that Luke was the inventor of the Christian historical perspective in the early church, following the decline of parousia expectation. (For a statement and critique of this position → Present; and for a critique of Wilckens's specific arguments see G. N. Stanton, op. cit., 19–30.)

Dodd's argument has also come under fire from D. E. Nineham in "The Order of Events in St. Mark's Gospel – an Examination of Dr. Dodd's Hypothesis" (in D. E. Nineham, ed., *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot*, 1955, 223–41). Nineham takes up Schmidt's original position that Mk. is made up of disconnected units, claiming that the proposed outline is so brief and the units themselves contain so little internal evidence of chronology that a chronological arrangement lacks any substantial base (op. cit., 226). With regard to the speeches in Acts, Nineham tries to force a dilemma. "On the one hand, if the speeches in the early part of Acts reflect genuine historical reminiscence of what was said by the Apostles, then they can afford no evidence for the existence of a formal outline account of the ministry; for it can hardly be supposed that the original Apostles

were dependent on any such traditional outline; they had their own memories. If, on the other hand (and this seems more probable to many scholars), these speeches were produced by the author of Acts as a general summary of the sort of thing *likely* to have been said, after the Thucydidean model, then the outline of the ministry contained in them can have no independent evidential value; for it may have been derived by St. Luke from St. Mark's gospel, which we know him to have had before him. And this point is not affected if it be conceded that St. Luke used sources in the compilation of these speeches, for it still remains true, that, *in the form in which we have them*, these speeches have passed through the medium of St. Luke's mind, and St. Luke intended Acts to be read as a complement to the gospel he had just finished writing" (op. cit., 229).

Nineham's argument is, however, less telling than might appear at first sight. The first half of his dilemma has the logical defect of a heads-I-win-tails-you-lose-argument, for it dismisses without argument the possibility that the summaries of the Acts speeches could be based on "genuine historical reminiscence" and at the same time afford "evidence for the existence of a formal outline account of the ministry". It is an *a priori* rejection of the possibility that the speeches could be both. It further overlooks the fact that the speeches in question are attributed to Peter, except that in Acts 13 which is attributed to Paul. What we have is material ostensibly based on Peter's memory giving Peter's kerygma together with that of Paul which (as we have seen above) he claimed to have received on authority and to have transmitted faithfully. Nineham's argument leaves untouched the possibility that Peter, either by himself or in conjunction with others, developed a kerygmatic outline which formed the core of his proclamation and which was adapted by others in the way that Dodd suggests. Furthermore, this could have bearing on the interpretation of the testimony of Papias that "Mark, indeed, having been the interpreter of Peter, wrote accurately, howbeit not in order, all that he recalled of what was either said or done by the Lord" (Eusebius, *HE* 3, 39, 15). Nineham has a point of substance when he claims that Mk. does not necessarily give a chronological account of the acts of Jesus, but the outline framework of Mk.'s Gospel may well reflect the kerygma of Peter.

The accounts of the preaching in Acts are clearly summaries and do not give everything that the speaker said. They also are clearly used by Lk. with an apologetic intent, having a part in the total purpose and structure of Acts. On the other hand, it does not follow from this that they were freely constructed on the model of uncritical ancient history, or that they have no independent evidential value. There is in Nineham's argument the same logical defect as before. Any similarity with Mk. is assumed to be derived from direct borrowing. The alternative possibility that the Gospel and the speeches in Acts might have a common origin in the kerygma cannot simply be swept aside because of the fact that they were edited in the process. Although the Thucydidean model is frequently appealed to by scholars who are content with a low estimate of the historical value of Acts, it does not actually support the idea that speeches were irresponsibly composed to fill gaps, support the author's contentions, or to show off his style. Thucydides himself wrote: "As to the speeches which were made before or during the war, it was hard for me, and for others who reported them to me, to recollect the exact words. I have therefore put into the mouth of each speaker the sentiments proper

to the occasion, expressed as I thought he would be likely to express them, while at the same time I endeavoured, as nearly as I could, to give the general purport of what was actually said" (*History of the Peloponnesian War* 1, 22, 1). The burden here is on accuracy rather than rhetoric. If Luke had this model in mind it would suggest a conscientious endeavour to give an accurate summary. On the other hand, Lk. is more indebted to the OT tradition of historiography tracing the activity of God in historical events (cf. I. H. Marshall, *Luke: Historian and Theologian*, 1970, 56). Moreover, the Greek of the speeches in Acts seems hardly designed to show off the writer's style; if anything, it is inferior to the rest of Lk.'s writings. The absence of Semitisms in the speeches does not settle the matter one way or the other (cf. M. Wilcox, *The Semitisms of Acts*, 1965, 165–71). (Wilcox allows that the credal elements in Acts may go back to Gk. written sources, oral tradition or Lucan composition, though he himself favours an earlier separate existence.) We do, however, have evidence of Lk.'s use of Mk., and where we can compare such reproduction of teaching (as in Lk. 21 par. Mk. 13), there is evidence of editing but not of free invention or substantial change. It is possible that the OT quotations in the speeches go back to a book of testimonia. The christology of the speeches is relatively primitive, as compared with the developed christologies of the later NT epistles. Finally, the reference to the "house of Israel" (Acts 2:36) and the hope that Israel as a nation will be saved suggests an early dating.

Perhaps it may be added that the speech of Stephen in Acts 7, which reviews Israelite history without actually describing the saving events of Christ's death and resurrection, constitutes an interesting commentary on the debate. For this speech does not contain the same kerygmatic features as the speeches attributed to Peter and Paul. On the other hand, Stephen was not an apostle but belonged to the Hellenists (cf. Acts 6:5, 8–15) who constituted a separate group, though his preaching ministry does not seem to have been confined to any particular group. Paul, however, associated himself with the apostles at Jerusalem and even disputed with the unbelieving Hellenists (Acts 9:26–30). The different emphases of Paul and Stephen would accord with Dodd's account of the kerygma. Similarly, Paul's Areopagus address in Acts 17 was a deliberate departure from his earlier preaching. For whereas the speech of Acts 13:16–41 was addressed to Jews of the Dispersion in the synagogue at Antioch of Pisidia, the Areopagus address was to Greeks. The former (like Stephen's speech) contained a review of Israelite history; the latter appealed to Greek beliefs about God. Both, however, contained the themes of judgment and resurrection.

There is a further instance of kerygma in Philip's encounter with the Ethiopian eunuch (Acts 8:26–40) and further examples of Pauline preaching in Paul's address to the elders of Ephesus (Acts 20:17–37) and his defences before Felix (Acts 24) and Agrippa (Acts 26), while at Rome Paul is said to have testified to the kingdom of God "trying to convince them about Jesus from the law of Moses and the prophets" (Acts 28:23). This last instance might well sum up the kind of preaching that Paul gave in Acts 13, but the other instances are palpably different from the Petrine kerygma. The variety of preaching certainly makes it clear that Luke did not attempt to reduce all preaching to a uniform pattern. The explanation of the differences may be sought in Philip's case in the fact that the identity of the

servant was raised by the eunuch (though the fact that the eunuch raised the question of the significance of Isa. 53:7 f. may be an indication that this was already a kerygmatic issue). In any case, Philip like Stephen was a Hellenist (Acts 6:6) and not one of the Jerusalem apostles. Paul's preaching to the Ephesian elders was not kerygma either to unbelieving Jews or to unbelieving Gentiles; it was teaching for the elders. Moreover, Paul's defences focused on the account of his actions rather than the substance of his apologetic. In other words, these instances of preaching indicate that the examples of Petrine preaching given in Acts were not typical of all preaching. Rather, they lend implicit support to the suggestion that the examples considered by Dodd contain the elements of an apologetic directed specifically to the Jews focusing on the person of Jesus in the light of salvation history and the crisis brought about by Jewish rejection of him. It might be objected that Peter's address to Cornelius does not fall within this category, as Cornelius was a Gentile and the address was the occasion for opening the church to Gentile believers. But it may be noted that Cornelius was one who worshipped with the Jews (Acts 10:1 ff.), and what is given in Acts 10:36–43 is the rationale of the conflict with Judaism, which in turn provides the rationale for turning to the Gentiles with the proclamation of Christ. What is given in the Petrine preaching in Acts is not simply a christology, but a christologically interpreted eschatology. The theme of the preaching is the eschatological significance of Christ for Israel.

The above survey has not been able to take into account the wealth of discussion of the speeches in Acts. For a recent review see F. F. Bruce, "The Speeches in Acts – Thirty Years After" (in R. Banks, ed., *Reconciliation and Hope: New Testament Essays on Atonement and Eschatology Presented to L. L. Morris*, 1974, 53–68); and see also the works listed in the bibliography below. It is clear that the last word on the origin and structure of the kerygma has not yet been said. On the other hand, there are grounds for holding with Riesenfeld and Moule that the kerygma of missionary preaching, the teaching of the epistles and the Gospel accounts of Jesus were not separate compartmentalized activities belonging to different phases of the church, but were in fact simultaneous and complementary. In the view of the present writer, the argument of Dodd for certain identifiable features of the structure of the apostolic kerygma is far from being overthrown, though it requires modification and restatement. For the common features discerned by Dodd are not common to all the preaching in Acts. Rather, they provide a summary of the preaching attributed to Peter which was taken over by Paul in the specific context of the conflict of the church with Judaism which focused on the identity of Jesus as the messiah in the light of OT testimonia and the Jewish rejection of Jesus. Where these factors did not obtain, the preaching took on different forms. The absence of explicit ascription of saving significance to the death of Christ in the earlier speeches does not lie in Luke's own theology, but in the circumstances of the primitive community. As F. F. Bruce observes: "That God had raised the crucified Jesus to life again was the great new fact which, in their eyes, dwarfed all others. The claims of Jesus, disallowed by his judges, had been confirmed by God: he was divinely vindicated as both Lord and Messiah, and as such he should be acknowledged by the whole house of Israel" (op. cit., 59). Moreover, as Bruce goes on to say (taking up a phrase of J. A. T. Robinson): "In Acts 3:19–21 we may not have 'the most primitive Christology of all', but it

might well be argued that we do indeed have the most primitive *eschatology* of all" (op. cit., 68). *C. Brown*

→ Apostle, → Gospel, → Jesus Christ, → Teach, → Word

(a). E. L. Allen, 'The Lost Kerygma" *NTS* 3, 1956–57, 349–53; P. Althaus, *The So-Called Kerygma and the Historical Jesus*, 1959; W. Baird, "What is the Kerygma?", *JBL* 76, 1957, 181–91; W. Barclay, "A Comparison of Paul's Missionary Preaching and Preaching to the Church", in W. W. Gasque and R. P. Martin, eds., *Apostolic History and the Gospel: Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F. F. Bruce*, 1970, 165–75; R. A. Bartels, *Kerygma or Gospel Tradition . . . Which Came First?*, 1961; J. W. Bowker, "Speeches in Acts: A Study in Proem and Yelammedenu Form", *NTS* 14, 1967–68, 96–111; C. E. Braaten and R. A. Harrisville, eds., *The Historical Jesus and the Kerygmatic Christ*, 1964; F. F. Bruce, *The Speeches in the Acts of the Apostles*, 1942; *The Acts of the Apostles*, 1953²; "The Speeches in Acts – Thirty Years After", in R. Banks, ed., *Reconciliation and Hope: New Testament Essays on Atonement and Eschatology Presented to L. L. Morris*, 1974, 53–68; and *Paul and Jesus*, 1977; R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, I, 1952, 33–183, 306–14; D. R. Carnegie, "The Kerygma in the Fourth Gospel", *Vox Evangelica* 7, 1971, 39–74; H. Conzelmann, "The Address of Paul on the Areopagus", in L. E. Keck and J. L. Martyn, *Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays Presented in Honor of Paul Schubert*, 1968, 217–30; O. Cullmann, *The Earliest Christian Confessions*, 1949; W. D. Davies, "Reflections on a Scandinavian Approach to 'The Gospel Tradition' ", in *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount*, 1964, 464–80; M. Dibelius, *From Tradition to Gospel* (1934) 1971; "The Speeches in Acts and Ancient Historiography", in *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles*, 1956, 138–85; C. H. Dodd, "The Framework of the Gospel Narrative", *ExpT* 43, 1931–32, 396–400 (reprinted in *New Testament Studies*, 1953, 1–11); and *The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments*, 1936; J. W. Doeve, *Jewish Hermeneutics in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts*, 1954; G. Ebeling, *Word and Faith*, 1963; *Theology and Proclamation*, 1966; and *The Word of God and Tradition*, 1968; C. F. Evans, "The Kerygma", *JTS* New Series 7, 1956, 25–41; J. W. Fraser, *Jesus and Paul: Paul as Interpreter of Jesus from Harnack to Kümmel*, 1974; G. Friedrich, *euangelizomai* etc., *TDNT* II 707–37; and *kēryx* etc., *TDNT* III 683–718; B. Gerhardsson, *Memory and Manuscript: Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity*, *Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis* 20, 1964; and *Tradition and Transmission in Early Christianity*, *Coniectanea Neotestamentica* 20, 1964; T. F. Glasson, "The Kerygma: Is Our Version Correct?", *Hibbert Journal* 51, 1952–53, 129–32; and "The Speeches in Acts and Thucydides", *ExpT* 76, 1964–65, 165; E. Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 1971; A. J. B. Higgins, "The Preface to Luke and the Kerygma in Acts", in W. W. Gasque and R. P. Martin, eds., op. cit., 78–91; A. M. Hunter, *Paul and his Predecessors*, 1940; E. Käsemann, *Essays on New Testament Themes*, *SBT* 41, 1964; and *New Testament Questions of Today*, 1969; J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, 1950; R. Koch, "Preaching", *EBT* II 686–93; R. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*, 1975; R. P. Martin, *New Testament Foundations* I, *The Four Gospels*, 1975; C. F. D. Moule, "Jesus in New Testament Kerygma", in O. Böcher and K. Haacker, eds., *Verborum Veritas. Festschrift für Gustav Stählin*, 1970, 15–26; V. H. Neufeld, *The Earliest Christian Confessions*, *New Testament Tools and Studies*, 5, 1963; D. E. Nineham, "The Order of Events in St. Mark's Gospel – an Examination of Dr. Dodd's Hypothesis", in D. E. Nineham, ed., *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot*, 1955, 223–41; H. Rahner, *A Theology of Proclamation*, 1968; A. M. Ramsey, "The Gospel and the Gospels", in *The Gospels Reconsidered: A Selection of Papers read at the International Congress on the Four Gospels in 1957*, 1960, 99–106; B. Reicke, "A Synopsis of Early Christian Preaching", in A. Fridrichsen *et al.*, *The Root of the Vine: Essays in Biblical Theology*, 1953, 128–60; H. N. Ridderbos, *The Speeches of Peter in the Acts of the Apostles*, 1961; H. Riesenfeld, "The Gospel Tradition and its Beginnings", *StudEv*, I, 1959, 1–29 (printed as a separate paper in 1957); and also in *The Gospels Reconsidered*, 1960, 131–54; and *The Gospel Tradition*, 1970, 1–29; J. Rohde, *Rediscovering the Teaching of the Evangelists*, 1968; J. Schniewind, *angelia* etc., *TDNT* I 56–73; E. Schweizer, "Concerning the Speeches in Acts", in L. E. Keck and J. L. Martyn, eds., op. cit., 208–16; M. Simon, *St. Stephen and the Hellenists*, 1958; D. M. Stanley, "The Primitive Preaching: The Traditional Schema", *Concilium* 20, 1966, 88–100; N. B. Stonehouse, *The Areopagus Address*, 1949 (reprinted in *Paul before the Areopagus and Other New Testament Studies*, 1957, 1–40); G. N. Stanton, *Jesus of Nazareth in New Testament Preaching*, *Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series* 27, 1974; J. M. P. Sweet, "Second Thoughts VIII. The Kerygma", *ExpT* 76,

1964–65, 143–47; D. O. Via, Jr., *Kerygma and Comedy in the New Testament*, 1974; J. J. Vincent, "Didactic Kerygma in the Synoptic Gospels", *SJT* 10, 1957, 262–73; A. N. Wilder, "Kerygma, Eschatology and Social Ethics", in W. D. Davies and D. Daube, eds., *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology: In Honour of Charles Harold Dodd*, 1954, 509–36 (reprinted separately *Facet Books: Social Ethical Series* 12, 1966); R. C. Worley, *Preaching and Teaching in the Earliest Church*, 1967.

(b). R. Asting, *Die Verkündigung des Wortes im Urchristentum*, 1939; H. E. Bahr, *Verkündigung als Information*, 1968; T. Boman, *Die Jesus-Überlieferung im Lichte der neueren Volkskunde*, 1967; R. Bultmann, "Allgemeine Wahrheiten und christliche Verkündigung", *ZTK* 54, 1957, 244 ff. (reprinted in *Glauben und Verstehen*, III, 1965³, 166 ff.); L. Cerfaux, "Témoins du Christ d'après le Livre des Actes", *Receuil L. Cerfaux*, II, 1954, 157–74; H. Flender, "Lehren und Verkündigung in den synoptischen Evangelien", *EvTh* 25, 1965, 701 ff.; J. Gewiess, *Die Urapostolische Heilsverkündigung nach der Apostelgeschichte*, 1939; K. Goldammer, "Der Kerygma-Begriff in der ältesten christlichen Literatur", *ZNW* 48, 1957, 77–101; E. Grässer, "Von der Exegese zur Predigt", *WuD* 60, 1971, 27 ff.; D. Grasso, "Il kerygma e la predicazione", *Gregorianum* 41, 1960, 424–50; and *L'Annuncio della Salvezza*, 1965; J. Herrmann, "Kerygma und Kirche", in *Neutestamentliche Aufsätze, Festschrift J. Schmid*, 1963, 110–14; P. Hitz, *L'Annonce Missionnaire de l'Évangile*, 1954; G. Hummel, ed., *Aufgabe der Predigt, Wege der Forschung*, 1971; W. Jetter, "Die Predigt als Gespräch mit dem Hörer", *Praktische Theologie* 56, 1967, 212 ff.; K. Kertelge, "Verkündigung und Amt im Neuen Testament", *BuL* 10, 1969, 189 ff.; E. Lerle, *Die Predigt im Neuen Testament*, 1957²; K. E. Lögstrup, "Verkündigung", *RGG*³ VI 155 ff.; F. W. Marquardt, "Geschichte und kirchliche Verkündigung", in *Antwort. Karl Barth zum siebzigsten Geburtstag*, 1956, 620–29; H. Ott, "Kerygma", *RGG*³ III 1250–54; A. Rétif, "Qu'est-ce que le Kérygme?" *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* 81, 1949, 910–22; "Témoignage et Prédication Missionnaire dans les Actes des Apôtres", ibid. 83, 1951, 152–65; and *Foi au Christ et Mission d'après les Actes des Apôtres*, 1952; H. Ristow and K. Matthiae, eds. *Der historische Jesus und der kerygmatische Christus*, 1962²; J. Roloff, *Apostolat, Verkündigung, Kirche*, 1965; and *Das Kerygma und der irdische Jesus*, 1970; H. Schlier, "Kerygma und Sophia", *EvTh* 11, 1950–51, 181 ff. (reprinted in *Die Zeit der Kirche*, 1956, 206 ff.); and *Wort Gottes*, 1962²; K. L. Schmidt, *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu. Literarische Untersuchungen zur ältesten Jesusüberlieferung* (1919), 1964; H. Schürmann, *Aufbau und Struktur der neutestamentlichen Verkündigung* 1954; and "Kerygma", *LTK* VI 122–25; K. Stendahl, "Kerygma und kerygmatisch", *TLZ* 77, 1952, 715–20; A. Strobel, *Kerygma und Apokalyptik*, 1967; U. Wilckens, "Kerygma und Evangelium bei Lukas", *ZNW* 49, 1958, 223–37; and *Die Missionsreden der Apostelgeschichte. Form- und traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*, 1961.

Promise

ἐπαγγελία

ἐπαγγέλλομαι (*epangellomai*), announce, proclaim, promise, profess; προεπαγγέλλομαι (*proepangellomai*), announce before, promise before; ἐπαγγελία (*epangelia*), announcement, promise; ἐπάγγελμα (*epangelma*), announcement, notification, promise.

CL 1. *epangellomai* and *epangelia* are derived from the root *angel-*, as are *euangelizomai* and *euangelion* (→ Gospel). In classical Gk. (the active form is attested in Homer) they are originally synonymous with other words from the same root (e.g. other compounds of *angellō*, like *an-*, *apangellō*), and mean respectively to announce, proclaim (Hdt. 3, 36), and announcement, report. In the context of state proclamations they denote summoning (e.g. Polybius, 9, 38, 2). In legal usage the noun means notification of a charge (Aeschines, 1, 64). In the mid. the vb. means to announce one's accomplishments, to make a profession (Xen., *Mem.* 1, 2, 7), or to take up a moral position.

2. The nearest point of contact to the NT usage of these terms is in the meaning to announce an intention, to offer to do something, to promise, to vow (e.g.

Polybius, 1, 72, 6). It is significant that, when they are used in this sense, it is never the gods who promise something to men, but only men to gods. The Gks. were very conscious of the tension between human promises and their fulfilment. In this connexion, the word often carries the specific sense of a promise of money. Characteristically, in the whole of the Eastern Hellenistic world, the concept became a technical term for a free-will payment, gift or endowment (F. Hiller, *Inschriften von Priene*, 1906, 123, 5 ff.). *ho epangeilamenos* (lit. the one who promised) thus means the founder. In early Hellenistic usage *hē epangelia* can also mean the proclamation of a feast (cf. *TDNT* II 578).

OT Unlike *euangelion*, good news (→ Gospel), *epangelia* has no Heb. equivalent. The LXX uses the word in Est. 4:7 to render the Heb. *pārāšâh*, exact statement, information.

1. (a) Despite the absence of a special term for it, the OT is of course familiar with the concept. G. von Rad attempts to show how "from Abraham to Malachi, Israel was kept constantly in motion because of what God said and did, and that she was always in one way or other in an area of tension constituted by promise and fulfilment" (*Old Testament Theology*, II, 1965, 371). In some cases the fulfilment of certain promises is painstakingly recorded (e.g. Jos. 21:43–45; 23:14; "not one thing has failed of all the good things which the Lord your God promised concerning you; all have come to pass for you"). But generally the fulfilment appears as a partial or token fulfilment, which does not reveal the whole of the divine plan. Hence Israel is compelled in every new situation of his history to reinterpret the old promises, and is called to new expectancy by new proclamations of salvation (for details → Word, art. *logos*, OT).

Basic to the theme of Israel's existence under promise is Gen. 12:1–3. "Now the LORD said to Abram, 'Go from your country and your kindred and your father's house to the land that I will show you. And I will make of you a great nation, and I will bless you, and make your name great, so that you will be a blessing. I will bless those who bless you, and him who curses you I will curse; and by you will all the families of the earth bless themselves.' " There is here a triple promise of the land, a great nation, and blessing (on the development of these themes → Earth, Land; cf. also W. D. Davies, *The Gospel and the Land: Early Christianity and Jewish Territorial Doctrine*, 1974; → Abraham; → Israel; → People → Bless). Gen. develops the promise of the nation through the story of Isaac (→ Abraham), the wanderings of Abraham and his descendants, and the → covenant theme (Gen. 17). In Jer. 31:31–34 there is the promise of a new covenant. This was at a time of national collapse, when the whole idea of surviving in the promised land was problematic. The central idea of the new covenant is that of the law written on the heart (cf. also Ezek. 18:1–32 and 36:26–37 which couples a new spirit and heart with national restoration). The teaching of the prophets consists of promises of → judgment and → grace, culminating in the promises of the Servant Songs of Isaiah (Isa. 42:1–4; 49:1–6; 50:4–9; 52:13–53:12; → Serve). The promises of return from exile and sustenance in calamity of the later chapters of Isa. renew the exodus theme (cf. Exod. 3:24 f.; 12:1 ff.; 15:1 ff.; Hos. 11:1; Isa. 40:1–31). But as in Gen. 12:3, there is also a theme of blessing which will extend beyond Israel, so that Yahweh promises that the servant will be "a light to the nations" (Isa. 49:6). And as early

as Isa. 2:24 and Mic. 4:1–3 there is the prophecy of the nations flowing to the mountain of the house of the Lord so that they may learn the ways of Yahweh in peace and righteousness.

(b) The OT records various vows made by the righteous (→ Swear). But while the law and the prophets demand faithfulness in personal dealings (Exod. 20:15 f.; Deut. 27:19; Hos. 4:1 f.; Mic. 6:8), human promises are ultimately secondary to the promises of God. In the last analysis it is he alone that can both promise and fulfil, for he alone knows and overrules the whole of the future.

2. (a) Jewish writers in the Gk. language (Macc. in the LXX, Philo, etc.) adopted Hellenistic usage. Thus they use *epangellomai* in the ordinary sense of promise (e.g. money, 1 Macc. 11:28). But they also prepare the way for Paul's use of *epangelia* for God's activity. In 3 Macc. 2:10 God promises to answer prayer.

(b) In rabbinic writings *b^{e}ṭāḥâh* is used as a description of the promises of God. This word is not found in the OT, but it is derived from the root *bāṭaḥ*, to trust, which is frequent in the MT, and thus emphasizes the trustworthiness of the promises of salvation (cf. SB III 207 ff.). The reference is often to the promises made to the patriarchs (the making of the people, the conquest of the land).

(c) With the appearance of apocalyptic, interest is strongly attracted to the *'ôlām habbā'*, the world to come (e.g. 2 Esd. 7:119), and the warning "to make sure that one will be a son (daughter) of the world to come" is frequently found (e.g. Berakoth 4b). At the same time assurance of salvation is considerably dampened by the doctrine that a part in the salvation to come is dependent on strict observance of the → law.

NT 1. *General Review.* (a) *epangellomai*, to promise, is found 15 times in the NT, but only in 4 instances is it used of human promises (Mk. 14:11, the offer of money to Judas; 2 Pet. 2:19, the promise of a false freedom by heretics; 1 Tim. 6:21, the profession of false teachings; 1 Tim. 2:10, the profession of *theosebeia*, fear of God). It is not found in a theological sense either in the Gospels, 1 Pet., Jude or Rev. Acts and 1 Jn. have it only once each. Most of the instances are in the Pauline corpus (5), Heb. (4), and Jas. (2).

(b) *proepangellomai* means to announce beforehand, to promise beforehand. In the NT it is found just twice (in Paul's writings): in 2 Cor. 9:5 he speaks of *tēn proepēngelmenēn eulogian hymōn* (the vb. is passive in meaning here), the blessing which you have promised in advance (i.e. the collection; → Poor, art. *ptōchos*, NT 4); and in Rom. 1:2 Paul refers to the gospel of God which he promised beforehand (*proepēngeilato*) in the old covenant by his prophets in the scriptures.

(c) *epangelia*, found 52 times, is used only once in a secular sense; the noun is used absolutely 33 times, most of these instances being in Paul; the sing. form is greatly predominant, but in 11 instances the plur. occurs. *epangelia* is not found in Matt., Mk., Jn., Jas., Jude or Rev. It is found once in 1 Jn., twice in 2 Pet., but 9 times in the Lucan writings (once in the Gospel; 8 times in Acts), 26 times in the Pauline corpus and 14 times in Heb. As in classical Gk., so also in the NT, *epangelia* can refer either to form or to content, words of promise, or things promised, though the distinction is not always clear in every case. It is clear that it is the thing promised to which reference is made in passages like Lk. 24:49; Acts 1:4; and likewise Heb. 11:33 and 39.

(d) *epangelma* in classical Gk. means announcement, order, promise. In the NT its meaning cannot be distinguished from that of *epangelia*. It is used only twice (in 2 Pet.). The aim of the letter being to stir up the hope of the return of Christ at a time when it was flagging, the concept of promise is restricted to this event and the subsequent new creation of heaven and earth: "But according to his promise [*kata to epangelma autou*] we wait for new heavens and a new earth in which righteousness dwells" (2 Pet. 3:13). Since this consummation brings with it a share in eternal life and a partaking of the *theia physis*, divine nature (NEB "the very being of God"), the author calls the promises which point to it "precious and very great" (1:4).

(e) The absence of the words of this group from the Gospels (with the exception of Mk. 14:11 and Lk. 24:49) is to be explained by the fact that the Gospels tell of Jesus' words and deeds, but rarely reflect upon them. Moreover, where they do so, they are interested in the continuity between God's word of old and his word now. Thus they interpret Christ in terms of the OT, as in the case of Lk. 4:21: "Today this scripture has been fulfilled [*sēmeron peplērōtai hē graphē hautē*] in your hearing" (referring to Isa. 61:1 f.; cf. the Matthean introductory formula for OT citations, *hina plērōthē*, "that it might be fulfilled"). Thus in spite of the absence of the term *epangelia*, the Gospels (especially Matt.) do deal with the category of promise and fulfilment (→ Fullness, art. *plēroō*, NT).

2. *Theological Exposition.* The theological significance of the concept is worked out particularly in three groups of NT writings: Luke–Acts, the Pauline letters, and Heb.

(a) Luke–Acts. (i) The giver of the promise is, as elsewhere in the NT, God alone, "the God of glory" (Acts 7:5; cf. 7:2 for the subject), "the Father" (Lk. 24:49; Acts 1:4). The promise provides insight into his plan of salvation, and carries with it the future realization of that plan, so that the fulfilment is a creative act (Acts 13:32 f.: he has fulfilled [*ekpeplērōken*] it in sending Jesus).

(ii) The recipients of the promise are "the fathers" (13:32) especially → Abraham (7:17), → Israel as the covenant people (13:23), the → disciples of Jesus (Lk. 24:49; Acts 1:4), the hearers of Peter's sermon at → Pentecost with their children, and those living far away from Jerusalem (2:38 f.). It is through Israel that Gentiles first hear the promise.

(iii) The content of the promise is the historical sending of Jesus as the *sōtēr*, saviour (13:23, 32 f.; 26:6). Because he, the crucified and risen one, has wrought forgiveness of sins, all those who turn to him in faith and are baptized in his name receive the Holy → Spirit, the promised gift of God in the last days (2:38–40; cf. 2:17–21; and 2:32–36).

(iv) By being fulfilled (→ Fullness, art. *plēroō*), the promise (*epangelia*) becomes the good news, the → gospel (*euangelion*). Acts 13:32 uses the vb. *euangelizesthai*, to bring good news, to describe Paul's testimony to the fulfilment of the promise.

(b) Paul. It is Paul who gives the most emphatic testimony that the *epangelia* is a gift of God's free grace. God alone has the absolute power to fulfil his word of promise (Rom. 4:21). For he is the God "who gives life to the dead and calls into existence the things that do not exist" (Rom. 4:17). He is *ho apseudēs theos*, the God who cannot lie (Tit. 1:2).

(i) In his struggle against mixing the gospel with Jewish legalism, Paul thought

through the question of the relation between God's law and his promises, his demands and his bountiful grace. In answer to the Jewish theory, that man can come to enjoy the promised salvation only on the basis of prior fulfilment of all the duties required by the law, the apostle set out in antithetical form three basic insights afforded by the gospel.

It is not the law which makes us recipients of the word of promise and its fulfilment, but justifying grace: *ou dia nomou hē epangelia tō Abraam ē tō spermati autou, to klēronomon auton einai ton kosmon, alla dia dikaiosynēs pisteōs*, "not through the law did the promise come to Abraham or his descendants, that he should inherit the world, but through the righteousness of faith" (Rom. 4:13). Since the law can make no man "alive" to God (*zōopoiēsai*), i.e. enable him to do the will of God, the law and the promise are in reality opposites. "For if the inheritance is by the law, it is no longer by promise; but God gave it to Abraham by a promise [*tō de Abraam di' epangelias kecharistai ho theos*]" (Gal. 3:18). "Is the law then against the promises of God? Certainly not; for if a law had been given which could make alive, then righteousness would indeed be by the law. But the scripture consigned all things to sin, that what was promised to faith in Jesus Christ might be given to those who believe" (Gal. 3:21 f.).

Law and promise can neither limit nor supplement one another, since the law demands works, whereas faith is neither a work of man nor a legalistic achievement. If those who make the law into a way of salvation were able by doing so to become "heirs", then faith would be null and the promise void (Rom. 4:14).

The example of Abraham shows in any case that the law cannot be a condition for the reception of the promise or substance of salvation, since Abraham lived before the law was given. The promise to Abraham is the characteristic type of all other promises. But it was given centuries before the revelation of the law, and the law must certainly not be interpreted as an added clause by means of which God might invalidate the binding nature of his promises, as a man might add a clause to his will. Thus Paul uses the picture of a *diathēkē*, will, → covenant, in Gal. 3:15–18, to emphasize the irrevocability of God's promises.

This note of assurance is not weakened by the ethical imperatives of the NT. 2 Cor. 7:1 makes it clear that it is not our sanctification which brings about the fulfilment of the promises; rather, the promises have a sanctifying effect upon the way we live.

(ii) For Paul it is fundamental that all God's promises have been given his "yes" in Christ (2 Cor. 1:20). The sending of Jesus, and all that he did, is God's active ratification of all his promises of salvation. Christ's ministry to Israel demonstrated God's *alētheia*, truthfulness (→ Truth), and took place in order to confirm the promise given to the patriarchs (Rom. 15:8). By dying in our place under the curse with which the law threatens every transgressor, he prepared the way for the sending of the Holy → Spirit. He died "that in Christ Jesus the blessing of Abraham might come upon the Gentiles, that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith" (Gal. 3:14).

Although in a wider context *dikaiosynē* (→ righteousness), *hyiothesia* (sonship), and *klēronomia* (inheritance) might be mentioned first, it is nonetheless strictly speaking the Holy Spirit who is chiefly spoken of as the promised gift of salvation (so Gal. 3:14; cf. also Eph. 1:3). The three images of *aparchē* (first fruits), *arrabōn*

(deposit), and *sphragis* (seal) are used to emphasize the certainty of salvation. In view of the close association of the Holy Spirit with eternal life, it is not surprising that in Tit. 1:2 "eternal life" is mentioned as the substances of the promise.

(iii) Historically, Israel is the first to receive the promise. The *ethnē*, Gentiles, originally stood outside the promise, tied as it was to the covenant order (Eph. 2:12).

In Gal. 3:16 Paul interprets *to sperma tou Abraam*, "the seed of Abraham", not collectively but in the singular, as referring to one individual, Christ. He is the universal heir; believers are only *synklēronomoi Christou*, co-heirs with Christ. Since, however, it is not physical descent from Abraham, but faith in Jesus Christ, that makes us entitled to the inheritance, believers from among the Gentiles are also "fellow heirs . . . and partakers of the promise in Christ Jesus" (Eph. 3:6).

(c) Hebrews. The situation to which this letter is addressed differs from that of the Pauline churches. The question of the relation of law to promise plays no part here; faith itself is in danger. Doubt is being expressed as to whether the promises will be fulfilled at all. The purpose of the letter is therefore to call its readers to hold fast to the promises, and to testify to God's faithfulness to his word.

(i) The writer has in mind a "cloud of witnesses" (12:1) who have borne witness to the character and depth of their faith both by divine interventions in their lives, and by personal *hypomonē*, steadfastness (→ Patience). As believers they lived out their lives on the basis of the divine promises, and with the same promises as their goal. Mention is made of the men and women of faith in the early history of Israel: Abraham (6:12 ff.; 7:6), Isaac and Jacob ("heirs with him of the same promise", 11:6), Sarah (11:11). Chapter 11 mentions, along with the judges, Samuel, David, and generally "the prophets", as people who experienced the promised help of God. In Heb. 4:1–9 the example of Israel in the → wilderness is used to make it clear that unbelief makes fulfilment of the promises impossible (cf. Ps. 95:11; → Rest).

(ii) The content of the promises mentioned in Heb. is the blessing of multitudinous descendants (6:14), rest (*katapausis*), and the new covenant, which on the basis of the remission of sins holds out the prospect of "the eternal inheritance" (9:15).

At the same time Heb. emphasizes that in the old covenant the promises neither were nor could be completely fulfilled. When it is said of Abraham in 6:15 that "he obtained the promise", the reference is still to no more than a partial fulfilment (the birth of Isaac). In the final analysis the promises are interpreted in terms of the gospel, and therefore as referring to complete salvation in Christ (cf. 4:2). Thus the writer declares in 11:39 that the whole cloud of witnesses who came before Christ have been made to wait: "they did not receive what was promised." For this reason he ascribes to the patriarchs an understanding of the promise which looks far beyond all historical foreshadowings and partial fulfilments, to an eternal consummation (11:10–16).

The keyword *kreittōn*, better, which is found 12 times, is used to describe the superiority of the new covenant to the old (→ Good). Christ is the "mediator of a better covenant . . . enacted on better promises" (8:6). Jeremiah's promise of a new covenant is cited twice, indicating that by the better promises we should understand full forgiveness, deep knowledge of God, and a Spirit-worked obedience

to his commandments (Heb. 8:8–12 = Jer. 31:31–34; Heb. 10:16 f. = Jer. 31:33 f.). Yet the content of the promises also includes all the other aspects of eternal, eschatological salvation, such as the unshakeable → kingdom (12:28), the future city (13:14), and the → sabbath for the → people of God (4:9).

The new covenant has been brought into operation by the death of Jesus. This means that the fulfilment of the promises is drawing steadily nearer. "You see the Day drawing near" (10:25). "Yet a little while, and the coming one shall come and shall not tarry" (10:37; cf. Isa. 26:20 LXX). It is, therefore, all the more necessary to remain steadfast during the short time that remains, not to cast away one's *parrhēsia*, confidence (→ Openness), and to "hold fast the confession of our hope without wavering" (10:23, cf. v. 35). As far as God is concerned, the promises remain unbreakable. They are an oath of God (6:13). This makes it all the more important for the members of the people of God to observe the exhortation to hold fast to the promises for their part (6:11 f.). *E. Hoffmann*

→ Covenant, → Fullness, → Hope, → Prophet

(a). I. Blythin, "The Patriarchs and the Promise", *SJT* 21, 1965, 56 ff.; J. Bright, *Covenant and Promise: The Future in the Preaching of the Pre-exilic Prophets*, 1977; F. F. Bruce, ed., *Promise and Fulfilment: Essays Presented to Professor S. H. Hooke*, 1963; R. Bultmann, "Prophecy and Fulfilment", in *Essays Philosophical and Theological*, 1955, 182–208; W. D. Davies, *The Gospel and the Land: Early Christianity and Jewish Territorial Doctrine*, 1974; A. T. Hanson, "Birth with Promise", *Studies in Paul's Technique and Theology*, 1974, 87–103; J. Jeremias, *Jesus' Promise to the Nations*, *SBT* 24, W. G. Kümmel, *Promise and Fulfilment: The Eschatological Message of Jesus*, *SBT* 23, 1961²; J. Moltmann, "Promise and History", in *Theology of Hope: On the Ground and the Implications of Christian Eschatology*, 1967, 95–138; G. von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, I, 1962; II, 1965; J. Schniewind and G. Friedrich, *epangellō* etc., *TDNT* II 576–86; C. Westermann, "The Way of Promise through the Old Testament", in B. W. Anderson, ed., *The Old Testament and Christian Faith*, 1964, 200–24; C. Westermann, ed., *Essays on Old Testament Interpretation*, 1963.

(b). F. Baumgärtel, *Verheissung*, 1954; F. W. Marquardt, *Die Bedeutung der biblischen Landverheissungen für die Christen*, *ThEH* Neue Folge 116, 1964; G. Sauter, *Zukunft und Verheissung*, 1965; C. Westermann, "Verheissungen an Israel", *EKL* III 1645 ff.; W. Zimmerli, "Verheissung und Erfüllung", *EvTh* 12, 1952–53, 6 ff. (reprinted in *Probleme alttestamentlicher Hermeneutik*, *ThB* 11, 1968³, 69 ff.).

Prophet

προφήτης

προφήτης (*prophētēs*), prophet, proclaimer; προφῆτις (*prophētis*), prophetess; προφητεύω (*prophēteuō*), make prophetic revelations, prophesy; προφητεία (*prophēteia*), prophetic activity, prophetic gift, prophetic word, prophetic saying; προφητικός (*prophētikos*), prophetic; ψευδοπροφήτης (*pseudoprophētēs*), false prophet; μαντεύομαι (*manteuomai*), foretell, utter oracles, prophesy.

CL 1. (a) *prophētēs* (Pindar, *Nemeans* 1, 60:9, 50; and Hdt., 8, 36 f., 135) is a noun made up of the stem *-phē-*, to say, proclaim, which always has a religious connotation, and the prefix *pro-*, which as a temporal adv. has the meaning of before, in advance. This may suggest the meaning: one who predicts, one who tells beforehand. It appears to be confirmed by the use of *prophēmi*, to predict, proclaim in advance. However, *prophēmi* is not found until very late, and so has no value as etymological evidence. Indeed, when one examines the combination of *pro-* with vbs. of speech

in earlier writings, it is evident that in no case does the object of the vb. point to the future. Several other vbs. are found: *proagoreuō* (Hdt., 3, 61 f.; Thuc., 2, 13); *prolegō* (Hdt., 8, 136; Thuc. 1, 139); *prophōneō* (Eur., *Hippolytus* 956). The meaning of these vbs. is clearly to proclaim openly, to state publicly, to proclaim aloud. This suggests that *prophēteuō* should be translated in the same way. This is corroborated by the use, found as early as the 5th century, of *prophētēs* in the sense of declarer, speaker (Pindar, *Paean* 6, 6; Eur., *Bacchae* 211). The religious flavour of the stem *-phē-* gives the word a special weight, and expresses the authority which can be claimed for the prophet's word.

(b) From this noun are derived the fem. *prophētis* (Eur., *Ion* 42, 321), the noun *prophēteia* (not found before 2nd century A.D.), and the corresponding adj. *prophētikos* and vb. *prophēteuō* (Pindar, *Fragment* 150).

2. The nature of the Gk. prophet is more easily ascertained from his place in public life than from etymological considerations. The words derived from this root are firmly tied up with the Gk. oracle. The most famous oracle was that of Delphi, presided over by Apollo (on this see especially H. W. Parke and D. E. W. Worrell, *The Delphic Oracle*, I–II, 1956²). In this connexion we meet the words in two senses.

The Pythia was called *prophētis*, but had the further title of *promantis* (Eur., *Ion* 681; Hdt., 6. 66). This office belonged originally to one, two or three girls drawn from the local population, but in later times at least the Pythia was elderly. The Pythia sat on a tripod over a cavity in the earth, from which an "oracular spirit" (*pneuma mantikon*) in the form of smoke arose and gave her the inspiration. This was enhanced by the chewing of bay-leaves (Apollo's plant). As a result she would burst out with enigmatic inarticulate sounds, similar to *glossolalia* (→ Word, art. *glōssa*). These concerned future events, as the title *promantis* suggests, and had a direct connexion with the person consulting the oracle, who came to it baffled by a problem about which he sought help in the form of instruction. He would present in writing a question which had arisen in his own life. Such questions might concern matters of business, religion, politics, ethics or education, and in them we find reflected the whole range of life in the ancient world.

Since, however, the Pythia's reply was usually incomprehensible to the visitor, there was need for other officials at the shrine, whose task it was to translate the utterance into a saying that could be clearly understood and remembered. The task was carried out by wise and highly respected old men, called to this position by the oracle, and likewise known as "prophets". They did not work by direct inspiration; had they done so, they would have been given the further title of *mantis*. Instead, their transmission of the message involved the use of their understanding (*logismos*). They received the Pythian oracles, tested them, completed them, interpreted them and formulated the final saying. Thus they never spoke on their own initiative, but only after a visitor had presented a question and the Pythia had uttered the oracle. (On the oracle of Delphi, which may be regarded as typical, cf. Plato, *Timaeus* 71e–72b. It should be noted that Plato idealizes the prophet to fit his philosophical concepts.) As an example, we may take the question put to the Delphic oracle by the Spartan Glaucus (Hdt., 6, 86). A stranger had deposited some money with him. If he committed perjury, he would be able to appropriate the sum himself. Might he, therefore, commit perjury? The prophetic response was that he could afford

this act of perjury, and that such a thing would never happen again. It might appear that he was not punished; but the false oath would pursue him (→ Curse). If it did not fall upon him, it would upon his children and his children's children. It would not rest until the whole family was destroyed.

From this example we may note the following basic features:

(a) The prophet expresses something for the content of which he is not responsible, since he has himself received it indirectly from the god. Where the inspiration is direct, a privilege reserved at Delphi at least solely for the Pythia, the prophet has the further title of *mantis*. Thus the Pythia bore the title of *promantis* in addition to that of prophet. Indirect inspiration comes through the inarticulate utterances of a Pythia, or through *symbola* such as the blowing of the wind, the rustling of the sacred oaks, the clanging of cymbals, or the shaking of an image of a god borne by priests. The prophets are thus "interpreters of mysterious utterances and visions" (Plato, *Timaeus* 72b).

(b) The prophet does not give advice unless he is asked for it. The initiative is the questioner's alone, not the god's or the prophet's.

(c) For this reason the words of the Gk. prophet are always addressed to a unique, historical, concrete, present situation in the life of the client. The advice then given embraces the whole range of counselling help which is called for, even up to the present day, by the troubles and needs of men and women.

(d) The prophet is called to his office by the oracular institution, and so not by a god.

To sum up, a prophet is a person, employed by the oracle, who by direct inspiration or by the interpretation of sounds and omens declares the will of the gods to a person who asks for advice. Accordingly, *prophēteuō* means to proclaim the counsel and will of the gods concerning a historical, concrete, present situation, in response to a definite question put by the client.

3. In early times the poet also has the title of prophet (Pindar, *Paean* 6, 6; cf. Homer, *Il.*, 1, 1; 2, 484–492), since he achieves in his poetry something which is otherwise impossible to mortals, and must therefore derive his wisdom, his *sophia*, from the gods (Pindar, *Paean* 7b, 11–15).

4. The prophet must be clearly distinguished from the soothsayer (*mantis*, seer, soothsayer). Admittedly, both titles can be held by one person (see above), but they refer to very different functions. If it is etymologically correct to say that *mantis* is derived from *mainomai*, to rage, to be out of one's senses, to be in ecstasy, it may suggest that the soothsayer is in origin one who makes a proclamation from or in a state of ecstasy. The prophet, on the other hand, speaks "with his reason". His divination is mediate, i.e. he receives his information from the gods through a medium (e.g. the Pythia).

The content of soothsaying, as in the case of prophecy, is never a timeless truth of universal validity, but a message directed to definite, individual events. Unlike prophecy, which sometimes deals with religious matters, soothsaying never concerns this realm (Plato, *Charmides* 173c). Soothsaying foretells future events, while prophecy is aimed at correcting a person's behaviour in view of events which may be expected. The chief impulse behind soothsaying is human curiosity (cf. J. Haeckel in L. Adam and H. Trimborn, eds., *Lehrbuch der Völkerkunde*, 1958, 62).

OT 1. The Heb. word for prophet, *nāḇî'*, is usually derived from the Akkad. vb. *naḇû*, to call, to proclaim. In the past, therefore, most scholars saw the etymology as parallel to the Gk. and understood the word in the active sense, one who calls, forth-teller, preacher (cf. H.-J. Kraus, *Worship in Israel*, 1966, 102). However, a parallel development in the Akkad. indicates that *nāḇî'* should be understood not actively but passively; one called, one appointed (W. F. Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity*, [1940] 1957, 303 ff.). Behind the passive form stands God as the agent, here the one who calls. Later *nāḇî'* became a technical term, and the literal meaning was forgotten.

From this noun the vb. *nāḇā'* is derived, which means to show, present, or express oneself, to speak as a prophet. It is found in hith. and niph. In early texts the dominant use is in the hith., meaning to behave as a prophet, implying adopting ecstatic behaviour. In later texts the niph. predominates, and is in most cases to be translated to speak prophetically (1 Sam. 10:5 f., 10 ff.; 19:20; 1 Ki. 22:10, 12). This point is corroborated by a second observation: the vb. is found among the earlier writing prophets only in Amos, and in none of the later ones but Jer., Ezek., Joel and Zech. This may suggest that in early times prophecy was dominated by ecstatic behaviour which later became suspect. Later still (from Jer. onwards) the vb. no longer suggested ecstasy and could be used without embarrassment.

(a) The noun *nāḇî'* is found in the OT 309 times, of which 92 instances are found in Jer. alone. The plur. signifies in the historical books groups of prophets; the sing. in early texts widely varying types of person, in later texts only, one who speaks on behalf of Yahweh. In earlier texts, the prophet can also have the title *'îš hā'ᵉlōhîm*, man of God, or *rō'eh* or *ḥōzeh*, seer. Man of God seems to be a title of distinction, which is also given to great leaders: → Moses (Deut. 33:1), → David (Neh. 12:24, 36 etc.), but above all Elisha (29 times), and the unnamed prophet of Judah in 1 Ki. 13:1–31 (15 times). This title expresses the close association of the person concerned with God.

The seer has the ability to reveal hidden secrets and future events (1 Sam. 9:6–20). With him the emphasis is on visions, with the prophet rather on his words (Isa. 30:10).

(b) Various figures in the history of Israel were given the title of *nāḇî'*. They include → Abraham (Gen. 20:7), Moses (Deut. 34:10) and Aaron (Exod. 7:1). Miriam received the title of prophetess (Exod. 15:20), which is doubtless linked with the Song of Moses at the Red Sea which was used as a cultic hymn (see below 2 (c)).

2. Before the fully-fledged prophecy of the so-called writing prophets took shape certain earlier forms are found in the OT.

(a) One of these is the appearance of groups of ecstatics who moved freely about the country, putting themselves by the use of musical instruments into a state of trance, and in such a condition babbling out their messages (cf. the phenomena in the NT period in 1 Cor. 14). This → ecstasy was infectious, so that Saul also came to be counted "among the prophets" (1 Sam. 10:5 ff.; cf. 19:18 ff.). The prophets of Baal were also ecstatics (1 Ki. 18:19–40). The ecstatic who could temporarily become "another man" (1 Sam. 10:6) constituted a certain attraction for the Israelites (1 Sam. 10:5). But on other occasions these "mad fools" (Hos. 9:7) repelled them. In Num. 11:10–30, where the 70 elders were seized by the Spirit

of God and went into an ecstasy, it is related that Joshua was critical. However, Moses replied: "Would that all the Lord's people were prophets, that Yahweh would put his spirit upon them!" (Num. 11:29). This is interpreted by some scholars as the attempt of the Elohist, by the inclusion of this story in the Mosaic tradition, to introduce the strange, repellent, un-Israelite phenomenon of ecstatic prophecy into the worship of Yahweh. Thus, G. von Rad comments: "The end which the story tries to serve is therefore that of the legitimation of this new religious phenomenon which may have caused the orthodox a good deal of perplexity. The story may actually be taken as evidence of an acceptance of the ecstatic movement into the institutions of Jahwism, or at least as an etiology of the prophetic movement which gave it legitimation" (*Old Testament Theology*, II, 1965, 19).

(b) Another early form is that of groups of prophets in monastic communities. These groups formed themselves around a prominent figure (e.g. Elisha, 2 Ki. 2:3 ff.; 4:38; 6:1), whom they addressed as "master" or "father", at whose feet they sat and learned, and with whom they lived in communal dwellings. → Elijah and Elisha were heads of separate bands of prophets (2 Ki. 2:1 ff.). Such groups are always found in connexion with a sanctuary (1 Ki. 13:11, Bethel; 2 Ki. 2:1, 4, 5, Gilgal, Jericho). Ecstasy has here a markedly reduced rôle (traces may be found at 2 Ki. 3:15). Instead, the gift of the Spirit seems to be manifested rather by the working of → miracles (2 Ki. 2:19–22; 2:23–25; 4:1–7, 18–37). Even these popular accounts, however, with their emphasis on miraculous deeds, reveal that Elisha was also a man of the word, who gave both spiritual (2 Ki. 4:1–7, 8–37; 5:1–14) and political counsel (2 Ki. 13:14 ff., "The chariots of Israel and its horsemen"; cf. 6:12; 8:7–15).

(c) One more early form must be mentioned: the cultic prophets employed as officials at the national sanctuary. They are to be distinguished clearly from the writing prophets (contra S. Mowinckel, *The Psalms in Israel's Worship* I–II, 1961), since the latter strongly criticized the cult (e.g. the temple, Hos. 8:14, RV mg.; Mic. 3:9–12; Jer. 7:1–15; sacrifice, Amos 3:14; Hos. 5:6; Isa. 1:10–17; priests, Hos. 4:4; Mic. 3:11; Jer. 2:8). Moreover, they acted and spoke in a way foreign to the cult (G. von Rad, op. cit., II, 54 f.). The cultic prophet had his place along with the priest in the cult. His task would have been to give oracles in answer to communal laments, and especially to the king. For this reason he had great influence in the royal court (1 Ki. 1:8), where he spoke as a man of God (1 Ki. 22:24 ff.) with remarkable severity (2 Sam. 12:1 ff.). The cultic prophets were feared, because their powerful → word could bring success or disaster (1 Sam. 16:4; 1 Ki. 17:18). Their words of salvation would be formulated after the manner of proverbs. In Isa. 33:1–24 there is preserved a prophetic liturgy (H. Gunkel, "Jesaia 33, eine prophetische Liturgie", *ZAW* 42, 1924, 177–208), which gives us insight into the language of these prophets. Among the cultic prophets we may count Shimei (1 Ki. 1:8), Zedekiah (1 Ki. 22:24), and perhaps also Nathan (2 Sam. 12:1 ff.; 1 Ki. 1:11 ff.) who worked in close association with the court and yet enjoyed an astonishing degree of independence. No books have come down to us from these prophets, unless one includes Nahum and Habakkuk who at least have some affinity with them. There are, however, unmistakable traits of the cultic prophet in Zechariah and still more in Haggai.

3. Prophecy in the characteristic sense associated with the prophetic literature of the OT began in Israel with the monarchy. However, no sharp dividing-line can be drawn. Ecstasy, soothsaying and miracle-working fade into the background, and the → word comes increasingly to the fore. Ties with the cult, with institutions and with the monarchy also become progressively looser. From Amos to Malachi the word was the predominant means of proclamation. The only actions of the prophets were symbolic actions. These were not strictly illustrations, but the acting out the content of the word (Hos. 1:4, 6, 9; Isa. 7:3; 8:3 f.; 20:2; Jer. 16:2, 5, 8). The classical prophets were active during three periods: the time of the dissolution of the Northern Kingdom (around 721 B.C.), of the Southern Kingdom (around 597–587 B.C.), and the time of the exile (around 539 B.C., the end of the Babylonian supremacy). In relation to history their message had a horizontal (the nation and the nations) and a vertical (past, present, future) dimension. The future dimension was in the nature of a warning, where the future is linked with the present situation of the hearer. It was not a prediction, where, as in soothsaying, the attention is taken away from the present to a point in the future and it is foretold what will happen. The themes include the following:

(a) Prophecy of judgment. Especially before the exile, it was the task of the prophets to warn the people, their representatives or a group of the people about the approaching → judgment. This could take various forms, such as droughts, earthquakes and wars. Since, however, the prophets were also responsible for exhorting and counselling the people, and preached with a view to repentance, the threat was accompanied by an explanation of the reason for the judgment. Thus the judgment comes about because of the → sin of the nation, of the king, or of a group within the nation. For the prophets, sin is human behaviour which is out of accord with the actions of God. In detail, this means in Isaiah, that the people is not putting its trust in Yahweh alone; in Amos and Micah, that the people is disregarding the law and commandments of Yahweh; in Hosea, Jeremiah and Ezekiel, the emphasis is rather on the unfaithfulness of the people in idolatry.

(b) Prophecy of salvation. Prophecies of salvation did not originate in curiosity about what will happen after God's judgment. They were based upon the loving will of God (in contrast to prophecies of judgment, which resulted from the wrong behaviour of men). This is further indicated by the various forms which the word of salvation, or promise, could take: the pledge is clearly the answer to a previous complaint, and so is not far removed from the favourable oracle (Isa. 43:1 ff.); the announcement promises God's future help (Isa. 41:17 ff.; Jer. 28:2 ff.); the description depicts the future reality of the salvation which God will bring about (Isa. 11:1 ff.; Zech. 8:4 f.). Prophecies of → salvation predominate during and after the exile. Salvation becomes a reality in the renewal of the relationship between Israel and God, in the eschatological king (the messiah), in the new ordering of the cult, the renewal of the state and political liberation of the nation. Majestic representation of salvation is often followed by an explanation of the ground on which it is based: not the faithfulness or holiness of the people, in its zeal for God and the covenant, but the faithfulness, holiness, zeal and unconditional love of God alone.

To sum up, the OT prophet is a proclaimer of the word, called by God to warn, exhort, comfort, teach and counsel, bound to God alone and thus enjoying a freedom that is unique.

4. Although later tradition added the book of Daniel to the prophets, it is in fact an example of Jewish apocalyptic. The latter is distinguished from prophecy by "pseudonymity, eschatological impatience and exact calculations about the last things, the range and fantasy of its visions, concern for world history and a cosmic horizon, numerical symbolism and esoteric language, doctrines of angels and hope of the afterlife" (W. Baumgartner, "Ein Vierteljahrhundert Danielforschung", *ThR* 11, 1939, 136 f.). Apocalyptic is therefore not a straightforward continuation of prophecy, though both share the element of future expectation. Its heyday comes after the prophets, between the 2nd century B.C. and the 2nd century A.D. The transition may be clearly seen in Zechariah: in the seven visions of the night (1:7–6:8) the prophet becomes a seer to whom the eschatological future of the nations and of Israel is revealed (cf. Isa. 24–27; Ezek. 38 f.; Joel).

5. The rabbis naturally saw in apocalyptic the legitimate successor of prophecy. "Up to this point [i.e. up to Alexander the Great] the prophets preached through the Holy Spirit. From then on, bow thine ear and hear the words of the wise [i.e. the apocalyptic writers]" (Seder 'Olam Rabbah 30). Prophecy itself is extinguished. In rabbinic writings the "voice from heaven" (→ Word, art. *phōnē*) begins to gain importance alongside apocalyptic. God still spoke but only through the echo of his voice (*baṯ qôl*) (SB II 125 ff.; cf. J. Jeremias, *New Testament Theology*, I 1971, 80 ff.). Josephus (*Ant.* 13, 311 ff.), on the other hand, reports that the Essenes had a great number of prophets who were held in high repute.

The cessation of prophecy is indicated by Ps. 74:9 and 1 Macc. 9:27 (cf. 4:46; 9:27; 14:41). On the other hand, some scholars see evidence for the expectation of an eschatological prophet connected with the person of → Moses on the basis of Deut. 18:15–18 (cf. Acts 3:22 f.; 7:37; and Jn. 6:14; 7:40) and connected with the person of → Elijah on the basis of Mal. 3:1 (cf. Matt. 11:10; Mk. 1:2; Lk. 1:17, 76; 7:27) and 4:1–6 (MT 3:19–24; cf. Matt. 17:11; Mk. 9:12; Lk. 1:17). (For further discussion see F. Hahn, "The Eschatological Prophet", in *The Titles of Jesus in Christology: Their History in Early Christianity*, 1969, 352–406; G. Molin, "Elijahu. Der Prophet und sein Weiterleben in den Hoffnungen des Judentums und der Christenheit", *Judaica* 8, 1952, 65–94; M.-J. Stiassny, "Le Prophète Élie dans le Judaisme", in *Élie le Prophète, Études Carmélitaines* 35, 199–255; SB II, 626 f.; IV 764–98; R. Schnackenburg, "Die Erwartungen des 'Propheten' nach dem Neuen Testament und den Qumran-Texten", *StudEv* 1, *TU* V, 18, 1959, 622–39; H. M. Teeple, *The Mosaic Eschatological Prophet*, 1959; and the literature listed in the articles on Moses and Elijah.)

6. The Qumran community treasured the prophetic writings of the OT (including the Psalms) to an extraordinary degree. They applied the prophecies to the events of their own day, which they saw as the "end of days" (i.e. the end-time). The Teacher of Righteousness reveals the secrets of the prophetic words (1QpHab 7:1–5) and so takes on the rôle of an actual prophet. The eschatological event which the Qumran community awaited was the coming of "the Prophet and of the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel" (1QS 9:11). This suggests a triumvirate, not a ruler with a threefold office (cf. Test.Lev. 18:9 ff.; cf. K. G. Kuhn, "Die beiden Messias Aarons und Israels", *NTS* 1, 1954–55, 168 ff.; F. F. Bruce, *The Teacher of Righteousness in the Qumran Texts*, 1956, 13).

NT In the NT *prophētēs* is found 144 times, most frequently in Matt. (37 times) and Luke (Gospel 29 times; Acts 30 times). In Mk. it is found only 6 times, and 14 times each in Jn. and Paul. It occurs 8 times in Rev., twice each in Heb. and 2 Pet. and once each in Jas. and 1 Pet. The noun means a prophet, one who proclaims and expounds divine revelation. In most cases it refers to OT prophets, but it is also applied to John the Baptist, Jesus and others who proclaim the Kingdom of God or Christ, and to the believer who possesses the gift of prophecy. Only in one place (Tit. 1:12) does a pagan receive the title of prophet. This is the poet Epimenides (6th century B.C.), from whose *Theogony* a proverbial saying is quoted ("Cretans are always liars, evil beasts, lazy gluttons"). Epimenides was regarded as a prophet by Plutarch (*Solon* 12), Plato (*Laws* 1, 642d) and others in the ancient world. The fact that he is regarded as a prophet here lends authority to the judgment.

As well as referring to a person, *prophētēs* can also be used of the OT prophetic writings (e.g. Matt. 5:17; Jn. 6:45; Rom. 3:21).

In the NT the title prophetess is not given to a woman who prophesies, with the exception of Lk. 2:36, where Anna, the daughter of Phanuel, is given this title because she proclaimed Christ. Jezebel, the type of the woman led astray into idolatry, gives herself the title (Rev. 2:20).

The abstract noun *prophēteia* is found only 19 times in the NT, and of these 9 times in Paul (including 5 times in 1 Cor. and twice in 1 Tim.) and 7 times in Rev. Otherwise it occurs once in Matt. and twice in 2 Pet. It refers to the prophetic word of an OT (e.g. Matt. 13:14) or Christian prophet (e.g. 1 Cor. 14:6). Only Paul uses it also as a term for the gift of prophecy (*charisma*; → Grace; e.g. Rom. 12:6). At Rev. 19:10 it probably means prophetic word, while at Rev. 11:6 it probably signifies prophetic activity.

It is similar with the occurrences of the vb., which is found 28 times in the NT, and of these 11 times in Paul, all in 1 Cor. The remaining instances are 4 in Matt., 2 each in Mk. and Lk., 1 in Jn., 4 in Acts, 1 each in 1 Pet. and Jude, and 2 in Rev. The basic meaning is to proclaim divine revelation (e.g. Matt. 7:22; cf. above, 2). This can be understood in an ethical, paracletic sense (e.g. 1 Cor. 14:3, 31; to comfort, exhort, teach); in a revelatory sense (e.g. Matt. 26:68) or as pointing to the future (e.g. Matt. 15:7; to foretell). Since the title of prophet is not given to women in the church, a circumlocution is used (Acts 21:9; Philip the evangelist's "four unmarried daughters who prophesied").

The late word *pseudoprophētēs* is found 11 times in the NT, including 3 times each in Matt. and Rev., but not at all in Paul. It occurs once each in Mk., Lk., Acts, 2 Pet. and 1 Jn. Normally it is used of a person who makes a false claim to being a prophet (e.g. Matt. 7:15). Since such people proceed to preach what is not true, the name comes to be applied to anyone who does this (1 Jn. 4:1) and so shows himself to be a false prophet. The adj. *prophētikos* occurs only in Rom. 16:26 and 2 Pet. 1:19. The vb. *manteuomai* is found only at Acts 16:16 of the soothsaying of the girl at Philippi who prior to her exorcism by Paul brought her owners great gain.

The NT term prophet is used in the following five senses.

1. *The Old Testament Prophet.* As in the OT ("Thus saith the Lord") he is described as "the mouth of God" (Jer. 15:19; Acts 3:18, 21). God is behind the passive construction in Matt. 2:17, 23 etc. Some take the reference in 1 Pet. 1:11 to

"the Spirit of Christ", the one at work in the prophets, to indicate the pre-existent Lord, who in 1 Pet. is one with God (cf. A. T. Hanson, *Jesus Christ in the Old Testament*, 1965, 133–36). In Heb. 1:1 (where *en* is used, on the analogy of Heb. b^e, of the instrument), the prophet is likewise seen as an instrument of God who makes an open proclamation. But the prefix *pro-* comes to be understood more and more in a temporal sense, so that, in contrast to the OT, the prophet is seen as one who foretells. He predicts everything which is later fulfilled in Jesus Christ (Matt. 1:22 f.; 2:5 f., 15, 17 f., 23, etc.). These texts are not proof-texts in the sense that the prophets make a prediction, and Jesus Christ fulfils it, therefore the prophecies are confirmed by → Jesus Christ or the scriptures proved through him. (For a discussion of the notion of fulfilment in Matt. which sees it not as direct, predictive prophecy but as fulfilled typology → Fullness, art. *plēroō*, NT 1 (b)–(c).) For Matt. the authority of the OT is so incontestable that it does not need to be proved. Rather, the texts are reflective quotations, intended to show that Jesus Christ does something, or that with his coming something happens. Matt. does his reflecting by the use of a suitable OT quotation. Since the prophets (→ Scripture) constitute an absolute authority for Matt., this means that Jesus Christ is proved by the quotation to be messiah. The direction of his argument is thus the opposite to that of a proof-text which establishes the truth of scripture.

A striking feature is the frequency of NT references to the violent deaths of the prophets (Matt. 23:31; the saying at Matt. 23:37 par. Lk. 13:34; in Acts 7:52 a line is drawn through the murder of the prophets to the death of Jesus). In early Christianity martyrdom was integrally related to the concept of the prophet (Matt. 23:35). Jesus presented himself as one who stood in the line of rejected prophets whose own rejection marked the climax of evil and brought open judgment on Jerusalem. He was also the culminating figure of those who were martyred for their righteousness (Matt. 23:35; Lk. 11:51). Abel (Gen. 4) was the first. Zechariah, the son of Jehoiada, is mentioned towards the end of the last book of the OT canon (2 Chr. 24:20 ff.). The latter may be identified here with Zechariah the son of Berechiah (Zech. 1:1). A Zechariah, son of Baris or Baruch was martyred in the Temple in A.D. 70 (Josephus, *War* 4, 5, 4), but he could hardly be the figure here. The Jewish tradition and LXX texts about the various Zechariahs show confusion.

2. *John the Baptist.* John is consistently given the title of prophet. This is justified by the fact that he takes up and makes even more radical the prophetic preaching of judgment and repentance (Amos 9:7 ff.; Mic. 3:12; Jer. 7:3 ff.; 26:1 ff.). His preaching was aimed at moral improvement, and at shaking the religious self-confidence of the Jews. His → baptism, which was not proselyte baptism or that practised at Qumran, must be seen as an eschatological sacrament of repentance, which is a testimony of conversion and forms a seal of salvation. It is not surprising that John was therefore regarded as the expected eschatological prophet who would bring in the age of salvation (cf. above, OT 3; Matt. 11:8 ff.). The NT however suppresses this (false) view, and portrays him as the eschatological forerunner (Matt. 3:1 ff.; 11:11 f.; 14:2 ff.; 16:14; 17:13; Mk. 6:25; 8:28; Lk. 7:20, 33; 9:19), or "witness" of Jesus (Jn. 1:6 ff.), who points in his preaching to Jesus Christ and in his baptism to Christian baptism (O. Cullmann, *The Christology of the New Testament*, 1963², 23–30; cf. J. Jeremias, *New Testament Theology*, I, 1971, 43–49;

C. H. H. Scobie, *John the Baptist*, 1963; W. Wink, *John the Baptist in the Gospel Tradition, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series* 7, 1968).

3. *Jesus Christ.* Only occasionally in the NT is Jesus Christ called a prophet, and generally only by the people (Mk. 6:15 par. Lk. 9:8; Matt. 16:14 par. Mk. 8:28, Lk. 9:19; Lk. 7:16). They may have in mind here contemporary prophets, but → Elijah is also mentioned by all three evangelists, and Matt. also refers to Jeremiah, suggesting that Jesus is thought of as in the succession of OT prophets. However, Jesus never described himself directly as a prophet. No great weight may be laid on Lk. 13:33 as a self-designation, since it is probably a quotation of a proverbial saying. In the passages ascribed to Q, the word prophet never occurs as a christological title; it is most frequently found in Lk. (cf. F. Hahn, *The Titles of Jesus in Christology*, 1969, 379 ff.; O. Cullmann, op. cit., 30–38). According to the NT, Jesus Christ is greater than the prophets (Matt. 12:41), since he not only announced but also brought salvation (1 Pet. 1:10 f.; Lk. 10:24). Christ is presented as a prophet in the sense of Deut. 18:15: "The Lord your God will raise up a prophet like me from among you, from your brethren – him shall you heed" (cf. Acts 3:22 f.; 7:37; Matt. 2:1–23; 4:1–11; 5:1 ff.; Jn. 6:14; 7:40).

J. Jeremias sees Jesus as a charismatic rather than as a professional theologian (Matt. 7:29 par. Mk. 1:22, Lk. 4:32). "The unanimous verdict on him was that he was a prophet. There was a constant echo to this effect among the people (Mark 6:15 par.; 8:28 par.; Matt. 21:11, 46; Luke 7:16; John 4:19; 6:14; 7:40, 52; 9:17) and even – though coupled with some scepticism – in Pharisaic circles (Luke 7:39; Mark 8:11 par.). According to Luke 24:19, Jesus' disciples, too, saw him as a prophet. Finally, it was as a false prophet that Jesus was arrested and accused. This is clear from the account of the mockery under Jewish confinement" (*New Testament Theology*, I, 1971, 77; cf. also J. D. G. Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit*, 1975, 82 ff.). In support of the latter point Jeremias cites Matt. 26:68 par. Mk. 14:65, Lk. 22:64, and notes that a false prophet had to die (Deut. 18:20; cf. 13:6; 17:13). " 'Prophet' was not a full description of the task for which he had been sent . . ., but he included himself among the ranks of the prophets (Luke 13:33; Matt. 23:31 f., 34–36 par., 37–39 par.; cf. Mark 6:4 par.; Luke 4:24; John 4:44). He does this not only in those passages in which he uses the term 'prophet', but also in those in which he claims to possess the spirit. For the synagogue regarded the possession of the holy spirit, i.e. the spirit of God, as *the* mark of prophecy. To possess the spirit of God was to be a prophet" (op. cit., 78; cf. the Beelzebul controversy, Matt. 12:25–37 par. Mk. 3:23–30, Lk. 11:17–23; and Mk. 13:11; Lk. 6:23, 26 par. Matt. 5:12; Jn. 7:37 ff.). Whereas the Spirit had long been quenched, Jesus initiated the time of salvation. It was heralded by John the Baptist who was more than a prophet (Matt. 11:9 par. Lk. 7:26). It is indicated by his own presence as one who is greater than → Jonah (Matt. 12:41 par. Lk. 11:32). "The time of barrenness and judgment is coming to an end. The quenched spirit is returning after a long absence. God is breaking his silence and is speaking again, as he once did in the days of the prophets" (op. cit., 82). But the "more" implied in these latter references "has an eschatological ring. . . . With the new activity of the spirit the time of salvation has begun" (ibid).

4. *Those Specially Commissioned.* In the nativity narrative of Lk., and only here, we find people who have been specially commissioned and equipped by God to

proclaim prophetic messages which have been given to them by the Holy Spirit (cf. R. Laurentin, *Structure et Théologie de Luc I–II*, 1964). Of these only Anna has the title of prophet (Lk. 2:36). Zacharias' song, the *Benedictus*, is described as a prophecy inspired by the Holy Spirit (Lk. 1:67). Elizabeth (Lk. 1:41 f.) and Simeon (Lk. 2:25) speak by the Holy Spirit, which is intended to imply a prophetic gift.

5. *Christian Prophets.* The early Christian church had Christians who possessed the gift of prophecy. They were regarded as a sign that the Spirit was present in the church (→ Spirit; → Grace). It must be assumed that at a very early stage this charismatic, impulsive prophecy became institutionalized, and prophets were then seen as the holders of a spiritual office. This had its own standing in the community between, or on a par with, → apostles and teachers (1 Cor. 12:28 f.; Eph. 4:11); next to apostles (Lk. 11:49; Eph. 2:20, though possibly OT prophets are referred to here; Eph. 3:5; Did. 11:3); next to teachers (Acts 13:1; Did. 15:1 f.); next to saints and apostles (Rev. 18:20).

(a) In the worship at Corinth they had in the service (1 Cor. 14:23 f.) the task of exhorting (1 Cor. 14:3, 24 f., 31), comforting (1 Cor. 14:3), and edifying the church (1 Cor. 14:3), and of communicating knowledge and mysteries (1 Cor. 13:2). Paul instructed them to do this in words which could be understood (1 Cor. 12:1; 14:15 f., 23 f.), and not in a state of → ecstasy. There was evidently a danger, however, that the prophetic spirit might break out in uncontrolled, ecstatic power and invade the church's worship in such a way that not just one (1 Cor. 14:30) but several (v. 31) would be prophesying at the same time. Paul handled this problem by declaring that the spirits of prophets should be subject to prophets (v. 32), by which he meant submission to order and the peace of God (v. 33a). The prophet must also be able to remain silent. It remains debatable whether we can detect in the epistles the utterances of early Christian prophets, in the form of "statements of holy law" (cf. E. Käsemann, "Sentences of Holy Law in the New Testament", *New Testament Questions of Today*, 1969, 66–81). Käsemann cites Rom 11:25 f.; 1 Cor. 3:17; 14:38; 15:51 f.; 16:22; Gal. 5:21 and 1 Thess. 3:4 as eschatological logia.

(b) In Eph. 2:20 the prophets form part of the "foundation" of the church. This image suggests that the period in which the foundations of the church were laid is over, i.e. the prophetic office is a thing of the past. The apostles are here the NT counterpart of the OT prophets. Together they constitute the foundation, "Christ Jesus himself being the chief cornerstone" (→ Rock).

(c) Warnings against false prophets in the Synoptic Gospels (Matt. 7:15, 22 f.; 24:24 par. Mk. 13:22) permit the conclusion that there must have been a great number of Christian prophets in the area of Syria and Palestine.

Using form-critical analysis, E. Käsemann attempts to isolate forms of prophetic proclamation (statements of holy law, curses, blessings, etc.) in the synoptic tradition, and to demonstrate that these are the logia of early Christian prophets ("The Beginnings of Christian Theology", op. cit., 82–107). Such "spurious" dominical sayings, he suggests, formed part of the sayings-source, and were understood in the early church to be words of the risen Lord given by the mouth of Christian prophets.

C. H. Peisker

Käsemann's view which is shared by many goes back to R. Bultmann, *The*

History of the Synoptic Tradition, 1968², 127 f., and beyond that to H. Gunkel, *Reden und Aufsätze*, 1913, 173, and H. von Soden, *Das Interesse des apostolischen Zeitalters*, 1892, 153. (For this and the following points see D. Hill, "On the Evidence for the Creative Rôle of Christian Prophets", *NTS* 20, 1973–74, 262–74.) In support of his view of this creative rôle for the Christian prophets Bultmann appealed generally to Rev. and Od.Sol. 42:6: "For I have risen and stand by them and speak through their mouth."

But the view has not gone unquestioned. M. Dibelius, himself a leading form-critic, drew attention to Paul's distinction between commands which came from the Lord and his own advice (1 Cor. 7:10, 12, 25; cf. *From Tradition to Gospel*, 1971, 241 f.). F. Neugebauer has pointed out that no similar transformation of logia occurs in Jewish and NT writings and that the theory pays no heed to the difference in literary genre between "Gospel" and "Apocalypse" ("Geistsprüche und Jesuslogien", *ZNW* 53, 1962, 218–28). Moreover, if, as Bultmann allows, the words of the prophets only gradually came to be regarded as those of the historical Jesus, this in itself presupposes that the community originally made a distinction between the two. And if the words of the risen Lord uttered by the prophets had the same value as those of the historical Jesus, there is no reason for projecting them back into a fictitious pre-Easter setting. Bultmann and his followers have not paid sufficient attention to the rôle of → tradition in early Christian → proclamation. "The place given by Bultmann and others to the Christian prophets is precisely that occupied by the Gnostic authors of apocryphal Gospels: in these works it is not the Jesus of history who teaches by action and by word, but the resurrected Lord who conveys truths and revelations to this or that privileged disciple" (D. Hill, op. cit., 264).

Hill draws attention to the weakness of the exegetical basis of Bultmann's view. The Odes of Solomon is probably not a 1st century Jewish-Christian work, but a gnostic hymn-book from the 2nd century A.D. (Henn.Schn., II, 809 f.; cf. Hill, op. cit., 265). Moreover, the verse on which Bultmann leans does not refer to Christian prophets but to believers in general. In the letters to the seven churches in Rev. 1–3, the Spirit of Christ addresses the churches as the Spirit of the exalted Lord (cf. also Rev. 16:15) and not in a form of words projected back into the life-situation of the historical Jesus. Similarly, Paul was careful to distinguish his own opinions from the teachings of Jesus, even though he claimed to have the Spirit as the Corinthians did (1 Cor. 7:40). Moreover, there is evidence to suggest that the early church distinguished between the Spirit addressing a man (Acts 10:1; 11:12; 13:2; 21:11) and the utterances of the glorified Lord (Acts 9:4 ff., 10 f.; 18:9; 23:11). Nowhere in the Pauline letters is there an implied identity between an encounter with the Spirit bringing a revelation and the words of the historical Jesus (Hill, op. cit., 267).

Whilst passages in Rev. may echo words attributed to the earthly Jesus (cf. Rev. 16:15 with Lk. 12:39; and Rev. 3:20 with Lk. 22:29 f. and Lk. 12:36), they clearly do not purport to be utterances of the earthly Jesus. In any case, the author of Rev. cannot be appealed to as a model of the activity and consciousness of Christian prophets generally in the NT period. The author is the authoritative mediator of the revelation (Rev. 1:1). Those who keep the words of his book are blessed (Rev. 1:3; cf. 22:7). Readers of his book, including the prophets, are

subordinate. The prophets of the community do not make any independent contribution to the prophecy; their function is to teach (cf. the teaching of the false prophetess in Rev. 2:24) (on all this see further D. Hill, "Prophecy and Prophets in the Revelation of St John", *NTS* 18, 1971–72, 401–18; A Satake, *Die Gemeindeordnung in der Johannes-Apokalypse*, 1966). The evidence of Acts 11:28 and 21:11 does not support the idea of the prophets producing utterances in the name of the historical Jesus; rather, Agabus speaks here by the Spirit. Similarly, there is no hint in 1 Cor. 7:40 and 14:3 of the charismatic prophet using the name of Christ in the first person.

Examples of Käsemann's concept of "Sentences of Holy Law" include 1 Cor. 3:17 and Matt. 10:32. But from a study of the form of such sentences, there is nothing to require the existence of a community of prophets to promulgate eschatological laws of this kind (cf. K. Berger, "Zu den sogenannten Sätzen heiligen Rechts", *NTS* 17, 1970–71, 10–40). Whilst such formulations can be transposed in to the realm of eschatology, their form "belongs to the genre of sapiential exhortation in which the sanction corresponds to the action according to a law of immanent justice" (D. Hill, op. cit., 271). Finally, Hill observes that Käsemann's attempt to link the activity of the Christian prophets with gnosticism fails because of sheer lack of knowledge about the Christian prophecy and the origin and nature of gnosticism (op. cit., 272 f.).

(d) Acts gives considerable information about prophets. It includes the prophecy of Agabus which involves prediction of future events: widespread famine (Acts 11:28) and Paul's arrest (Acts 21:10 f.). But among contemporary German scholars the accounts of Acts are commonly conceived to be of little value as a historical source. The reason for this sceptical attitude is bound up with the acceptance of Conzelmann's ascription to Luke of a view of time which divides history into three eras: the period of Israel, the middle time, and the period of the church. The third era begins with → Pentecost (Acts 2:1 ff.), and therefore takes up most of the book of Acts. It is characterized as, among other things, the time when the Spirit is poured out on all Christians (whereas in the second era Jesus was the only bearer of the Spirit). One sign of the superabundant outpouring of the Spirit is the great number of early Christian prophets who are named (Acts 11:27 f.; 13:1; 15:32; 21:9 ff.), and the principle that all Christians are given prophetic inspiration (Acts 2:17 f.; 19:6). The numerous references to prophecy are held to be theologically motivated. However, theological interpretation need not necessarily be something alien superimposed on a situation that was historically different. (For discussion of Luke's view of history → Present, art. *The Parousia and Eschatology in the NT*, especially NT 2 (b).)

In the Lucan writings OT prophets are referred to in Lk. 4:24; 7:16; 39; 9:8, 19; 13:33; 24:19; Acts 3:22 f. Acts 7:37 sees Jesus as a prophet in terms of the prophecy of a successor to → Moses in Deut. 18:15, 18. John the Baptist is described as a prophet in Lk. 1:76 (cf. Mal. 4:5); 7:26; and 20:6. Christian prophets are envisaged in Lk. 11:49: "Therefore also the Wisdom of God said, 'I will send them prophets and apostles, some of whom they will kill and persecute.' " Here Wisdom may be identified with the Spirit of God as in later Judaism (cf. Wis. 9:17), implying a contrast with the wisdom of Solomon (Lk. 11:31) (for further discussion see E. E. Ellis, *The Gospel of Luke*, *New Century Bible*, 1966, 170 ff.). The passage

may well be a comment attributed to the Spirit which is intended to supplement the previous words of the historical Jesus. Acts mentions a group of prophets from the Jerusalem church visiting Antioch, including Agabus (Acts 11:27 f.; cf. 21:10), a group resident in Antioch, including Barnabas and Paul (Acts 13:1), and the two prophets who accompanied the Jerusalem decree to Antioch, Judas Barsabbas and Silas (Acts 15:22, 32). The vb. *prophēteuō* is always used in Acts of Christians (Acts 2:17 f.; cf. Joel 2:28 ff.; Acts 19:6; and 21:9). Although Peter is not called a prophet, he has the marks of one, which include the knowledge of men's hearts (Acts 5:3; 8:21 ff.; cf. Lk. 7:39). He also had experience of visions and dreams fulfilling the prophecy of Joel (cf. also Acts 10:10). Similarly others had these prophetic experiences (Acts 9:10; 16:9; 22:17 ff.; 27:23; cf. Num. 12:6). Acts 21:9 refers to the four daughters of Philip who prophesied (cf. also the references to them in Eusebius, *HE* 3, 31, 4; 3, 37, 1). E. E. Ellis sums up this evidence by saying that "Christian prophecy in Acts is represented as an eschatological power of the Holy Spirit from God (Acts 2:17) or from the risen Jesus (Acts 1:8; 2:17; 33; cf. Psa. 68:19(18); Eph. 4:8). Although prophecy is a possibility for any Christian, it is primarily identified with certain leaders who exercise it as a ministry" ("The Role of the Christian Prophet in Acts", in W. W. Gasque and R. P. Martin, eds., *Apostolic History and the Gospel: Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F. F. Bruce*, 1970, 56).

The purpose of Ellis's study is to try to ascertain more precisely Luke's understanding of what constitutes and what distinguishes prophecy. Certain functions are reminiscent of the OT prophet: prediction of future events (Acts 11:28; 20:23, 25; 27:22), the declaration of divine judgments (Acts 13:11; 28:25–28), and the employment of symbolic actions (Acts 21:11). Ellis notes a particular link between prophecy and exhortation. "And Judas and Silas, who were themselves prophets exhorted [*parekalesan*] the brethren with many words and strengthened [*epestērixan*] them" (Acts 15:32; → Exhort, art. *parakaleō*). The vb. *parakaleō* is used of the ministry of John the Baptist (Lk. 3:18; cf. 7:26), as well as of that of the prophets (Acts 11:23; 16:40; 20:2), though not that of Jesus. It is applied to Peter (Acts 2:40; cf. also 1 Thess. 2:12), and is found in the NT only in Acts 14:22 of the prophets Paul and Barnabas and in the Thessalonian letters with the cognate *stērizō* (1 Thess. 3:2; 2 Thess. 2:17). The corresponding noun *paraklēsis* which occurs in Lk.-Acts, Paul and Heb. is associated by Luke with the activity of the Spirit (cf. Acts 9:31; 13:15). Ellis observes that "the written *paraklēsis* of the Jerusalem Decree is set in parallel with the verbal 'exhortation' of the prophets Judas and Silas, and the term 'son of *paraklēsis*', applied to Barnabas in Acts 4:36, possibly represents 'son of prophecy'. The understanding of *paraklēsis* as the specific ministry of a prophet is supported in the Pauline literature by I Corinthians 14:2 f." (op. cit., 57; cf. also Rom. 15:4 f.; 2 Cor. 5:20). The interpretation of scripture, usually in the synagogues, is a central feature of the mission of the prophets, though it is not confined to them (Acts 2:14–36; 3:12–26; 4:8–12; 6:9 ff.; 7:2–53; 8:30–35; 9:20 ff.; 13:5, 16–41; 16:22 f.; 17:2, 10 f., 17, 22–31; 18:4, 24–28; 19:8; 28:23). The interpretation of scripture was understood as a prophetic function (Dan. 9:2, 14; Targum to Jdg. 5:9; cf. SB IV 116; R. Meyer, *TDNT* VI 817). Similarly, the allusion to the rabbis sitting "in Moses' seat" (Matt. 23:2) indicates that the rabbis saw themselves as the successors to the prophets (Ellis, op. cit., 58).

As at Qumran, there was no sharp division between the prophet and the teacher (op. cit., 59). Jesus himself was seen as teacher and eschatological prophet (cf. Lk. 7:39 f. with Mk. 1:21 par. Lk. 4:31; and Mk. 6:1–6 par. Matt. 13:53–58; Lk. 4:16 ff.). In the light of the implied connexions in these contexts between prophecy and the exposition of scripture, Ellis suggests "that the prophets Judas and Silas were not chosen incidentally to accompany the Decree. Probably they were chosen because they had already exercised an influential role in establishing (or proclaiming) the biblical rationale upon which the provisions of the Decree were justified" (op. cit., 62).

Ellis observes that the prophets in Acts exercised a widespread ministry in a varied fashion – singly or in groups, travelling or in settled congregations. But their functions were not restricted to those who were specifically designated as prophets. This is, in fact, paralleled by other ministries and → gifts in the NT where sometimes the gifts are shared by anyone and sometimes they relate to specific offices (cf. Acts 2:33; 6:3, 8 ff. with 1 Cor. 12:28, 31; 14:1; 2 Tim 1:11; op. cit., 63 f.). On the basis of his comparison of the rôle of the prophet with that of the apostle and elder, Ellis concludes that "the role of the prophet may overlap that of the elder as it does that of the apostle and teacher, especially in certain teaching functions. But unlike the prophet the apostle (in Jerusalem at least) and the elder or 'shepherd' are incorporated into the organizational structure" (op. cit., 66; → Apostle; → Bishop). At various points in Acts, Luke presents the Christian mission as a continuation of the mission of Jesus who is now the exalted Lord (Acts 1:1; 9:5; 10:13; 16:7; 22:18; 23:11) and as a contest between conflicting spiritual powers (Acts 8:9–24; 13:6 ff.; 16:16; 19:13–20). Ellis concludes: "The role of the Christian prophet is related to both of these Lucan themes. The prophet is the Lord's instrument, one among several means by which Jesus leads his church. As one who makes known (*gnōstos*) the meaning of Scripture, exhorts, and strengthens the congregation, and instructs the community by revelations of the future, the Christian prophet manifests in the power of the Spirit the character of his Lord, who is the Prophet of the end-time (3:22)" (op. cit., 67).

(e) In Rev. prophets appear to have superseded apostles. In the three passages where the latter are mentioned Rev. 2:2 refers to false apostles, and Rev. 18:20 and 21:14 refer to the apostolic Twelve who are the counterpart of the OT prophets. On the other hand, prophets are mentioned in Rev. 10:7; 11:10, 18; 16:6; 18:20, 24; 22:6, 9. The author regards himself as a prophet (Rev. 22:9). He has received from the exalted Lord a revelation of the meaning of the events of history (Rev. 1:1). This is embodied in a series of seven sets of visions which constitute the substance of his book (→ Number, art. *hepta*). He is called to console and exhort (cf. above (d)). Although the words *parakaleō* and *paraklēsis* do not occur, the letters to the Seven Churches (chs. 2 and 3) and indeed the whole work constitutes a series of messages of consolation and exhortation. The work carries the authority of the exalted Christ, speaking through the Spirit (Rev. 22:18 f.).

In "Prophecy and Prophets in the Revelation of St John" (*NTS* 18, 1971–72, 401–18) D. Hill argues that the author "considered himself to be a prophet, and that his writing, while employing much of the traditional apparatus of Apocalyptic but lacking many of the most characteristic features of that genre, may justifiably, and probably correctly, be regarded as prophetic in intention and character,

especially in its concern with and interpretation of history" (op. cit., 406). The term prophet in the book denotes primarily Christian prophets who, while they may be separable from the body of believers, cannot be said to have special precedence or position on the basis of existing evidence (op. cit., 410). The phrase *hē martyria Iēsou (Christou)*, "the witness of Jesus (Christ)", occurs six times (Rev. 1:2, 9; 12:17; 19:10 twice; 20:4) and the clause "to have the witness" or "the witness of Jesus" three times (Rev. 6:9; 12:17; 19:10). On the basis of his study of these passages, Hill contends that the author holds a unique position. He stands in the tradition of OT and Jewish prophecy, rather than of Christian prophecy, and mediates to his brethren (the Christian prophets) the revelation of Jesus Christ. The Christian prophets are distinguished from other Christians in that they actually fulfil the ministry of witness and prophecy that is expected of the entire church which, at least in Rev. 19:10, is potentially a community of prophets (op. cit., 414; cf. 1 Cor. 14 where prophecy is a gift to be sought by all, though exercised by a few). The concept of prophetic activity in Rev. is comparable with that seen by Ellis in Lk.-Acts in relation to interpreting the meaning of scripture (see above (d)). As A. Feuillet has observed, Rev. is a "re-reading of the OT in the light of the Christian event" (*L'Apocalypse. État de la Question*, 1963, 65; cf. op. cit., 417).

(f) For a time prophecy continued to have a place in the church. Prophets are known in the Didache, but the author shows some nervousness about false prophets and those who outstay their welcome (Did. 10:7; 11:7–12; 13:1–7; cf. also Justin, *Dial.* 82, 1). They featured in Montanism in the 2nd and 3rd centuries (cf. Eusebius, *HE* 5, 16, 3–17; 5, 19, 2; Epiphanius, *Haer.* 48, 49; Hippol., *Haer.* 8, 19, 1–3; Tert., *De anima* 9). Besides Montanus himself, Priscilla and Maximilla claimed to be prophetesses. But Montanist abuse led to the gradual discrediting and disappearance of prophecy. *C. Brown*

→ Covenant, → Ecstasy, → Elijah, → Jonah, → Law, → Moses, → Priest, → Revelation, → Sacrifice, → Wisdom, → Word

(a). B. W. Anderson and W. Harrelson, eds., *Israel's Prophetic Heritage: Essays in Honor of James Muilenberg*, 1962; G. W. Anderson *et al.*, *Studies on Prophecy: A Collection of Twelve Papers, Supplements to VT* 26, 1974; J. G. Baldwin, *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, TC*, 1972; A. Bentzen, "The Ritual Background of Amos i. 2–ii. 16" *OTS* 8, 1950, 85–99; E. Best, "Prophets and Preachers", *SJT* 12, 1959, 129–50; J. Bright, *Jeremiah, Anchor Bible*, 1965; and *Covenant and Promise: The Future in the Preaching of the Pre-exilic Prophets*, 1977; F. F. Bruce, *The Teacher of Righteousness in the Qumran Texts*, 1956; M. Buber, *The Prophetic Faith*, 1949; R. Bultmann, "Prophecy as Fulfilment", in C. Westermann, ed., *Essays on Old Testament Interpretation*, 1963, 50–75; M. Burrows, "Prophecy and the Prophets at Qumran", in B. W. Anderson and W. Harrelson, eds., op. cit., 223–32; H. von Campenhausen, *Ecclesiastical Authority and Spiritual Power in the Church of the First Three Centuries*, 1969; K. W. Carley, *Ezekiel among the Prophets: A Study of Ezekiel's Place in the Prophetic Tradition, SBT* Second Series 31, 1975; B. S. Childs, *Isaiah and the Assyrian Crisis, SBT* Second Series 3, 1967; R. E. Clements, *Prophecy and Covenant, SBT* 43, 1965; and *Prophecy and Tradition, Growing Points in Theology*, 1975; J. L. Crenshaw, "The Influence of the Wise upon Amos. The 'Doxologies of Amos' and Job 5:9–16; 9:5–10", *ZAW* 79, 1967, and 45 ff.; *Prophetic Conflict: Its Effect upon Israelite Religion, BZAW* 124, 1974; P. E. Davies, "Jesus and the Role of the Prophet", *JBL* 64, 1945, 214–54; A. B. Davidson, *Old Testament Prophecy*, ed. J. A. Paterson, 1903; C. H. Dodd, "Jesus as Teacher and Prophet", in G. K. A. Bell and A. Deissmann, eds., *Mysterium Christi: Christological Studies by British and German Theologians*, 1930, 53–66; "The Prophecy of Caiaphas (John xi 47–53)", in *Neotestamentica et Patristica* (O. Cullmann Festschrift), *Supplements to NovT* 6, 1962, 134–43; J. D. G. Dunn, *Jesus*

and the Spirit: A Study of the Religious and Charismatic Experience of Jesus and the First Christians as Reflected in the New Testament, 1975; and *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament: An Inquiry into the Character of Earliest Christianity*, 1977; W. Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament*, I, 1961, 289–391; and *Ezekiel*, 1970; O. Eissfeldt, "The Prophetic Literature", in H. H. Rowley, ed., *The Old Testament and Modern Study*, 1951, 115–61; and *The Old Testament: An Introduction* 1965, 241–442; E. E. Ellis, *The Gospel of Luke*, *New Century Bible*, 1966; and "The Role of the Christian Prophet in Acts", in W. W. Gasque and R. P. Martin, eds., *Apostolic History and the Gospel: Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F. F. Bruce*, 1970, 55–67; H. L. Ellison, *Men Spake from God: Studies in the Hebrew Prophets*, 1952; I. Engnell, "Prophets and Prophetism in the Old Testament", in *Critical Essays on the Old Testament*, 1970, 123–79; S. Erlandsson, *The Burden of Babylon: A Study of Isaiah 13:2–14:23*, *Coniectanea Biblica* OT Series 4, 1970; J. E. Fontenrose, *Python: A Study of Delphic Myth and its Origins*, 1959; G. Fohrer, "Remarks on Modern Interpretation of the Prophets", *JBL* 80, 1961, 309–19; and *History of Israelite Religion*, 1973; S. B. Frost, *Patriarchs and Prophets*, 1963; N. K. Gottwald, *All the Kingdoms of the Earth: Israelite Prophecy and International Relations in the Ancient Near East*, 1964; A. Guillaume, *Prophecy and Divination*, 1938; W. K. C. Guthrie, "Delphic Oracle", *OCD* 322 f.; H. A. Guy, *New Testament Prophecy*, 1947; F. Hahn, *The Titles of Jesus in Christology Their History in Early Christianity*, 1969; R. K. Harrison, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, 1970, 663–962; and *Jeremiah and Lamentations*, *TC*, 1973; J. H. Hayes, "The Use of Oracles against Foreign Nations in Ancient Israel", *JBL* 87, 1968, 81–92; E. W. Heaton, *The Old Testament Prophets*, 1976 (revised); D. Hill, "Prophecy and Prophets in the Revelation of St John", *NTS* 18, 1971–72, 401–18; and "On the Evidence of the Creative Rôle of Christian Prophets", *NTS* 20, 1973–74, 262–74; D. R. Hillers, *Treaty Curses and the Old Testament Prophets*, 1964; J. Jeremias, *New Testament Theology*, I, *The Proclamation of Jesus*, 1971, 76–84; A. R. Johnson, *The Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel*, 1962²; O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 1–12*, 1972; and *Isaiah 13–39*, 1974; E. Käsemann, "Sentences of Holy Law in the New Testament", and "The Beginnings of Christian Theology", in *New Testament Questions of Today*, 1969, 66–81, 82–107; R. Knierim, "The Vocation of Isaiah", *VT* 18, 1968, 64–68; H. Krämer, R. Rendtorff, R. Meyer, G. Friedrich, *prophētēs* etc., *TDNT* VI 781–861; H.-J. Kraus, *Worship in Ancient Israel: A Cultic History of the Old Testament*, 1966; C. Kuhl, *The Prophets of Israel*, 1960; J. Lindblom, *Prophecy in Ancient Israel*, 1962; A. Lods, *The Prophets and the Rise of Judaism*, 1937; W. McKane, *Prophets and Wise Men*, *SBT* 44, 1965; A. A. MacRae, "Prophets and Prophecy", *ZPEB* IV 875–903; J. L. Mays, *Amos*, 1969; F. L. Moriarty, "Prophets and Covenant", *Gregorianum* 66, 1965, 817–33; S. Mowinckel, *Prophecy and Tradition: The Prophetic Books in the Light of the Study of the Growth and History of the Tradition*, 1949; and *The Psalms in Israel's Worship*, I–II, 1962; J. Muilenburg, "The 'Office' of the Prophet in Ancient Israel", in J. P. Hyatt, ed., *The Bible in Modern Scholarship: Papers Read at the 100th Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature*, 1965, 74–97; B. D. Napier, "Prophet, Prophetism", *IDB* III 896–919; M. Newman, "The Prophetic Call of Samuel", in B. W. Anderson and W. Harrelson, eds., op. cit., 86–97; M. Noth, "History and the Word of God in the Old Testament", and "Office and Vocation in the Old Testament", in *The Laws in the Pentateuch and Other Studies*, 1966, 179–93, 229–49; H. M. Orlinsky *et al.*, *Interpreting the Prophetic Tradition*, 1969; H. W. Parke and D. E. W. Worrell, *The Delphic Oracle*, I–II, 1956²; J. B. Payne, *Encyclopedia of Biblical Prophecy: The Complete Guide to Scriptural Predictions and their Fulfilment*, 1973; N. W. Porteous, "The Prophets and the Problem of Continuity", in B. W. Anderson and W. Harrelson, eds., op. cit., 11–25; G. von Rad, "The Deuteronomistic Theology of History in the Book of Kings", in *Studies in Deuteronomy*, *SBT* 9, 1953, 74–91; *Old Testament Theology*, II, 1965; and *The Message of the Prophets*, 1968 (containing material from *Old Testament Theology*); J. Reiling, *Hermas and Christian Prophecy: A Study of the Eleventh Mandate*, *Supplements to NovT* 37, 1973; H. Ringgren, *Israelite Religion*, 1966; T. H. Robinson, *Prophecy and the Prophets in Ancient Israel*, 1953²; H. H. Rowley, "The Law and the Prophets", in *The Unity of the Bible*, 1953, 30–61; *Men of God: Studies in Old Testament History and Prophecy*, 1963; *From Moses to Qumran*, 1963; "The Prophets and the Cult", in *Worship in Ancient Israel: Its Forms and Meaning*, 1967, 144–75; "The Nature of Old Testament Prophecy in the Light of Recent Study", in *The Servant of the Lord and Other Essays on the Old Testament*, 1965², 95–134; H. H. Rowley, ed., *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy Presented to Professor Theodore H. Robinson*, 1950; M. H. Shepherd, Jr., "Prophet in the NT", *IDB* III 919 f.; J. Schildenberger, "Prophet", *EBT* II 716–22; W. Schmithals, *Gnosticism in Corinth*, 1971; E. Schweizer, *Church Order in the New Testament*, *SBT* 32, 1961; J. B. Taylor, *Ezekiel*, *TC* 1965; H. M. Teeple, *The Mosaic Eschatological Prophet*, 1959; W. C. van

Unnik, "A Formula Describing Prophecy", *NTS* 9, 1962–63, 86–94; R. de Vaux, *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions*, 1961, 384 ff.; and "Jerusalem and the Prophets", in *Interpreting the Prophetic Tradition*, 1969, 275–300; B. Vawter, *The Conscience of Israel: Pre-Exilic Prophets and Prophecy*, 1973²; T. C. Vriezen, "Prophecy and Eschatology", *Supplements to VT* 1, 1953; and "Essentials of the Theology of Isaiah", in B. W. Anderson and W. Harrelson, op. cit., 128–46; J. W. Wevers, *Ezekiel, New Century Bible*, 1969; C. Westermann, *Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech*, 1967; *Isaiah 40–66*, 1969; C. Westermann, ed., *Essays on Old Testament Interpretation*, 1963; C. F. Whitley, *The Prophetic Achievement*, 1963; R. N. Whybray, *Isaiah 40–66, New Century Bible*, 1976; G. Widengren, *Literary and Psychological Aspects of the Hebrew Prophets*, 1948; H. W. Wolff, *Hosea, Hermeneia*, 1974; E. J. Young, *My Servants the Prophets*, 1955; and *The Book of Isaiah*, I–III, *New International Commentary*, 1965–72; F. W. Young, "Jesus the Prophet: A Re-examination", *JBL* 68, 1949, 285–99; W. Zimmerli, *The Law and the Prophets: A Study of the Meaning of the Old Testament*, 1965; and *Ezekiel*, I, *Hermeneia*, 1977.

(b). R. Bach, *Die Aufforderung zur Flucht und zum Kampf im alttestamentlichen Prophetenspruch, WMANT* 9, 1962; E. Balla, *Die Botschaft der Propheten*, 1958; T. Chary, *Les Prophètes et le Culte à Partir de l'Éxil*, 1956; W. Dietrich, *Prophetie und Geschichte. Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum deuteronomischen Geschichtswerk, FRLANT* 108, 1972; E. Fascher, *Prophētēs. Eine sprach- und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*, 1927; G. Fohrer, "Neuere Literatur zur alttestamentlichen Prophetie", *ThR* 19, 1951, 277 ff.; ibid. 20, 1952, 192 ff.; ibid., 28, 1962, 1 ff. 235 ff., 301 ff.; *Die symbolische Handlungen der Propheten, AThANT*, 25, 1953; "Prophetie und Magie", *ZAW* 78, 1966, 25 ff.; and *Studien zur alttestamentlichen Prophetie, BZAW* 99, 1967; F. Gils, *Jésus Prophète d'après les Évangiles Synoptiques, Orientalia et Biblica Lovanensia* 2, 1957; H. Greeven, "Propheten, Lehrer, Vorsteher bei Paulus", *ZNW* 44, 1952–53, 1–43; and "Die Geistesgaben bei Paulus", *WuD* Neue Folge 1959, 111 ff.; J. Haeckel, "Religion", in L. Adam and H. Trimborn, *Lehrbuch der Völkerkunde*, 1958, 40 ff.; J. Harvey, *Le Plaidoyer prophétique contre Israël après la Rupture de l'Alliance*, 1967; M. L. Henry, *Prophet und Tradition. Versuch einer Problemstellung, BZAW* 116, 1969; S. Herrmann, "Das Prophetische", in *Reich Gottes und Wirklichkeit*, Festschrift A. D. Müller, 1961 (reprinted in *Probleme alttestamentlicher Hermeneutik, ThB* 11, 1968³, 341 ff.); *Die prophetischen Heilswartungen im Alten Testament, BWANT* 5, 5, 1965; *Prophetie und Wirklichkeit in der Epoche des babylonischen Exils, AzTh* 1, 32, 1967; and "Die konstruktive Restauration. Das Deuteronomium als Mitte biblischer Theologie", in *Probleme biblischer Theologie*, Festschrift G. von Rad, 1971, 155–70; F. Hesse, "Würzelt die prophetische Geschichtsrede im israelitischen Kult?", *ZAW* 65, 1953, 45–53; and *Das Verstockungsproblem im Alten Testament, BZAW* 74, 1958; F. Haeussermann, *Wortempfang und Symbol in der alttestamentlichen Prophetie, BZAW* 58, 1932; F. Horst, "Die Visionsschilderungen der alttestamentlichen Propheten", *EvTh* 20, 1960, 193 ff.; E. Jenni, *Die politischen Voraussagungen der Propheten, AThANT* 29, 1956; and *Die alttestamentliche Prophetie*, 1962; A. Jepsen, "Gottesmann und Prophet. Anmerkungen zum Kapitel 1. Könige 13", in *Probleme biblischer Theologie*, Festschrift G. von Rad, 1971, 171–82; G. Jeremias, *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit, StUNT* 2, 1963; J. Jeremias, *Kultprophetie und Gerichtsverkündigung in der späten Königszeit Israels, WMANT* 35, 1970; H.-J. Kraus, *Prophetie und Politik, ThEH* Neue Folge 36, 1952; K. G. Kuhn, "Die beiden Messias Aarons und Israels", *NTS* 1, 1954–55, 168 ff.; G. Mensching *et al.*, "Propheten", *RGG*³ V 608 ff.; O. Michel, *Prophet und Martyrer, BFChTh* 37, 2, 1932; L. Monloubou, *Prophète qui es-tu? Le Prophétisme avant les Prophètes*, 1968; F. Neugebauer, "Geistsprüche und Jesuslogien", *ZNW* 53, 1962, 218–28; F. Nötscher, "Prophetie im Umkreis des alten Israel", *BZ* 10, 1966, 161 ff.; C. H. Peisker, "Propheten", in *Kleine Predigttypologie*, II, 1965, 159 ff.; E. Osswald, *Falsche Propheten im Alten Testament*, 1962; P. von der Osten-Sacken, *Die Apokalyptik in ihrem Verhältnis zur Prophetie und Weisheit, ThEH* Neue Folge 157, 1969; O. Plöger, "Priester und Prophet", *ZAW* 63, 1951, 157 ff.; G. Quell, *Wahre und falsche Propheten*, 1952; and "Der Kultprophet", *TLZ* 81, 1956, 401 ff.; R. Rendtorff, "Priesterliche Kulttheologie und prophetische Kultpolemik", *TLZ* 81, 1956, 339 ff.; "Propheten", *EKL* III 343 ff.; "Erwägungen zur Frühgeschichte des Prophetentums in Israel", *ZTK* 59, 1962, 145 ff.; and "Tradition und Prophetie", *ThV* 8, 1962, 216–26; H. Graf von Reventlow, *Das Amt des Propheten bei Amos, FRLANT* 80, 1962; "Prophetenamt und Mittleramt", *ZTK* 58, 1961, 269–84; *Liturgie und prophetisches Ich bei Jeremia*, 1963; and *Wächter über Israel. Ezechiel und seine Tradition, BZAW* 82, 1962; H. Riesenfeld, "Jesus als Prophet", in *Spiritus et Veritas*, Festschrift K. Kundzin, 1953, 135 ff.; W. Richter, *Die sogenannten vorprophetischen Berufungsberichte, FRLANT* 101; 1970; A. Satake, *Die Gemeindeordnung in der Johannes-Apokalypse*, 1966; SB II 626 f.; IV 764–98; E. A. Schächter, "Bundesformular und

prophetischer Unheilspruch", *Biblica* 48, 1967, 128–31; J. Scharbert, *Die Propheten Israels*, I–II, 1967; W. Schmauch, "Das prophetische Amt in der Gemeinde", *Junge Kirche* 19, 1958, 126 ff.; R. Schnackenburg, "Die Enderwartungen des 'Propheten' in den Hoffnungen des Judentums und der Christenheit", *Judaica* 8, 1952, 65–94; and "Die Erwartung des Propheten nach dem Neuen Testament und den Qumrantexten", *TU* 73, 1959, 622 ff.; H.-J. Schoeps, "Die jüdischen Prophetenmorde", in *Aus frühchristlicher Zeit. Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*, 1950, 126 ff.; K. Schwarzwäller, "Kirche und Prophetie", *ErTh* 26, 1966, 580 ff.; K. Seybold, *Das davidische Königtum im Zeugnis der Propheten*, *FRLANT* 107, 1972; O. H. Steck, *Israel und das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten. Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung des deuteronomischen Geschichtsbildes im Alten Testament, Spätjudentum und Urchristentum*, *WMANT* 23, 1967; and *Überlieferung und Zeitgeschichte in den Elia-Erzählungen*, *WMANT* 26, 1968; J. Steinmann, *Le Prophétisme biblique des Origines à Osée*, 1959; and *Le Livre de la Consolation d'Israël et les Prophètes du Retour de l'Éxil*, 1961; C. Tresmontant, *La Doctrine morale des Prophètes d'Israël* 1958; J. Vollmer, *Geschichtliche Rückblicke und Motive in der Prophetie des Amos, Hosea und Jesaia*, *BZAW* 119, 1971; E. von Waldow, *Der traditionsgeschichtliche Hintergrund der prophetistchen Gerichtsreden*, *BZAW* 85, 1963; H. W. Wolff, "Hauptprobleme alttestamentlicher Prophetie", *EvTh* 15, 1955, 446 ff. (reprinted in *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament*, *ThB* 22, 1964, 206 ff.); "Das Geschichtsverständnis der alttestamentlichen Prophetie", *EvTh* 20, 1960, 218 ff. (reprinted in *Probleme alttestamentlicher Hermeneutik*, *ThB* 11, 1968³, 319 ff.) and "Hoseas geistige Heimat", *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament*, 232–50; E. Würthwein, "Der Ursprung der prophetischen Gerichtsrede", *Wort und Existenz*, 1970, 111–26; "Amos-Studien", ibid., 68–110; "Jesaja, 7, 1–9. Ein Beitrag zu dem Thema: Prophetie und Politik", ibid., 127–43; W. Zimmerli, *Studien zur alttestamentlichen Theologie und Prophetie*, *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, II, 1973.

Punishment, Vengeance

δίκη

δίκη (*dikē*), justice, punishment, vengeance; ἐκδικέω (*ekdikeō*), execute justice, punish, avenge; ἔκδικος (*ekdikos*), avenger; ἐκδίκησις (*ekdikēsis*), vengeance, recompense, punishment.

CL 1. The noun *dikē* can mean, on the one hand, a mythological personification, the goddess of just punishment (Hesiod, *Works* 256 ff.), and on the other hand, in legal language, justice (Homer, *Il.* 16, 388), a judicial case (Hesiod, *Works* 249), a legal decision or judgment (Homer, *Il.* 18, 508; *Od.* 11, 570). It can also mean vengeance or punishment (Hesiod, *Works* 712; Josephus, *Ant.* 6, 237 f. *War* 7, 450; Philo, *Op.Mund.* 80). Along with the later word *dikaiosynē* (→ Righteousness), *dikē* is one of the basic concepts in the Gk. legal world, particularly in the administration of justice.

2. The vb. *ekdikeō*, be outlawed, avenge, punish, which is first attested in Apollodorus of Athens in 150 B.C., has undergone a striking change in meaning. Etymologically it is derived from *ekdikos* (Aesch. onwards): one who places himself through his own fault outside the law is outlawed and acts unlawfully. The adj. means something unjust: *paschō ekdika*, "I suffer injustice."

But the much more common word with the same content in the Gk. language is *ekdikazō* (Aristoph. onwards) which means to decide a legal case, punish, avenge. This word gave its meaning to the new Hel. form *ekdikeō*, so that it moved from the meaning be outlawed to that of avenge, and *ekdikos* from the meaning outlaw to that of avenger. Correspondingly *ekdikēsis* should be translated vengeance, recompense. The juridical use of *ekdikeō* in the papyri is also important. Here it

means to decide a case, work as an advocate, defend or help someone to obtain his rights.

OT 1. In the LXX the noun *dikē*, justice, vengeance, punishment, is surprisingly seldom used to translate Heb. words in comparison with the other words in this group, like *dikaiosynē*, → righteousness; 21 out of 28 instances of *dikē* are in the apocryphal literature. Only 9 times does it represent *rîḇ*, law-suit (over 60 occurrences in the MT) and 4 times *nāqām*, vengeance (which, with *n^{e}qāmâh*, occurs over 40 times in the MT). It can be used of Yahweh's intervention to exact vengeance and punishment from his people: Lev. 26:25 speaks of the "sword . . . that shall execute vengeance for the [breach of] covenant" (cf. M. Noth, *Leviticus*, 1965, 194 ff.). Similarly, in Amos 7:4 Yahweh summons fire, to punish with it. But it can also be used of his intervention against his enemies (Deut. 32:41). At a later period, particularly in the Pss., there was an emphasis on his intervention to ensure justice for the person offering prayer (Pss. 9:4 f.; 35:23; 43:1; 74:22; → Righteousness) and for the *'eḇyônîm*, the poor (Ps. 140:12; → Poor).

In the apocryphal literature *dikē* means justice (Wis. 1:8), vengeance (cf. Wis. 18:11) and punishment (cf. 2 Macc. 8:11).

2. The LXX's translation of OT concepts like *nāqam*, avenge, *pāqaḏ*, visit, punish, *rîḇ*, conduct a law-suit, and *dāraš*, seek, by *ekdikeō* is a problem in so far as quite different concepts of justice are here brought into contact with one another. Concepts from the OT's message of justice which communicates to individual men the will of God and from its judicial procedure, which is carried out solely with God's authority, are translated by words from a legal terminology that was previously neutral and secular. The OT took the thought embodied in Deut. 32:35 very seriously, and left vengeance to God (cf. Gen. 4:15; 1 Sam. 24:12[13]; 2 Ki. 9:7; and Pss., e.g. 37:28; 99:8; 58:10; 79:10) or practised it as God's command (Num. 31:2). The day of vengeance is spoken of in Hos. 9:7. Vengeance remained something → holy just as → blood is holy.

The various constructions used are numerous: the thing and the person that are avenged, as well as the victim of the avenging, are generally in the acc. after *ekdikeō* and in the gen. after *ekdikēsis*. The phrase *ekdikein ekdikēsin* comes from the Heb. *nāqam n^{e}qāmâh*, take vengeance (e.g. Ezek. 25:12; cf. Lk. 18:7 f.).

U. Falkenroth

3. In the OT punishment and → judgment go together. Sodom and Gomorrah provided a classical instance of Yahweh's punishment of a notoriously wicked pagan city providing a theme which was taken up in the NT (cf. Gen. 19:24 f. with Lk. 17:29; Gen. 19:26 with Lk. 17:32; Gen. 19:28 with Rev. 9:2). For other references to Sodom see Gen. 10:19; 13:10, 12 f.; 14:8, 10 ff.; 18:16–32; Deut. 29:23; 32:32; Isa. 1:9 f.; 3:9; 13:19; Jer. 23:14; 49:18; 50:40; Lam. 4:6; Ezek. 16:46–56; Amos 4:11; Zeph. 2:9 (cf. Matt. 10:15; 11:23 f.; Mk. 6:11; Lk. 10:12; Rom. 9:29; 2 Pet. 2:6; Jude 7; Rev. 11:8). The prophet Amos announced the punishment of the surrounding nations for their crimes against humanity (Amos 1 and 2), but this culminates in the announcement of the punishment of Israel for his transgressions in the form of idolatry (Amos 3:14) and the crimes committed against fellow Israelites (Amos 4:1 ff.). The foreign invasions were construed by the prophets as punishment for Israel's sin, culminating in the destruction of the

Northern Kingdom after the fall of Samaria in 722 B.C. (2 Ki. 15–17) and the exile of large sections of the population of Judah in the time of Jeremiah (2 Ki. 23–25), following the fall of Jerusalem (597 B.C.) and its destruction (587 B.C.).

On an individual level the Mosaic legislation specified a range of punishments for crimes both against God and against man. Some of the laws are comparable with those formulated in the Code of Hammurabi who belonged to the old Babylonian Amorite dynasty and reigned between 1728 and 1686 B.C. (for text see *ANET*, 163–80). However, there was a fundamental difference of outlook. As G. L. Archer observes, "Biblical jurisprudence was based upon the assumption that man is under obligation to carry out the revealed will of God in leading a holy life, respecting the rights of God and man, not simply upon a utilitarian basis of a pragmatic nature, but rather as a creature made in the likeness of God" ("Crimes and Punishments", *ZPEB* I 1031).

Archer notes the following crimes against God. Idolatry was punishable by death, normally stoning (Deut. 13:10–16; cf. Exod. 20:3–6; 22:20). Idols, cultic objects and altars were to be destroyed (Deut. 7:5, 25). Infant sacrifice (cf. 2 Ki. 21:6, 16) which was involved in the worship of Moloch and Canaanite idols, was also punishable by death (Exod. 22:18; Lev. 20:27; Deut. 18:10 f.; → Magic). Blasphemy was deemed to bring retribution from Yahweh (Exod. 20:7; 22:28; Lev. 19:12; 24:11–23; Deut. 5:11). The penalty for false prophecy was death (Deut. 18:20 ff.; cf. Jer. 26:8 f.). Violation of the → sabbath (Exod. 20:9 f.; cf. Gen. 2:3; Exod. 16:23) was punished by death (Exod. 31:13–17; Num. 15:32–36), though the punishment was evidently not widely carried out. The warning of Jer. 17:27 suggests that the sabbath was not being kept, but pronounces national retribution. Whereas offences committed by inadvertence could be atoned for (Lev. 16; Num. 15:27), stubbornness was punishable by being cut off from the people, which could mean death (Num. 15:30 f.; Deut. 17:8–12).

Civil crimes included murder which was punishable by death (Gen. 9:6; Exod. 21:12; Num. 35:31). Heb. law permitted no monetary damages as a substitute, as did Hittite law. However, those who had killed inadvertently or accidentally might flee to cities of refuge (Num. 34:22–15). The law provided for execution by the nearest able-bodied male relative of the deceased, "the avenger of blood" (Num. 35:19). But under the monarchy the king seems to have assumed jurisdiction (2 Sam. 13:19; 14:7, 11; 1 Ki. 2:34). In the case of unsolved murder, ritual and sacrificial provision was made lest the land should remain polluted (Deut. 21:1–9). Second degree murder with no clearly specified penalty was recognized (Exod. 21:22–25).

The penalty for criminal assault resulting in serious or permanent injury was stated in terms of the *lex talionis*, i.e. the same injury must be inflicted on the offender. "If any harm follows, then you shall give life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burn for burn, wound for wound, stripe for stripe" (Exod. 21:23 ff.; cf. Lev. 24:19 f.; Deut. 19:21; Matt. 5:38). This was much less severe than the Middle Assyrian laws (cf. *ANET*, 186), and, in fact, what the OT appears to be doing here is to establish a principle of equity so that punishments fit the crimes. It is perhaps significant that nothing is said as to how the law was to be implemented. Assault on one's parents was deemed serious enough to be punishable by death (Exod. 21:15). Serious injuries to slaves entitled the slaves to

manumission (Exod. 21:26 f.). In cases of robbery, provision was made for restitution plus punitive damages (Exod. 22:1, 4; 22:3; Lev. 6:2–7; 19:13).

In contrast with the Sumerian, Babylonian, Assyrian and Hittite law codes, the Mosaic law made no provision for religious prostitution, and prostitution in general was opposed (→ Discipline). Sodomy and homosexuality were punishable by death (Lev. 18:22, 29; 20:13), as were carnal relations with animals (Lev. 18:23; 20:15). G. L. Archer comments: "All crimes of unchastity were regarded as grievous offences against God, adversely affecting the whole community; failure to punish them would mean the moral decline of Israel to the degenerate level of the pagan Canaanites before them. This, in turn, would lead to their expulsion from the Land of Promise" (*ZPEB* I 1033; cf. Lev. 18:24–29). Remarriage of a divorced wife would cause the land to sin (Deut. 24:4; → Divorce). The adultery committed by married persons was punishable by stoning (Lev. 20:10; Deut. 22:14; cf. Exod. 20:14). This extended even to those who were betrothed (Lev. 22:23 f.). There was, however, no set penalty for fornication. An Israelite might even marry a reformed harlot, though priests were not allowed to do so (Lev. 21:7), and fornication by a priest's daughter was a capital crime (Lev. 21:9). Rape carried the death penalty, though the law drew a distinction between acts perpetrated out of doors, where the victim was unable to summon help, and cases where help could be summoned (Deut. 22:23–27). In the case of the seduction of a consenting unbetrothed virgin, the man might take her to wife in payment of fifty shekels to her father (Deut. 22:28 f.; cf. Exod. 22:16 f.). Polygamy was countenanced (→ Marriage), but there were certain forbidden degrees of marriage, and incest constituted a capital crime (Lev. 18:7–18; 20:11–21). On the case of levirate marriage, where a surviving brother marries the childless wife of a deceased brother (Deut. 25:5–10; cf. the Book of Ruth) → Marriage. Intercourse during menstruation (which was treated in the context of the laws dealing with incestual relations) was not subject to a civil penalty but brought ritual uncleanness (Lev. 18:19; 20:18; cf. 15:24).

The Fifth Commandment laid down the decree: "Honour your father and your mother, that your days may be long in the land which the Lord your God gives you" (Exod. 20:12; cf. Lev. 19:3; Deut. 5:16; Matt. 15:4; Mk. 7:10; Eph. 6:2). Not only was assault on one's parents a capital offence, but so was cursing (Exod. 21:15, 17; Lev. 20:9; Deut. 21:18 ff.). Kidnapping (which in ancient times was practised for purpose of selling the victim as a slave) carried the death penalty (Exod. 21:16; Deut. 24:7). False accusation and perjury carried the same penalty as that required for the crime (Deut. 19:19).

Cases of torts (i.e. personal wrongs dealt with by personal actions rather than by public prosecution) were judged by the elders of a town sitting by the gate (cf. Ruth 4). Such cases included damage to crops and vineyards from straying cattle or fire (Exod. 22:5 f.), injury to livestock or to persons from livestock (Exod. 21:33 f.; Lev. 24:18, 21). On the case of the oppressed who came under Yahweh's special protection (Exod. 22:11–24) → Poor.

Stoning is the most frequently mentioned form of capital punishment in the OT. Perhaps it was used in cases affecting the community at large because it involved the maximum participation of the community including the prosecuting witnesses (Deut. 17:7). For instances see Lev. 20:2–5, 27; 24:15 f.; Num. 15:32–36; Deut.

13:1–5; 17:2–7; 22:22 f.; Jos. 7:27; Jn. 8:7; Acts 7:57. In the case of murder, death by the sword is prescribed by Num. 35:19, 21 (but cf. also Exod. 32:27 and Deut. 13:15 in the cases of apostasy and idolatry). Death by burning was prescribed for certain sexual offences which involved prohibited degrees of intercourse (Lev. 20:14; 21:9). Execution by hanging on a tree involving the public exposure of the victim involved particular shame (Deut. 21:22 f.; cf. Jos. 10:27; for fuller discussion → Cross).

Mutilation is mentioned in Deut. 25:12 and the case of the *lex talionis* (Exod. 21:23 ff.) noted above. Scourging to a maximum of forty stripes is stipulated in Deut. 25:1–3 (cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 4, 238; 2 Cor. 11:24; → Beat for other NT instances). It was apparently a penalty for one who unjustly accused his wife of unchastity before marriage (Deut. 22:18). Archer suggests that imprisonment was largely restricted to detention prior to trial (*ZPEB* I 1036; but cf. Jer. 37:15 f. where Jeremiah was detained without a formal hearing). Monetary fines are mentioned in Exod. 21:22, 30 f.; 22:1–4; Deut. 22:18 f., 29. Enslavement was the penalty prescribed for the thief who could not repay damages (Exod. 22:3). It was also allowed for non-payment of debts (2 Ki. 4:1; Neh. 5:5; Amos 2:6). Exod. 21:2 lays down a maximum of six years in the case of an Israelite. Voluntary slavery is discussed in Lev. 25:39 ff. (→ Slave). *C. Brown*

4. Late Judaism remained within the bounds laid down by the OT tradition. The Qumran texts often repeat the prohibition of the independent taking of vengeance. Vengeance belongs to God or to men to whom he has deputed it.

NT 1. In the NT *dikē* only occurs 3 times, of which 2 are found in the context of the expectation of the judgment (→ Judgment, art. *krima*). 2 Thess. 1:9 uses it of the punishment of eternal destruction meted out to those who oppress the community, and Jude 7 of the punishment by eternal fire (→ Fire, art. *pyr*) of the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah, which is used as an example of the judgment of the godless. Acts 28:4 tells how the Maltese supposed that Paul, who had been attacked by the snake, is a murderer whom *dikē* "does not allow to live." Some scholars see here an allusion to the Gk. mythological concept of a punitive deity (cf. E. Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 1971, 713).

2. *ekdikeō* also occurs only seldom in the NT. The passages where it occurs go back to OT traditions, especially to Deut. 32:35, 43, and also to the descriptions of the day of judgment and the tradition of teaching about the state. Lk. gives one example of the purely Gk. sense to execute justice (18:3 ff.), but otherwise it means to punish or avenge.

(a) As in the case of the OT, *ekdikeō* and its derivatives are chiefly used in the NT with the sense of avenge. No important new thinking lies behind this, since the occurrences mostly appear in the form of OT phrases (and also in quotations) and thus naturally give expression to the vengeance of God. The translation avenge or vengeance is particularly appropriate where *ekdikeō* is used of God's activity. This divine vengeance is frequently mentioned in connexion with descriptions of the divine day of judgment. 2 Thess. 1:8 is typical in this respect, using motifs from Isa. 66:15. God's vengeance on his enemies is a compensation for those who suffer persecution.

Similarly both passages in Rev. (6:10; 19:2) are concerned with the Last Judgment. Both are connected with one another. The first records the anguished questioning and petition of the martyrs for vengeance, i.e. for the final judgment. This is not fulfilled immediately; there is still a delay, a little interval; hence vengeance, purged of all human lust for it, is left to God and its execution is first proclaimed in 19:2 (using the words of 2 Ki. 9:7), once the number of their fellow-servants and brothers is complete (6:11). Here we can see a motive for waiting for God's vengeance; in the words of E. Lohmeyer "only when judgment has been fully executed does full blessedness come to the martyrs" (*Die Offenbarung Johannis*, *HNT* 16, 1970³, on Rev. 16:10 f.).

(b) It is not the only motive. While Rev. makes the persecutors and the unbelievers the recipients of vengeance, in Heb. 10:30 it is the community itself. Those who have experienced → grace and who live by it know that God's vengeance is a serious matter and acknowledge his justice in his acts of vengeance. Paul recalls Lev. 19:18 and Deut. 32:35, when he says that vengeance is God's (Rom. 12:19 f.; cf. Heb. 10:30; Matt. 5:38–42). It is always God's prerogative to execute vengeance; instead of vengeance the community is called upon to love its enemies. He who does so "heaps coals of fire upon the head" of his enemy, i.e. he bestows upon him the fruit of → grace, that is, → love and → peace (cf. Prov. 25:21 f.; Matt. 5:44; Lk. 6:27; → Head, OT 2). But God will one day uphold his rights in gracious or vengeful judgment.

(c) *ekdikos*, avenger, in Rom. 13:4 designates an office, since this particular pericope contains a remarkable collection of expressions derived from the language of secular government. The might of the state is entrusted by God with the office of avenger. It is in line with OT thinking that an institution, conceived of in a wholly unmythological way (i.e. the authorities of Rom. 13:1 are not demonic powers), should thus have authority conferred upon it. This applies both to the kings of Israel and to other kings to whom Yahweh has given power (cf. Exod. 22:28; 1 Sam. 15:1; 24:6; 2 Sam. 1:14; 1 Ki. 19:16 ff.; 2 Chr. 36:22 f.; Ezra 1:1 ff.; Prov. 8:15; Isa. 10:5 ff.; 44:28; 45:1). (On Rom. 13:1 ff. → Might, art. *exousia*, NT.) The very similar passage in 1 Pet. 2:13 ff. confirms that this is a tradition (cf. also Jn. 19:11; Tit. 3:1). If we can translate God's activity of *ekdikeō* as avenging, then we can also follow Luther in translating *ekdikos* as avenger in 1 Thess. 4:6 without ignoring the official ring of the word.

(d) We must also mention the secular use of the word as, e.g., in 2 Cor. 7:11 where *ekdikēsis*, punishment, and *apologia*, vindication, defence, two terms from criminal law, occur together. Here it just means punishment: Paul's sharp intervention against an "offender" produces his punishment. Similarly he makes known in 2 Cor. 10:6 his readiness to punish every disobedience.

(e) Luke is the only one to use the word once in the everyday legal language of Hellenism, in the parable of the importunate widow (Lk. 18:3 ff.). Here it means to provide someone with justice. On the other hand, the other two passages in Lk.'s writings (Lk. 21:22; Acts 7:24) follows closely the language of the LXX.

3. On the forms of punishment inflicted by the Jews and the Romans in the NT period → Beat, → Council, → Cross. On the penalties imposed in the early Christian communities in connexion with church discipline → Bind, → Destroy, art. *olethros*, → Open. *U. Falkenroth*

κόλασις | κολάζω (*kolazō*), punish; κόλασις (*kolasis*), punishment.

CL J. Schneider links the original meaning of *kolazō* with its etymology, i.e. to maim, cut off. "Punishment is designed to cut off what is bad or disorderly" (*TDNT* III 814). Both the noun and the vb. were fixed terms in Gk. sacral jurisprudence. In inscriptions there are references to the deity punishing violations of the cultic laws. Plato put forward the view that he who punishes aright does good, and that punishment is a blessing since it frees one from a false frame of soul (*Grg.* 476a ff.; cf. *TDNT* III 815).

OT The two terms occur chiefly in non-canonical literature. The vb. *kolazō* is without Heb. equivalent and is found in 1 Esd. 8:24; Wis. 3:4; 11:5, 8, 16; 12:14 f., 27; 14:10; 16:1, 9; 18:11, 22; Sir. 23:21; Dan. 6:13(12); 1 Macc. 7:7; 2 Macc. 6:14; 3 Macc. 3:26; 7:3, 14; 4 Macc. 2:11; 8:6; 18:5. *kolasis* stands for *mi̲kšôl*, cause of guilt, offence, in Ezek. 14:3, 4, 7; 18:30; 44:12. It is used in connexion with the vb. *kālam* in the niph., be put to shame, in Ezek. 43:11. It has no Heb. equivalent in Wis. 11:13; 16:2, 24; 19:4; Jer. 18:20; 2 Macc. 4:38; 3 Macc. 1:3; 4 Macc. 8:9; 13:7.

Philo distinguished between the beneficent power of God with which he made the world and which is called God, and the judicial power in virtue of which he rules what is created and which is called Lord (*Rer.Div.Her.* 166; cf. *TDNT* III 815 for further references). God's mercy is older than punishment (*Deus.Imm.* 76) and God prefers to forgive rather than to punish (*Spec.Leg.* 2, 196). Punishment is for those who will not listen to reason (*Agric.* 40). Both Josephus (e.g. *Ant.* 1, 60) and Philo speak of *kolasis* as divine retribution. For other instances in non-biblical literature see Arndt, 440. The idea of eternal punishment *kolasis aiōnios* is found in Test.Reub. 5:5.

NT Both words occur only twice each in the NT. The vb. is found in Acts 4:21 of the Jewish leaders' treatment of Peter and John: "And when they had further threatened them, they let them go, finding no way to punish them, because of the people; for all men praised God for what had happened." It is used of divine chastisement in 2 Pet. 2:9: "then the Lord knows how to rescue the godly from trial, and to keep the unrighteous under punishment until the day of judgment."

The noun occurs in 1 Jn. 4:18: "There is no fear in love, but perfect love casts out fear. For fear has to do with punishment, and he who fears is not perfected in love." Schneider takes this to mean that "the man who lives in fear (before God) is already punished by this fear. His fear is his punishment" (*TDNT* III 817). He notes, however, that most commentators do not take it in this way. Rather, the meaning would seem to be that continued existence in fear is a sign of an inadequate relationship with God which is meant to exist on the plane of love. The love in question is both God's love for us and ours for him and the brethren (cf. v. 19 with 2:9 ff.; 3:11–18; 4:7–12). When men live on that level, they have "confidence for the day of judgment" (v. 17).

Matt. 25:46 raises the question of eternal punishment. At the end of the parable of the sheep and the goats the Lord separates the blessed, who manifested their righteousness in practical love, from the cursed who failed to do so, not recognizing the *incognito* presence of Christ in the needy brethren. "Then he will say to those

at his left hand, 'Depart from me, you cursed, into the eternal fire prepared for the devil and his angels. . . .' And they will go away into eternal punishment [*eis kolasin aiōnion*], but the righteous into eternal life [*eis zoēn aiōnion*]" (Matt. 25:41, 46). The passage has often been cited in support of the doctrine of endless torment. But it may be questioned whether it implies more than the finality of judgment. The term eternal has both qualitative and quantitative overtones (→ Time, art. *aiōn*). Jesus did not teach, like Plato and others, that the → soul was intrinsically immortal and that it would necessarily go on after death. References to the eternal → fire (Matt. 18:8; cf. Mk. 9:43–48; Jude 7) are necessarily figurative.

In attempting to determine the meaning of such passages, attention needs to be paid to semantics and the philosophical analysis of the structure and function of language. The words "life" and "judgment" are what I. T. Ramsey called *models* which describe something in familiar terms which is, in fact, not capable of being described in a purely literal way. For although eternal can be entered into now, its future character lies hidden beyond this life. The word "eternal" is what Ramsey termed a *qualifier* which serves as a directive to understand the model in a special way (*Religious Language: An Empirical Placing of Theological Phrases*, 1957, 61 f.; cf. also *Freedom and Immortality*, 1960, 91–148). The qualifier is not simply a literal description of the noun but a reminder that it is being used in a non-literal sense (cf. such phrases as "heavenly Father", "infinite love"). Similarly the phrase "eternal sin" (Mk. 3:29) does not mean an endless sin but one which has dimensions and ramifications beyond the present life.

Eternal → judgment is referred to in Heb. 6:2 and 2 Thess. 1:9. This, like the idea of eternal fire, does not necessarily imply that those concerned go on being judged or continue to be consumed. If the metaphor of fire is to be pressed at all, it would imply that the fire of righteousness continues to burn, but that what is consumed once is consumed for good (cf. also Paul's observation about works being consumed by fire, 1 Cor. 3:15). Rev. 20:10 speaks of the beast and false prophet tormented for ever in the lake of fire into which are also cast Death, Hades and anyone whose name is not in "the book of life" (Rev. 20:14 f.). The latter passage suggests that the lake of fire is not the same as → hell. For the author of Rev., all "dogs and sorcerers and fornicators and murderers and idolaters, and every one who loves and practises falsehood" are excluded from the new Jerusalem (Rev. 22:15). The parable of the rich man and Lazarus (Lk. 16:19–31) pictures the rich man's conscious awareness of torment in the after-life (for discussion see J. D. M. Derrett, "Dives and Lazarus and the Preceding Sayings", in *Law in the New Testament*, 1970, 78–99). In interpreting this parable it has to be decided whether the parable is intended to teach the conscious ongoing torment of the unrighteous or whether the point is: *if only* the unrighteous could return to life, they would testify to the tragic mistake that they have made, which has led to their eternal rejection, but as it is, people have sufficient warning in the law and the prophets.

C. Brown

→ Anger, → Beat, → Council, → Cross, → Death, → Destroy, → Discipline, → Divorce, → Hell, → Judgment, → Life, → Might, → Present, → Resurrection, → Time.

(a). A. Alt, "The Origins of Israelite Law", in *Essays on Old Testament History and Religion*, 1966, 79–132; G. L. Archer, "Crimes and Punishments" (*ZPEB* I 1030–36); B. F. C. Atkinson, *Life*

and Immortality: An Examination of the Nature and Meaning of Life and Death as they are Revealed in the Scriptures, 1969; J. Baillie, *And the Life Everlasting*, 1934; L. Boettner, *Immortality*, 1956; H. Buis, *The Doctrine of Eternal Punishment*, 1956; and "Punishment, Everlasting", *ZPEB* IV 954–57; H. B. Clark, *Biblical Law*, 1944²; O. Cullmann, *The State in the New Testament*, 1957; and *Immortality of the Soul or Resurrection of the Dead?*, 1958; R. B. Girdlestone, *Dies Irae: The Judgment of the Great Day, Viewed in the Light of Scripture and Conscience*, 1869; H. E. Guillebaud *The Righteous Judge: A Study of the Biblical Doctrine of Everlasting Punishment*, 1964; M. Hengel, *Crucifixion in the Ancient World and the Folly of the Message of the Cross*, 1977; M. Horbery, *An Enquiry into the Scripture Doctrine concerning the Duration of Future Punishment*, 1744; J. Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus: An Investigation into Economic and Social Conditions during the New Testament Period*, 1969; J. H. Leckie, *The World to Come and Final Destiny*, 1922²; C. S. Lewis, "The Humanitarian Theory of Punishment", *The Churchman* 78, 1959, 55–60; W. Lillie, "Towards a Biblical Doctrine of Punishment", *SJT* 21, 1968, 449–61; G. E. Mendenhall, *Law and Covenant in Israel and the Ancient Near East*, 1955; A. Phillips, *Ancient Israel's Criminal Law: A New Approach to the Decalogue*, 1970; J. A. T. Robinson, *In the End God*, 1968²; S. D. F. Salmond, *The Christian Doctrine of Immortality*, 1903⁵; J. Schneider, *kolazō* etc., *TDNT* III 814–17; G. Schrenk, *dikē*, *TDNT* II 178–82; and *ekdikeō* etc., *TDNT* II 442–46; A. N. Sherwin-White, *Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament*, 1963²; V. F. Storr, *Christianity and Immortality*, 1918; R. de Vaux, *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions*, 1961, 143–63.
(b). J. Blinzler, "Die Strafe für Ehebruch in Bibel und Halacha", *NTS* 4, 1957–8, 32–47; H. Gollwitzer, "Das Wesen der Strafe in theologischer Sicht", *EvTh* 24, 1964, 195 ff.; E. Käsemann, "Römer 13 in unserer Generation", *ZTK* 56, 1959, 16 ff.; A. Strobel, "Zum Verständnis von Röm. 13", *ZNW* 47, 1956, 67 ff.

Pure, Clean

The study of religions reveals a widely held view that the world is divided into areas of purity and impurity; cf. the corresponding distinction between sacred (→ Holy) and profane. Through a process of purification, originally of a cultic and ritual nature, separation can be effected from areas of impurity (e.g. dirt, disease) and unclean powers (e.g. foreign gods, demons, or one's own sin), so as to achieve the state of purity needed for participation in the cult or enjoyment of the blessing of God. The Gk. language has two adjectives signifying purity: *hagnos* and *katharos*. *hagnos* is a word originally connected with a root meaning holy; it signifies a qualitative holiness or purity belonging to the deity and the associated things or persons (cultic objects and officials). More common are *katharos* and its cognates, indicating cultic, physical or moral cleanliness in persons and things. In the NT words from both roots are found in a specifically limited and usually metaphorical sense.

ἁγνός

ἁγνός (*hagnos*), pure, holy; ἁγνίζω (*hagnizō*), purify; ἁγνεία (*hagneia*), purity, chastity, propriety; ἁγνισμός (*hagnismos*), purification; ἁγνότης (*hagnotēs*), purity, sincerity.

CL *hagnos*, adj. from the vb. *hazomai* which is in turn derived from* *hagiomai*, to stand in awe of someone, originally meant that which inspires (religious) awe, tabu (→ Godliness, art. *sebomai*). In secular Gk. usage *hagnos* is found from Homer onwards. In religious language it is primarily an attribute of deity; then it refers to things having some relation to the deity. It thus comes to mean holy, in the sense of pure. Ritual purity is in mind here, e.g. avoidance of blood-guilt, touching corpses. Since to the primitive mind sexual intercourse also makes a person

ritually unclean, *hagnos* came to mean chaste. The originally cultic, religious term was then transferred to the sphere of morality, and is frequently used in the Hellenistic period in the sense of innocent, morally faultless. It is also used as a compliment for faultless execution of office. From *hagnos* are derived the vb. *hagnizō*, to purify (by means of expiatory rites), first found in Soph., and the cognate noun *hagnismos*, purification. Both terms are limited to the cultic sphere. *hagneia*, a noun derived from *hagnos*, is likewise found first in Soph., and is used of cultic purity, chastity, purity of mind. Another noun derived from *hagnos* is *hagnotēs*, which is unknown outside the NT and means purity, moral blamelessness.

OT 1. In the LXX *hagnos* is rare (11 examples), since the word normally used for cultic purity is → *katharos*. *hagnos* translates the Heb. *ṭāhôr*, ritually pure, and *zaḵ*, morally upright. In distinction from *hagios* (Heb. *qāḏôš*, set apart for God, appropriate to God, → holy), and *katharos*, which refers to both cultic and ethical purity, the particular nuance of *hagnos* is one of integrity: e.g. Ps. 12:6, "The promises of the Lord are promises that are pure" (cf. Ps. 19:8); Prov. 20:9, "Who can say, I have made my heart clean; I am pure from my sin?" (cf. Prov. 15:26; 21:8). It is significant that *hagnos* is found chiefly in the Wisdom Literature.

2. More common in the LXX is the vb. *hagnizō*, which describes the measures taken to achieve eligibility for the cult. Whereas *hagios* (→ holy) always includes the thought of the power and might of that which is holy, *hagnizō* expresses consistently the removal of what is not seemly (e.g. Exod. 19:10, washing of garments; Num. 6:3, abstinence from alcohol), especially in the sense, to purify oneself from sin or uncleanness (hith. of *ḥāṭā'*, e.g. Num. 8:21; 19:12). *hagneia* also refers in the OT (Num. 6:2–21, law of the Nazirite; 2 Chr. 30:19, sanctuary) and Apoc. (1 Macc. 14:36, temple) to ritual purity.

NT 1. In the NT only *hagnizō* and *hagnismos* (only at Acts 21:26) occur in their proper meaning, ritual purification: once in connexion with the Jews before the Passover (Jn. 11:55); later when Paul takes a vow in Jerusalem (Acts 21:24–26; 24:18). In Jas. 4:8; 1 Pet. 1:22; 1 Jn. 3:3, on the other hand, *hagnizō* refers to moral purification. *hagnos* is lacking in the Gospels, Heb. and Rev. altogether; it is found only in the epistles, where Hellenistic influence is noticeable. It means: (a) chaste (2 Cor. 11:2; Tit. 2:5); (b) innocent with regard to something (2 Cor. 7:11); (c) morally pure, upright: said of Christ (1 Jn. 3:3); in respect of a Christian's behaviour (1 Tim. 5:22; 1 Pet. 3:2; Phil. 4:8); as an attribute of wisdom (Jas. 3:17). The adv. *hagnōs* refers to sincerity in Christian service (Phil. 1:17); the noun *hagneia* to moral purity and blamelessness (1 Tim. 4:12; 5:2).

2. This survey of the occurrence and meaning of this root in the NT shows that the original significance, i.e. ritual purity, no longer has a great part to play. This is understandable, since it was only the Jewish Christian community in Jerusalem which clung to the temple cult and therefore had to observe the ordinances connected with it (Acts 3:1; 21:18–26). To all the Gentile churches, ritual purification probably meant nothing, for nowhere in the NT – apart from the apostolic decree (Acts 14:28–29), which was intended to make it possible for Gentile and Jewish Christians to live together in mixed churches – are cultic regulations for Christians to be found. The concept of purification gains however a new meaning, for the term is used to express the moral purity which is demanded in the behaviour of

Christians. Here the starting point is the fact that Christ is *hagnos*, pure, i.e. without sin (1 Jn. 3:3). Because he is pure, those who belong to him should also be pure. Through his unique sacrificial death Christ has not only made the normal sacrifices of the temple cult unnecessary, but he has also exposed their real meaning. It is a similar situation with the purity which he gives his own. It is more than ritual purity. Purity and integrity are, moreover, not merely human virtues: they indicate the relation of a person to God. Therefore this term is no longer used of sexual purity or abstinence. The NT term for that is *enkrateia* (→ Discipline).

H. Baltensweiler

καθαρός

καθαρός (*katharos*), clean, pure; καθαίρω (*kathairō*), to clean, make clean; ἐκκαθαίρω (*ekkathairō*), clean out; καθαρίζω (*katharizō*), cleanse, purify; καθαρότης (*katharotēs*), cleanness, purity; καθαρισμός (*katharismos*), cleansing; ἀκάθαρτος (*akathartos*), unclean; ἀκαθαρσία (*akatharsia*), uncleanness; περικάθαρμα (*perikatharma*), refuse, offscouring.

CL The family of words which go with *katharos* embraces the realms of physical, cultic and ethical purity.

1. The adj. *katharos* (derivation obscure, probably nothing to do with Latin *castus*) is common from Homer onwards, and means: (a) originally, clean, in a physical sense as opposed to *rhyparos* = dirty (e.g. pure, clean water, Eur. *Hippolytus* 209); (b) clean, in the sense of free, without things which come between, as opposed to *plērēs* or *mestos*, full (e.g. *en katharō*, Homer *Il.* 23, 61); (c) ritually clean, as opposed to *akathartos*, unclean; (d) in a religious sense, morally pure (e.g. *katharos adikias*, Plato, *Republic* 6, 496d; *katharos cheiras*, Hdt., 1, 35).

The cognate vb. *kathairō* meant originally to clean, sweep, cleanse (Diod.Sic. 19, 13, 4); in the Koine it means to clean (in the NT only at Jn. 15:2). The compound vb. *ekkathairō* (Homer) expresses an intensification of the primary meaning; to sweep out, cleanse thoroughly (e.g. Hdt. 2, 68; in the NT, 1 Cor. 5:7; with an accusative of the one cleansed, 2 Tim. 2:21). More common is the later Hellenistic vb. *katharizō*, to cleanse, in physical, ritual or religious sense (e.g. Josephus, *Ant.* 10, 70, to purify the land).

The noun *katharotēs* goes back to cl. Gk. (Xen., *Mem.* 2, 1, 22; Plato, *Laws*, 778c), and means cleanness, in both literal and figurative senses. The later Hellenistic term *katharismos*, which replaces the Attic *katharmos*, is found first as a technical term in agriculture, and then generally in the sense of physical or ritual cleaning (Michigan Papyri 185, 16).

The negative terms formed by the addition of alpha-privative, i.e the adj. *akathartos* and the noun *akatharsia*, refer to the whole realm of uncleanness, ranging from menstruation to moral pollution through wrongdoing (cf. Plutarch, *De Placitis Philosophorum* 5, 6; Plato, *Laws* 4, 716e). *perikatharma*, a substantival form from *perikathairō*, to clean all round, from every side, refers to what is removed in a thorough clean-up. It means dirt, refuse (Epict. 3, 22, 78; in the NT only at 1 Cor. 4:13, offscouring of the world; → Dirt).

2. In Gk. religion the system of purificatory and expiatory rites had nothing to do with penitence for sin or an inward purification of the heart. It was concerned rather with the warding off of demonic spirits, which wandered round about, by

means of exorcism and ritual acts. It thus had an apotropaic function. A woman after childbirth, and also her child, were unclean. So too was a dead person. Those who touched them must therefore undergo purification, which removed the uncleanness which had come from without. A person who shed blood, even if he had done so in the course of executing justice, had to be cleansed. The blood of an → animal was poured over the hands of the person who had become unclean, so banishing death by death, i.e. by the substitutionary sacrifice of an animal. Later these rites, which had affected the whole of people's ordinary and religious life, were given a deeper, ethical meaning. The credit for this goes to the Orphics and Pythagoreans, but above all to the mystery religions and the philosophers. This transformation in the concept of purity may be seen from the inscription on the temple of Asclepius at Epidaurus: "Let only the pure cross the threshold of the fragrant temple: and no one is pure, save he who has holy thoughts." A person who was initiated was called *kekatharmenos* (Plato, *Phaedo* 69c).

The Delphic oracle had a great influence. Not only was it responsible for purification in cases of murder; quite apart from this, the spirit of Delphi, which inspired the whole life of Greece, led to a relaxation and deeper interpretation of the old purificatory rites (cf. T. von Scheffer, *Hellenistische Mysterien und Orakel*, 1940, 139; → Prophet CL). It was a liberating spirit, a spirit of moderation, that went out from Delphi. It is typified by the third of the old inscriptions which adorn the Temple of Apollo at Delphi: along with *gnōthi seauton*, "Know thyself", and *mēden agan*, "Nothing overmuch", are the words *metanoei hamartōn*, "Repent [i.e. get a new spirit] if you have sinned" (cf. R. Pfeiffer, "The Image of the Delian Apollo and Apolline Ethics", *Journal of the Warburg Institute* 15, 1952, 20 f.).

3. The concept "pure" and its opposite "impure" are woven into the history of all religions. In primitive culture there is the idea of a supernatural force (*tabu*), possessing dangerous powers which are conceived in material terms and thought to be transferable by physical contact. In particular, → birth, → death, and sexual processes (discharges, menstruation, intercourse) are associated with the power-charged tabu, making subsequent purification necessary where there has been contact with them. As religions developed, this supernatural force came to be seen not only as a threat, but also as a friendly deity. A person wishing to approach the deity must be careful not to offend the latter by uncleanness which contradicts its nature. This is how the demand arose for cultic purification. The priest must undertake purificatory rites, removed and washing away what is unclean, in order to free the individual from the evil and demonic influences which constantly threaten him and cause him anxiety. Not until later was purity conceived in an inward sense, with the result that it was freed from ritual and linked instead to morality, so gaining an ethical character. In the comparative study of religions, however, the general rule is that purificatory rites are divorced from ethics, and this may be traced throughout the whole range of world religions.

OT 1. In the LXX *katharos* renders 18 different Heb. equivalents, but by far the most frequent is *ṭāhôr*, in the sense of ritual purity. Occasionally the LXX also translates the Heb. *nāqî*, pure, innocent (Job 4:7), and *zāḵaḵ*, to be bright, pure, innocent (Job 15:15) by *katharos*. The negative adj. *akathartos* corresponds to *ṭāmē'*, the noun *akatharsia* to *ṭum'âh*, both principally in the sense of ritual

impurity (e.g. Lev. 5:3; 15:24). *katharizō* is the equivalent of the qal and piel of *ṭāhar* (Lev. 12:7, 8), and sometimes also of the piel of *ḥāṭā'* (Lev. 8:15). *katharizō* can thus also be used as a synonym for *exhilaskesthai*, to atone (Lev. 16:30). The majority of references to purity and impurity are widely thought to come from relatively late texts, viz. the Priestly writer and the prophet Ezekiel with his background in priestly circles. But this does not preclude the possibility that the distinction between clean and unclean goes back to a very early period. Within the same realm of ideas are the concepts of → holy (Heb. *qāḏôš*; LXX *hagios*), and profane (Heb. *ḥōl*; LXX *koinos*; → Fellowship, art. *koinōnia*).

2. In the OT also purity and impurity are spoken of chiefly in a cultic sense. The distinction between them is inseparably connected with Israel's belief in Yahweh. It is grounded on the presupposition that uncleanness and Yahweh are irreconcilable opposites. Purity is therefore regarded, as a rule tacitly, as the norm, qualifying one to take part in the cultus; impurity is inimical to Yahweh and separates one from worship and from God's people, so that it must be opposed and purged out as an abomination (Lev. 7:19 f.). This distinction can be described as the pre-ethical foundation of the cultic and secular life of Israel.

(a) It begins with the person himself. Diseases, especially → leprosy, render him unclean. One of the duties of the priests is to pronounce a person who has contracted leprosy either clean or unclean by means of the so-called declaratory formulae (e.g. Lev. 13:17, 44). Here the close association between sin and disease in the faith of Israel finds expression. Likewise sexual processes are regarded as making a person unclean (emission of semen, Lev. 15:16; menstruation, Lev. 15:19; unhealthy discharges, Lev. 15:2, 25; intercourse, 1 Sam. 21:5 f.; adultery, Lev. 18:20; rape, Gen. 34:5; homosexuality, Lev. 18:22; and other sexual aberrations, Lev. 18:6 ff.). These regulations are directed in particular against the sexual practices of the Canaanites. A dead body is unclean in the highest degree; its uncleanness is transferred to every person who is present and also to open vessels (Num. 19:14 f.). Whereas in general, cleansing with clear water is sufficient, in cases of defilement by contact with a dead body special cleansing water, previously mixed with the ashes of a red heifer, is necessary (Num. 19). This practice expresses Israel's decisive rejection of all forms of a cult of the dead, as found in the religions round about.

(b) Lev. 11 presents a catalogue of clean and unclean → animals, which may or may not be eaten. The purpose of this distinction is to guard against animal worship (which was occasionally practised in the Northern Kingdom, 1 Ki. 12:28 ff.), to show Israel's rejection of animals symbolizing foreign religions (e.g. the pig in the Adonis-Tammuz cult), and to formulate health regulations. Foreign territory is likewise regarded as unclean, since foreign gods are worshipped there (Amos 7:17). Even Israel's own land and his temple can be defiled by idolatry (Jer. 2:7; 7:30). The temple, the altar and the most holy place, as the abodes of Yahweh, are the places of greatest purity and sanctity; because of the uncleanness of the Israelites, they need regular purification by the ritual of atonement (Lev. 16).

(c) Even the prophets, with the occasional polemic against the cult, do not abandon the distinction between clean and unclean. They extend and spiritualize the cultic concepts, for in criticizing cultic abuses they introduce a concept of purity which has to do with people and their behaviour (Jer. 2:23; Isa. 6:5). The

concept of impurity thus approaches those of → guilt and → sin (Jer. 33:8; Ezek. 39:24; cf. Ps. 51).

Thus when the OT distinguishes between clean and unclean, it is far from being concerned merely with cold, legalistic superficialities. Rather, we have here evidence of the dynamic struggle of the Yahweh religion, as it sought to establish itself in the face of rivals constantly appearing in the cultic world of Israel and her neighbours. "It is precisely in this grasp of the material side of life by the cultic sphere that Jahweh's urgent will to be immanent comes to expression, a will which is wholly unsatisfied with Israel's spirituality" (G. von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, I, 1962, 279).

3. It was left to late Judaism to surround the laws of purity with a multitude of casuistic and sometimes grotesque prohibitions and commands, which made the regulations into a law which was hard to fulfil. A → Pharisee was defiled even by sitting on the clothes of one of the "people of the land" (*'am hā'āreṣ*), who could not read the Torah (Hagigah 2:7).

The commonest act of ritual purification was the washing of the hands before the blessing at a meal (cf. Jn. 2:6; Mk. 7:3 f.). The requirement of hand-washing applied also to the hours of prayer (→ Baptism; → Hand). According to Rabbi Johanan (*c.* A.D. 250), the recitation of the Shema must be done as follows to be perfectly correct: one must relieve oneself, wash one's hands over it, put on one's phylacteries (the small cases containing parchment rolls on which were written the passages Exod. 13:1–10; 11–16; Deut. 6:4–9; 11:13–21), and then speak and pray the "Hear, O Israel" (R. Meyer, *TDNT* III 421 f.; → Command; → Hear).

The regulations about purity were meant as a guide for life, but they became a heavy burden. Certainly there can be found in Judaism the development of a spiritual and ethical view of purity, e.g., when Rabbi Meir (*c.* A.D. 150) says, "Cleanse and sanctify yourself from every sin and fault" (Berakoth 17a). But this and similar sayings were unable to check the development of a legalistic system of casuistry.

4. The Essenes were even stricter than the Pharisees on matters of purity and purification. Since they regarded themselves as the priestly, redemptive community of the end-time, they made the rules for the priests, particularly those regarding purity, binding on the whole community. Daily immersion was practised in the water-pools which have been uncovered in the excavations of the ruins at Qumran. If a person offended in some way against the rules of the community he was excluded temporarily or permanently from the purity of the many (i.e. the whole community) (e.g. 1QS 6:16 f., 25; 7:3, 16). At the same time, however, fig. language is used when an individual gives thanks that God has cleansed him from sin (1QS 3:4–12; 4:20 f.). (For further discussion see A. R. C. Leaney, *The Rule of Qumran and its Meaning*, 1966, especially 141 f., 191 f.)

NT In the NT *katharos* and its cognates occur in nearly all the writings. Instances are rather more common in the Synoptic Gospels, Heb. and the Pastoral Epistles than elsewhere. Paul seldom uses the words. On the whole, references to purity are not so frequent as, for instance, those to words derived from *hagios*, → holy. It is not possible without bias to speak of a unifying concept of purity in the NT. Here too we find *katharos* used in the physical (e.g. Rev. 15:6), cultic (e.g.

Matt. 8:2–4; Lk. 17:14) and spiritual (e.g. Matt. 5:8) senses. However, the concept of purity did acquire a new character through the preaching and person of Jesus.

1. (a) Jesus developed his doctrine of purity in the struggle against Pharisaism. In Matt. 23:25 f. he rejects the observance of ritual regulations on the ground that this kind of purity is merely external. Behind the practices of the Pharisees lurks the misguided notion that uncleanness coming in a concrete form from outside can defile a person (Matt. 15:11, 16 f. par. Mk. 7:15, 18). The opposite is true: "The things which come out of a man are what defile him" (Mk. 7:15, 20 par.). For from within, out of the heart of man, come evil thoughts, murder, wickedness, fornication, foolishness etc. (Mk. 7:21–23). Jesus countered the Pharisaic emphasis on cleansing the hands with a demand for purity of heart, as expressed in the sixth Beatitude: "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God" (Matt. 5:8). "In Ps. 24.3 f. access to God's presence during Temple worship is for him who has 'clean hands and a pure heart'. These are the spiritually 'pure', not the ritually or ceremonially clean. To 'see God' is a pictorial expression indicating the bliss of fellowship with God in the Kingdom (cf. Ps. 17.15; 42.3; 4 Ezra 7.98 – 'for they hasten to behold the face of him whom they served in life and from whom they are to receive their reward when glorified')" (D. Hill, *The Gospel of Matthew*, *New Century Bible*, 1972, 113). For the pure love of Jesus, i.e. the love which surrenders itself fully to God and to other men, there are no longer any unclean foods (Mk. 7:19c). Jesus sat down at table with tax collectors and sinners (Mk. 2:13–17). He did not repel the lepers, but healed them (Lk. 17:11–19). He talked to → Samaritans (Lk. 17:19c) and even Gentiles (Matt. 8:5–13; 15:21–28; → Greek; → People). This does not mean that Jesus annulled the purity regulations of the Torah (cf. e.g. Lk. 17:14–17). But in removing the dividing barriers of the ceremonial law, and turning the Pharisaic concept of purity on its head by demanding purity of heart and of character, he broke through the innermost essence of Judaism and left it behind him (cf. E. Käsemann, *Essays on New Testament Themes*, *SBT* 41, 1964, 39 f.).

(b) For the Christian community at Jerusalem, at least, it was a very difficult matter to bring themselves to step across the barriers which Jesus had broken down; for as Jewish Christians they held on at first to the ceremonial law and the temple cultus. This difficulty is illustrated by the story of the conversion of the centurion Cornelius as a result of Peter's preaching (Acts 10:1–11:18). In a vision Peter becomes aware of the invalidity of the outward distinction between clean and unclean, "What God has cleansed, you must not call common" (Acts 10:15). In the apostolic decree of the Jerusalem council, ritual requirements were laid upon the Gentile church at Antioch (Acts 15:29; → Noah on possible link with the "Noachian decrees"); but on the same occasion the view prevailed that God has made no distinction between Jews and Gentiles, but cleanses men's hearts by faith (Acts 15:9).

2. (a) Paul was the first to recognize clearly that Christ had brought about the end of the law, and that accordingly all cultic and ceremonial distinctions had become obsolete. In the controversy between the strong brethren and the weak, distinguished by their attitude to the eating of meat which had been used in heathen sacrifice, Paul comes down resolutely on the side of the strong: "Everything is

clean" (Rom. 14:20; cf. also Tit. 1:15; "To the pure [through faith] all things are pure"). For him the only reason for observing any kind of legalistic rules (e.g. religious festivals, Rom. 14:5; abstinence from alcohol, Rom. 14:21) is regard for the weaker brother. There is no longer any question of their having absolute validity.

(b) In the Johannine writings purity is brought into relation with the saving death of Jesus. In other words, it is given an explicit christological foundation: "The blood of Jesus his Son cleanses us from all sin" (1 Jn. 1:7; cf. 1:9). The story of the washing of the disciples' feet also shows that those who allow themselves to be served (as in baptism) by Jesus are clean (Jn. 13:10; cf. also Eph. 5:26). Purity is mediated by the word of Christ (Jn. 15:3). In Johannine thought, therefore, purity is not an ethical quality which a man must work for, but the outworking of the fact that the church belongs to Christ.

(c) The Epistle to the Hebrews interprets the death of Jesus with the help of OT ritual concepts, in order to demonstrate the superior quality of the new covenant over the old (Heb. 9:13–14). In contrast to the purification of the OT temple by sacrifice, repeated every year, which the writer interprets as an annual reminder of sin (10:1–4), the purification effected by the blood of Christ is valid once and for all. Moreover, it serves not only to bring outward purification, but rather cleansing from sin (1:3; 10:22). Like 1 Jn., Heb. links the concept of purity with that of → forgiveness (Heb. 9:22).

(d) It is not until the Pastoral and Catholic Epistles (especially Jas., 1 Pet.) that the concept of purity gains in part an ethical character. The Epistles to Timothy, in language formally similar to the preaching of Jesus, exhort to purity of heart and conscience (1 Tim. 1:5; 3:9; 2 Tim. 2:22). Meanwhile in content, the focus shifts from the person of Jesus to didactic instruction: "The aim of our charge is love that issues from a pure heart and a good conscience and sincere faith" (1 Tim. 1:5; cf. 1 Pet. 1:22).

The Epistle of James shows a certain tendency to return to a concept of purity already discarded by Paul and John, in that it describes self-denial in the face of a sinful world as pure and undefiled religion (Jas. 1:27). The nearest the NT comes to traditional Jewish thinking is in the Revelation, with its talk of purity in terms of physically clean linen garments (15:6; 19:8, 14) and the new Jerusalem of pure → gold (21:18, 21).

3. This survey of the history of these terms goes to show how variously, even in the NT, the purity which Jesus demanded, and which he conferred, was understood. Paul and John come nearest to showing its universal scope and liberating character; in the later writings a narrowing and moralizing tendency may be observed. The history of the concept demonstrates how the NT writers struggled to maintain an evangelical doctrine of purity, and how easy it is to fall back into a legalistic outlook. It is significant that in the NT comparatively little use is made of the idea of purity in preaching Christ or in Christian ethics. The preaching and teaching are dominated rather by key words like → discipleship, obedience (→ Hear, art. *hypakouō*), sanctification (→ Holy, art. *hagios*), or → love. Probably the concept of purity was not an appropriate image to convey the whole breadth of NT ethics, or even the preaching of Christ. All the more surprising and alarming is it, therefore, that in the course of the church's history there have again and again

been groups and sects which have taught that a rigorous and ascetic purity is a distinguishing mark of Christian faith, and which have often enough sought to impose this by laws and by compulsion. Frequently, like the Essenes, they have assumed the name of *katharoi*, pure ones. Their genealogy stretches from the church of Marcion, through the Montanists, Manichaeans and Donatists of the early church, the medieval Cathari, and the Anabaptist movement at the time of the Reformation, to radical groups in the Pietist movement (Voetius, Arnold) – to mention only the most important. They all have in common a view of purity, which is, generally speaking, nearer to the radical Judaism of the Pharisees or Essenes, than to the NT doctrine of purity as introduced by Christ. This development shows that in Christian proclamation the struggle between → law and → gospel must constantly be fought anew, in order that a Christ-centred doctrine of purity may be achieved, liberating rather than bringing legalism and anxiety to men.

H.-G. Link, J. Schattenmann

→ Animal, → Baptism, → Defile, → Demon, → Dirt, → Hand, → Head, → Heart, → Holy, → Leprosy, → Priest, → Sacrifice, → Sin

(a). J. B. Bauer, "Clean and Unclean", *EBT* I 118–21; G. W. Buchanan, "The Role of Purity in the Structure of the Essene Sect", *Revue de Qumrân* 15, 4, 1974, 397–406; C. H. Cave, "The Obedience of Unclean Spirits", *NTS* 11, 1964–65, 93–97; F. Hauck, *hagnos* etc., *TDNT* I 122 ff.; J. Jocz, "Clean", *ZPEB* I 884–87; A. R. C. Leaney, *The Rule of Qumran and its Meaning*, 1966; G. van der Leeuw, *Religion in its Essence and Manifestation*, 1964²; R. Meyer and F. Hauck, *katharos* etc., *TDNT* III 413–31; M. Noth, "The Laws in the Pentateuch: Their Assumptions and Meaning", in *The Laws in the Pentateuch and Other Studies*, 1966, 1–107; R. Pfeiffer, "The Image of the Delian Apollo and Apolline Ethics", *Journal of the Warburg Institute*, 15, 1952, 20 ff.; G. von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, I, 1962, 272–79; L. E. Toombs, "Clean and Unclean", *IDB* I 641–48; G. Wagner, *Pauline Baptism and the Pagan Mysteries*, 1967.

(b). J. Döller, *Die Reinheits- und Speisegesetze des Alten Testaments, Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen* 7, 2 f., 1917; R. Hink, R. Rendtorff, and E. Lohse, "Rein, Unrein", *RGG*³ V 939 ff.; K. Koch, "Reinigung, kultische", *EKL* III 576 ff.; W. Kornfeld, "Reine und unreine Tiere im Alten Testament", *Kairos* 7, 1965, 134–47; T. von Scheffer, *Hellenistische Mysterien und Orakel*, 1940; T. Wächter, *Reinheitsvorschriften im griechischen Kult, Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten* 9, 1, 1910.

Q

Quench

σβέννυμι

σβέννυμι (*sbennymi*), quench, extinguish, quell.

CL The underlying idea of the vb. is to extinguish by drowning with water, as opposed to smothering; to allay or subdue, the latter especially metaphorically. The vb. is of ancient origin, and is found from Homer onwards. It remained virtually unchanged in its basic meaning throughout the centuries. In the classical authors it means literally to put out, quell, quench, check (cf. Lat. *extinguere*). When applied to liquids, it means to dry up, evaporate. In the passive the term is used occasionally of people becoming extinct, while in medical literature it describes the disappearance of inflammation. These, however, are rather special uses of an otherwise well-understood term. In both voices *sbennymi* lent itself readily to metaphorical usage. In a late Gk. papyrus it means to wash out, erase.

OT In the LXX the term is found with its normal literal meaning, though metaphorical usage occurs in Cant. 8:7 (the quenching of love) and 4 Macc. 3:17 (the quenching of passion) and occasionally elsewhere. The common Heb. equivalent is *kāḇaḥ*, extinguish, quench (Lev. 6:5 f. [12 f.]; 2 Sam. 14:7; 21:17; 2 Ki. 22:17; 2 Chr. 29:7; 34:25; Amos 5:6; Isa. 1:31; 34:10; 42:3; 43:17; 66:24; Jer. 4:4; 7:20; 17:27; 21:12; Ezek. 21:3 f. [20:47 f.]; 32:7; Cant. 8:7). Occasionally it translates *dā'aḵ*, be extinguished (Job 18:5 f.; 21:17; Prov. 13:9; 20:20; 24:20; Isa. 43:17). In Job 30:8 it translates *nāḵā'*, be scourged out of. There is no Heb. equivalent in Lev. 9:2(9); Est. 4:17; Job 4:10; 16:15(16); 34:26; 40:12(7); Prov. 10:7; Wis. 2:3; 16:17; Isa. 42:4; Sir. 23:16; 28:12, 23; 3 Macc. 6:34; 4 Macc. 3:17; 9:20; 18:20. *šāḇar*, break, is used in Ps. 104(103):11, and *dā'aḵ* in Ps. 118(117):12, where the ET has quench, but neither verse has *sbennymi* in the LXX. In Josephus, *War* 7, 405, it is used of extinguishing fire.

NT *sbennymi* is used consistently in the NT in a literal sense (Matt. 12:20; 25:8; Mk. 9:48; Eph. 6:16; Heb. 11:34) and also in a metaphorical sense (1 Thess. 5:19).

In Eph. 6:16 the believer is urged to shelter behind an all-embracing → faith, so that he can deflect and extinguish all those evil temptations that would sear and consume the personality. The shield *(thyreos)* is the old wooden *scutum* familiar to the Romans, which protected most of the body. Its leather covering soaked in water effectively stopped and extinguished tow-headed darts dipped in pitch which were used as fiery missiles.

In 1 Thess. 5:19 the church is warned against any further quenching of the → Spirit, whose advent was marked by the likeness of fiery tongues (Acts 2:3; → Pen-

tecost), by behaviour which is contrary to Christ's will. The reference does not apply specifically to the cessation of speaking in tongues. "In v. 20 attention is directed to one particular gift, prophecy, but here the concern is more general: no gift of the Spirit is to be extinguished (*sbennyte*). The metaphor is especially vivid – the putting out of a flame or light – and is appropriate since 'fire' is associated with the Spirit (Mt. 3.11 = Lk. 3.16; Acts 2.3 f; 18:25; Rom. 12:11; 2 Tim. 1.6). If those who have been given gifts by the Spirit are either not allowed to exercise them within the community or what they say and do is ignored then in effect the fiery power and light of the Spirit is quenched and the church is not built up (I Cor. 14.26; cf. W. C. van Unnik, " 'Den Geist löschet nicht aus' (I Thessalonicher v. 19)", *NovT* 10, 1968, 255–69, for parallels from Hellenistic religion and culture)" (E. Best, *A Commentary on the First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians, BNTC*, 1972, 238).

The expression "he will not break a bruised reed or quench a smouldering wick" is a quotation from Isa. 42:3 which occurs in the context of the application of the Servant Song of Isa. 42:1–4 to Jesus (Matt. 12:18:21). The passage shows that, "in refusing to quarrel with the Pharisees or to allow his Messiahship to be openly acknowledged, Jesus is the one who *will not wrangle or cry aloud*" (D. Hill, *The Gospel of Matthew, New Century Bible*, 1972, 214). For further discussion of this passage see B. Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic*, 1961, 144–52; K. Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew and its Use of the Old Testament, Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis* 20, 1967², 144–52; R. H. Gundry, *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel, Supplements to NovT* 18, 1967, 110–16; → Serve. Commenting on the original meaning of the phrase in the context of Isa. 42, R. N. Whybray sees a contrast with the work of destruction of the earlier prophets. The Servant's work "will be to handle the *bruised reed* with great care and to keep the *dimly burning wick* from going out: that is, to nurture the remains of faith and hope among the exiles, by announcing the imminent arrival of Yahweh's universal rule" (*Isaiah 40–66, New Century Bible*, 1975, 73).

The description of → punishment in Mk. 9:48, "where their worm does not die, and the fire is not quenched", is taken from Isa. 66:24 which Whybray sees as an early description of eternal punishment (op. cit., 294). The passage also influenced Sir. 7:17 and Jdt. 16:17. The picture is taken from the Valley of Hinnom (→ Hell, art. *gehenna*) where human sacrifice had been offered during the monarchy (2 Ki. 23:10; Jer. 7:31; 32:35). Later it became the city's rubbish dump, and unclean corpses which could not be otherwise buried were burnt there or left to decompose. For rabbinic teaching on this see SB II 9 f.

The mention of the heroes of old who by faith "quenched raging fire" (Heb. 11:34) is probably an allusion to Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego who were delivered from the fiery furnace for refusing to worship Nebuchadnezzar's golden image (Dan. 3; → Miracle, art. *sēmeion*, OT 1 (c)). The readers of the epistle might also have to face a fiery ordeal in the near future (cf. the *pyrōsis* of 1 Pet. 4:12; cf. F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Hebrews, NLC*, 1964, 335). *R. K. Harrison, C. Brown*

ἄσβεστος

ἄσβεστος (*asbestos*), inextinguishable, that which is not or cannot be quenched.

CL The earliest secular sense was that of unquenchable, though Aeschylus extended the meaning to signify ceaseless. As a noun it was used by Dioscorides and others of unslaked lime, and subsequently of plaster. By the time of Pliny, the fire-proof asbestos fibres (*asbestus*) were being made into fire-resistant clothing which was known as *asbestinos*.

OT The adjective *asbestos* occurs once only in the LXX (Job 20:26), with some manuscript variations. It is not matched by any one word in the MT, the phrase *lō' nuppāḥ*, not blown upon, serving as the equivalent in Job 20:26.

NT *asbestos* is almost as rare in the NT as in the LXX, occurring three times only (Matt. 3:12; Mk. 9:43; Lk. 3:17). The Matthean and Lucan references quoted from part of the eschatological teaching of John the Baptist, while Mk. 9:43 refers to the unquenchable → fires of → hell. Fire was the most powerful destructive force known in the ancient world, and the NT use of *asbestos* implies utter and complete destruction of whatever is rejected by God as unsuitable or unworthy.

R. K. Harrison

→ Fire, → Hell, → Pentecost, → Prophet, → Spirit, → Word

(a). E. Best, *A Commentary on the First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians, BNTC,* 1972; F. Foulkes, *The Epistle of Paul to the Ephesians, TC,* 1963; F. Lang, *sbennymi, TDNT* VII 165 ff.; R. A. Ward, *Commentary on 1 and 2 Thessalonians,* 1973.
(b). W. C. van Unnik, " 'Den Geist löschet nicht aus' (I Thessalonicher v. 19)", *NovT* 10, 1968, 255–69.

Quiet, Rest, Silence, Sound, Voice, Noise

ἡσυχία

ἡσυχία (*hēsychia*), quiet, quietness, rest, silence; ἡσυχάζω (*hēsychazō*), be quiet, be silent, rest; ἡσύχιος (*hēsychios*), quiet.

CL In non-biblical Greek *hēsychia* is used of the quietness of peace (as opposed to war) (Thucydides), relief from pain (Plato), a place of solitude (Xenophon), and the tranquillity of the philosopher who escapes from the turmoil of politics (Plato). Herodotus uses the adjective *hēsychios* to describe a disposition that is quiet. *hēsychazō* commonly denotes a cessation of speech, work or conflict, a calming of oneself, or the imposition of silence.

OT In the LXX *hēsychia* is used in reference to freedom from war (1 Chron. 4:40; 22:9), the stillness of night (Prov. 7:9), and tranquillity of life (Prov. 11:12; Ezek. 38:11; 1 Macc. 9:58). The vb. *hēsychazō* is often used of the peace that follows warfare (e.g. Jdg. 3:11, 30; 2 Ki. 22:20), also of refraining from speech (Neh. 5:8, Job 32:6), ceasing from a course of action (Job 32:1), relaxation (Job 37:8; Jer. 46[26]:27), or even culpable inaction (Jdg. 18:9).

NT 1. *Luke.* In the Lucan writings *hēsychazō* denotes abstention from work (Lk. 23:56), the cessation of an effort to convince (Acts 21:14), and the silencing of potential opposition (Lk. 14:4; Acts 11:18), while *hēsychia* in Acts 22:2 portrays the

silence that descended on the agitated Jerusalem crowd when they heard Paul address them in Aramaic, their native tongue.

2. *Paul.* In 1 Thess. 4:11 Paul exhorts the Thessalonians to aim at leading an unobtrusive life of tranquillity (*hēsychazein*), or, to reproduce his oxymoron, to make it their ambition to be free of (inordinate) ambition. Moreover, they are to avoid the disorderliness of → busybodies and to attend quietly (*meta hēsychias*, denoting an attendant disposition) to their business, and earn their own living (2 Thess. 3:12). Any eschatological excitement (cf. 2 Thess. 2:1–2) that produces corporate turmoil or individual laziness is here repudiated. And the Christian should pray for conditions that will permit "a quiet and tranquil [*hēsychion*] manner of life", a life free from outward disturbance and marked by inner tranquillity (1 Tim. 2:2).

The apostle enjoins → women to listen silently (*en hēsychia*) to the instruction given in the church and to show the necessary deference to their teachers (1 Tim. 2:11). The public exposition of scripture ("to teach") was outside a woman's proper domain of service (but cf. Tit. 2:3–5), as was any exercise of ecclesiastical authority over a man. In the church she was to remain silent (*einai en hēsychia*) (1 Tim. 2:12).

3. *Peter.* Peter insists that a woman's adornment should not be external but inward, "the imperishable ornament of a gentle and quiet [*hēsychiou*] spirit" (1 Pet. 3:4), a spirit which calmly bears the disturbances created by others and which itself does not create disturbances.

M. J. Harris

ἦχος

ἦχος (*ēchos*), sound, noise, report; ἠχέω (*ēcheō*), make a sound.

CL In secular Greek *ēchos* (a later form of *ēchē* and closely related to *ēcheō* in meaning) denotes the sound of words (as opposed to their meaning) or of letters or of a voice. It can, like *ēcheō*, be used of an echo (Aristotle) and, in a technical medical sense, of ringing noises in the ears (Hippocrates). The verb *ēcheō* may describe the clanging of a metal shield (Herodotus) or the chirp of a grasshopper (Theocritus).

OT In the LXX *ēchos* occurs 23 times, rendering 4 different Heb. terms, and *ēcheō* 22 times, representing 6 Heb. words. Both terms generally denote inarticulate sounds such as the blast of the trumpet (Exod. 19:16 [*ḥāzāq*]; Ps. 150:3 [*tēqa'*]), the roaring of water (Ps. 46 [45]:3 [*hāmâh*]; Isa. 17:12 [*šā'âh*, niph.]), or the tumult of a city (Ruth 1:19 [*hûm*, niph.]; 1 Sam. 4:15 [no equivalent]; 1 Ki. 1:41 [*hāmâh*], 45 [*hûm*, niph.]).

NT 1. There are 4 NT uses of *ēchos*. It denotes the roaring of the sea and the waves (Lk. 21:25), a sound (*ēchos*) from the sky like a violent blast of wind (Acts 2:2), the → trumpet-blast (Heb. 12:19), and (metaphorically) a rumour that was spread throughout a region (Lk. 4:37).

2. 1 Cor. 13:1 contains the only NT use of *ēcheō*. Paul may be insisting that to exercise the gift of glossolalia without love (i.e. without an interpretation that enabled all to understand and benefit, cf. 1 Cor. 14:5–12, 19) was to be as unedifying as "a noisy [*ēchōn*] gong or a clanging cymbal" (RSV) that might be heard in pagan

worship. Or he may be making the more general observation that to have the gift of tongues but no Christian love amounted to nothing more than paganism.

M. J. Harris

φωνή

φωνή (*phōnē*), sound, noise, voice, language; φωνέω (*phōneō*), make a sound, call, summon.

CL To the Greeks *phōnē* signified an audible sound made by a living creature, and covered the whole range of animal noises or human sounds. As applied to man, it meant voice, speech (as articulate sound made by the voice) or statement (as significant speech). A deity was thought to have an extraordinary *phōnē* (cf. Acts 12:21–22). *phōneō*, on the other hand, may denote the sound produced by a musical instrument, as well as by man or animal.

OT In the LXX *phōnē* generally renders Heb. *qôl* which denotes any audible sound such as the clap of thunder (Exod. 19:16) or the twittering of birds (Ps. 104[103]:12), but not the organ of speech or speech itself. In several Psalms (e.g. Pss. 29[28]:3 f., 8; 104[103]:7) the creatorial and revelatory voice of God is described as thunder. To hear (i.e. obey) God's voice was the essence of covenantal religion (1 Sam. 12:14) and true religion (Jos. 24:19–24; → Hear, art. *akouō*). By the first century the rabbis had a developed view of the *baṯ qôl* ("daughter of a voice"), an echo of a heavenly voice that was audible on earth and proclaimed some divine oracle or judgment.

There are only 10 uses of *phōneō* in the LXX, the vb. being used of human speech (Ps. 115[113]:15; 3 Macc. 2:22), animal cries (Zeph. 2:14) and the trumpet-blast (Amos 3:6).

NT 1. As in the LXX, so in the NT *phōnē* describes any noise or sound, whatever its source (whether animate or inanimate); for example, the wailing of Rachel (Matt. 2:18), the rustling of wind (Jn. 3:8), the tumult of a crowd (Rev. 19:1).

2. Not all human voices sound alike (Jn. 3:29; Acts 12:14) and each person has more than one "tone of voice" (Gal. 4:20). Speaking "in a loud voice [*megalē phōnē*]" is not restricted to human beings (Lk. 23:23; Acts 7:57, 60; 14:10; 26:24) or the souls of martyrs (Rev. 6:9–10). Unclean spirits (Mk. 1:26; 5:7; Lk. 4:33, Acts 8:7), angels (Rev. 5:12; 14:7, 9), or the archangel (1 Thess. 4:16) may speak this way. Particularly noticeable is the close association of this idea with (a) the praise of God by angels (Rev. 5:11–12) or men (Lk. 17:15–16; 19:37–38; Rev. 7:9–10); (b) the power of Jesus to raise the dead (Jn. 11:43; cf. 5:25, 28–29) and his authority as the risen Son of man (Rev. 1:10–12, 15); (c) the death of Jesus (Matt. 27:46 par. Mk. 15:34; Matt. 27:50 par. Mk. 15:37; Lk. 23:46).

3. The "voice from heaven" that figures so prominently in Rev. (e.g. 1:10; 4:1; 10:8; 11:12) or that dialogues with Peter regarding Jewish food-laws (Acts 10:9–16) is distinguishable from the rabbinic Bath Qol by being generally identifiable as the personal voice of God (Rev. 16:17), Christ (Acts 10:13–14; 11:7–9), an → angel (Rev. 18:1–2) or some heavenly inhabitants (Rev. 11:15). Binding together the Synoptic records of the baptism (Matt. 3:13–17 par. Mk. 1:9–11, Lk. 3:21 f.) and the

transfiguration of Jesus (Matt. 17:1–8 par. Mk. 9:2–8, Lk. 9:28–36) is the reference to the voice "from heaven" (Mk. 1:11) or "from the cloud" (Mk. 9:7) that, like the Bath Qol, issues a public divine declaration that is audible on earth (Matt. 3:17; 17:5 par.; but note the "You are" of Mk. 1:11; Lk. 3:22; cf. Jn. 12:28). The words "my Son" in this messianic confirmation clearly indicate that the voice belongs to God the Father (→ Son of God).

4. For John, to → hear (i.e. heed) the voice of Jesus (Jn. 10:3, 16, 27; 18:37) was to gain eternal → life (Jn. 5:24–25; 6:68; 10:27–28).

5. Perhaps the solution to the apparent contradiction between Acts 9:7 and Acts 22:9 with regard to Paul's companions' hearing "the voice" during his encounter with the risen Christ outside Damascus is that in Acts 9:7 it was Paul's voice (not Christ's) they heard or that the genitive case *phōnēs* after *ākouō* ("hear") denotes hearing either without understanding (Acts 9:7) or with understanding (Acts 22:7), while the accusative case *phōnēn* describes only hearing with understanding (Acts 22:9; cf. 9:4; 26:14).

6, Not infrequently the content of a *phōnē* is a solemn declaration of confession of faith (Acts 13:27; 19:34; 22:14; 24:21; 2 Pet. 1:17).

7. The NT use of *phōneō* is restricted to the four Gospels, Acts and Rev. 14:18. In some cases (e.g. Lk. 8:8; 16:24; Acts 10:18) it is indistinguishable in meaning from *krazō* (→ "cry out"), especially when "in a loud voice" (*megalē phōnē*) is added (e.g. Mk. 1:26). On occasion it denotes an urgent request (Matt. 27:47 par. Mk. 15:35) or a powerful command (Lk. 8:54; Jn. 12:17), and not infrequently an authoritative summoning (e.g. Mk. 9:35; Lk. 16:2) or a polite invitation (e.g. Lk. 14:12; Jn. 1:48). In Palestine the cock would crow (*phōneō* expresses this in Matt. 26:34, 74 par. Mk. 14:30, 72; Lk. 22:34, 60) during the third watch (i.e. between midnight and 3 a.m.).

M. J. Harris

O. Betz, *phōnē* etc. *TDNT* IX 278–303; A. Marmorstein, *Studies in Jewish Theology*, 1950, 135 ff.; J. Schneider, *ēcheō*, *TDNT* II 954 f.

R

Rabbi

Rabbi was in NT times a title of respect given by the common man to the scribes and by a student to his teacher. Gradually it became a technical term for a man who had received ordination (*s*ᵉ*mîḵâh*), i.e. who had received authority to act as judge in religious matters. This was conferred on him by the laying on of hands. The use of the term ordination must not be understood to mean that he was in any sense a minister in the Christian sense; he was exclusively an authority on the law (Torah) as it had come to be understood in the synagogue. This ordination was practised only in Palestine and ceased in the 4th cent. From then on *s*ᵉ*mîḵâh* with the title of Rabbi has been conferred by the opinion of three rabbis that the person has adequate knowledge to expound the law.

ῥαββί

ῥαββί (*rhabbi*) (from Heb. *rabbî*, "my lord"), *ῥαββουνεί* (*rhabbounei*) (from Aram. *rabbûnî*), Rabbi, my master. On the alternative forms *rhabbi* and *rhabbei* see Funk § 38.

OT The Sem. *raḇ* means many or great. In the latter sense we find it both inside and outside Israel as a designation for chief officers (e.g. Jer. 41:1; 39:13; Dan. 1:3; Est. 1:8; Jon. 1:6, of a sea captain), and it has come down to us in the titles of certain Assyrian and Babylonian officials (e.g. 2 Ki. 18:17; Jer. 39:18).

NT 1. In NT times it was a title of respect for the scribes and their pupils, the Pharisees (Matt. 23:7, 8). John the Baptist's disciples addressed him by this title (Jn. 3:26). It is applied to Jesus a number of times: by Nicodemus (Jn. 3:2), by Nathanael (Jn. 1:49), by Peter (Mk. 9:5; 11:21), by Judas (Matt. 26:25, 49; Mk. 14:45); it is also used by disciples and others in Jn. 1:38; 4:3; 6:25; 9:2; 11:8. *rhabbounei* comes from the Aram. equivalent of *rhabbei*; it is found in the mouth of Bartimaeus (Mk. 10:51) and of Mary Magdalene (Jn. 20:16).

2. In the Gospels the commonest form of address for Jesus is *didaskale*, i.e. teacher (→ Teach); Luke uses the synonym *epistata* six times (Lk. 5:5; 8:24, 45; 9:33, 49; 17:13). Frequently he is called *kyrie*, i.e. → Lord. This is often no more than a mark of respect (e.g. Matt. 13:27). Since, however, in parallel passages in the Synoptics, it is used where the others have Teacher – the best example is Matt. 8:25 (*kyrie*), Mk. 4:38 (*didaskale*), Lk. 8:24 (*epistata*) – we are probably safe in assuming that where Jesus is called Lord it normally represents Rabbi. This title was normally avoided in Gk.-speaking circles as unfamiliar (cf. the translation in Jn. 20:16). In some contexts, however, it probably represents *mārî*, i.e. My Lord. This was another

title given to scholars. Behind "Teacher and Lord" in Jn. 13:13, 14 there lies *rabbî ûmārî*.

3. The argument is occasionally met that, since the use of the title Rabbi becomes normal only after the destruction of the temple, the NT usage is evidence of the late composition of the Gospels. The argument is baseless, for the technical use of Rabbi clearly derives from an earlier popular usage. *H. L. Ellison*

→ Law, → Pharisee, → Scribe

(a). S. W. Barron, *The Jewish Community*, I–III, 1942; M. M. Berman, *The Role of the Rabbi*, 1941; J. Bowker, *The Targums and Rabbinic Literature*, 1969, 40–92; J. Braydé *et al.*, "Rabbi", *Jewish Encyclopedia* X 294–97; G. H. Dalman, *The Words of Jesus, Considered in the Light of Post-Biblical Jewish Writings and the Aramaic Language*, 1902, 327 ff., 331–40; J. D. M. Derrett, *Jesus' Audience*, 1973; A. J. Feldmann, *The Rabbi and his Early Ministry*, 1941; A. Finkel, *The Pharisees and the Teacher of Nazareth*, 1964; L. Finkelstein, ed., *The Jews*, I–III, 1971; W. Foerster, *Palestinian Judaism in New Testament Times*, 1964, 170–75; J. Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus: An Investigation into Economic and Social Conditions During the New Testament Period*, 1969, 242–49; M. Kadushin, *The Rabbinic Mind*, 1952; E. Lohse, *rhabbi, rhabbouni*, *TDNT* VI 961–65, and *The New Testament Environment*, 1976, 115–20; C. G. Montefiore and H. Loewe, *A Rabbinic Anthology*, new edition 1974, 696–713; Moore, *Judaism*, III, 15 ff.; J. Neusner, " 'Pharisaic-Rabbinic' Judaism", *History of Religions* 12, 1972–73, 250–70; Schürer, II, 1, 315 ff.; A. Steinsaltz, *The Essential Talmud*, 1976; G. Vermes, *Jesus the Jew*, 1973, 113–28.

(b). E. Lohse, *Die Ordination im Spätjudentum und im Neuen Testament*, 1951; E. Nestle, "Rabbi", *ZNW* 7, 1906, 184; SB I 916 f.; G. Schrenk, "Rabbinische Charakterköpfe im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter", *Studien zu Paulus*, 1954, 9–45.

Ready, Prepare, Gird

The NT uses two different groups of words to convey the idea of preparing, equipping, being ready, or being resolved for something lying in the future. One is the group of words associated with *hetoimos*, the other the related vbs. *kataskeuazō* and *paraskeuazō*, derived from *skeuos*, vessel. As far as their meaning is concerned, the two groups cannot be clearly separated, except to say that *kataskeuazō* frequently brings out more strongly the idea of producing, making, constructing, while the *hetoimos* group refers to something already existing in a state befitting its purpose or use, or to the initiation of such a state. The same may be said of the *zōnnymi* group. The meaning of this word is very similar. Originally it meant to gird; hence, to make oneself ready to depart, to stand in readiness. The words dealt with in this article describe the state of readiness primarily in its outward aspect. The other side of the picture, concerned with the inner attitude of a person, is supplied by the words considered under the article on Guard, Keep, Watch. The distinction between these two groups of words is not clear-cut, and the dividing line is a fluid one.

ἕτοιμος

ἕτοιμος (*hetoimos*), ready, prepared; ἑτοίμως (*hetoimōs*), readily; ἑτοιμάζω (*hetoimazō*), get ready, hold in readiness; ἑτοιμασία (*hetoimasia*), state of readiness, preparation; προετοιμάζω (*prohetoimazō*), prepare beforehand.

CL "The clear meaning of this word group is preparation both in the active sense of 'making ready' and in the passive sense of 'readiness', 'ability' or 'resolution' "

(W. Grundmann, *TDNT* II 704). In classical Gk. it is not found in a religious sense, except that Homer (*Il.* 10, 571) uses it in connexion with sacrifice: *hiron hetoimassein.*

OT In the LXX the words serve chiefly to translate *kûn* (especially niph. and hiph.) and the principal meanings are to be firmly established, to establish, set up, make, prepare, get ready.

1. Though widely used in a secular sense, the words have a religious meaning, e.g. in connexion with the Passover (2 Chr. 35:4, 6, 14 f. LXX); sacrificial animals (Num. 23:1, 29); the ark (1 Chr. 15:1; 2 Chr. 1:4); the showbread (1 Chr. 9:32); the temple vessels (2 Chr. 29:19); the temple (2 Chr. 31:11); divine service (2 Chr. 35:16).

2. Besides this, the words are used for the all-embracing divine activity of creation, preparation, and establishing.

(a) God has established the heavens (Prov. 3:19; 8:27) and founded the earth (Jer. 28:15 LXX), founded the earth upon the rivers (Ps. 24[23]:2), and established the mountains (Ps. 65[64]:6). He prepares rain (Ps. 147[146]:8; cf. Job 38:25). His hands have made man (Ps. 119:73 LXX *v.l.*). He provides food for his creatures (Pss. 65[64]:9; 78[77]:20; Job 38:41), and concerns himself with their destiny (Gen. 24:14, 44).

(b) God's creation and providence extends also to his acts of salvation in history. He has established Israel to be his → people for ever (2 Sam. 7:24), and sworn that he will bring them into a land appointed for them (Exod. 23:20; Ezek. 20:6). Therefore, he creates food for them (Ps. 78[77]:19 f.), and despite their recurring unbelief and all their enemies, leads them into the sanctuary that his own hands have prepared (Exod. 15:17), prepared for everlasting glory (Sir. 49:12 LXX). Moreover, he sets up the kings of Israel and establishes their rule. If Saul had been obedient, the Lord would have established his kingdom for ever (1 Sam. 13:13), whereas David, who is appointed by him, is given the promise, "I will establish your descendants for ever" (Ps. 89[88]:4; cf. 2 Sam. 7:12; 1 Chr. 14:2; 17:11; 1 Ki. 2:24).

(c) God does all this because his faithfulness is established in the → heavens (Ps. 89[88]:2). There he has set up his throne from the beginning (Pss. 93[92]:2; 103[102]:19), a throne founded upon righteousness and justice (Ps. 89[88]:14). He has established it for → judgment (Ps. 9:7), and for the judgment day he has prepared a sacrifice (Zeph. 1:7 f.; cf. Isa. 30:33; 14:21).

3. The all-embracing work of God in creating and providing for his people does, however, demand self-preparation and readiness on man's part. The → people and → Moses are called upon to prepare themselves (ritually) for the revelation of God at Sinai (Exod. 19:10 f., 15; 34:2; cf. Num. 16:16 LXX). In the prophets Israel is challenged: "Prepare to meet your God" (Amos 4:12; cf. Mic. 6:8; 2 Chr. 27:6). This involves also the preparation of the → heart: "Those who fear the Lord will prepare their hearts" (Sir. 2:17 LXX; cf. Pss. 57[56]:7; 108[107]:1; 112[111]:7; Sir. 2:1; 18:23; Prov. 23:12 LXX).

NT 1. In the NT the noun *hetoimasia* occurs only once (Eph. 6:15), but the vbs. *hetoimazō* and *prohetoimazō* between them appear 43 times, and the adj. and adv. 20 times. All are relatively rare in the writings of Paul. When used with

reference to objects, the meaning corresponds exactly with that in the OT. It is noteworthy, however, that the words of this group are not used with reference to God's creation and providence in nature, and in a cultic setting only with reference to the Passover (Matt. 26:17, 19 par. Mk. 14:12, 16; Lk. 22:9, 13). Apart therefore from their wide use in a secular sense, they connote (a) God's activity of creating and providing in terms of the history of salvation; (b) man's self-preparation and readiness.

2. In his song of praise Simeon declared: "My eyes have seen thy salvation which thou hast prepared in the presence of all peoples" (Lk. 2:30 f.; cf. 3:6; Isa. 52:10). Yet the world is unable in its own light to recognize the salvation present and promised in Jesus: God has prepared it for those who love him (1 Cor. 2:9). It is his purpose, by his free elective grace "to make known the riches of his glory for the vessels of mercy, which he has prepared beforehand for glory" (Rom. 9:23). Jesus comforts his fearful disciples by saying, "I go to prepare a place for you" (Jn. 14:2 f.; but cf. Matt. 20:23 par. Mk. 10:39). So too Peter is able to encourage the Christians undergoing trials in Asia Minor by telling them that they "by God's power are guarded through faith for a salvation ready to be revealed in the last time" (1 Pet. 1:5). God's free mercy does not clash with, but rather forms the basis of, the doctrine that he is "ready to judge the living and the dead" (1 Pet. 4:5; cf. Matt. 25:34, 41). For the invitation "Come, for all is now ready" (Lk. 14:17; cf. Matt. 22:4, 8; and also Jn. 7:6 "Your time is always ready") has gone out, but many have proved unworthy. No one, however, has cause to glory in himself, "For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus for good works, which God prepared beforehand, that we should walk in them" (Eph. 2:10; cf. 2 Tim. 2:21).

3. To this sphere, which is marked out by God's work of preparation arising from his free elective choice (→ Elect), belong also the statements about man's self-preparation and readiness. The OT call, "In the wilderness prepare the way of the Lord" (Isa. 40:3; → Cry, art. *boaō*), is applied in the NT to John (Matt. 3:3 par. Mk. 1:3, Lk. 3:4; cf. Lk. 1:17, 76), who by his preaching of repentance prepared the way for the coming of the Lord to his people. The Lord who has come is also, however, the Lord who is to come. He will come like a thief in the night, like a bridegroom to the wedding. The church is therefore exhorted to be ready for his coming (Matt. 24:44 par. Lk. 12:40; cf. also Rev. 19:7; 21:2). Only those virgins who are ready when the bridegroom arrives will be let in (Matt. 25:10). The servant, who made nothing ready despite his knowledge of the master's will, stands condemned (Lk. 12:47). The church is therefore exhorted to be ready "for every good work" (Tit. 3:1), "to make a defence to anyone" (1 Pet. 3:15), and also "to punish every disobedience" (2 Cor. 10:6). This is not contradicted by the exhortation to be shod "with the equipment [*hetoimasia*, lit. "preparation"] of the gospel of peace" (Eph. 6:15). In this context Paul's declaration should also be noted, that he is ready not only to be imprisoned but even to die for the Lord Jesus at Jerusalem (Acts 21:13; cf. by contrast Lk. 22:33). 2 Cor. 12:14 refers to Paul's readiness to visit the Corinthians, despite his painful relations with them.

S. Solle

κατασκευάζω

κατασκευάζω (*kataskeuazō*), make ready, prepare, build, construct, erect, equip, furnish; παρασκευάζω (*paras-*

keuazō), get ready, prepare (oneself); *παρασκευή* (*paraskeuē*), day of preparation.

CL Classical writers from Hdt. onwards use both these compounds in passages relating to the setting up and decoration of rooms and festal routes (e.g. Lysias, Thuc.), or to preparations of various kinds, e.g. dressing, the preparation of a meal (only *paraskeuazō*), the building of a ship or preparation for battle on land or sea (e.g. Hdt., Xen.). *kataskeuazō* is also used in an inward sense, both in statements about the instruction of those who are learning, and concerning preparation for religious rituals (e.g. Aristotle, Josephus). Finally *kataskeuazō* is used in philosophical logic and geometry of the construction of positive arguments (Aristotle, Plutarch, Euclid).

OT 1. The LXX has *kataskeuazō* 30 times, of which 19 examples are in the Apocrypha. In Isa. 40:28; 43:7; 45:7, 9 the vb. refers to God's work of preparation in the sense of creation (in the Heb. text the terms are *bārā'*, create, and *yāṣar*, create, form, shape). It is found in the same sense 5 times in Wis., Bar., and 4 Macc. Equipping with arms and warships is mentioned particularly in 1 Macc. (3:29; 10:21; 15:3). The Apocrypha also uses *kataskeuazō* in connexion with the production of idols (Ep. Jer. 9, 45 f.; also in a LXX addition to Isa. 40:19).

2. *paraskeuazō* is found 16 times in the LXX. Jeremiah uses it in 6:4; 46(26):9; 50(27):42; 51(28):11 in connexion with preparing for battle. It is later used in reports of the preparation of a meal (Tob. 8:19; 2 Macc. 2:27; 6:21).

3. Otherwise the two vbs. are used of various activities of preparation: construction of a building (Num. 21:27; 2 Chr. 32:5); tilling a field (Prov. 24:27); spreading a net as a trap (Prov. 29:5). In 1 Sam. 24:3 *paraskeuazō* is used absolutely, clearly in a specialized sense, and is usually translated "relieved himself". The context would also allow the sense "to change".

NT In the NT, where the simple form *skeuazō* is lacking, *paraskeuazō* is found 4 times, always in a similar sense, and *kataskeuazō* 11 times.

1. In Acts 10:10 it refers to the preparation of a meal. In 1 Cor. 14:8, where the meaninglessness of speaking in tongues is compared with the indecision brought about if the battle trumpet makes an indistinct noise, we have the metaphor of preparation for battle. 2 Cor. 9:2 f. deals with the Christians in Achaia, who have "been ready since last year" to take the collection to Jerusalem (→ Poor, art. *ptōchos* NT 4). The next verse contains, in the same context, the adj. *aparaskeuastos*, which occurs nowhere else in the NT, and is here used of the possibility of "not being ready".

2. (a) *kataskeuazō* is used in 4 cases in connexion with sayings about John the Baptist's function as the preparer of the way: Matt. 11:10; Mk. 1:2; Lk. 1:17; 7:27 (→ Elijah). In each case Mal. 3:1 is cited (with echoes of Exod. 23:20 and Isa. 40:3, where → *hetoimazō* is used), though Mal. 3:1 does not place any emphasis on *kataskeuazō*. In Lk. 1:17 the context is also one dealing with the Baptist, but here the subject is his task "to make ready for the Lord a people prepared".

(b) The other NT examples of *kataskeuazō* (almost all in Heb.; see below) refer to the construction and furnishing of a building. In these contexts we can always detect an association in content with man's preparation for his meeting with God, as we also found in the examples from the Gospels. 1 Pet. 3:20 mentions (in connexion with

man's appropriation in baptism of the work of Jesus) the "preparation" of → Noah's ark.

Half of the NT examples of *kataskeuazō* are in Heb. The OT concept of God's all-embracing work of creation introduces the simile of the building of a house, and concludes that God has built everything (Heb. 3:3 f.). The underlying thought here is that of Christ as the builder of the church. The other places in Heb. where the word is used deal with building and furnishing according to a prescribed pattern: 11:7 speaks of Noah, building the ark in obedient faith, in order to prepare a way of escape. In a reflection similar to that found in the Synoptic Gospels, the word is here used of human preparation for God's saving act. The same is true of Heb. 9:2, 6: an exhaustive consideration of Christ's unique sacrifice is introduced in verses 1–10 by a description of the tabernacle, which was set up and furnished with all manner of contents according to strict instructions (→ Tent).

3. In secular Gk. *paraskeuē* is found in the general sense of preparation, but the NT uses the noun *paraskeuē* always as a temporal expression to indicate the "day of preparation" preceding a → Sabbath or Passover festival: Matt. 27:62; Mk. 15:42; Jn. 19:14, 31, 42. This suggests that in the NT, as in the OT, and in the same sense in all strands of the tradition, *paraskeuazō* and *kataskeuazō* are terms which have the sense of pointing to, preparing and equipping. They have the theological function of looking forward to God's saving activity towards man, which is introduced by a ministry of preparation having about it the flavour of Advent. *F. Thiele*

ζώννυμι

ζώννυμι (*zōnnymi*), gird; *ζώνη* (*zōnē*), girdle, belt; *διαζώννυμι* (*diazōnnymi*), tie or gird around; *περιζώννυμι* (*perizōnnymi*), gird with, gird around.

CL *zōnnymi* (Homer), gird (oneself or another); *diazōnnymi* (Thuc.), gird around, bind round oneself; and *perizōnnymi* (Aristophanes), gird around, bind round (oneself or another with something), are used in the act. and mid., and the compound forms also in the pass. The noin *zōnē*, girdle, is derived from *zōnnymi*. In classical usage *zōnē* is also found in the sense of a money belt or purse (cf. Mk. 6:8; → Bag).

OT Generally speaking the OT uses the words in the same way as classical Gk., but the words of this group represent a number of different Heb. terms. The girdle (*zōnē*), made of linen or leather, served to tuck in the long skirts of the robe, in order to give greater freedom of movement. Hence the putting on of a girdle acquired the particular meaning of making oneself ready to go (2 Ki. 4:29), and to lay aside one's girdle meant correspondingly to rest. A person in authority wore it as part of his finery (Isa. 22:21), an officer as his badge of rank. A richly embroidered girdle (Heb. *'abnēṭ*) formed part of the vestments of the high priest (Exod. 28:4, 39[35], 40[36]; 29:9; 39:29[36:37]; Lev. 8:7, 13; 16:4). Several other Heb. nouns are also found including *ḥ^{a}gôr* (1 Sam. 18:4 *v.l*) and *ḥ^{a}gôrâh* (1 Ki. 2:5; 2 Ki. 3:21; Isa. 3:24). The most frequent Heb. vb. meaning to gird is *ḥāgar* (Exod. 29:9; Lev. 8:7, 13; 16:4; Jud. 18:11 *v.l.*; 1 Sam. 17:39; 25:13; Ps. 109[108]:19; Ezek. 23:15).

A golden girdle, worn around the breast, is regarded as an angel's mark of distinction (Dan. 10:5; cf. Rev. 15:6). For mourning, a hair shirt or a rope is worn (Isa. 3:24; cf. 2 Sam. 3:31). A broad leather girdle was used as armour, to protect the

lower part of the body (1 Sam. 25:13), and so the expression "everyone who wears the girdle" means "the men fit for war".

A metaphorical use occurs in e.g. Ps. 65(64):6 (Yahweh is "girded with might"); Ps. 18(17):32, 39 (Yahweh girds the righteous "with strength"); and Ps. 30(29):11 (girded "with gladness"). Isaiah (11:5) looks forward to the new → David as an ideal king, the messiah, of whom it is said that "Righteousness shall be the girdle of his waist, and faithfulness the girdle of his loins."

NT In the NT the words are used in the same way as in classical Gk. and the LXX:

(a) They occur in a direct sense without any specialized meaning in, e.g., Jn. 21:7 (Peter girds himself with his outer garment because he does not wish to meet the Lord improperly dressed), and Lk. 17:8 (the servant girds himself in order to serve his master). Jn. 13:4 f. records how Jesus, the Master, changed his clothes in preparation for performing the task of a slave, a loving service which at the same time demonstrates the new order of life, which belongs to the age which is dawning.

(b) In some passages "to gird" has, as in the LXX, the special meaning of making oneself ready to depart, i.e. to get moving, stand in readiness. Thus in Acts 12:8 Peter is commanded to prepare himself for leaving the prison; and in Jn. 21:18 this same vigorous Peter who is well able to gird himself and make himself ready to go, is told that when he is old another will make him ready for a journey, and so determine the direction and destination of his life (probably an allusion to Peter's martyrdom). In this sense, too, Lk. 12:35 (echoing Exod. 12:11) is to be understood as a challenge to the church to live unfettered by the world, in expectation of the Lord's coming, in readiness to depart (cf. 1 Cor. 7:29–31). Matt. 10:9 par. Mk. 6:8 further add to the picture of the disciples' way of life as they live in expectation of the end, by telling them not to secure themselves financially, but to leave everything to God's provision.

(c) According to Mk. 1:6, John the Baptist did not wear over his clothing the linen girdle customary among nomads, but a leather one (cf. 2 Ki. 1:8). His appearance is to be seen (following Mal. 3:1; 4:5) as that of → Elijah *redivivus*, the eschatological forerunner of the messiah. His clothing does not indicate hostility to culture, or especial asceticism, but is to be explained, like the location of his ministry, in terms of wilderness typology. The rough mantle of camel's hair was the recognizable garb of a prophet going back to Elijah and Elisha (1 Ki. 19:19; 2 Ki. 2:13 f.; cf. Zech. 13:4). John's garb proclaimed his conscious prophetic calling (cf. C. H. H. Scobie, *John the Baptist*, 1964, 128).

In the vision of Rev. 1:13 the golden girdle marks the exalted Christ as the true high → priest, as does his long robe (Exod. 28:4; see OT above).

In Acts 21:11 Agabus (like the prophets of the OT; cf. Isa. 20:2; Jer. 13:1 ff.) carried out a symbolic action with Paul's girdle (a long cloth worn about the waist), to indicate the coming arrest of Paul. "The accompanying word of interpretation 'Thus says the Holy Spirit!' corresponds to the OT 'Thus says Yahweh!' " (E. Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 1971, 602).

(d) *perizōnnymi* is used in a metaphorical sense, with *en* of the instrument, in Eph. 6:14, which echoes Isa. 11:5 LXX. The believers are to put on God's → "truth" like a military girdle, which can protect them against the attacks of the evil one.

F. Selter

→ Clothe

W. Grundmann, *hetoimos* etc., *TDNT* II 704 ff.; A. Oepke, *zōnnymi* etc., *TDNT* V 302–8.

Reason, Mind, Understanding

Since Kant reason (Lat. *ratio*) has meant the whole range of man's intellectual powers, bringing together into a single whole the individual faculties of thought, knowledge and understanding. It presupposes positive data, objects or facts which it perceives. The Gk. term *nous* is capable of embracing all the instruments of sensual and conceptual perception, and depending on the context it can mean sense, understanding, thoughts, or reason. *dianoia* and *synesis*, by contrast, belong more to the narrower, intellectual category of discursive thought. *synesis* contains in addition the existential components of mature and experience-based insight. The vb. *epistamai*, to understand, know, is not given separate consideration here; it expresses the result of a process of perception, i.e. knowledge, cognizance (in the NT it is only used with any frequency in Acts). In the NT the relation of faith to knowledge is thought out and discussed chiefly by Paul.

νοῦς

νοῦς (*nous*), mind, intellect, understanding, reason, thought; *νοέω* (*noeō*), apprehend, perceive, understand, gain insight into; *νοῆμα* (*noēma*), thought, mind; *ἀνόητος* (*anoētos*), unintelligent, foolish; *ἄνοια* (*anoia*), folly; *διανόημα* (*dianoēma*), thought; *διάνοια* (*dianoia*), understanding, intelligence, mind, thought; *δυσνόητος* (*dysnoētos*), hard to understand; *ἔννοια* (*ennoia*), thought, knowledge, insight; *κατανοέω* (*katanoeō*), notice, observe, consider, contemplate.

CL 1. (a) The Gk. word *nous*, attested since Linear B, probably goes back etymologically to the root **snu* (cf. Ger. *schnaufen*, to pant; *schnuppern*, to sniff). Originally it refers to the inner sense, directed at an object; then, disposition, understanding, insight, reason, mind. Along with feeling and will, understanding belongs, as the ability to think, to the inner powers of man (e.g. Parmenides, 16, 2). Plutarch (*On the Education of Children* 8) puts *logos*, → word, and *nous* in a definite relationship to one another: the understanding rules the word, the word serves the understanding. *nous* is also, however, the moral attitude, disposition, which is determined by the reflection of the mind (e.g. Hdt., 7, 150; Soph., *OT* 600). It also means resolve and intention (e.g. Homer, *Il.* 9, 104 f.; Hdt., 1, 27).

(b) In Gk. philosophy and religion the concept is developed further in theory. Here it comes to mean reason or mind as the organ of thought, which comprehends the world and existence. Early Gk. philosophy describes the meaning of understanding: it perceives, orders and controls everything (e.g. Anaxagoras, *Fragment* 12).

In Plato *nous* does not mean the whole realm of thought, but the highest of the three parts of the → soul. *nous* is here called the *logistikon*, the ruling principle of pure thought (*Phaedr.* 247c). This true and divine reason rules in man and in the universe, in the microcosm as well as in the macrocosm (*Tim.* 30a b, 46c ff.). Reason comprehends truth (*Rep.* 6, 490b). Reason and truth, begotten by Philomathes along with the *ōn*, being, lead to knowledge. In man's reason lies his awareness of God.

Aristotle set understanding above the powers of the soul. He distinguished a *nous theōrētikos*, theoretical reason, from *nous praktikos*, practical reason (*An.* 3, 9, p. 432b, 27 ff.; 3, 101, p. 433a, 14 ff.; *Eth.Nic.* 6, 2, p. 1139a, 17 ff.). This reason is immortal and divine. The *nous* is both the most important part of the human mind and the embodiment of the divine (*Eth.Nic.* 10, 7, p. 1177a, 14 f.).

This linking of *nous* and the divine is also characteristic of Stoicism. According to Epictetus, reason is the essence of God (*Dissertationes* 2, 8, 1 f.).

In the *Corpus Hermeticum, nous* is thought of in the most strictly abstract way, as the original divine principle (e.g. 1, 6; 1, 12; 5, 11). Man too has a share in this *nous*, even if not in its original fiery form. This *nous* is the eye of reason, through which alone man can comprehend God (5, 10a). The *nous* enters the soul and leads it to knowledge (10, 21). All in all, this is a typically gnostic, syncretistic doctrine of salvation, for which the Gk. concept of *nous* is pressed into service.

2. (a) With *nous*, mind, there goes a whole group of words, derived from the same root, including the noun *dianoia* (Hdt. onwards), the act or faculty of thinking and reflection. Aristotle (*Met.* 5, 1, p. 1025b, 25) divides this into *praktikē*, *poiētikē* and *theōrētikē*, practical, creative and reflective thinking. It is the special philosophical power of thought, theoretical understanding as opposed to sensory perceptions and feelings (Democritus, *Fragment* 11). *dianoia* also means way of thinking, disposition, intention (e.g. Plato, *Laws* 10, 888a) or purpose, design (Hdt., 1, 90, 3; 8, 97, 3). Like *nous*, *dianoia* can also be used of the sense and meaning of a word (e.g. Plato, *Critias* 113a).

(b) *ennoia* (Eur. onwards) meant originally the act of thought (Pseudo-Plato, *Definitions* 414a), then the result: thought, realization, insight, disposition, even the disposition of the gods (e.g. Xen., *Cyr.* 1, 1, 1). In philosophy *ennoia* means idea, concept (e.g. concept of time, Plato, *Timaeus* 47a; the idea of the beautiful, Aristotle, *Eth.Nic.* 10, 10, p. 1179b, 15). *ennoia* is conceptual thought, without which things cannot be perceived (Diogenes Laertius, 7, 42). According to Stoic doctrine, these concepts are derived from experience and are reproduced from one's understanding of the nature of things (e.g. Epictetus, *Dissertationes* 2, 17, 7).

(c) *noēma* (Homer onwards) is that which is thought, a thought. Like *ennoia*, it can mean concept (Aristotle, *An.* 3, 6, p. 430a, 27 f.). It can, however, also mean plan (Plato, *Politicus* 260d).

(d) The meaning of *dianoēma* (Xen. onwards) is not much different: thought, notion, resolve, plan (e.g. Plato, *Sym.* 210d). Thus it can be contrasted with → work (*ergon*) (Isocrates, 3, 9). It can also mean ulterior motive (P.Lond. 5, 1724, 15). This term is also found in the sense of illusions and the confused thoughts of those sick with fever (Hippocrates, *Epidemiai* 1, 23).

(e) Similarly *anoia* (Theognis onwards) means folly, want of understanding. Plato (*Timaeus* 86b) distinguishes two kinds of lack of understanding: that resulting from madness and that resulting from lack of teaching.

3. Corresponding to these nouns is a group of verbs which give expression to the process of thinking, and to thought itself:

(a) *noeō* (Homer onwards) originally meant to perceive with understanding including both sensory and mental impressions (Homer, *Il.* 11, 599). In the philosophy of Parmenides, thought and being are made almost identical (Parmenides, *Fragment* 3). A theme which is significant for Gk. thought is *homoion homoiō noeitai*, "Like is

known by like." Deity is known to itself. The Roman poet, Manilius, expressed the same idea in this way: *quis caelum possit nisi caeli munere nosse et reperire deum nisi qui pars ipse deorum est*, "Who would be able to know heaven except by the gift of heaven, and who would be able to find a god unless he be a part of the gods himself?" (*Astronomica* 2, 115).

(b) A strengthened form of *noeō* is *katanoeō* (Hdt. onwards), to direct one's mind and interest towards something, to notice and perceive it (e.g. Xen., *Cyr.* 2, 2, 28). Thus *katanoeō* can mean to observe, test, comprehend, understand, in the latter sense being almost synonymous with *syniēmi*, to understand.

4. (a) In addition to *noeō* the verbal adj. *noētos* is attested from the time of Parmenides and means intelligible. The opposite is expressed by *anoētos* (from the pre-Socratics), unintelligible, unimaginable. Plato (*Parmenides* 132c) speaks of *noēmata ... anoēta*, unintelligible, unthinkable thoughts. *anoētos* also means senseless, foolish, indicating a lack of understanding and judgment (Plato, *Grg.* 464d). The plur. *anoētoi* is used as the contrary of *phronountes*, senseless and sensible respectively (Anaxippus, *Fragment* 4). The *anoētoi* are not far removed from the *kakoi* and *ponēroi*, the bad.

(b) *dysnoētos* is the equivalent of hard to understand (e.g. Aristotle, *De Plantis* 1, 1 p. 816a, 3). This is how Lucian (*Alexander* 54) describes the oracular utterances. Along with this goes *dysexēgētos*, hard to interpret (Diogenes Laertius, 9, 13).

OT 1. In comparison with the central rôle played by the *nous* in the world of Gk. literature, it is surprising how little use is made of this group of words in the LXX. The most common of the terms is *dianoia*, which appears 75 times, whereas *nous* and *noeō* are each attested only about 35 times, and the other derivatives even less. This sparing use of the words in the LXX is connected with the fact that the Heb. has no term equivalent to the Gk. *nous*. *lēḇ* or *lēḇāḇ*, which is rendered in the LXX 6 times by *nous* and 38 times by *dianoia*, is otherwise nearly always translated *kardia*, → heart. Nevertheless, this variation in translation does indicate that in OT thought the heart is the seat of intellectual processes. But OT anthropology knows nothing of the Gk. division of the soul into three parts, so that human understanding does not become pushed into the foreground in such a one-sided and isolated way as is the case, at least to some extent, in the Gk. world. In the OT the understanding belongs together with the will, and aims less at theoretical contemplation than at right conduct. The intellectual sphere is thus anchored more firmly in the whole person, both body and soul, than it is in Gk. thought (cf. W. Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament*, II, 1967, 147 ff.). The intellectual element is displayed more clearly in the use of the vb. *noeō* than it is with the noun *nous*, for it goes back to the Heb. *bîn*, to understand, perceive. Insight and understanding also mean in the OT the process of judging and exploring the relation of things to one another. The difference is that this insight is not regarded as an independent achievement of man using his critical faculty, but as a gift of Yahweh. The most important statement of the OT theory of knowledge is that all true knowledge comes from God (cf. L. Koehler, *Hebrew Man*, 1956, 115–48; *Old Testament Theology*, 1957, 99–126).

In general, these words are seldom found in the earlier parts of the OT. They are more frequent in the Wisdom literature; but they come into their own in the Gk. writings of the LXX (especially Macc.). This fact indicates that the specifically Gk.

concept of *nous* did not enter the OT tradition until the post-canonical, apocryphal era. The process reaches a kind of climax in Philo.

2. (a) The fact that *nous* 6 times (out of a total of 31) stands in the LXX for *lēḇ* and *lēḇāḇ*, heart, inner being, suggests that the texts have undergone a certain Hellenizing process (Exod. 7:23; Isa. 10:7b, etc.); but it also shows that *nous* is to be understood in a sense more associated with the will. Other expressions pointing in the same direction are to keep in mind (2 Macc. 15:8), to give attention to something (1 Esd. 9:41); and phrases like an understanding mind (4 Macc. 1:35; 2:16), a pure mind (Test. Ben. 8:3), an innocent mind (Wis. 4:12), or in Josephus, a healthy mind (*Ant.* 8, 23). But at the same time, the use of *nous* to translate *lēḇ* also includes the element of deliberation, sometimes almost philosophical reflection, with the aim of making a practical decision (e.g. Isa. 10:7; 41:22). An unusual use of *nous* is to translate *rûaḥ*, spirit (Isa. 40:13; cf. Jud. 8:14). But the use of *nous* for *'ōzen*, ear, may be due to a scribal error – *nous* instead of *ous*, ear (Job 33:16; 12:11).

(b) *dianoia* (c. 75 times) is also used in the LXX to translate heart. It can be used to express the idea of to oneself, in one's heart, in one's mind, and so comes to be used to express emotions and acts of will (Isa. 35:4; Exod. 35:22). It can also express the whole of one's inner life (Gen. 8:21). Occasionally it renders the Heb. *maḥᵃšāḇôṯ*, plots, plans (Dan. 11:25), and also *bînâh*, understanding (Dan. 9:22).

In the apocryphal writings *dianoia* means spirit, mind, consciousness, disposition, especially in a moral sense. God is the guide of the *dianoia* (Aristeas 238). The good, moral, pure mind can be beguiled (Test.Ben. 8:2; Test.Jud. 11:1). Philo is able to write of the *dianoia* in the same way as he does of the *nous*, that it is the divine element in man (*Det. Pot. Ins.* 29), the organ by which God is perceived (*Virt.* 57), and that which makes man immortal (*Op. Mund.* 135).

(c) *ennoia* (13 times) is used to render various Heb. words, especially in Prov. (1:4; 2:11; 3:21; 4:1; 5:2; 8:12;16:22; 18:15; 19:7;23:4, 19; 24:7; Wis. 2:14). All the Heb. equivalents mean understanding, wisdom, knowledge, and so *ennoia* retains its sense of reflection, insight, perception, wisdom, though not the theoretical meaning of concept. This latter sense is not found before Philo (*Leg. All.* 3, 234). Test. Naph. 2:5 uses it for thought; as does Philo (the *ennoia* of God, *Det. Pot. Ins.* 86).

(d) *noēma* (3 times) appears in the LXX in the sense of evil intention, plot; not as in classical Gk., concept (Sir. 21:11; Bar. 2:8; 3 Macc. 5:30).

dianoēma, on the other hand, usually in the LXX means wise thought, insight (Prov. 14:14; 15:24; Isa. 55:9; Ezek. 14:3 f.; Sir. 25:5; 32[35]:18).

(e) *anoia* (13 times) means lack of understanding, folly, especially in a moral sense (Prov. 14:8; 22:15, for *'iwwelet*; it is found again in 2 Macc. 4:6, 40; 14:5; 15:33, where it always means wickedness, and in Josephus (*Ant.* 8, 318) coupled with baseness (cf. also Job 33:23; Ps. 22[21]:2; Eccl. 11:10; Wis. 15:18; 19:3; 3 Macc. 3:16, 20).

3. (a) *noeō* (35 times) renders, along with *syniēmi* and *ginōskō*, the various forms of the Heb. *bîn*, to observe, notice, understand (e.g. Prov. 20:24; Jer. 2:10), or the Heb. *śāḵal*, understand, have insight (e.g. Prov. 1:3; Jer. 10:21).

The typical organ of understanding in the OT is the → heart (Prov. 16:23; Isa. 6:10). This implies that this understanding lies within the realm of moral decisions. In Isa. 47:7 ("you did not lay these things to heart") the LXX translates freely, and yet without changing the meaning, "you did not understand this in your heart." In Philo

noeō means to think, losing its association with sense perception (*Leg. All.* 2, 70; *Abr.* 44).

(b) *katanoeō* (30 times) is used in the LXX in the sense of to notice, regard, for the Heb. *rā'âh*, to see (Isa. 5:12; Exod. 19:21); for *nāḇaṭ* hiph., to look (e.g. Pss. 10:14[9:35]; 22[21]:17; synonymous to *blepō*, to look, Dan. 7:21; so also in Philo, *Vit. Mos.* 1, 158). The LXX translates *ṣāp̄âh*, to spy, watch, by *katanoeō* (e.g. Ps. 37[36]:32), and Josephus uses the vb. in the same way (*Ant.* 5, 5). Philo uses it in the sense of meditative reflection, in referring to the beauty of an idea (*Ebr.* 137).

(c) *anoētos* (9 times) appears in the LXX for the Heb. *'ᵉwîl* (Prov. 17:28) and *'iwweleṭ* (Prov. 15:21), foolish, without sense. Otherwise it is without Heb. equivalent (Deut. 32:31; Ps. 49[48]:12; Sir. 21:19; 42:8; 4 Macc. 5:8 f.; 8:17). It occurs alongside *mōros* (Sir. 21:19; 42:8) in a moral and religious sense: senseless, foolish.

4. (a) In Philo's writings we find all the elements of the Gk. concept of *nous*. The mysterious element of thought and understanding comes in, however, for stronger emphasis here than in classical Gk. God is the reason behind all things, the perfect world-reason. Because reason is inspired by God, it leads to the knowledge of God (*Deus Imm.* 143; *Spec.Leg.* 1, 18; *Migr.Abr.* 192). Whereas the Greeks defined reason, and looked for its origin in human powers, thus placing their emphasis upon reasoned consideration of the world, Philo was more interested in the significance of reason as a means to gain knowledge of God. More important for him than any knowledge of God gained by reason is an ecstatic knowledge of God, conveyed by God's Spirit. So long as ecstasy continues, reason must take second place (*Rer. Div. Her.* 265; *Leg.All.* 2, 31).

(b) It can be established that in intertestamental Judaism the words of this group are used with a bias towards the moral side. A religious element may be detected more clearly than in Gentile writings. At the same time Gk. anthropology exercised an influence in translation and use of terms. *nous* generally means mind, moral nature (e.g. Test.Ben. 8:3; Test.Jud. 14:2 f.).

(c) For the Qumran community understanding and insight belong only to God and his children of light. The dualistic tract 1QS 3:13–4:26 praises the mysteries of the insight and wisdom of God, which will bring to an end at the appointed time the existence of wickedness (1QS 4:18). Those who would join the community must first be tested for their insight (CD 13:11). The Hymns praise God, who has lent to his own the insight to recognize his wonders and mighty deeds (1QH 11:28; 12:13; 13:13). In the writings of the sect we find the (gnostic?) version of the Aaronic blessing: "May he lighten your heart with life-giving wisdom and grant you eternal knowledge" (1QS 2:3).

NT 1. If we consider first and foremost the frequency of the *nous* group of words in the NT, we find the same situation as in the LXX: namely, that the group does not have a central part to play in the NT as a whole. *nous* is found only 24 times, *noeō* and *katanoeō* 14 times each, and the other associated terms even less often. This statistical survey gives, however, a false impression. It is true that the concept of *nous* has only a peripheral place in the Gospels (with the partial exception later of Lk., who uses *katanoeō* 8 times) and in the later letters. On the other hand, we find that this Hellenistic terminology occurs relatively more frequently in Paul (21 of the 24 occurrences of *nous* itself are in the so-called Pauline corpus). It was Paul who

not only acted as the historical link between the early church and its Hellenistic environment, but also thought out, in his dealings with the church at Corinth, the fundamental theological relationship between faith and knowledge. Although he adopted concepts and ways of formulating problems from Hellenism, he rejected the Gk. attempts at solving them, and relegated reason to its proper and inalienable place, both limiting and freeing it by means of the Christian faith.

All in all, it may be said that the NT gives to this group of words its own interpretation. The contrast between understanding and lack of understanding becomes clearer. The whole group of words is associated more firmly with the will, and the understanding spoken of is an understanding of God and his will in salvation, an understanding of the word in scripture and preaching. Understanding itself becomes a disposition, an attitude, and thus a standpoint of faith.

2. (a) The noun *nous*, which is found in the Pauline corpus, including Eph., Col., and the Pastorals, has the meaning mind, faculty of judgment, insight (e.g. 2 Thess. 2:12). But this understanding is a religious understanding, a religious faculty of judgment, and is set along side the → conscience (Tit. 1:15). *nous* is a term parallel to → faith, which in the Pastorals means the same thing as religion: the false teachers are corrupt in their religious discernment, and not to be trusted in matters of Christian religion (2 Tim. 3:8; also 1 Tim. 6:5).

In Rom. 7:23 Paul writes, "I see in my members another law at war with the law of my *nous*". Then in v. 25 he goes on, "So I serve the law of God with my *nous* [i.e. with my understanding], but with my flesh [i.e. as flesh] I serve the law of sin." This *nous* is the same thing as the *esō anthrōpos*, the inner man, or the *egō*, the real self, which can distinguish between good and bad. The self agrees with the law, that it is good; the self wishes to fulfil the law. But against this law which the *nous* recognizes, the law of religious understanding, there fights the other law of → sin. *nous* is here the religious knowledge and insight which honours and recognizes the law of God.

The understanding, namely, the faculty of religious discernment, is what is meant in Eph. 4:18 by *dianoia*. Here we read of the darkening of the understanding – parallel, incidentally, to the futility of the *nous*. On the positive side we read of the gift of understanding, the ability to recognize religious truth: by this gift from the hand of Christ, Christians are enabled to discern him who is true, namely God (1 Jn. 5:20).

(b) *dianoia* comes very near in meaning to *nous*, and means, ability to think, faculty of knowledge, understanding, the organ of *noein*; then, mind, and particularly disposition. NT usage is quite different from that of Gk. philosophy, but correspondingly near to that of the LXX. This is shown by citations of the OT in which *dianoia* stands in parallelism to *kardia*, heart (Heb. 8:10; 10:16; from Jer. 31:33 LXX). The same combination is seen in Lk. 1:51, *hyperēphanoi dianoias kardias*, "proud in the imagination [or way of thinking] of their hearts" (cf. NEB "arrogant of heart and mind"). In the sense of understanding or mind, *dianoia* is counted among the inward powers of man (Matt. 22:36 par. Mk. 12:30; Lk. 10:27; → Command, art. *entolē* NT 1; → Hear, art. *akouō* NT 3). On the other hand, *dianoia* can in some contexts mean the power of the disposition or the will, and thus acquire a religious flavour. It is the spiritual consciousness, the disposition, the attitude of faith. This consciousness can be sincere (2 Pet. 3:1). It can also be hostile (Col. 1:21). It can be

figuratively girded up, like the loins, i.e. when a person begins to think actively (1 Pet. 1:13).

(c) Similarly, *ennoia* is used in the NT neither in a gnostic nor in a philosophical sense, e.g. in the sense of concept. In the sense of thought, it is found alongside *enthymēsis*, consideration, again in biblical fashion with the gen. *tēs kardias*, of the heart (Heb. 4:12). The Christians are exhorted to arm themselves with the same thought, with which Christ was filled when he suffered (1 Pet. 4:1).

(d) *noēma* is found only in Paul (5 times in 2 Cor., once in Phil.). Even here we find a religious sense: the understanding of the divine will concerning salvation, the thinking concerned with this. This thinking can be corrupted, so that it no longer concerns itself simply with Christ (2 Cor. 11:3). It can be hardened and made inaccessible to God's word and the understanding of scripture (2 Cor. 3:14). It can become blind, so that it no longer perceives the illumination which comes from the gospel of the glory of Christ, and leads only to unbelief (2 Cor. 4:4). The → apostle, in the authority of his position and his commission, makes it his business to take every thought captive, so that it will submit, not to the apostle, but to Christ (2 Cor. 10:5). *noēma* is thus the general faculty of judgment, which can take decisions and pronounce verdicts right or wrong, depending on the influences to which it is exposed. In 2 Cor. 2:11 the plur. refers to the designs of Satan. At the climax of Phil. Paul urges his readers to continual rejoicing, forbearance and freedom from anxiety by committing everything to God in prayer. He then adds: "And the peace of God, which passes all understanding, will keep your hearts and your minds in Christ Jesus" (Phil. 4:7).

(e) *dianoēma* appears only in Lk. 11:17, where it refers to hostile thoughts. The par. in Matt. 12:25 uses *enthymēseis*, thoughts, considerations, and refers to the → Pharisees (cf. 11:24).

(f) *anoia* is lack of understanding, non-recognition, the absence of *nous* and *dianoia*. Those without understanding have no comprehension of Jesus' action towards a sick man on the → Sabbath (Lk. 6:11). They are without understanding of the saving work of God in Christ. The folly of false teachers will come to light (2 Tim. 3:9).

3. (a) *noeō* means to perceive, recognize in a religious sense, with especial reference to God, his acts and his will. The juxtaposition of *noeō* and *kardia*, heart, in the quotation from Isa. 6:9–10, shows that *noeō* is regarded as an activity of the heart, a spiritual recognition (Jn. 12:40). The invisible is perceived, but not in a mystic vision: rather the visible expression of the invisible is thought through, in a kind of process of reflexion leading from the creation to the Creator. "Ever since the creation of the world his invisible nature [*ta ... aorata autou*], namely, his eternal power and deity, has been clearly perceived [*nooumena kathoratai*] in the things that have been made. So they are without excuse" (Rom. 1:20; → God, art. *theos* NT 4(b)). The invisible is seen as something recognized. Knowledge of the infinite God is reached through the finite order. Similarly, Wis. 13:4 calls on men to reflect on the beauty and power of nature: "But if men were amazed at their power and working, let them perceive from them how more powerful is he who formed them." Ultimately this recognition is dependent upon → faith. That the world was created by the word of God, only faith can perceive (Heb. 11:3).

The parenthetical expression, "let the reader understand", Matt. 24:15, calling the

reader of the synoptic apocalypse to understand the text aright, uses *noeō* in the sense of an understanding of the divine plan of salvation. The church has the spiritual understanding (*synesis*) of the divine, secret plan, which the apostle proclaims in his writings (Eph. 3:4).

(b) The use of *katanoeō*, to see and perceive, inspect, follows a similar pattern (Lk. 6:41 par. Matt. 7:3). The speck in the brother's eye is seen, but the log in one's own eye has to be noticed and observed. Lk. 20:23 shows that *katanoein* includes what goes on behind the scenes. In the same way, Heb. 3:1 means that it is not the outward figure of Jesus that we should look to, but what he really is, as the emissary of God, as the real High Priest, and as the proper object of Christian faith. Christians are exhorted to pay attention to one another, i.e. to focus their attention on their standing as Christians, working itself out in love, good works and mutual fellowship (Heb. 10:24).

(c) The *anoētos* is the man who is lacking in understanding, knowledge, instruction, spiritual insight, the foolish man (Rom. 1:14), the opposite to the *sophos*, wise. The Galatians, who do not understand the freedom which their salvation has given them, are *anoētoi*, foolish (Gal. 3:1, 3), as are the disciples who do not understand God's plan of salvation, embracing as it does the death of Jesus. Their lack of understanding is in connection with the OT and its promises (Lk. 24:25). Foolishness here consists in deficient spiritual understanding of the good will of God.

(d) *dysnoētos*, hard to understand, occurs only once in the NT (2 Pet. 3:16), where it refers to difficult passages in the letters of Paul.

4. (a) The understanding of the *nous* has particular reference to the OT scriptures. The risen Christ opened the minds of the disciples that they might understand the scriptures (Lk. 24:45). The man with understanding is the one who knows the real meaning of the scriptures and the ways in which God manifests himself there; in other words, the one who knows the → secrets of the divine plan (Rev. 13:18; 17:9). Here *nous* and *sophia*, understanding and → wisdom, are interchangeable terms. It is the divine wisdom which has been given to the spiritual.

(b) *nous theou* is God's plan of salvation itself, which it is so important to know. Rom. 11:34 speaks of the *nous* of God, of his plan of salvation, the divine intention: "Who has known the mind of the Lord? " (cf. Isa. 40:13 f.). Again, in 1 Cor. 2:16 we read of the *nous* of the Lord, of his intention to save, his thoughts and plans, also quoting Isa. 40:13 (→ Council, art. *symbouleuō*). After the quotation Paul continues: *noun Christou echomen*, "we have the mind of Christ". This is in keeping with the thought in 1 Cor. 2:12, that Christians have received the Spirit from God, in order that they may know what God has given them. In this context we should also consider Paul's remarks about speaking in tongues, which are reminiscent of Philo. The one who speaks in tongues is filled with the Spirit. The Spirit prays but the mind "is unfruitful" (1 Cor. 14:14). In the same passage Paul contrasts speaking with the mind and speaking in tongues (14:19). It must not be overlooked that speaking with the mind is also the gift and work of the Spirit. Even where the Spirit and the mind are separated (14:14), it is only a matter of two different modes of operation of the Spirit. In v. 14 *pneuma* is used in a narrower sense, of → ecstasy brought on by the Spirit, which is contrasted with the mind, in which the Spirit is also at work. What is described in v. 24, the conviction of the outsider when he comes into the Christian assembly, is a conscious experience, the result of the comprehensible prophetic

charisma. On the intercession of the Spirit and tongues → Prayer, art. *entynchanō*.

(c) *nous* in the sense of right understanding leads to a right attitude of mind. The heathen have a foolish attitude of mind because they lack right knowledge (Eph. 4:17). Christians, on the other hand, must be renewed in the spirit of their mind (Eph. 4:23). The Spirit upholds and fills the mind of the Christian. The hortatory part of the epistle to the Romans begins with the command to be transformed by the renewing of the mind (Rom. 12:2). Everyone is to be convinced in his decisions and his knowledge (Rom. 14:5). Paul appeals to the Corinthians, beset by divisions, to continue in one mind and opinion (1 Cor. 1:10). *G. Harder*

σύνεσις

σύνεσις (*synesis*), faculty of comprehension, understanding, insight; συνίημι (*syniēmi*), perceive, comprehend, understand; συνετός (*synetos*), quick at apprehending, understanding, intelligent; ἀσύνετος (*asynetos*), senseless, foolish.

CL This group of words is common in classical Gk. literature, the vb. and noun being attested since Homer, the adj. *synetos* and its opposite *asynetos* since Theognis and Hdt. The vb. *syniēmi* originally meant to bring together (Homer, *Il.* 1, 8); this simple meaning is not found in the NT. Figuratively, *syniēmi* means to perceive, take notice of, understand, see into, comprehend. The word thus signifies, first, perception, then, taking note of, and finally, grasping, in the sense of understanding – though the latter meaning does not occur before Heraclitus.

The noun *synesis* means, first, a joining (of rivers, Homer *Od.* 10, 515); then, in a transferred sense, the faculty of apprehension, understanding, judgment, insight, comprehension. The term is distinguished from other related terms in Aristotle, *Eth. Nic.* 6, 11; but neither the vb. nor the noun acquired any great philosophical importance.

The adj. *synetos* means quick at apprehending, understanding, clever; passively, intelligible; and the opposite is *asynetos*, stupid or unintelligible.

OT In the LXX the words of this group occur frequently, the noun and the vb. being found about 100 times each, the adj. 53 times, though the negative adj. is much rarer (11 times). As one might expect, they are found most frequently in the Wisdom literature. The most important Heb. equivalents are *bîn*, to observe, notice, understand, and its derivatives.

It is a characteristic of the meaning of this group of words that they are used mostly in connexion with sayings about → Wisdom. *synesis*, understanding, insight (Gk. translation of Heb. *bînâh* or *tᵉḇûnâh* in the same sense), and *sophia*, wisdom (for Heb. *ḥoḵmâh* in the same sense), are used together (e.g. Isa. 11:2; 29:14; Job 12:13; Sir. 1:19 f.; and especially in the programmatic texts Prov. 1:7 par. Ps. 111[110]:10; Prov. 2:1 ff.; 9:10). Other words used synonymously or in parallelism complete the picture: in Isa. 43:10 we find "know" and "believe" next to "understand". The object of this knowledge is the fact that God is God (e.g. Jer. 9:24; note the contrast with human wisdom in v. 23, cf. also the LXX text of 1 Sam. 2:10). "Fear of the LORD", "justice and righteousness", "good and evil" are named as the objects of insight (Prov. 2:5, 9; 9:10; 1 Ki. 3:9, 11). From this it may be concluded that in later wis-

dom teaching insight is not understood as a faculty open to every man. This was how the older proverbial wisdom thought of wisdom and understanding (G. von Rad, *Wisdom in Israel*, 1972, 53–73). But when they became linked closely to the objects of knowledge just mentioned, the terms became more narrowly defined. Since the knowledge of God is always associated with God's revelatory activity, insight can ultimately be understood only as a gift of God which he imparts in response to man's request (1 Ki. 3:9; Dan. 2:21; Ps. 119[118]:34, 73, 125), but can also withdraw because of men's disobedience (Isa. 29:14). Under the influence of OT ideas, the definition of the term can change in the world of Hel. Judaism: e.g. *asynetos* can mean a lack of apprehension but also of moral insight (Sir. 15:7; Josephus, *War* 6, 170).

NT In the NT these words are found less frequently than in the LXX. The vb. occurs only in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts, in quotations from the LXX at Rom. 3:11 and 15:21, and otherwise 2 Cor. 10:12 and Eph. 5:17; the noun only 7 times altogether (once in a quotation); and the adj. and its opposite only very occasionally in the Synoptic Gospels, and only in quotations in Paul. The words are not present in John's Gospel or the Johannine Epistles (though the ideas are present in Jn. 12:37–41). The OT idea that insight is a gift of God and is linked with his revelation reappears in the NT usage. This is clear from the fact that the terms we are discussing appear in important passages in quotations from the OT, or in loose connection with such quotations (Isa. 6:9 f. in Matt. 13:13 par. Mk. 4:12; Lk. 9:10; cf. Matt. 13:15; Mk. 8:17 f., 21; Acts 28:26 f.; Deut. 6:5 in Mk. 12:33; Ps. 14:2 in Rom. 3:11; Deut. 32:21 in Rom. 10:19; Isa. 52:15 in Rom. 15:21; Isa. 29:14 in 1 Cor. 1:19).

1. In the Synoptic Gospels the most important passages are those which are concerned with the theme of the so-called "messianic secret" (→ Secret).

(a) Mark records the disciples' lack of understanding regarding the words and actions of Jesus (6:52; 7:18; 8:17, 21; in 8:18 with direct reference to Isa. 6:9 f. or Jer. 5:21; and the same idea expressed with other vbs. in Mk. 4:40 f.; 9:10, 32). This gives expression to the thought that the biographical nearness of the disciples to Jesus is not alone sufficient to guarantee understanding. Jesus' work is understood in retrospect in the light of Easter. It is the → faith which the gospel stimulates and which God gives that leads the church into insight.

The so-called "parable theory" of Mk. 4:10–12 serves to press home the same point. Here the conflict between Jesus' teaching by parables, with its aim of illumination and understanding, and Mk's concept of the secret messiahship of Jesus, is solved by the assertion that the works of Jesus become revelation to those who believe. Therefore they are given the secret of the kingdom of God. To "those who are without" everything is said in parables. Because they do not understand these, they are unable to turn and be saved (→ Parable, art. *parabolē* NT 7). Here again Isa. 6:9 f. is cited (v. 12).

(b) A comparison of the Matthean parallels with the passages in Mk. indicates that Matt. adopts a somewhat different emphasis. This is true not only of the so-called "parable theory" but also of the disciples' lack of understanding.

The failure of the disciples to understand the parables is not for Matt. paramount.

At the end of the parabolic discourse reports Jesus asks the disciples, "Have you understood all this? " Matt. reports the answer "Yes" (Matt. 13:51). The statement of Mk. 6:52, which attributes their lack of insight to hardness of heart, is passed over in the Matthean version and replaced by an exclamation of worship, praising Jesus as the Son of God (Matt. 14:33). The discussion of → leaven (Mk. 8:14–21, par. Matt. 16:5–12), which ends in Mk. with the accusing question, "Do you not yet understand? ", leads in Matt. to the final understanding of the disciples. H. Conzelmann sees a "psychologising trend" in Matt. (*TDNT* VII 895) which displays a greater interest in the disciples' understanding than Mk. Mk. presents the material as a problem; Matt. presents the problem and at the same time shows how the disciples came to understand. But he does not minimize the fact that understanding is a divine gift (cf. Matt. 16:16 ff.; 17:5 ff.).

(c) In Luke many of the passages under discussion are missing, or have been greatly shortened (e.g. the parable theory in Lk. 8:9 f.). In Lk. 18:34 the disciples' lack of understanding is emphasized particularly in regard to the passion prediction of Jesus. In Lk. 2:47 the insight of Jesus at twelve years of age is the subject of amazement, and there is no doubt that insight is here regarded as a gift of God – just as in Lk. 2:50 his parents' failure to understand must be seen as the exact opposite. On the other hand, it is the risen Christ who enables the downcast disciples on the Emmaus road to understand the scriptures and to grasp the fact that his sufferings were foreordained by God (Lk. 24:45).

Finally, in Acts 28:26 f., Isa. 6:9 f. is cited as the explanation for the unwillingness and inability of the Jews in Rome to understand (cf. Jn. 12:40, where *noeō* is used instead of *syniēmi*). Along with the LXX, the writer of Acts has changed the imperative "harden" of the prophetic word into the indicative "hardened", simply describing the refusal of the people. It is thus indicated that, although insight is a gift of God, lack of insight must be regarded as culpable (→ Hard; → Blind).

2. In Paul the use of these words is again affected by OT concepts, especially since in the majority of cases it is in quotations from the OT or allusions to OT phrases (Rom. 3:11 = Ps. 14:2; Rom. 10:19 = Deut. 32:21; Rom. 15:21 = Isa. 52:15; 1 Cor. 1:19 = Isa. 29:14). Whether lack of insight is being condemned (Rom. 3:11), or God's wrath pronounced over the arrogance of those who believe themselves to be wise (1 Cor. 1:19), or whether the subject is the universality of the message of salvation (Rom. 10:19; 15:21), insight is always seen as a gift of God and lack of insight as not merely a chance lack of knowledge. The latter is a sign that a man in his deepest being rejects God ("their senseless minds were darkened", Rom. 1:21). Thus in the Pauline passages the context emphasizes more strongly than in the Synoptic Gospels that lack of insight must be regarded as culpable behaviour. *asynetos*, having no insight, "foolish" (RSV), appears among the list of evils in Rom. 1:31. Similarly the connexion between understanding and knowledge is more obvious than in the Synoptic Gospels (e.g. 1 Cor. 1:19; Rom. 1:21 f.).

3. In the later Pauline literature we find not only the familiar ideas (insight as a gift, 2 Tim. 2:7), but also a new emphasis arising because of the connexion of these words with the concept of mystery. Fullness of understanding is given in the revelation of the → secret of God in Christ, in whom all the treasures of → wisdom and → knowledge lie hidden (Col. 2:2 f.). We may compare Eph. 3:4, where the content of the mystery of Christ is, in keeping with the wider context of the thought in Eph.,

associated with the church. In these epistles the nearness of this group of words to the concept of wisdom is again obvious (Col. 1:9; 2:2; Eph. 5:17; cf. v. 15).

J. Goetzmann

→ Conscience, → Faith, → Knowledge, → Man, → Mind, → Secret, → Think, → Truth, → Wisdom

(a). G. Barth, "Matthew's Understanding of the Law", in G. Bornkamm, G. Barth and H. J. Held, *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew*, 1963, 58–164; K. Barth, *Anselm: Fides Quaerens Intellectum; Anselm's Proof of the Existence of God in the Context of his Theological Scheme*, 1960; J. Behm and E. Würthwein, *noeō* etc., *TDNT* IV 948–1022; B. Blanshard, *Reason and Analysis*, 1962; and *Reason and Belief, Based on Gifford Lectures at St Andrews and Noble Lectures at Harvard*, 1974; G. Bornkamm, "Faith and Reason in Paul's Epistles", *NTS* 4, 1957–58, 93–100; and "The Revelation of God's Wrath (Romans 1–3)", in *Early Christian Experience*, 1969, 47–70; R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, I, 1952, 211–20; and "Romans 7 and the Anthropology of Paul", in *Existence and Faith*, (1961) 1964, 173–85; H. Conzelmann, *syniēmi* etc., *TDNT* VII 888–96; and *An Outline Theology of the New Testament*, 1969, 180 f.; A. C. Ewing, *Reason and Intuition*, 1942; W. Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament*, II, 1967, 118–50; N. S. F. Ferré, *Reason in Religion*, 1963; S. Freud, *The Future of an Illusion*, 1928; K. von Fritz, "*Noos* and *noein* in the Homeric Poems", *Classical Philology* 38, 1943, 79 ff.; and "*Nous, noein* and their Derivatives in Pre-Socratic Philosophy (excluding Anaxagoras), Part I, From the Beginning to Parmenides", *Classical Philology* 40, 1945, 223 ff.; H.-G. Gadamer, "The Power of Reason", *Man and World* 3, 1970, 5–15; W. K. C. Guthrie, *A History of Greek Philosophy*, I *The Earlier Presocratics and the Pythagoreans*, 1962; II *The Presocratic Tradition from Parmenides to Democritus*, 1965; III *The Fifth-Century Enlightenment*, 1969 (see indexes under *nous*); R. Jewett, *Paul's Anthropological Terms: A Study of their Use in Conflict Settings, Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Christentums* 10, 1971, 358–90; D. W. Kemmler, *Faith and Human Reason: A Study of Paul's Method of Preaching as Illustrated by 1–2 Thessalonians and Acts 17, 2–4, Supplements to NovT* 40, 1975; L. Koehler, *Hebrew Man*, 1956, 115–48; and *Old Testament Theology*, 1957, 99–126; J. L. Martyn, "Epistemology at the Turn of the Ages: 2 Cor. 5:16", in W. R. Farmer, C. F. D. Moule and R. R. Niebuhr, eds., *Christian History and Interpretation. Studies Presented to John Knox*, 1967, 269–87; A. E. Murphy, *The Uses of Reason*, 1943; E. Nagel, *Sovereign Reason*, 1954; W. Pannenberg, "Faith and Reason", in *Basic Questions in Theology*, II, 1971, 46–64; G. von Rad, *Wisdom in Israel*, 1972; N. H. G. Robinson, "Reason and Religion", *SJT* 23, 1970, 338–48; B. Russell, *Skeptical Essays*, 1928; G. Santayana, *The Life of Reason*, 1954; B. Snell, *The Discovery of the Mind: The Greek Origins of European Thought*, 1953 (the Ger. translation *Die Entdeckung des Geistes*, 1955[3] contains additional material); W. H. Walsh, *Reason and Experience*, 1947; G. J. Warnock, "Reason", in P. Edwards, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, VII, 1967, 83 ff.; A. N. Whitehead, *The Function of Reason*, 1929; R. N. Whybray, *The Intellectual Tradition in the Old Testament, BZAW* 135, 1974; H. W. Wolff, *Anthropology of the Old Testament*, 1974, 46–55.

(b). P. Bonnard, "L'Intelligence chez Saint Paul", in *L'Évangile Hier et Aujourd'hui*, Festschrift F. J. Leenhardt, 1968, 13 ff.; A. Fridrichsen, "Zur Auslegung von Römer 1.19 f.", *ZNW* 17, 1916, 159 ff.; H.-J. Iwand, *Glauben und Wissen, Nachgelassene Werke*, I, ed. H. Gollwitzer, 1962, 17 ff.; H. J. Krämer, *Der Ursprung der Geistesmetaphysik*, 1964; W. G. Kümmel, *Römer 7 und die Bekehrung des Paulus, Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament* 17, 1929; J. Kürzinger, "Der Schlüssel zum Verständnis von Römer 7", *BZ* Neue Folge 7, 1963, 270–74; B. Lohse, "Vernunft", *EKL* III 1649 ff.; H. Lüdemann, *Die Anthropologie des Apostels Paulus und ihre Stellung innerhalb seiner Heilslehre. Nach den vier Hauptbriefen*, 1873; O. Moe, "Vernunft and Geist im Neuen Testament", *ZSTh* 11, 1934, 351 ff.; K. Oehler, "Vernunft und Verstand", *RGG*[3] VI 1364 ff.; and *Die Lehre vom noetischen und dianoetischen Denken bei Platon und Aristoteles*, 1962; H. Ott, "Glaube und Vernunft", *TLZ* 92, 1967, 401 ff.; O. Sander, "Leib-Seele Dualismus im Alten Testament?", *ZAW* 77, 1965, 329 ff.; R. Schottlaender, "*Nous* als Terminus", *Hermes* 64, 1929, 239 ff.; G. Schrenk, "Geist und Enthusiasmus", in *Wort und Geist. Festschrift K. Heim*, 1934, 75 ff. (reprinted in *Studien zu Paulus, AThANT* 26, 1954, 107 ff.); T. Simon, *Die Psychologie des Apostels Paulus*, 1897; B. Snell, "Wie die Griechen lernten, was geistige Tätigkeit ist", *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 93, 1973, 172–84; J. Stenzel, "Zur Entwicklung des Geistesbegriffes in der griechischen Philosophie", *Antike* 1, 1925, 244 ff.; P. Stuhlmacher, "Glauben und Verstehen bei Paulus", *EvTh* 26, 1966, 337 ff.; G. Teichmüller, *Neue Studien zur Geschichte der Begriffe*, I–III (1876–79) 1965 (see index under *nous*); E. Weber, "Die

Beziehungen von Römer 1–3 zur Missionspraxis des Paulus", *BFChTh*, 9, 1905, 86 ff.; H. H. Wendt, *Die Begriffe Fleisch und Geist im biblischen Sprachgebrauch*, 1878.

Recompense, Reward, Gain, Wages

The following article brings together several Gk. words. The group associated with *apodidōmi* conveys the idea of recompense. The word *misthos* is taken from commercial life and originally denoted the payment made to a worker, but since Hellenistic times it was also used in religious contexts. *opsōnion*, on the other hand, is a term drawn from military circles, meaning the soldier's rations, then payment for military service, and finally the salary of a government official. *kerdos* is the word with the widest meaning. It suggests the consequences of payment: profit, advantage, gain. Since advantage and disadvantage and profit and loss belong together as opposites, *zēmia* (loss) is discussed together with *kerdos*.

ἀποδίδωμι

ἀποδίδωμι (*apodidōmi*), give away, give up, give back, sell, give back what is due, recompense; ἀνταποδίδωμι (*antapodidōmi*), give back, repay, return, requite, pay back in his own coin; ἀνταπόδοσις (*antapodosis*), repaying, reward, recompense; ἀνταπόδομα (*antapodoma*), repayment, requital, recompense.

CL *apodidōmi*, attested in general Gk. usage from the time of Homer, means primarily to give up, render (Diod. Sic. 14, 84, 2), or, to give back (Xen., *Hell.* 2, 2, 9). In the mid. it means accordingly to sell. Hence it acquired the specific meaning of giving something up which one must give up because of some kind of obligation (thus to pay out a wage, Xen., *Anab.* 1, 2, 12; to pay one's vow, Xen., *Mem.* 2, 2, 10). This gives the word the technical sense to render, requite, in both good and bad senses (Dion. Hal., 6, 73). The compound form *antapodidōmi* and its derivatives express this meaning of the word still more definitely in the Hellenistic period. In the article which follows we shall concentrate on the idea of recompense, since it is here that the term has relevance theologically.

OT 1. In the OT act and consequence are firmly linked like cause and effect. The reward arises out of the action done, like the harvest from the act of sowing (e.g. Job 8:7; Prov. 22:8; cf. Gal. 6:7 ff.). The concept of a personal judge and recompenser is present here in so far as God is the one who maintains this order and allows the action to return upon the doer (Heb. *hēšîḇ*, hiph. of Heb. *šûḇ*, return, i.e. cause to return, requite, 1 Sam. 26:23 f; 2 Sam. 16:8). As such, he avenges wrongdoing (*nāqam*, Jer. 15:15). Man's responsibility before God is expressed clearly by the root *pāqaḏ*, to visit (→ Bishop, art. *episkopos* OT): God keeps a watch over his servants, recognizing right actions and inflicting punishment upon the wicked (Hos. 1:4; 4:9, 14; 8:13; 9:7; Amos 3:14). The most important term for recompense is, however, *šālēm* in the piel, which means to restore, repay, pay damages (cf. Exod. 22). In legal, judicial usage it comes to mean to requite, because the judge so to speak repays a claim which a person has earned by his action either on the good side (reward) or on the bad (punishment). This is especially clear in Prov. 19:17. Reward and → punishment correspond to the action of the one being judged (cf. Jdg. 1:7; 2 Sam. 3:39; Ps. 62:12; Jer. 25:14; 50:29).

2. The idea of recompense is found first and foremost as a concept characteristic of the theology of the OT, in the negative sense of God's punishment for the dis-

obedience of Israel. God punishes the people as a whole. Ezekiel was the first to declare that no man will die on account of another's sin (Ezek. 18). God requites his people for their unfaithfulness. This is not despite his → election of them; rather they are responsible to him because they have been "known" by God (Amos 3:2). It is their faithlessness to the → covenant between God and his people which is the cause of their punishment. Deut. is the first book to speak of a "reward" for the faithful (Deut. 28). The Deuteronomic history (Jdg.-2 Ki.) finds in the recompense of God the key to understanding the history of Israel. This is set out programmatically in Jdg. 2:6 ff.

3. In the intertestamental period the idea of recompense came to be related exclusively to the → law. The latter is no longer anchored in the historic event of the old covenant; it is no longer a set of instructions on how to remain within the grace of the covenant. It becomes an absolute norm, according to which each person's actions are assessed and by means of which one hopes to attain to salvation (which is seen as altogether other-worldly and in the future). Recompense is now no longer simply the punishment of faithlessness and apostasy; it also determines who has succeeded in reaching the height of fellowship with God by means of his good → works. The OT by contrast regarded → fellowship with God as a free gift, which had come to the people by grace in the deliverance from Egypt and the bestowal of the land of Canaan. Now judgment, recompense, and salvation or condemnation are transferred completely into the future. The present state of salvation, which for the OT consisted in living in the promised land, became lost in the hardships of the people from the time of the Babylonian captivity. This legalistic understanding of recompense leads the LXX to translate the Heb. equivalents into the legal terms *antapodidōmi*, to requite, and *antapodoma*, requital.

NT 1. In the NT *apodidōmi* occurs 43 times, predominantly in Matt. (18 times), Lk. (12 times) and Paul (8 times). As with the Hellenistic writers, the whole wide range of the word is represented: to hand over (Matt. 27:58); to give back (Lk. 4:20); to sell (Acts 5:8, mid.); to pay what has been agreed or to fulfil an agreed obligation (Matt. 20:8); to pay a debt (Matt. 18:23 ff.); to perform what one has sworn to do (Matt. 5:33); and then especially, to forgive. The vb. is not found in Jn. In the sense of to recompense, it occurs chiefly in Matt. and Paul, but also in Rev.; in the sense of to restore, in Lk.

antapodidōmi (7 times; of which 4 are in Paul, 2 in Lk.) fits into the same pattern. It emphasizes the character of what is given in return. *antapodoma* and *antapodosis* are used in reference to the divine recompense (Lk. 14:12; Rom. 11:9) at the final judgment (Col. 3:24).

2. Theologically *apodidōmi* has its home in the NT expectation of → judgment and → punishment. Jesus proclaimed the final judgment as being at hand and summoned men to repentance. The NT concept of recompense can best be illustrated from a passage like Mk. 8:38: "For whoever is ashamed of me and my words in this adulterous and sinful generation, of him will the Son of man also be ashamed, when he comes in the glory of his Father with the holy angels" (par. Lk. 9:26). As in the OT, it is a person's attitude to the Lord (in the NT Jesus Christ), our faithfulness towards him, that determines our fate on the last day. This is the meaning of the parable of the last judgment in Matt. 25:31–46. Here the ultimate criterion is the

behaviour of men towards Christ, even though this attitude is expressed also in their relationships with their neighbours. In the same way John can identify the → work which will be approved at the judgment with faith (Jn. 6:29), and conversely describe unbelief simply as sin (Jn. 16:9; cf. 12:48). Recompense, then, is not a matter of the reckoning up and weighing against each other of individual works; the decisive factor is whether we are true to Jesus and his word, whether we confess him or reject him. This is corroborated by Heb. 10:26–30, with its insistent warning against apostasy and leaving the new covenant, for fear of recompense. "For we know him who said, 'Vengeance is mine, I will repay [*emoi ekdikēsis, egō antapodōsō*].' And again, 'The Lord will judge his people' " (quoting Deut. 32:35 f.). The NT, like the OT, thinks in terms of a covenant already established, fellowship already firmly fixed, and expects recompense to operate against those who withdraw from Jesus Christ.

3. This gives us the background of the NT use of *apodidōmi*. Man is responsible to his heavenly Judge, whether he is a Christian or an unbeliever (Rom. 2:6; cf. 1 Cor. 3:13 ff.; 2 Cor. 5:10). *apodidōmi* does not imply an evaluation of human works on the basis of some inherent moral worth in the works themselves, even where reference is made to an *apodidōmi* according to works (Matt. 16:27; Rom. 2:6; 2 Tim. 4:14; Rev. 22:12). The works are rather the expression either of opposition to Christ, or of agreement and faith; in them is manifested either allegiance to the new covenant, which causes the Christian to be obedient to his Lord and to be his disciple, or the unbeliever's state of rejection.

A passage which is particularly instructive in this context is Rev. 20:11–15 on the final judgment. All men are judged according to their works, which are recorded in books which have been opened (v. 12). When it comes, however, to the book of life (vv. 12, 15), the pattern of recompense is no longer carried through consistently. The believers are withdrawn from the judgment. Through → election they have a → righteousness which leads to life. For them the recompense consists of the "inheritance" which God gives (cf. Col. 3:24). Since recompense comes with the final judgment, Christians are forbidden to wreak their own vengeance in the present age (Rom. 12:17; 1 Thess. 5:15; 1 Pet. 3:9). On the question of human merit → *misthos* below.

P. C. Böttger

κέρδος

κέρδος (*kerdos*), gain; *κερδαίνω* (*kerdainō*), to gain; *ζημία* (*zēmia*), damage, disadvantage, forfeit, loss; *ζημιόομαι* (*zēmioomai*), suffer damage, loss, forfeit.

CL *kerdos*, gain, profit, advantage; more rarely used in Gk. for clever advice, cunning attacks; and in the plur. deceit, a frequent meaning from Homer onwards. The vb. *kerdainō* means to make to profit or gain an advantage, gain something or somebody for something; it can also mean to spare or avoid (e.g. in Acts 27:21), since avoiding loss brings a gain.

The opposite of *kerdos* is *zēmia*, disadvantage, loss, and (occasionally) punishment. The opposite of *kerdainō* is accordingly *zēmioomai*, suffer loss, attested only after Homer. These contrasting pairs are brought together in Matt. 16:26 and Phil. 3:7.

OT Although neither *kerdos* nor *kerdainō* (which can be traced back to Hesiod) is

used in the LXX, the OT and LXX both use careful periphrases for profit, making the following distinctions.

1. Gains which are unjustly acquired or striven for are termed Heb. *beṣa'*, unjust gain, robbery, booty, profit (Gen. 37:26; Exod. 18:21; Jdg. 5:19; Ps. 119:36; Isa. 33:15; 56:11; 57:17; Jer. 22:17; 51:13; Ezek. 22:13; 33:31). The corresponding vb. *bāṣa'* means to cut to pieces, plunder, make a profit (cf. Ps. 10:3; Prov. 1:19; Jer. 6:13; 8:10). The LXX, keeping the general sense, translates the idea by *anomia*, lawlessness, *adikia*, unrighteousness, *anoma*, lawless things (cf. Prov. 1:19; 28:16; Isa. 33:15; Jer. 6:13 "everybody is out for gain").

2. Gain as a *yiṯrōn*, advantage or profit = LXX *perisseia*, surplus, abundance (→ Fullness, art. *perisseuō*). The Preacher is the only one to enquire about profit in life and to deny it critically (Eccl. 2:11); there is nothing of any profit under the sun (cf. Eccl. 1:3; 3:9; 5:15 with 2:13; 3:19; 5:8, 15; 6:8; 7:11 f. [12 f.]; 10:10 f.).

3. To gain, as a translation of *yā'al* (hiph.), means to have an advantage or bring a profit: "What advantage have I?" (Job 35:3; cf. 21:15). The LXX translates gain, advantage by *ōpheleia.*

NT In the NT *kerdos* is found only 3 times, all in Paul. *kerdainō* occurs 16 times, of which the following are particularly important theologically: Matt. 16: 26 par. Mk. 8:36, Lk. 9:25; Matt. 25:16 ff.; Phil. 3:8; 1 Cor. 9:19 ff.

1. The NT is critically opposed to the normal economic orientation of profit in so far as profit is looked for out of selfish motives. Tit. 1:11 is directed against teachers of false doctrine from Crete who were spreading abroad ideas with an eye to their own advantage. They teach "for base gain" (cf. also the warnings to the leaders and deacons of the congregation in 1 Tim. 3:8; Tit. 1:17; 1 Pet. 5:2). Anyone who is out for gain and whose view of life is dominated by the profit-motive falls into an arrogant self-centredness, and thus into sin (Jas. 4:13). Matt. 16:26 par. Mk. 8:36, Lk. 9:25 give a similar warning against finding a basis for one's life by means of self-preservation. It is no use securing the lordship of the world and all its powers, if one's life is forfeited. The most important thing that a man has is his life; but paradoxically he must lose it in order to gain it.

2. Paul develops a positive understanding of gain in Phil. 1:21, and in Phil. 2:5 ff. distinguishes it from the values that men put on life. He recounts his own privileges, both inherited and acquired, such as his circumcision and membership of the chosen people, his conduct in life and his faithful adherence to the law. The historical and moral advantages of this sort, which had been his "gain" (*kerdos*), had become, for the sake of Christ, total loss (*zēmia*), because they were bound by the law of reputation and achievement, and conferred none of the "righteousness from God" (Phil. 3:9). Paul, therefore, regards human gains as losses, in order to gain Christ and be found in him. The gain of Christ is the ultimate good. Death itself is therefore a "gain" (Phil. 1:21), since it marks the end of the life of martyrdom and leads to life with Christ. Simply to come to Christ and to be with him is gain.

3. Allied with this is the particular meaning that gaining takes on in the language of mission. Paul conceives of his missionary commission as a "gaining". In 1 Cor. 9:19 he declares: "For though I am free from all men, I have made myself a slave to all, that I may win [*kerdēsō*] the more." Winning or gaining here corresponds with "saving" in 1 Cor. 9:22; this is the goal of missionary work.

Matt. 18:15 exhorts people to encourage, and so "gain", the brother who has fallen into sin, through their pastoral care and concern. In 1 Pet. 3:1 wives are to "win" their husbands who do not obey the word simply by their behaviour.

4. By contrast with reward (→ *misthos*), which is paid out or earned as recompense for work done or for certain human behaviour, gain comes from the hidden work of Christ. In order to gain "talents" (Matt. 25:16 ff.), whether they be understood as men or Christ, one needs his gifts and his commissioning. Only through him does life reach its goal: only in him is the *perisseia* which the Preacher searched for in vain – the full measure of God's grace and his gift of righteousness (Rom. 5:17). *B. Siede*

μισθός

μισθός (*misthos*), pay, wages, reward; μισθόω (*misthoō*), hire; μισθωτός (*misthōtos*), hired servant; μίσθωμα (*misthōma*), contract price, rent; μίσθιος (*misthios*), hired servant; μισθαποδοσία (*misthapodosia*), recompense; μισθαποδότης (*misthapodotēs*), one who pays wages, a rewarder.

CL The noun *misthos* can be traced from Homer onwards in the sense of reward for work. But as well as workers, soldiers (Thuc.), orators, doctors or actors (Xen., Plato) may also receive *misthos*. The word occurs mainly in industrial or commercial contexts. More rarely, pictorial examples can be found of good fortune being given to men as a reward for their ethical endeavours (Pindar, Isoc., Plato). In the religious sphere, *misthos* was not used, since Gk. religion did not rest on the basis of rewards. In general, too, it was not reward that was the goal of ethical endeavour, but → honour (→ Glory, art. *timē*). Happiness (*eudaimonia*, a word not found in the NT, originally referring to the presence of good spirits), was not something one received as a gift; one gained it through *aretē*, → virtue. Striving for righteousness or justice was only a part of the total endeavour to find *aretē*, as Socrates first pointedly expounded. Socrates also delineated the concept of "the Good" (*agathos*), in which the → good man is one whose life is directed towards the Good (*agathon*), and who considers the reward or → punishment which awaits him in the next life (cf. the Gorgias myth). Plato rarely used the term in ethical contexts, and even when he used the idea he thought more in terms of living according to the immanent laws of being (*Rep.* 10, 612d ff.).

From Hellenistic times onwards, the idea of reward penetrated into religious thought. As before, in the Orphic and Eleusinian Mysteries, so now the belief in rewards and punishments in the next life begins to play a decisive rôle in the Hellenistic religions of Serapis-Isis and of Mithras. In Roman religion the commercial conception of payment and of reward expanded to include the relationship of men to gods, illustrated by the basic phrase *do ut des*, I give (to you) so that you can give (to me); in Roman religion people carried out their stipulated obligations expecting help in return. The concept of reward is linked here, clearly, with the language of sacrifice (cf. H. Preisker, *TDNT* IV 705 f.).

OT 1. The noun *misthos* stands chiefly for Heb. *śāḵār*, hire, wages, reward, depending on context (Gen. 15:1; 30:18, 28, 32 f.; 31:8a; Exod. 2:9; 22:14[15];

Num. 18:31; Deut. 15:18; 24:15; 1 Ki. 5:20[6]; 2 Chr. 15:7; Ps. 127[126]:3; Eccl. 4:9; 9:5; Zech. 8:10; 11:12; Mal. 3:5; Isa. 40:10; 62:11; Jer. 31[33]:16; Ezek. 29:18 f.). The LXX also uses *misthos* for the following Heb. cognates: *maśkōreṯ*, wages, reward (Gen. 29:15; 31:7, 41; Ruth 2:12); *śaḵîr*, adj. hired (Deut. 24:16; Job 7:1); *śeḵer*, hire, wages (Prov. 11:18); and for the hithp. of the vb. *śāḵar*, hire (Hag. 1:6). The LXX uses *misthos* to translate the following other Heb. words: *'eškār*, gift (Ezek. 27:15; *'eṯnan*, hire (of a harlot) (Isa. 23:18); *mᵉḥîr*, price, hire (Mic. 3:11); *'izzaḇôn*, wares (Ezek. 27:27, 33); *pō'al*, wages of work (Job 7:2; Jer. 22:13); and *pᵉ'ullâh*, work, recompense (Lev. 19:13). There is no Heb. equivalent in Gen. 31:8b; Tob. 2:12, 14; 4:14; 5:3, 7, 9, 14 f.; 12:1 ff., 5; Prov. 11:21; 17:8; Eccl. 9:6; Wis. 2:22; 5:15; 10:17; Sir. 2:8; 11:18, 22; 34[31]:22; 36:18[21]; 51:22, 30; 2 Macc. 8:33.

The vb. *misthoō* normally translates various verbal forms derived from *śāḵar*, to hire (Gen. 30:16; Deut. 23:5[4]; Jdg. 9:4; 18:4; 2 Sam. 10:6; 2 Ki. 7:6; 1 Chr. 19:6 f.; 2 Chr. 24:12; 25:6; Neh. 6:12; 13:2; Isa. 7:20; 46:6). The sole exceptions are Hos. 3:2 (*kārâh*, get by trade, buy); 2 Esd. 4:5 (*śāḵar*, hire); and 1 Macc. 5:39, where there is no Heb. text.

Other cognate words in the LXX are: *misthios* for *śāḵîr*, a hired servant (Lev. 19:13; 25:50; Job 7:1; and without Heb. equivalent in Sir. 7:20; 34[31]:22; 37:11); *misthōma* for *'eṯnān* and *'eṯnan*, hire (Deut. 23:19[18]; Mic. 1:7; Ezek. 16:31, 34, 41), for *'eṯnâh*, hire of a harlot (Hos. 2:14[12]), for *nāḏān*, bribe of a harlot (Ezek. 16:33) and without Heb. equivalent (Prov. 19:13; Ezek. 16:32). *misthōtēs*, mercenary, occurs in 1 Macc. 6:29. *misthōtos*, usually translates *śāḵîr*, hired servant (Exod. 12:45; 22:14[15]; Lev. 19:13; 22:10; 25:6, 40; Deut. 15:18; Job 7:2; 14:6; Mal. 3:5; Isa. 16:14; 21:16; Jer. 46[26]:21; though it is without Heb. equivalent at Lev. 25:53; Jdg. 4:10; 6:2, 5; Isa. 28:1, 3; 1 Macc. 6:29).

2.(a) Reward in the OT is primarily used in its secular sense summoning Israelites to social action. Daily labourers are to be paid their wages daily in order to avoid possible want or starvation (Jer. 22:13; Deut. 24:14; cf. also the wage disagreements between Laban and Jacob in Gen. 31:25 ff.).

(b) Semitic and Israelite thought is largely determined by the connexion between the dealings and fortunes of men. Earthly rewards and → punishments are part of the obvious make-up of OT faith. Leah receives her son Issachar as a reward from God (Gen. 30:18; cf. Ps. 127:3), while Yahweh punishes the Amalekite crimes by putting them under a ban and destroying them (1 Sam. 15:2 f.). In earlier days, the negative aspect of punishment and retribution stood in the foreground. Amos 1:3–16, in particular, sets out the connexion between the bleak fate of Israel and the other nations and God's judgment. Ezekiel replaced the concept of wholesale recompense by that of punishment which takes note of more individual offences: "The soul that sins shall die. The son shall not suffer for the iniquity of the father, nor the father suffer for the iniquity of the son; the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon himself, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon himself" (Ezek. 18:20). Deut. unfolds a positive understanding of reward, for the first time linking together obedience (→ Hear) and → blessing (cf. Deut. 28:1–15), and their antithesis disobedience and → curse (cf. Deut. 28:15–68). But it is in the Wisdom literature that the concept of reward receives its distinctive stamp. Here for the first time a systematized pattern is developed, possessing authority for the whole of life; the consequence of which is the

expectation of reward for the righteous, and punishment for the godless (cf. E. Würthwein, *TDNT* IV 711). Prov. 11:21 (LXX) reads "Depend upon it! A man who is evil does not remain unpunished; a man who sows righteousness will receive a just reward" (cf. 11:18 and 31). Job's attack on the theology of his friends (Job 8:4–6) is a protest against this theory of retribution for good and bad, because it does not do justice to the real suffering of the godly man (Job 27:51 f). The Preacher's resignation in Eccl. 8:14 also reveals his dissatisfaction with an overneat correlation of rewards and punishments: "There is a vanity which takes place on earth, that there are righteous men to whom it happens according to the deeds of the wicked, and there are wicked men to whom it happens according to the deeds of the righteous. I said that this also is vanity."

(c) But it is important to note how very different the conception of divine reward is from our own human concepts. God is a sovereign Lord who rules his servants – and so could be compared to an oriental king – but who is not in the slightest respect obliged or compelled by the amount of work they have done. It is a gift that he gives, a royal bounty, which far exceeds in value any service from his subjects. Ps. 127:3 is a good example of this. Here the two words *naḥᵃlâh*, a possession that has been donated, and *śāḵār*, reward, are both used in parallel with similar meanings: "Lo, sons are a heritage of the LORD [*naḥᵃlaṯ YHWH*], the fruit of the womb a reward [*śāḵār*]." The reward that man receives from God, is not payment for services, or a remuneration for some achievement worthy of, or appropriate for God; it is something conceivable only against the background of ancient social relationships – a free gift from a generous king. Similarly Gen. 15:1: "After these things the word of the LORD came to Abram in a vision, 'Fear not, Abram, I am your shield; your reward shall be very great.' " Dan. 11:39 provides a secular or possibly anti-Jewish analogy where the king who is opposing God gives a reward of land to those who acknowledge him. The blessings of salvation in the OT and the reward of God are always understood in earthly terms (cf. Deut. 28:3 ff., where Deut. speaks of "life", which anyone receives who obeys the commandments). Even in passages like Deut. 30:15, "life" is to be understood first and foremost in this-worldly terms: "See, I have set before you this day life and good, death and evil."

3. It was essentially in later Judaism, when the concept of a final judgment had been accepted, that a reward from God was considered as having significance beyond this life. But hand in hand with this development went a fateful modification in the understanding of reward. Since the Israelite prophets had branded unbelief as the source of all corruption, it was not a great step to draw the opposite conclusion that one could earn God's grace in the judgment through good behaviour. Good → works become the means of attaining the grace which has as yet not been received, and become the pre-condition of the expected reward. The law ceases to be the fence which holds Israelites inside the saving boundaries of the covenant, and becomes a ladder and a means of acquiring salvation, now thought of in purely futuristic terms. "R. Hananiah b. Abashya says: The Holy One, blessed is he, was minded to grant merit to Israel; therefore hath he multiplied for them the law and commandmants, as it is written, *It pleased the Lord for his righteousness' sake to magnify the law and make it honourable*" (Makkoth 3:16; cf. Isa. 42:21; Pirqe Aboth 2:16; 3:16; 6:11). Yahweh's covenant has now become a starting-position for self-justification, instead of something one aims to fulfil in its own right. One reckons up the precise value of

some suitable work and sets it off against the appropriate reward; yet one can never be quite certain whether this is credited to one's account or not. Eschatological expectation could never become a matter of certain hope, where a conception of reward had been perverted into a system of merit and achievement.

NT 1. In the NT *misthos* appears noticeably and frequently in Matt. (10 times, as against once in Mk. and 3 times in Lk.). The concept is only in the background in Paul (5 times) and John (twice). Two surprising compound words are found in Heb. which occur nowhere else in the NT: *misthapodosia*, rewards or recompense (3 times), and *misthapodotēs*, one who rewards or recompenses (once).

(a) *misthos* is a basic part of Jesus' preaching concerning the coming → kingdom of God. Many references give the impression that Jesus took over the prevalent Jewish conception of reward; if one sells all one's possessions, one wins a treasure in heaven (Matt. 19:21 par. Mk. 10:21, Lk. 18:22). God will not withhold the reward for godliness if it is directed to him and not always concerned with one's own reputation in society (Matt. 6:1). Jesus very definitely placed all human action and existence under the coming judgment; but this raises the question all the more forcefully, as to whether this does not open the flood-gates to "works-righteousness".

The parable of the workers in the vineyard (Matt. 20:1–16) gives an answer to this. First, it should be noticed that the landowner is entirely free and under no external constraint (v. 15), a characteristic which is made even clearer in the parable of the talents (Matt. 25:24). The reason why those who had worked only an hour were paid the same wage as the others who "had borne the burden and heat of the day" (v. 12) is not that their work was of a higher quality (as in the case in the similar Jewish parable about Rabbi Bun bar Hiyya [died c. A.D. 325], reproduced in J. Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, 1963², 138 f.; cf. T. J. Ber. 2:3c). Nor was it that God had reckoned their small efforts worth the same pay (as some Catholic interpreters understand it, cf. G. Bornkamm, "Der Lohngedanke im Neuen Testament", *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, II, 1963 ², 84). Rather, payment is made by the householder purely on grounds of freedom and generosity; all thought of balancing effort and reward is eliminated.

God does not only repay far beyond any merit (cf. Lk. 19:17, 19); payment of reward is simply independent of the worker's achievements. Its sole root lies in God's sovereign generosity: "Am I not allowed to do what I choose with what belongs to me? Or do you begrudge my generosity?" (Matt. 20:15). Every claim to one's deserts must fall silent in the face of the demand for total obedience: "So you also, when you have done all that is commanded you, say, 'We are unworthy servants; we have only done what was our duty' " (Lk. 17:10). Nevertheless, even the smallest act of service in the kingdom of God will not go unrewarded: "And whoever gives to one of these little ones even a cup of cold water because he is a disciple, truly, I say to you, he shall not lose his reward" (Matt. 10:42; cf. Mk. 9:41).

(b) A closer examination of the service to be performed and its reward completes the picture. Jesus' polemic against the false piety of the → Pharisees is instructive (Matt. 6:1 ff.). A Pharisee who is putting his piety on show is not looking for God's acceptance and honour but for men's. If men admire him and his virtues, his reward has already been paid out to him – literally so (Matt. 6:2, 5, 16). It is paid out by the masters he has chosen for himself – men. A truly pious man, however, does

everything for God's sake; hence God will reward him in his judgment. This antithesis of men and God is the essential one in Matt. 6:3, 15, 18, not that of "in secret" and openly. True worship should be offered for God's sake, not man's. The faith which stands on the side of God, ready to → suffer for Jesus' sake, does not have to wait for its reward (Matt. 5:11 ff.). Profession of faith in the Lord is not only verbal; it also means acceptance of "the least of these my brethren" in his name (Matt. 25:40; cf. 25:45; 10:42). Such an attitude is rewarded because and in so far as a person occupies the place in the kingdom of God which has been prepared for him. Our works have no intrinsic moral value which can accrue merit with God. Nor are they to be thought of as isolated achievements that might be taken into consideration in the judgment. Rather, they are integral parts of faith and of our confession of Christ. Only as such are they rewarded, but even this is not dependent on a fixed value-scale with quantitive demarcations; the sole basis is our total acceptance by the eschatological judge (Matt. 10:32), which includes full salvation and eternal life (Mk. 8:36; 10:30). God rewards confession of faith "a hundredfold" in this age and then in the age to come (Mk. 10:30; cf. Matt. 19:29; Lk. 18:30). In making the concept of reward subsidiary to the prior category of the coming kingdom of God, Jesus makes a clean break with the calculating approach of Judaism.

2. (a) Paul was well acquainted with the thought of judgment based on works (cf. Rom. 2:6; 2 Cor. 5:10). But with him the rabbinic Jewish concept of merit is replaced by his radical doctrine of justification. How is this to be understood? The nature of *misthos* is explained by the use of other concepts: the righteous man receives "praise" (Rom. 2:29), "honour" (Rom. 2:7), and the "prize of the high calling" (Phil. 3:14) from God in the judgment. As with Jesus, so with Paul; the reward is what the Romans called a *praemium* (a reward bestowed or a gift), not *pretium* (the price or value set on something) (cf. G. Bornkamm, op. cit., 91). What we have earned is → death; → life is what God gives us in his grace (Rom. 6:23). God does not owe us this reward; he gives it to us as grace (Rom. 4:4). The doctrine of justification thus gives its own particular stamp to the understanding of reward (→ Righteousness).

(b) This does not mean that the *misthos* has no place in a Christian's activity. There is the prize that beckons the victor in the race (1 Cor. 9:24; cf. Phil. 3:14). There is the acknowledgment that awaits the wise master-builder of the community (1 Cor. 3:14). There can, however, only be any question of reward, when it is given for something that one is not obliged to do. Paul was under obligation to preach the gospel: "For if I preach the gospel, that gives me no ground for boasting. For necessity is laid upon me. Woe to me if I do not preach the gospel!" (1 Cor. 9:16). But Paul freely waived the church's obligation to maintain his upkeep, lest he be regarded as under obligation to men (1 Cor. 9:15; → Boast). A reward is given for something done voluntarily. But although Paul speaks to the Corinthians of his reward, his understanding of it is paradoxical. For it turns out that the reward he seeks is not something that he covets for himself, but to make the gospel free of charge. "For if I do this of my own will [i.e. preach the gospel], I have a reward; but if not of my own will, I am entrusted with a commission. What then is my reward? Just this: that in my preaching I may make the gospel free of charge, not making full use of my right in the gospel" (1 Cor. 9:17 f.). His motive is to avoid putting any obstacle in the way of the gospel (1 Cor. 9:12). It is a further aspect of his conduct as

a skilled master-builder (1 Cor. 3:10) and an apostle who is content to suffer (1 Cor. 4:9 ff.). As such, it stands in marked contrast with those who are already filled and rich, and who reign like kings (1 Cor. 4:8).

(c) *misthos*, then, may be thought of as God's reply to a Christian's action, although there is no strict causal connexion between the two. Paul's doctrine of justification is carried through to all aspects of Christian living. It is instructive, in this respect, to see how Paul, in one particular case, distinguishes between the builder and his work which, because it is unserviceable is burned up in the → fire of → judgment, while he himself is saved, albeit "only as through fire" (1 Cor. 3:15). Nevertheless, God's grace does not allow him to be lost. The ultimate validity of grace in pronouncing the verdict of righteous in the last judgment lies in the fact that not only our Christian faith but also our good works are just as much the gift of God (Eph. 2:10). It is God who "is at work in you, both to will and to work for his good pleasure" (Phil. 2:13). All personal vainglory is excluded.

3. Hebrews reveals by its choice of vocabulary that reward can be spoken of only in terms of the sovereign act of God. Heb. 10:35 ff. says that it is the blessing of the promise that brings us God's reward (*misthapodosia*, recompense, and *epangelia*, promise, are in parallel). What is at issue here is not so much reward for individual actions; *misthapodosia* means, rather, the bestowal of eternal life, the summation of the Christian hope (Heb. 11:6). No human action can in any way counterbalance this in value. On the contrary, this gift is intended for those who seek God with a bold faith: "Therefore do not throw away your confidence [*parrhēsian*], which has great reward [*megalēn misthapodosian*]" (Heb. 10:35; → Openness). "And without faith it is impossible to please him. For whoever would draw near to God must believe that he exists and that he rewards [*misthapodotēs ginetai*] those who seek him" (Heb. 11:6). Faith is indeed bound up with → patience and "not neglecting to meet together" (Heb. 10:25); but there is never any mention of merit which would deserve salvation. Heb. contains repeated warnings against despising the grace of God and the day of opportunity (e.g. Heb. 2:7–19; 4:1–13; 6:4–8; 10:35 ff.; 12:3 ff., 15 ff.; 25 ff.). These references show that there comes a point in sinning which is a point of no return. But the believer has not come to Mount Sinai with all its terrors of judgment, but "to Mount Zion, to the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to innumerable angels in festal gathering, and to the assembly of the first-born who are enrolled in heaven, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus, the mediator of a new covenant, and to the sprinkled blood that speaks more graciously than the blood of Abel" (Heb. 12:12 ff.). The prospect of judgment for the faithful is not a petty reckoning up of human values and achievements, but a joyful hopefulness (Heb. 10:35). In this respect → Moses is an example of faith, for "he considered abuse suffered for the Christ greater wealth than the treasures of Egypt, for he looked to the reward [*misthapodosian*]" (Heb. 11:26, on the meaning of this verse → Possessions, art. *thēsauros*, NT 3).

4. In Jn. 4 Jesus' discourse with the disciples following the conversation with the Samaritan woman shows that the "harvest", the eschatological age of salvation, has already broken in (→ Seed, Harvest; → Black, White, Red, art. *leukos*). Indeed, the "reaper" is already drawing his pay. "He who reaps receives wages [*misthon*], and gathers fruit for eternal life, so that sower and reaper may rejoice together. For here the saying holds true, 'One sows and another reaps.' I sent you to reap that for which

you did not labour; others have laboured, and you have entered into their labour" (Jn. 4:36 ff.). For related imagery, see Lev. 26:5; Deut. 28:33; Jdg. 6:3; Ps. 126:5 f.; Amos 9:13; Mic. 6:15; Matt. 9:37 f. par. Lk. 10:1 f.; and T. Peah 4:18 ("My fathers have gathered treasures in this age; I have gathered treasures in the age to come"). The thought of wages is not a matter of merit. Rather, the fact that the reaper is receiving his wages underlines the presence of the eschatological hour. The "work of God" which has eternal life as its consequence is faith (Jn. 6:29). It is in this sense that 2 Jn. 8 speaks of the *misthos* of faith: "Look to yourselves, that you may not lose what you have worked for, but may win a full reward."

5. According to the witness of the OT and the NT, the fulfilment of life's meaning is not something that lies within our capacity. It is a gift that comes from outside ourselves. It comes from God himself who, as our judge, pronounces us righteous despite ourselves. All rewards lie in God's gift. This excludes the idea of God having to bestow an equivalent reward for our meritorious action. And yet there is a connection between the anticipated reward and our conduct. But the relationship is not one of direct cause and effect. We see it, when we realize that all goodness comes from God and that the reward is yet one further token of the free grace of God which enabled us to act in the first place. The NT statements about rewards are thus opposed to the diametrically opposite ideas that man can deserve salvation and that justification by faith makes unimportant what we do with our lives.

P. C. Böttger

ὀψώνιον

ὀψώνιον (*opsōnion*), wages, payment.

CL & OT *opsōnion* is a combination (from Menander's time) from *opson*, any kind of sustenance prepared on a fire (as distinct from → bread and other accompaniments to a meal, such as wine) and *ōneomai*, buy. It refers actually to the cash one needs to buy such additional foods (1 Esd. 4:56); then (in the plur. and also in LXX) particularly to a soldier's maintenance allowances, which he received above and beyond natural provisions, such as cereal and oil. Finally, it means wages in general (1 Macc. 3:28; 14:32), and occasionally the salary of government officials. *opsōnion* can thus be seen to be a regular term used with strict reference to payment which one is entitled to receive daily or monthly, etc., and for which one could eventually sue, if need be. It is a minimum subsistence wage rather than an appropriate reward for work carried out (→ *misthos*; and cf. Lat. *stipendium*).

NT *opsōnion* occurs 4 times in the NT. Apart from the Baptist's advice to the soldiers to be satisfied with their wages (Lk. 3:14), it occurs only in Paul (1 Cor. 9:7; 2 Cor. 11:8; Rom. 6:23).

1. In 1 Cor. 9:7 Paul uses the term *opsōnia* (plur.) to refer to the support to which he was entitled from the various congregations as remuneration for his missionary work (cf. 2 Cor. 11:8). This is not only an allusion to soldiers' pay, comparing his missionary work with military service; it also implies the legal claim of the apostle on the congregations. Hence, for Paul to waive his *opsōnion* is to underline that God's gift of grace costs nothing, just as it is offered to all men in the apostolic preaching without any conditions (→ *misthos*, NT).

2. Rom. 6:23 is not a pronouncement about the nature of → death. The point of the verse is to state that sin pays out wages. *thanatos* is a predicative noun, not the subject of the sentence. The wages of sin and the gift of God are set over against one another in antithesis. *ta opsōnia* are the provisions which sin pays out to those who do military service for it, and these provisions for life consist in – death! Sin promises life and gives death; but this death does not just begin at the end of our temporal life, it is the current payment which we already receive. That is the only right which we can lay claim to, as sinners (v. 23a). But over against this right stands God's gift of → grace which we receive in service under him (v. 23b). This is not a relationship which insists on its rights but one which is based on grace. No one in God's service can claim anything as of right; he receives eternal life as a free gift from God.

O. Becker

→ Judgment, → Poor, → Possessions, → Punishment, → Righteousness, → Work

(a). F. Büchsel, *apodidōmi, TDNT* II 169; C. Caragounis, *NovT* 16, 1974, 35 ff.; K. P. Donfried, "Justification and Last Judgment in Paul", *Interpretation* 30, 1976, 140–52; F. V. Filson, *St. Paul's Conception of Recompense*, 1931; H. W. Heidland, *opsōnion, TDNT* V 591 f.; A. Marmorstein, *The Doctrine of Merits in Old Rabbinical Literature*, I–II, (1920) 1968; H. Preisker and E. Würthwein, *misthos* etc., *TDNT* IV 695–728; P. S. Minear, "And great shall be your reward", *Yale Studies in Religion* 12, 1941; L. Morris, *The Biblical Doctrine of Judgment*, 1960; G. de Ru, "The Conception of Reward in the Teaching of Jesus", *NovT* 8, 1966, 202 ff.; H. Schlier, *kerdos* etc., *TDNT* III 672 f.; W. S. Towner, "Retributional Theology in the Apocalyptic Setting", *Union Seminary Quarterly Review* 26, 1917, 203–14.

(b). A. Alt, "Zur Talionsformel", *ZAW* 52 (Neue Folge 11), 1934, 303 ff. (reprinted in *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, I, 1968[4], 341 ff.); W. Bienart, *Die Arbeit nach der Lehre der Bibel*, 1956[2], 88–96; G. Bornkamm, "Der Lohngedanke im Neuen Testament", *EvTh* 6, 1946, 143 ff. (reprinted in *Studien zu Antike und Christentum. Gesammelte Aufsätze*, II, 1963[2], 69 ff.); H. Braun, *Gerichtsgedanke und Rechtfertigungslehre bei Paulus, Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament* 19, 1930; H. Gomperz, *Die Lebensauffassungen der griechischen Philosophie und das Ideal der inneren Freiheit*, 1927; F. Horst, "Recht und Religion im Bereich des Alten Testaments", *EvTh* 16, 1956, 49 ff. (reprinted in *Gottes Recht, ThB* 12, 1961, 286 ff.); L. Ihmels, *Der Lohngedanke in der Ethik Jesu*, 1908; E. Jüngel, *Paulus und Jesus, Hermeneutische Untersuchungen zur Theologie* 2, 1962, 66–70; F. K. Karner, *Die Bedeutung des Vergeltungsgedankens für die Ethik Jesu* (Dissertation, Leipzig, 1927); V. Kirchner, *Der Lohn in der alten Philosophie, im bürgerlichen Recht, besonders im Neuen Testament*, 1908; K. Koch, "Gibt es ein Vergeltungsdogma im Alten Testament?", *ZTK* 52, 1955, 1–42; K. Koch, W. Bienert and P. Jacobs, "Vergeltung und Vergebung", *EKL* III 1636 ff.; G. Lanczkowski et al., "Vergeltung", *RGG*[3] VI 1341 ff.; E. Lohmeyer, *Die Briefe an die Philipper, an die Kolosser und an Philemon, KEK* 9, 1964[13], 57 ff., 131 ff.; L. Mattern, *Das Verständnis des Gerichts bei Paulus*, 1966; O. Merk, *Handeln aus Glauben. Die Motivierungen der paulinischen Ethik*, 1968; O. Michel, "Der Lohngedanke in der Verkündigung Jesu", *ZSTh* 9, 1932, 47 ff.; W. Pesch, *Der Lohngedanke in der Lehre Jesu verglichen mit der religiösen Lehre des Spätjudentums, Münchener theologische Studien* 7, 1955; W. Preiser, "Vergeltung und Sühne im deutschen Strafrecht", in *Festschrift E. Schmidt*, 1961, 7 ff.; K. H. Rengstorf, "Die Frage des gerechten Lohnes in der Verkündigung Jesu", *Festschrift Karl Arnold*, 1955, 141–155; O. Schulthess, *misthos*, Pauly-Wissowa XV 2078 ff.; M. Wagner, "Der Lohngedanke im Evangelium", *Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift* 43, 1932, 106–12; K. Weiss, *Die Frohbotschaft Jesu über Lohn und Vollkommenheit, NTAbh* 12, 4/5, 1927.

Reconciliation, Restoration, Propitiation, Atonement

Reconciliation means the restoration of a good relationship between enemies. In order to achieve this good relationship in the confrontation of God and man, it is necessary that the factors which produce the enmity be removed. This is achieved by atonement. These various aspects involve the use of the three groups of words dealt

with in this article. *(ex-)hilaskomai* and its derivatives belong to the cultic realm and chiefly denote actions which are supposed originally to make the gods favourably disposed and, later, to expiate → sin. The group of words around *katallassō*, on the other hand, comes from the secular world and indicates the improvement (*allassō*, to change) of a negative relationship. *apokatastasis* is a technical term in politics and eschatology, meaning a partial or universal restoration. In the NT the cultic term *hilasmos*, the political term *apokatastasis* and the ordinary term *katallagē* are all comparatively rare, but they occur in crucial passages.

ἀποκατάστασις

ἀποκαθίστημι (*apokathistēmi*) and *ἀποκαθιστάνω* (*apokathistanō*), re-establish, restore; *ἀποκατάστασις* (*apokatastasis*), restoration.

CL 1. The vb. *apokathistēmi* (Xen. onwards) meant originally to restore to a previous state, and then generally to restore. It is found at first in a literal and non-religious context: of the giving back of what has been lent (Xen., *Respublica Lacedaemionorum* 6, 3), of the renovation of a canal (W. Dittenberger, *Orientis Graecae Inscriptiones*, I–II, 1903–5, 672), of the restoration of a sick person (Dioscorides, *De Materia Medica* 1, 64, 4); later, more generally, of the renewal of the world (Lactantius, *Divinae Institutiones* 7, 18).

2. A derivative of the vb. is the later noun *apokatastasis* (e.g. Aristotle, *Magna Moralia* 1204b, 36) with the basic meaning of re-establishment of a former state, restoration. Here again we find it chiefly in secular contexts to begin with: the bringing back of hostages (Polybius, 3, 99, 6), the improvement of a road (Dittenberger, op. cit., 483, 8), the reconstitution of a city's affairs (Polybius, 4, 23, 1).

3. These words have a specialized use in connexion with astronomical and cosmological speculation in the Hellenistic and late classical age. Thus *apokatastasis* became a "technical term for the restitution of the cosmic cycle" of the constellations (A. Oepke, *TDNT* I 390). Ancient, and particularly Stoic, thought imagined the course of the universe in terms of an infinite series of cyclical cosmic periods (H. von Arnim, *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta*, II, 190), of which the *apokatastasis* is always the final stage of the old period and the point where the new one begins. In Stoicism and the Hermetic literature the concept of *apokatastasis* is occasionally associated with political expectations (cf. *Corp. Herm.* 11, 2); and in the neo-Platonism of the post-Christian era we find an anthropological application to the → soul of the individual (Iamblichus, *De Mysteriis* 1, 10; Proclus, *Institutio Theologica* 199). Here the *apokatastasis* designates the repeated entry of the immortal soul into the mortal body through reincarnation, with the object of thus being cleansed from matter and reattaining its original condition, which is itself also sometimes called *apokatastasis* (e.g. *Corp. Herm.* 8, 4).

OT 1. Only the vb. is found in the LXX, usually to translate the root *šûḇ*, in the qal meaning to turn back, return; in the piel to bring back; and most frequently hiph. to bring back, restore. In non-religious contexts *apokathistēmi* can take on a wide range of meanings, especially in the early strands of the Pentateuch: e.g., Abraham paying money to Ephron (Gen. 23:16); a stone being rolled from the mouth of a well

(Gen. 29:3); a man being reinstated in his office (Gen. 41:13); water flowing back (Exod. 14:26 ff.).

2. More important is the use of the word in the message of the prophets. While *apokathistēmi* is found but rarely in the preaching of the early prophets (e.g., Amos 5:15; Hos. 2:5[3]; 11:11), it has a special theological significance in the announcement of eschatological salvation in exilic and post-exilic prophecy. Yahweh will bring Israel back from exile into his own land (Jer. 16:15; 23:8; 24:6). Ezekiel draws a parallel between the eschatological restoration of Israel and his beginnings (Ezek. 16:55), and Mal. 4:6 (3:24) prophesies of the → Elijah *redivivus* who will turn the hearts of fathers and sons towards each other again. Thus in the LXX *apokathistēmi* becomes more and more the term for the eschatological, and in part messianic, hopes of Israel for restoration of her former state.

3. This tendency is stronger still in the intertestamental writings, in which *apokathistēmi* is used for Aram. *tûḇ*, to return. Here the word acquires at times a specifically political character. In Dan. 4:33 f. it is used of Nebuchadnezzar's recovery of power and dominion; while 1 Macc. 15:3 speaks of the plans of Antiochus VII to regain control of "the kingdom of our fathers" and re-establish the former state of affairs. Josephus used *apokatastasis* in describing the return of the Jews from exile (*Ant.* 11, 63), but Philo linked this idea with the mystical one of the restoration of the soul (*Rev.Div.Her.* 293).

4. In this connexion mention should also be made of the political, messianic hope of the → Samaritans, which centred upon an eschatological figure known as the Taheb, the returner, the restorer (cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 18, 85; cf. A. Merx, *Der Messias oder Taëb der Samaritaner*, 1909; J. Macdonald, *The Theology of the Samaritans*, 1964, 362–71).

NT In the NT the vb. is found 8 times (mostly in the Synoptic Gospels), and the noun only once (Acts 3:21).

1. (a) In Mk. 3:5 par. Matt. 12:13, Lk. 6:10 and Mk. 8:25 the original non-religious meaning of *apokathistēmi* is found in connexion with the healing of the sick: a hand or a blind man is restored, i.e. healed. Heb. 13:19 ("that I may be restored to you the sooner", i.e. that I may come to you sooner) likewise goes back to ordinary Gk. usage.

(b) Mk. 9:12 par. Matt. 17:11 is an allusion to Mal. 4:5 f. (3:23 f.). In the debate about the messiah, the political messianic hopes, which centred upon the figure of → Elijah *redivivus* "who will restore all things", are countered by reference to the fate of the Son of man, who "will suffer many things and be despised". In the NT the Jewish political concept of the messiah associated with *apokathistēmi* is transformed into the doctrine of the suffering Son of man, with the consequence that this usage of the vb. noticeably recedes (→ Jesus Christ, art. *Christos*; → Son of God, art. *hyios tou anthrōpou*; → War).

A similar tendency may be seen in Acts 1:6 ff. To the question of the disciples, still conceived in terms of a political messiah, "Will you at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?", a reply is given which forbids reckoning and calculation, and points to the promised gift of the → Spirit. Luke thus raises the question to a different level: in the era of the church it is not political control that matters, but the interim kingdom of the Spirit and of power.

2. (a) The passage from Peter's sermon at the temple portico, which is the only place in the NT where the noun *apokatastasis* is found, reads: "Repent therefore and turn again, that your sins may be blotted out, that times of refreshing may come from the presence of the Lord, and that he may send the Christ appointed for you, Jesus, whom heaven must receive until the time for establishing all [*achri chronōn apokatastaseōs pantōn*] that God spoke by the mouth of his holy prophets from of old" (Acts 3:19 ff.). This sentence accords with the eschatological messianic hope of OT prophecy and Judaism (see above OT 2). The *apokatastasis pantōn* does not mean the conversion of all mankind, but the restoration of all things and circumstances which the OT prophets proclaimed, i.e. the universal renewal of the earth. While the *kairoi anapsyxeōs*, "times of refreshing", mean the coming in of the change and the subjective effects of this event, the *chronoi apokatastaseōs*, "times of restoration" [or "establishing" RSV], emphasize the objective side and the permanent condition of the world renewed (cf. A. Oepke, *TDNT* I 392).

(b) In the early church Origen used Acts 3:21 as the basis for a theory of the Apokatastasis, i.e. the doctrine of the restoration of all created things. Central to this is the view that God's work of salvation has as its aim the removal of all the disorder in creation which has resulted from sin, and so the medical, political and cosmic restoration of all created things to the harmony of one all-embracing order of being (Origen, *De Prin.* 1, 6, 1–4; 2, 3, 1–5; 3, 6, 1–9). This doctrine of universal Apokatastasis, which includes elements of late classical and Jewish ideas of Apokatastasis, was taken up in the East by Gregory of Nyssa, and in the West by Scotus Erigena, Hans Denck, J. A. Bengel, F. C. Oetinger, F. D. E. Schleiermacher and others, and in some cases developed with reference to man into the doctrine of universalism. (Cf. *TDNT* I 392 f.; B. Altaner, *Patrology*, 1960, 233, 324, 353, 356, 455, 632.) Although he rejected Origen's teaching, Karl Barth came close to the idea (*CD II*, 2, 172 f., 295, 352 f., 417, 422, 476; cf. C. Brown, *Karl Barth and the Christian Message*, 1967, 130–33). From an exegetical point of view there is less justification for this doctrine in Acts 3:21 than in 1 Cor. 15:27 f. From the point of view of systematic theology, the doctrine of Apokatastasis or of universalism should be considered less in the context of Jewish political hopes and classical cosmology than in that of the universal significance of the Christ event. *H.-G. Link*

ἱλάσκομαι

ἵλεως (*hileōs*), gracious, merciful; *ἱλάσκομαι* (*hilaskomai*), propitiate, expiate, conciliate, make gracious, be gracious; *ἱλασμός* (*hilasmos*), propitiation, propitiatory sacrifice; *ἱλαστήριον* (*hilastērion*), that which expiates or propitiates, means of propitiation, mercy-seat.

CL 1. (a) The adj. *hileōs*, *-ōn*, is the Attic form of *hilaos* or *hileos*, kindly, gracious, and a parallel word to *hilaros*, cheerful (cf. Lat. *hilaris*). It meant originally cheerful, joyous (Plato, *Laws* 1, 649a); later, kindly, gracious, benevolent (e.g. Xen., *Cyr.* 1, 6, 2). *hileōs* is chiefly used of rulers or gods; in connexion with gods the phrase *hileō poiein*, to make gracious, is found (Plato, *Laws* 10, 910a).

(b) The mid. deponent *hilaskomai* (Homer onwards), is etymologically connected with *hilaos* and *hileos*, friendly, gracious, and *hilēmi*, to be gracious. Like the intensive form *exhilaskomai* (Hdt. onwards), it has a causative meaning: to make

gracious, appease (e.g. Homer, *Od.* 3, 419; Hdt. 7, 141). The passive aor. *hilasthēnai* should be translated in an intrans. middle sense: to let oneself be appeased, to have mercy (especially common is the imperative *hilasthēti*, be merciful). Generally the subject is a man, and the object a deity; the setting is usually a cultic action by which the deity is to be appeased (Hdt. 5, 47; 6, 105; Xen., Cyr. 7, 2, 19). Sometimes a man (e.g. the emperor) is the object of *hilaskesthai*, which can then be rendered to conciliate (Plutarch, *Antonius* 67, 3), or bribe (Hdt., 8, 112, 2).

(c) The noun *hilasmos*, which is derived from *hilaskomai*, is rare and found mainly in late writings. It denotes the action by which a deity is to be propitiated (e.g. Plutarch, *Solon* 12).

(d) *to hilastērion* is the neut. adjectival noun from *hilastērios*. On Gk. inscriptions it means a propitiatory gift for the gods (W. R. Paton and E. L. Hicks, eds., *The Inscriptions of Cos*, 1891, nos. 81, 347).

2. The basic idea behind the Gk. *hilasmos* is man's effort to dispose in his favour the awful and frequently calamitous power of the dead, the demons and the gods, and to strengthen his own actions by the assistance of supernatural forces. This presupposes some elementary knowledge of the threat posed to human existence by the envy, punishment, wrath and baseless anger of the all-powerful gods. The propitiation of deities is done by means of cultic acts, including human or animal sacrifice, purificatory rites, prayers, and also dances and games (cf. F. Büchsel, *TDNT* III 311 f.). In Rhodes and Massilia criminals were sacrificed until a late period in order that the city might be absolved. Human sacrifice, offered without scruple in Homeric times, did however become less frequent as civilization progressed, and was replaced by symbolic acts. In cases of extreme need a *ver sacrum* was sometimes vowed, which meant that the animals born in the following spring had to be sacrificed, and the humans when they had grown up must go into exile.

In later, more enlightened times the power of the gods lost some of its terrors, and so the significance of propitiatory rites diminished. In Stoicism the cultic rites are replaced by the moral person, who lives in keeping with the will of the deity by means of ethical behaviour.

OT 1. (a) In contrast to the usage of classical Gk. (cf. CL 1(a) *hileō poiein*), the terms used in the LXX are *hileōs einai* or *genesthai*, to be or become gracious, translating the Heb. *sālaḥ*, to forgive (15 times), and *niḥam*, to be sorry, be moved to pity, etc. The adj. *hileōs* occurs in the LXX only as a predicate of God.

(b) The vb. *hilaskomai* is found relatively seldom (12 times) in the LXX, and only in a mid. or pass. sense: to have mercy (with Yahweh as subject), usually (7 times) in translation of the Heb. *sālaḥ*, to forgive. The compound form *exhilaskomai* is found considerably more often (about 100 times), and in by far the majority of cases (about 80) its Heb. equivalent is *kipper*, to cover, propitiate. Accordingly, *exhilaskomai* is used predominantly in the active sense, to propitiate, and refers to the cultic activity of the → priest (the majority of places where it is used occur in the priestly writing of Exod.-Num.). Occasionally *exhilaskomai* has the sense of purify (of objects; Heb. *ḥiṭṭē'*, e.g. Ezek. 43:20, 22, 23), or entreat the favour of (a person, Heb. *ḥillâh*, e.g. Zech. 7:2; 8:22; Mal. 1:9). The important point to note is that with *exhilaskomai* the grammatical subject is usually a man (the priest) and the object God. In Sir.,

however, sin is the object (e.g. Sir. 20:28), and the subject is either God (Sir. 5:6; 34:19[31:23]) or man (Sir. 3:3, 30; 20:28) (see further F. Büchsel, *TDNT* III 315).

(c) The LXX generally uses *hilasmos* (about 100 times) or *exhilasis* (twice) and *exhilasmos* (about 15 times) to translate derivatives of the Heb. vb. *kipper* (piel), to cover over, pacify, propitiate, which describe the process of propitiation (sacrificial propitiation in the cult, e.g. Lev. 23:27 f.; 25:9).

2.(a) Sacrificial rites are widespread throughout the ancient world, and there is nothing originally or specifically Israelite about them (see above, OT). Some scholars hold with G. von Rad that sacrifice and its attendant rites were not the creation of original Yahwism. "It was only in Canaan that Israel entered into an old and widespread sacral practice, into which she later poured her own ideas" (*Old Testament Theology*, I, 1962, 252). In pre-exilic writings we find the common concept of sacrifice, i.e. that of propitiating an angry deity: "If it is the LORD who has stirred you [Saul] up against me [David], may he accept an offering" (1 Sam. 26:19; cf. also Gen. 8:20 ff.; 2 Sam. 24:17–25).

(b) According to some critical views cultic rites and forgiveness of sins were of little importance in pre-exilic Israel. But for the exilic and post-exilic community they took up a central place in the worship of Yahweh (cf. K. Koch, "Sühne and Sündenvergebung um die Wende von der exilischen zur nachexilischen Zeit", *EvTh* 26, Neue Folge 21, 1966, 217 ff.). Even from a statistical survey of the occurrence of these words, it is clear that *exhilaskomai*, *hilasmos* and *hilastērion*, like their Heb. equivalents, are found almost exclusively in passages attributed to the priestly writings. ([Ed.] This point appears to be a tautology: if the passages designated as belonging to the priestly writings are defined in terms of their interest in the cult, it is inevitable that cultic terms will predominate in them.) At the same time there took place a general reinterpretation of the concept of propitiation widely held in the ancient world and taken over by Israel. This may be seen in the Pentateuch and passages like Isa. 43:22–25. The emphasis changed from the attempt to change the deity's mind by man-made sacrifice, to the specifically Israelite idea of propitiation, according to which Yahweh makes atonement for his people (cf. Deut. 21:8). Up till now OT scholarship has not been able to explain adequately what caused this transformation in the concept of propitiation to take place (cf. K. Koch, op. cit., 224 f.).

(c) The characteristic Israelite concept of propitiation can only be understood against the background of the OT doctrine of sin (→ Sin, art. *adikia*, OT 2). An offence (even if unconscious) against Yahweh's covenant laws gives rise to objective guilt (cf. 1 Sam. 14:2 ff.), which sets in motion a destructive force whose disastrous effects fall of necessity as punishment on the miscreant and his affairs (cf. G. von Rad, op. cit., I, 265–79). This chain of sin and disaster can be halted only by Yahweh, inasmuch as he diverts the evil effect of a misdeed from the doer and his affairs to a beast, which dies in his place, the classic example being the ritual of the scapegoat given to Azazel on the Day of Atonement (Lev. 16:20 ff.). In this act of atonement the subject, who brings about the atonement, is thus Yahweh. The → priests function merely as his representatives in the cultic action (cf. Exod. 28:38; Num. 18:22 f.), while the wrongdoer or the sinful people are the recipients of the atonement. According to the Israelite view, life is actually carried in the → blood, and therefore blood acts as the means of atonement (Lev. 17:11; cf. 17:14; Gen. 9:4;

Deut. 12:23). Sin can be transferred, because the animal, being a possession, has "a part in the personality of the man or human community" (K. Koch, op. cit., 229). Yahweh has given the → sacrifices to his people in order to take away "the iniquity of the congregation" (Lev. 10:17). *H.-G. Link*

3. In discussing reconciliation and atonement it has become customary to draw a distinction between propitiation and expiation. In propitiation the action is directed towards God or some other offended person. The underlying purpose is to change God's attitude from one of wrath to one of good-will and favour. In the case of expiation, on the other hand, the action is directed towards that which has caused the breakdown in the relationship. It is sometimes held that, while God is not personally angry with the sinner, the act of sin has initiated a train of events which can only be broken by some compensatory rite or act of reparation for the offence. In short, propitiation is directed towards the offended person, whereas expiation is concerned with nullifying the offensive act.

(a) G. von Rad is not untypical of a broad segment of biblical scholars who maintain that sacrifice in the Bible is concerned with expiation rather than with propitiation. Commenting on Lev. 17:11 ("For the life of the flesh is the blood; and I have given it for you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls; for it is the blood that makes atonement, by reason of the life"), von Rad writes: "But it is not the blood in itself that effects expiation, but the blood in so far as the life is contained in it. Expiation therefore does not depend upon the blood, but upon the life, whose bearer the blood is" (op. cit., I, 270; cf. J. Herrmann, *Die Idee der Sühne im Alten Testament*, 1905, 67). Further support for this idea of expiation is found in the provisions made by Deut. 21:1–9 for purging "the guilt of innocent blood in the midst of thy people Israel" (v. 8). "As a rule ... expiation is effected through the vicarious death of an animal. But what is of special importance in this connexion is that appeal is made to Jahweh himself actively to effect the expiation. Accordingly the one who receives expiation is not Jahweh, but Israel: Jahweh is rather the one who acts, in averting the calamitous curse which burdens the community" (op. cit., I, 270). Similarly, von Rad interprets the Day of Atonement ritual (Lev. 16): "What was effected in expiation was that in both cases, with persons and objects alike, Jahweh removed the baneful influence of an act. He broke the nexus of sin and calamity; and this was as a rule effected by way of channelling the baneful influence of the evil into an animal which died vicariously for the man (or the cultic object). Expiation was thus not a penalty, but a saving event" (op. cit., I, 271). Von Rad's position essentially reiterates that of G. F. Oehler: "The law nowhere indicates that in sacrifice ... an act of punitive punishment is executed; it in no way asks us to look on the altar as a place of punishment" (*Theology of the Old Testament*, 1874, 431).

(b) The case for expiation rather than propitiation has been further supported on linguistic grounds by C. H. Dodd in his article on "*hilaskesthai*, its Cognates, Derivatives and Synonyms in the Septuagint" (*JTS* 32, 1931, 352–60; reprinted with minor alterations in "Atonement", *The Bible and the Greeks*, 1935, 82–95; quotations are from the latter). Dodd's argument is based upon an analysis of the meaning of the Greek words used in the LXX to translate the OT Heb. *kipper*. He points out that "The stock rendering is *hilaskesthai*, or *exhilaskesthai*, with the corresponding substantives *hilasmos*, *exhilasis*, *exhilasma*. In classical Greek and in the *Koine*

hilaskesthai, exhilaskesthai, have regularly the meaning 'placate', 'propitiate', with a personal object. As a secondary meaning *exhilaskesthai* also bears the sense 'expiate', with an impersonal object; e.g. Plato, *Laws*, 862c, *to apoinois exhilasthen*, Ditt. *Syll.*[3] 1042, *hos d' an polypragmonēsē ta tou theou ē periergasētai, hamartian opheiletō Mēni Tyrannō ēn ou mē dynētai exhilasasthai.* Thus the words are in themselves ambiguous, and a close study of LXX usage is necessary to determine which sense predominated in Hellenistic Judaism" (op. cit., 82).

Before proceeding to examine Dodd's case in detail, it may be noted with Leon Morris that the quotation from Plato is concerned with the legislator who must endeavour to restore good relations by payment of indemnity for injury. The context suggests that it is the appeasement of a person that is in mind rather than the expiation of a crime (*The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross*, 1963[3], 146; cf. also F. Büchsel, *TDNT* III 316). The probable date of the Men Tyrannus inscription, referred to by Dodd, is in the 2nd or 3rd century A.D., and can hardly be decisive for the determination of the translation of the LXX.

Dodd's article was basically a schematic analysis of the words used in the LXX to translate the Heb. *kipper*. He began by noting words used other than *hilaskomai* etc., such as *hagiazō*, sanctify (Exod. 29:33, 36), *katharizō*, cleanse (Exod. 29:37; cf. v. 36; Deut. 32:43; Isa. 47:11), and *athōoō*, pronounce free from guilt (Jer. 18:23). Other passages that Dodd examined were Dan. 9:24 and Exod. 30:10. Dodd concluded that, "where the LXX translators do not render *kipper* and its derivatives by words of the *hilaskesthai* class, they render it by words which give the meaning 'to sanctify', 'purify' persons or objects of ritual, or 'to cancel', 'purge away', 'forgive' sins. We should therefore expect to find that they regard the *hilaskesthai* class as conveying similar ideas" (op. cit., 84).

Dodd then turned to passages where the *hilaskesthai* word-group translates words other than *kipper* and its derivatives. He instances: *exhilaskesthai*, in the middle voice with a human subject, for *ḥiṭṭē'*, cleanse from defilement (2 Chr. 29:24; 30:18; Ezek. 43:26; cf. v. 23; 45:15, 17, 20; cf. v. 19; Hab. 1:11; Amos 8:14; *hilaskesthai*, in the middle with divine subject, for *sālaḥ*, to forgive (2 Ki. 5:18; Ps. 25[24]:11; 2 Chr. 6:30; cf. *exhilasmos* in Dan. 9:9 Theodotion; Sir. 5:5 f.); *hilaskesthai* in the passive, *hileōs einai or gignesthai, euhilateuein*, all with divine subject, for *sālaḥ*, forgive (Deut. 29:20; 2 Sam. 24:4; Amos 7:2 and various unspecified instances in 1 Ki., 2 Chr. and Jer.); *hileōs gignesthai, euhilatos gignesthai*, with divine subject for *nāśā' (l[e])*, lit. lift up, i.e. pardon (Num. 14:19; Ps. 109[108]:8; Sir. 16:7); *hilaskesthai* in the passive, *hileōs gignesthai*, with divine subject, for *niḥam* (niphal) and *riḥam* (piel), have compassion (Exod. 32:12, 14; Isa. 54:10); *exhilaskesthai* in the middle with a human subject and God as the object, for *ḥillâh*, appease, pacify, propitiate (Zech. 7:2; 8:22; Mal. 1:9, the first clear examples which Dodd allows of this meaning); *exhilaskesthai* in the middle with a human subject, for *pillēl*, pray, intercede (Ps. 106[105]:30; cf. Num. 25:11, where Dodd allows an element of propitiation). Dodd concludes that, "where words of the *hilaskesthai* class do not render *kipper* and its derivatives, everywhere, except in the four cases last considered, they render words which fall into one or other of two classes: (i) with human subject, 'to cleanse from sin or defilement', 'to expiate'; (ii) with divine subject, 'to be gracious', 'to have mercy', 'to forgive' " (op. cit., 88).

Finally, Dodd examined those passages where the *hilaskesthai* group translates

kipper and its derivatives. Dodd noted the following types of usage. *hilaskesthai* and *exhilaskesthai* in the middle voice with a direct object mean to cleanse, purge, sanctify, cancel sin etc., as in the Men Tyrannus inscription (Lev. 16:16, 33; Ezek. 45:20 and other unspecified passages in Lev. and Ezek.; Dan. 9:24 Theodotion; Sir. 3:30). It has the same meaning in the passive, as in Plato's *Laws* (Num. 35:33; Deut. 21:8; 1 Sam. 3:14), where as before, the subject is human. Only in Ps. 65:3 (64:4) is the subject God. In view of this, Dodd gives the meaning of expiation to *exhilasmos* (Heb. *kippurîm*, Exod. 30:10 A; Lev. 23:27 f.; Num. 5:8; Heb. *kappōreṯ*, 1 Chr. 28:11), *exhilasis* (Heb. *kippurîm*, Num. 29:11; cf. Hab. 3:17), and *hilastērion* (Heb. *kappōreṯ*, Exod. 25:17–22[16–21]; 31:7; 35:12; 37:6[38:5]; 37:6, 8 f. [38:5, 7 f.]; Lev. 16:2, 13 ff.; Num. 7:89). *hilaskesthai* and *exhilaskesthai* in the middle with prepositional phrases (*epi*, *peri*, *hyper*), with a human subject, is the most frequent use (e.g. Exod. 30:15 f.; 32:30; Ezek. 45:17; and frequently in Ezek. and the Pentateuch). This usage corresponds to the Heb. *kipper* with the acc. or the prepositions *'al*, *b^{e}'aḏ*. Dodd takes the meaning here to be: to make expiation for, to expiate or cleanse. Where *hilaskesthai* and *exhilaskesthai* occur in the middle with a dat. and a divine subject (Ps. 78[77]: 38; Ezek. 16:63) the vb. means to forgive. The same vbs. in the passive (Ps. 89[88]:9; 2 Chr. 30:18 f.) and also *hileōs gignesthai* (Deut. 21:8) mean to be propitious or gracious towards, and so to forgive (but not, according to Dodd, to be propitiated). *exhilaskesthai* in the middle with the acc. direct object and with a human subject means to appease, or placate (Gen. 32:20[21]; Prov. 16:14). *exhilasma* occurs only twice for *kōper*, equivalent, compensation, equivalent of a life, ransom (1 Sam. 12:3; Ps. 49[48]:8). Dodd drew from all this the conclusion "that the LXX translators did not regard *kipper* (when used as a religious term) as conveying the sense of propitiating the Deity, but the sense of performing an act whereby guilt or defilement is removed, and accordingly rendered it by *hilaskesthai* in this sense" (op. cit., 93). He went on to draw the further conclusion that this was the meaning that the NT writers assumed when they used this word group (op. cit., 93 ff.).

(c) Dodd's case has been subjected to minute criticism from various angles. An immediately apparent weakness is that Dodd limited his discussion to questions of grammar and equivalent translations in the LXX without looking at the wider context of ideas and motivation (cf. D. Hill, *Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings: Studies in the Semantics of Soteriological Terms*, *Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 5*, 1967, 24). Dodd did not inquire at all into the background of what the OT says about the character of Yahweh and man's relationship with him. Even so, as Roger R. Nicole has pointed out, Dodd failed to take into account a large group of words which translate *kipper* and its cognates, e.g. *aphaireō*, take away (Isa. 27:9), *antallagma*, that which is given in exchange (Isa. 43:3). Nicole maintains that "in his first line of investigation Dodd's conclusions are based on less than 40 per cent of the relevant evidence, and this in a case where the uniformity of the usage is a major factor in the argumentation" ("C. H. Dodd and the Doctrine of Propitiation", *WTJ* 17, 1955, 129). In the light of his own detailed examination of the various translations of *kipper* in the LXX, Nicole claims that Dodd's findings should be rewritten as follows: "Where the LXX translators do not render *kipper* and its cognates by words of the *hilaskesthai* class, they render it by words which give the meaning 'to sanctify', 'to forgive', 'to remove', 'to cover with pitch', 'to ransom', 'to contribute', 'to give', 'to veil', 'to anoint', 'the village', 'the

myrrh', or they have failed to render it altogether. We should therefore expect to find that they regard the *hilaskesthai* class as conveying similar ideas" (ibid.; cf. Dodd, op. cit., 84, quoted above). The point of the observation is to draw attention to Dodd's arbitrary selectivity in concentrating on one particular meaning to the exclusion of other attested meanings. Moreover, as D. Hill points out, the range of meanings which Dodd himself allows to this group of words (from 'sanctify' to 'cancel') is so wide that it cannot offer a precise guide to the meaning of the *hilaskomai* group (op. cit., 25 f.). Even where there is a single theme of meaning, the actual meaning must be determined by the way in which words are used in context."

This last point has bearing on the debate concerning the etymology of *kipper*. The two main alternative meanings proposed for the root are "to cover" and "to wipe away". But as Hill again points out, this debate is indecisive for determining the biblical uses of the word-group (op. cit. 30 f.). On the one hand, the meaning of words change in the course of time. The root meaning of a word is at best only a general guide. The more exact determination of meaning must depend on the way words are used in particular contexts (cf. J. Barr, *The Semantics of Biblical Language*, 1961, 107–60). On the other hand, the difference between the two suggested meanings is not great, and both lend themselves to propitiatory and expiatory interpretations.

kipper in the Heb. OT is normally translated by *exhilaskomai*. The latter vb. does not occur at all in the NT which prefers *hilaskomai*. Nevertheless, *exhilaskomai* is important, as it occurs 105 times (83 of which to translate *kipper*). It is the normal vb. used when OT writers speak of making atonement. Their usage falls into two main groups, according to whether the atonement is brought about by some cultic action (the majority of cases) or by some other non-cultic means. Dodd was inclined to dismiss instances like Gen. 32:20(21) and Prov. 16:14, where he admitted that the meaning was to appease or placate, since the usage here was not strictly religious and thus belonged to the non-cultic use (Dodd, op. cit., 92). But Hill (op. cit., 31) and Morris (op. cit., 161–67) argue that the non-cultic use is fundamental, since it enables us to ascertain the general, basic meaning of *exhilaskomai* (cf. also S. H. Langdon, *ExpT* 22, 1910–11, 323; J. Herrmann, *TDNT* III 302 f.).

Morris examines the following passages in some detail, all of which contain *exhilaskomai* in a non-cultic sense: Exod. 30:12–16; Num. 31:50; Isa. 47:11 (where some form of payment averts wrath); Exod. 32:30 (where Moses offers his life to make atonement); 2 Sam. 21:1–14 (where the hanging of seven descendants of Saul reconciles the Gibeonites); Num. 35:33 ("You shall not thus pollute the land in which you live; for blood pollutes the land and no expiation can be made for the land, for the blood that is shed in it, except by the blood of him who shed it"); Deut. 32:41 ff. (Yahweh "avenges the blood of his servants, and takes vengeance on his adversaries, and makes *kipper* [LXX *ekkathariei*, will cleanse out] for the land of his people"); Deut. 21:1–9 (the killing of a heifer to avert the guilt of innocent blood from a community); Prov. 16:14 (a wise man will appease the wrath of a king); Isa. 27:9 (forgiveness brought about by the destruction of idolatrous altars); Ezek. 16:63, cf. vv. 38, 42 (forgiveness through satisfaction); Pss. 65:3; 78:38; 79:9; Dan. 9:24; Jer. 18:23 ("Forgive not their iniquity ... deal with them in the time of thine anger"); Num. 25:1–18 (by offering up the lives of evil-doers the zealous priest makes atonement and averts divine wrath); 2 Chr. 30:18 and Isa. 6:7 (both passages concerned

with the purging away of uncleanness). Morris concludes that in 7 of these passages atonement is made through offering a *kōper* of life, and in 9 the *kōper* is money, goods or a metaphorical price (op. cit., 166 f.). Clearly, some cases are less clear-cut than others, since not all of these passages explicitly refer to the person who is propitiated. However, in those cases where the propitiated party is mentioned, it is evident that the offence is not dealt with in an impersonal way as if the mere performance of an act is sufficient to bring about the desired consequences. It may be stated that those passages which can be construed in an expiatory sense can also be construed in a propitiatory sense. On the other hand, those passages which require a propitiatory sense cannot be reduced to a simple expiatory sense.

Turning to the cultic use of *kipper*, Morris points out that the vb. acquired a technical meaning which completely overshadowed other meanings. Hence, in most places it means "to accomplish reconciliation between God and man", without indicating how that reconciliation is obtained (op. cit., 167). Num. 16:41–50 provides a link between the cultic and non-cultic uses. The means of averting Yahweh's wrath is by Aaron's making an offering of → incense (vv. 46 f.). Various passages speak of gifts in which there is an element of atonement (Num. 15:25; cf. 7:25; 31:1–54; Deut. 16:16; Jdg. 6:18 f.; Isa. 18:7; Zeph. 3:10). 1 Sam. 3:14 is an early cultic passage in which Yahweh's personal enmity to the house of Eli is so great that "the iniquity of Eli's house shall not be atoned [*yiṯkappēr*] with sacrifice or offering for ever." Lev. 5:16 refers to a guilt offering for an unwitting trespass: "He shall also make restitution for what he has done amiss in the holy thing, and shall add a fifth to it and give it to the priest; and the priest shall make atonement [*yᵉkappēr*] for him with the ram of the guilt offering, and he shall be forgiven [*wᵉnislaḥ lô*]." Morris suggests that the extra fifth looks remarkably like a sort of *kōper*, and that the same may be said for other examples of the guilt offering (op. cit., 169). Even in cases where restitution could not be paid to the offended party because of his death, the restitution plus one fifth still had to be paid to Yahweh (Num. 5:8). Although the prophets denounced popular ideas of sacrifice which assumed that Yahweh would be satisfied with a gift without a corresponding change of heart (Isa. 1:1 ff.; Mic. 6:6 ff.), they did not put forward an alternative theory of sacrifice.

Morris holds that the remaining cases of *exhilaskomai* which translate a vb. other than *kipper*, which have already been noted in discussing Dodd's case, are also compatible with the idea of propitiation. Indeed, as Dodd himself recognized, the element of propitiation is positively required by Zech. 7:2; 8:22; Mal. 1:9; cf. also Ps. 106(105):30; Num. 25:11.

The vb. *hilaskomai* which is used in the NT occurs only 11 times in the OT, always in the middle or passive and always with Yahweh as subject. In general, it means to forgive. But in 6 of these passages there is explicit mention of divine wrath. In view of this Morris claims that "it is manifestly impossible to maintain that the vb. has been emptied of its force" (op. cit., 158). Thus, in Exod. 32:14 it translates *nāḥam* (in the niphal): "And the LORD repented [*wayyinnāḥem YHWH*] of the evil which he thought to do to his people." But it must be noted that vv. 11 f. refer to the wrath of Yahweh which is averted by the intercession of Moses. In Lam. 3:42 *hilaskomai* translates *sālaḥ* which means to forgive: "We have transgressed and rebelled, and thou hast not forgiven." But the forgiveness in question here is of the kind which involves the turning away of divine wrath. The same may be said of Dan.

9:19 (Theodotion): "O Lord, forgive"; which may be compared with v. 16: "O Lord, according to all thy righteous acts, let thy anger and thy wrath turn away from thy city Jerusalem, thy holy hill; because for our sins, and for the iniquities of our fathers, Jerusalem and thy people have become a byword among all who are round about us." The personal wrath of Yahweh is present in 2 Ki. 24:3 f.: "Surely this came upon Judah at the command of the LORD, to remove them out of his sight, for the sins of Manasseh, according to all that he had done, and also for the innocent blood that he had shed; for he filled Jerusalem with innocent blood, and the LORD would not pardon." The idea of forgiveness in Ps. 78(77):38 is practically identical with the averting of divine wrath: "Yet he, being compassionate, forgave their iniquity, and did not destroy them; he restrained his anger often, and did not stir up all his wrath." The same is true of Ps. 79(78):8: "Do not remember against us the iniquities of our forefathers; let thy compassion come speedily to meet us, for we are brought very low." There is a clear link between the pardoning of guilt and Yahweh's character in Ps. 25(24):11: "For thy name's sake, O LORD, pardon my guilt, for it is great" (cf. vv. 16 ff.). In Ps. 65(64):3 the notion of forgiveness is uppermost, but the context makes it clear that it is no mere impersonal matter but something which concerns Yahweh personally: "When our transgressions prevail over us, thou dost forgive them." Est. 13:17 (Addition C v. 10) is concerned with the forgiveness of the people under sentence of death. In 2 Ki. 5:18 the former → leper and convert to Yahwism, Naaman, asks for pardon for bowing down in the house of Rimmon, an action prohibited by the Second Commandment on the grounds that Yahweh is a jealous God (Exod. 20:5; Deut. 5:9): "In this matter may the LORD pardon your servant: when my master goes into the house of Rimmon to worship there, leaning on my arm, and I bow myself in the house of Rimmon, when I bow myself in the house of Rimmon, the LORD pardon your servant in this matter."

The noun *hilasmos* occurs 10 times in a variety of contexts. In Lev. 25:9 and Num. 5:8 it translates *kippurîm* and may be translated as atonement. The former is concerned with the Day of Atonement and the latter with the ram of atonement, offered to Yahweh in restitution for wrong committed against a fellow Israelite. In Ps. 130(129):4 and Dan. 9:9 (Theodotion) it translates *s^{e}lîḥâh*, forgiveness. In Amos 8:14 it translates *'ašmâh*, wrong doing, guilt. In Ezek. 44:27 it is the equivalent of *ḥaṭṭā't*, sin offering. There is no Heb. equivalent in 1 Chr. 28:20 and 2 Macc. 3:33, where it is applied to the sacrifice offered by Onias to deliver Heliodorus from further punishment.

The LXX uses *hilastērion* 22 times for the Heb. *kappōreṯ* which may be rendered "propitiatory" (BDB, 498) or "mercy seat" (RSV). The older translation "cover" (cf. RSV mg) has no justification in usage. It occurs in Exod. 25:17–22 (16–21); 31:7; 35:12; 38:6, 8 f. (5, 7 f.); Lev. 16:2, 13 ff.; Num. 7:89). It designates the slab of → gold 2½ cubits by 1½ cubits placed on top of the ark of testimony (→ Tent, Tabernacle; → Temple). On it and as part of it were the two → cherubim, whose outstretched wings came together and formed the throne of Yahweh. When the high → priest entered the Holy of Holies on the Day of Atonement (Lev. 16), this holiest place had to be enveloped in a cloud of → incense. The → blood of the sin-offering of atonement was sprinkled on it and before it. In 1 Chr. 28:11 the temple proper, as distinct from the porch etc., was called the *bēṯ hakkapporeṯ*, "the room [lit. house] for the mercy seat" (RSV). In Ezek. 43:14, 17, 20 *hilastērion* stands for *'^{a}zārâh*, a

ledge surrounding Ezekiel's altar. It occurs without Heb. equivalent in Amos 9:1, and also in 4 Macc. 17:22 where it may be an adj. qualifying the noun death or a noun in apposition: "they having as it were become a ransom [*antipsychon*] for our nation's sin; and through the blood of these righteous men and the propitiation of their death [*tou hilastēriou thanatou*], the divine Providence delivered [*diesōsen*] Israel that before was evil entreated" (cf. also 2 Macc. 7:37; 4 Macc. 6:28).

hileōs occurs 35 times in the LXX particularly in the phrase *hileōs einai*, be propitious, for Heb. *sālaḥ*, forgive. It features in the prayer of → Solomon at the dedication of the → temple (1 Ki. 8:30, 34, 36, 39, 50; 2 Chr. 6:21, 25, 27, 39; cf. also Num. 14:20; 2 Chr. 7:14; Jer. 5:1, 7; 50[27]:20; 31[38]:34; 36[43]:3). It renders no less than 7 other Heb. expressions chiefly connected with forgiveness in Gen. 43:23; Exod. 32:12; Num. 14:19; Deut. 21:8; 1 Sam. 14:45; 2 Sam. 20:20; 23:17; 1 Chr. 11:19; and has no corresponding Heb. in 1 Macc. 2:21; 2 Macc. 2:7, 22; 7:37; 10:26; 4 Macc. 6:28; 8:14; 9:24; 12:18.

In the intertestamental period human expressions of piety may have atoning power as well as cultic acts. This is anticipated by Prov. 16:6: "By loyalty and faithfulness iniquity is atoned for, and by the fear of the LORD a man avoids evil." According to Sir. 3:30, "A flaming fire doth quench water; so doth almsgiving atone for sin." In later Judaism good deeds, the study of the Torah, suffering, and one's own death may have atoning value (T. Yoma 5:6 ff.; cf. E. Lohse, *Märtyrer und Gottesknecht*, 1963 ², 35 ff.). The death of the martyrs has a special atoning worth, as may be seen in the quotation above from 4 Macc. 17:22 (cf. 2 Macc. 7:37; SB II 275 ff.; Lohse, op. cit., 66 ff.).

To sum up the discussion so far, it is clear that the authors of the Heb. OT and the LXX translators are far removed from the crude pagan idea of propitiating a capricious and malevolent deity. On the other hand, the evidence that we have examined does not suggest that these writers shared a common quasi-mechanistic view of life in which the effects of sin could be nullified by resorting to the appropriate rite as an antidote. There is a personal dimension which affects both the offending and the offended parties which means that, even where an offence has to be expiated, the action has to be taken because the personal relationship between the parties requires it. What C. K. Barrett says of Paul's teaching in Romans might also be applied to those passages in the OT concerning the expiation of man's sin: "It would be wrong to neglect the fact that expiation has, as it were, the effect of propitiation: the sin that might have excited God's wrath is expiated (at God's will) and therefore no longer does so" (*The Epistle to the Romans*, *BNTC*, 1957, 78).

(d) The element of propitiation is further supported by a closer examination of the significance of → blood in the OT. The view that → life is in the blood has already been noted (see above, OT 2 (c)). This has been taken by an influential body of theologians to mean that sacrifice is a way of releasing life. Thus Vincent Taylor writes: "The victim is slain in order that its life, in the form of blood, may be released, and its flesh is burnt in order that it may be transformed or etherialized; and in both cases the aim is to make it possible for life to be presented as an offering to the Deity" (*Jesus and His Sacrifice*, 1937, 54 f.). Similarly, E. L. Mascall writes: "The slaying was merely an indispensable preliminary by which the life was set free to be offered" (*Corpus Christi*, 1955, 89; cf. F. C. N. Hicks, *The Fullness of Sacrifice*, 1930). With Mascall, Hicks and other Catholic writers, this interpretation laid the

OT foundation for a view of the eucharist which saw the sacrament as the means of communicating the life of Christ to the faithful, on whose behalf it was released in the sacrifice of Calvary and renewed in the eucharist.

The chief grounds for adopting this interpretation of the OT lie in the way passages like Lev. 17:11 are understood: "For the life [Heb. *nepeš*; LXX *psychē*] of the flesh is in the blood [Heb. *dām*; LXX *haima*]; and I have given it for you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls; for it is the blood that makes atonement, by reason of the life." This may be coupled with the prohibition in Lev. 17:14: "For the life of every creature is the blood of it [so Gk., Syr., cf. Vulg.; the Heb. reads: for the life of all flesh, its blood is in its life]; therefore I have said to the people of Israel, You shall not eat the blood of any creature, for the life of every creature is its blood; whoever eats it shall be cut off." A similar prohibition is contained in Deut. 12:23: "Only be sure that you do not eat the blood; for the blood is the life, and you shall not eat the life with the flesh." The same command is given to → Noah which is contained in the so-called "Noachian decrees": "Only you shall not eat flesh with its life, that is, its blood" (Gen. 9:4). The eating of flesh with blood in it is further prohibited in (e.g.) Lev. 3:17; 7:26 f.; 17:10, 12; 19:26; Deut. 12:16, 23;15:23. Various other passages link blood and life. Thus → David refused to drink the water brought to him from the well of → Bethlehem: "He poured it out to the LORD, and said, 'Far be it from me, O LORD, that I should do this. Shall I drink the blood of the men who went at the risk of their lives?' " (2 Sam. 23:16 f.). The taking of human life is also prohibited in the "Noachian decrees": "For your lifeblood I will surely require a reckoning; of every beast I will require it and of man; of every man's brother I will require the life of man" (Gen. 9:5). Blood is used as a synonym for life or soul by the Psalmist: "From oppression and violence he redeems their life [Heb. *napšām*; LXX *psychas*]; and precious is their blood in his sight" (Ps. 72[71]:14).

The view represented by Taylor has, however, been strongly challenged by a number of scholars (L. Morris, op. cit., 112–28; A. M. Stibbs, *The Meaning of the Word "Blood" in Scripture*, 1954²; J. Behm, *haima, haimatekchysia, TDNT* I 172–77; J. A. Robinson, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians*, 1904, 29; G. F. Moore, *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, 1899–1903, column 4221; C. Ryder Smith, *The Bible Doctrine of Salvation*, 1946, 233; cf. also H. W. Wolff, *Anthropology of the Old Testament*, 1974, 60 ff., whose study of blood makes no reference to the theory of the shedding of blood as the release of life). On closer examination it becomes clear that "blood" in many of the passages quoted means death rather than life. So long as the blood circulates in the animal or human being, there is life. When it no longer circulates, death ensues. This, of course, is prior to the modern theory of the circulation of the blood, discovered by William Harvey in the seventeenth century. Rather, it was recognized that, while blood flowed, there was life. Behind the prohibition of eating flesh with blood in it, there may also have been sound hygienic reasons. Gen. 9:5 (like Gen. 42:22) is concerned with the destruction of life. Alongside Ps. 72[71]:14 may be set Ps. 116:15: "Precious in the sight of the LORD is the death of his saints."

Similarly, David's question about drinking the blood of his brave followers can only be a metaphorical one in which blood signifies life surrendered in death. Of the 362 instances of the word *dām*, blood, in the Heb. OT, Leon Morris claims that no less than 203 associate blood with violent death (op. cit., 112). Among these are

some 165 general instances like "Whoever sheds the blood of man, by man shall his blood be shed" (Gen. 9:6), "the avenger of blood" (Num. 35:19), "he who avenges blood is mindful of them" (Ps. 9:12). The expression "innocent blood" occurs 21 times (e.g. Deut. 19:10, 13; 21:8 f.; cf. 27:25; 1 Sam. 19:5; 1 Ki. 2:31; Prov. 6:17; Isa. 59:7). The idea of one's blood being upon oneself is found 12 times (e.g. Lev. 20:9, 11 ff., 16, 27; 2 Sam. 16:8; 1 Ki. 2:32 ff.). On blood-guiltiness see Gen. 9:4 ff.; Lev. 17:4; Deut. 19:10; Prov. 1:18; 28:17; Isa. 1:15; Hos. 1:4; 4:2; Nah. 3:1; Ezek. 22:2; 24:6, 9. There are some 5 references to the death of animals (e.g. Lev. 17:3 f.) in addition to 103 references to sacrificial blood (e.g. Exod. 23:18). In passages like Gen. 37:26; 1 Ki. 2:5; Ps. 58[57]:10, blood clearly signifies death.

Taken in isolation, it is possible to construe certain passages which deal with atonement (e.g. Exod. 30:10; Lev. 16:27; 17:11) as offering the life of the victim. But it is equally possible to understand them as offering the death of the victim whose life has been taken away. However, in Num. 35:33 which deals with the execution of a murderer, there can be no question of the presentation of his life before God. And in various passages where atonement is effected by some means other than the cultus it is the termination of life which brings about the atonement. Thus Moses sought atonement for the sin of the people by asking Yahweh to blot him out of the book which he had written (Exod. 32:30 ff.). Phinehas made atonement by slaying Zimri and Cozbi (Num. 25:13). David made atonement by delivering seven descendants of Saul to be hanged by the Gibeonites (2 Sam. 21:3 f.). In the case of a murder committed by an unknown person atonement is made by breaking the neck of a heifer (Deut. 21:1–9).

In the case of sacrifice within the cultus, atonement is generally effected not simply by offering the blood but by the offering of the whole sacrifice (Ezek. 45:17; for the various types of offering → Sacrifice). Moreover, different parts of the animal were associated with atonement: e.g. the head (Lev. 1:4; cf. Yoma 3:8; 4:2; 6:2); the burning of the fat (Lev. 4:26; cf. 3:16 f.; Isa. 1:11; 34:6; 2 Sam. 1:22). In some cases where atonement is spoken of, the blood appears to be excluded altogether. Thus Aaron and his sons were instructed to "eat those things with which atonement was made" (Exod. 29:33). Similarly, Moses rebuked the sons of Aaron by asking: "Why have you not eaten the sin offering in the place of the sanctuary, since it is a thing most holy and has been given to you that you may bear the iniquity of the congregation, to make atonement for them before the LORD? Behold, its blood was not brought into the inner part of the sanctuary. You certainly ought to have eaten it in the sanctuary, as I commanded" (Lev. 10:17 f.). In other places atonement is connected with ceremonies like the → pouring of → oil on the head of a cleansed → leper (Lev. 14:18, 29), the offering of → incense (Num. 16:46), and the scapegoat (Lev. 16:10). In the Passover ritual blood is the means of averting destruction. "The blood shall be a sign for you, upon the houses where you are; and when I see the blood, I will pass over you, and no plague shall fall upon you to destroy you, when I smite the land of Egypt" (Exod. 12:13). Morris comments: "The obvious symbolism is that a death has taken place, and this death substitutes for the death of the firstborn" (op. cit., 121).

Finally, attention may be drawn to certain prophetic passages in which the slaughter of nations is compared with sacrifice. Thus Jeremiah spoke of the destruction of Egypt and her allies: "The sword shall devour and be sated, and drink its fill

of their blood. For the LORD God of hosts holds a sacrifice in the north country by the river Euphrates" (Jer. 46:10b). In similar vein Zephaniah also spoke of the day of the Lord: "Be silent before the LORD God! For the day of the LORD is at hand; the LORD has prepared a sacrifice and consecrated his guests. And on the day of the LORD'S sacrifice – 'I will punish the officials and the king's sons and all who array themselves in foreign attire' " (Zeph. 1:7 f.). Here too there can be no question of sacrifice being a means of releasing life; the essential idea is the taking away of life in death.

In view of these considerations, the conclusion may be drawn that, where blood is mentioned in the OT, the thought that is uppermost is the shedding of blood (whether literally or in some other way of terminating life), and where blood is linked with sacrifice or atonement the thought is that of the death of the victim rather than the release of his life. As in our study of *kipper* and the *hilaskomai* word-group, there lies in the background the thought that such acts are not arbitrary or unethical. In the last analysis they are required because Yahweh is who he is. The biblical writers see no tension with righteousness at this point. Indeed, these things are seen as part and parcel of the moral structure of life which in turn derives from Yahweh.

C. Brown

4. The ideas of atonement acquired a particular form in the Qumran community. The community on the one hand held firmly to the OT view that God is the subject of atonement (e.g. 1QH 4:37; 1QS 11:1–14; CD 4:6 ff.; 20:34). At the same time, however, there was the idea that the Essene community as the true → Israel makes atonement for the whole land (*l*^{e}*kapper b*^{e}*'aḏ hā-'āreṣ*) by its obedience to the Torah (1QS 8:6, 10; cf. 2:8; 5:6; 8:3; 1QSa 1:3; Lev. 18:27 f.; Num. 35:33; Joel 3:17[4:17]; Jub. 50:5; Sib. 5:264; Syr. Bar. 66:2; see further A. R. C. Leaney, *The Rule of Qumran and Its Meaning*, 1966, 217).

NT In view of the relatively frequent and quite familiar occurrence of cultic terms in the LXX, it comes as a surprise to find how rarely the NT makes use of these words. Each of the four terms is used only twice, so that the whole group of words appears only 8 times in the NT (of which 3 are in Heb.).

1. (a) *hileōs* appears in Matt. 16:22 as a negative exclamation in Peter's rebuke of Jesus when Jesus told him of his impending death at Jerusalem: "God forbid, Lord! This shall never happen to you." The Gk. is *hileōs soi, kyrie* (lit. "gracious to you, Lord"). The words *eiē ho theos* ("may God be") are understood. For biblical parallels see Gen. 43:23; 2 Sam. 20:20; 1 Chr. 11:19 (cf. also *hileōs soi, Alypi* "May [Serapis] help you", quoted by Arndt, 376; cf. Funk § 128, 5; Moulton-Milligan, 303).

(b) Heb. 8:12 comes at the end of a quotation from Jer. 31:31–34: "for I will be merciful toward their iniquities, and I will remember their sins no more." It concludes an argument that the new covenant has been inaugurated by Christ, that this is the covenant foretold by Jeremiah, and therefore that, "In speaking of a new covenant he treats the first as obsolete. And what is becoming obsolete and growing old is ready to vanish away" (Heb. 8:12).

2. (a) Strikingly enough, *exhilaskomai* which is the regular vb. in the LXX does not occur in the NT at all. The aor. passive of *hilaskomai* is used in Lk. 18:13 in the tax collector's prayer in the temple: "God, be merciful to me a sinner! [*ho theos,*

hilasthēti moi tō hamartōlō]." The thought is similar to that of Ps. 79(78):9 LXX: "and forgive our sins for thy name's sake [*kai hilasthēti tais hamartiais hēmōn heneka tou onomatos sou*]." The same vb. is used in both cases. It can be rendered as both "be propitious" and "be merciful" (Moulton-Milligan, 303; Arndt, 376). Whether one sees here overtones of the need for propitiation, as in cl. Gk., or whether one sees a more general cry for mercy, depends on the weight one gives to Dodd's argument that the passive meaning of "be propitiated" has been evaporated in the LXX (op. cit., 93 f.; cf. above OT 3 (b)). However, it must be pointed out that the tax collector certainly felt the need for a forgiveness that only God himself could bestow. Otherwise, he would not have uttered the prayer.

Jesus' comment is contained in Lk. 18:14: "I tell you, this man went down to his house justified [*dedikaiōmenos*] rather than the other; for every one who exalts himself will be humbled, but he who humbles himself will be exalted." On justification → Righteousness, art. *dikaiosynē*. Commenting on the parable, E. E. Ellis sees the → Pharisee's attitude as not untypical of attitudes within Judaism (*The Gospel of Luke, New Century Bible*, 1966, 215). In the Talmud one rabbi was said to be confident that his righteousness was sufficient to exempt his whole generation from judgment. If the saved numbered only "a hundred, I and my son are among them; and if only two, they are I and my son" (Suk. 45b). In terms of performing those acts which were currently understood as comprising righteousness, Paul declared himself "as to the righteousness under the law, blameless" (Phil. 3:6). Even at Qumran, amidst the profound consciousness that the community was the elect and righteous Sons of Light, there was a sense that righteousness was a gift of God. "As for me, my justification is with God. In His Hand are the perfection of my way and the uprightness of my heart. He will wipe out my transgression through His righteousness. . . . From the source of His righteousness is my justification" (1QS 11:2 f., 5). Thus justification here might be said to be by grace alone, but it was not, as with Paul, by faith related to the saving act of Christ (Rom. 3:20–27) or related to the law (Rom. 8:4; cf. 7:1–25; Gal. 3:10 ff.). The development of these aspects of reconciliation and justification belong to the post-Pentecost church.

The parable in Lk. 18 focuses on two aspects: on man's side what matters is a heartfelt turning to God which simply casts oneself on God's mercy; on God's side human self-righteousness is of no avail, but God has mercy on the ungodly who turn to him for mercy. The final statement about → humility and exaltation (→ Height, art. *hypsoō*) is regarded by some as possibly an originally independent saying (Ellis, op. cit., 214). It does, however, fit the context and train of thought remarkably well. For it picks up OT teaching about God, righteousness and humility (e.g. Prov. 3:34; Isa. 55:15; 58:3 ff.; cf. also 1 Pet. 5:5 f.). It says in effect to those to whom the parable was addressed ("who trusted in themselves that they were righteous and despised others", Lk. 18:9), that this teaching is nothing new. If they (and the Pharisee in the parable) had really understood the Scriptures, they would have understood this truth about God and man.

(b) Heb. 2:17 takes up the cultic ritual of the Day of Atonement: "Therefore he had to be made like his brethren in every respect, so that he might become a merciful and faithful high priest in the service of God, to make expiation for the sins of the people [*eis to hilaskesthai tas hamartias tou laou*]" (cf. Lev. 16:14 ff.). The RSV here follows Dodd's line of interpretation (see above, OT 3 (b)). "Christ is represented

as performing an act whereby men are delivered from the guilt of their sin, not whereby God is propitiated" (C. H. Dodd, op. cit., 94). Jesus is portrayed as the faithful high priest (cf. 1 Sam. 2:35) who atones for the → sins of the people. The death and exaltation of Jesus are interpreted in terms of the annual Day of Atonement ritual which is seen as a type of Jesus' reconciling work and which is thus rendered obsolete by the fulfilment which comes with Jesus.

Jesus stands in the service of God. In the phrase "a merciful and faithful high priest in the service of God [*eleēmōn . . . kai pistos archiereus ta pros ton theon*]" the *ta* is an acc. of respect (Funk § 160). This has been taken to imply that God is not the recipient of the reconciliation. Rather, Jesus is appointed and authorized by God "to fulfil that which neither the propitiatory acts of the OT nor those of other religions have been able to accomplish" (O. Michel, *Der Brief an die Hebräer*, *KEK* 13, 1966 [12], 169). Comparison with cultic atonement exhibits the radical nature of the sacrifice of Jesus' life for the sin of others (cf. Heb. 7:27; 9:12, 26; 10:12). The outcome of Jesus' atonement (*hilaskesthai*) is the wiping out of the guilt of sins (*hamartias*) and the offer of → forgiveness to the new people of God. Clearly, this is an action by God through his high priest Jesus for the salvation of men. But while there is no thought of appeasement of an angry deity in the pagan sense, and God is not said explicitly to be the recipient of the *hilaskesthai*, it may be asked whether Dodd's conclusion is not too simplistic. For whether we look at it against the wider background of personal relations with Yahweh in the OT or the more specific background of the Day of Atonement ritual (see above, OT 3 (c)), the reason why guilt has to be expiated lies in the character of God himself. The Day of Atonement ritual is required not because of some mechanistic view of the universe which requires the appropriate ritual as an antidote to nullify the effects of sin. It is because God himself is who he is and what he is. He is both the provider and the recipient of the reconciliation.

3. The noun *hilasmos* occurs only in 1 Jn. "And he is the expiation for our sins [*hilasmos . . . peri tōn hamartiōn hēmōn*], and not for ours only but also for the sins of the whole world" (1 Jn. 2:2 RSV). "In this is love, not that we loved God but that he loved us and sent his Son to be the expiation for our sins [*hilasmon peri tōn hamartiōn hēmōn*]" (1 Jn. 4:10 RSV). The decision whether to translate *hilasmos* by "expiation" or "propitiation" must be decided against the background of the considerations already discussed (see above, OT 3 (b) and (c)). However, it must be said that, as with other passages in the OT and NT concerning reconciliation, it is not a matter of applying some impersonal antidote. The question at issue is our personal relationship with God, and that which hinders this relationship needs to be dealt with for God's part just as much as for ours (cf. 1 Jn. 1:5–10; 4:7 ff., 13–21).

1 Jn. 2:2 and 4:10 are parallel statements to 1 Jn. 2:1 and 1 Jn. 4:9: "My little children, I am writing this to you so that you may not sin; but if any one does sin, we have an advocate with the Father [*paraklēton . . . pros ton patera*], Jesus Christ the righteous"; "In this the love of God was made manifest among us, that God sent his only Son into the world, so that we might live through him." In view of this parallelism and the fact that cultic language is not in general characteristic of 1 Jn., it has been suggested that 1 Jn. 2:2 and 4:10 were later additions due to the redactional influence of the community (cf. R. Bultmann, *The Johannine Epistles*, *Hermeneia*, 1973, 23, 68). But in fact, words of the *hilaskomai* word-ground fit in naturally with

the terminology of blood, cleansing and sin (1 Jn. 1:7 ff.) and would come naturally to anyone familiar with this area of the thought-world of the LXX.

In 1 Jn. 2:1 Jesus is described by use of the personal term → advocate (*paraklētos*). But now, as B. F. Westcott pointed out, he is not said to be the propitiator but the propitiation (*The Epistles of St John*, 1892 [3], 44). This is parallel to him being "our life" (Col. 3:4), "our wisdom, our righteousness and sanctification and redemption" (1 Cor. 1:30). He does not simply guide, teach, quicken; he is "the way, the truth, and the life" (Jn. 14:6). The action is clearly linked with his death: "But if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship with one another, and the blood of Jesus his Son cleanses us from all sin" (1 Jn. 1:7). Christ's death is the ground on which we may be cleansed, when we confess our sins: "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just, and will forgive our sins and cleanse us from all unrighteousness" (1 Jn. 1:9). "The *hilasmos* is not one-sidedly linked with the single achievement of the death, but with the total person and work of Jesus, of which His death is, of course, an indissoluble part, 5:6; cf. 3:16; 1:7" (F. Büchsel, *TDNT* III 318). Jn. does not set out the need for a *hilasmos*. For him it is self-evident in the light of the character of God and the coming → judgment (1 Jn. 4:17). But once again atonement is not regarded as something that man does to God, but rather as the expression of God's love to men (1 Jn. 4:10).

4. (a) In the description of the sanctuary in the → tent in Heb. 9:1–5 *hilastērion* means mercy seat: "above it were the cherubim of glory overshadowing the mercy seat" (Heb. 9:5a; cf. Exod. 25:18–22; 37:7 ff. LXX; see above, OT 3 (c)).

(b) The interpretation of Rom. 3:25 has been the subject of much discussion. It stands at the centre of Paul's statement of God's → righteousness in the face of man's sin. The Gentile stands condemned apart from the law (Rom. 1:18–32; cf. 2:12) and the Jew is condemned by the law (Rom. 2:1–3:20). "But now the righteousness of God has been manifested apart from the law, although the law and the prophets bear witness to it, the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ for all who believe. For there is no distinction; since all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God, they are justified by his grace as a gift, through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus, whom God put forward as an expiation by his blood, to be received by faith [*hon proetheto ho theos hilastērion dia pisteōs*]. This was to show God's righteousness, because in his divine forbearance he had passed over former sins; it was to prove at the present time that he himself is righteous and that he justifies him who has faith in Jesus" (Rom. 3:21–26).

E. Käsemann sees Rom. 3:25 as a quotation taken up by Paul from Jewish Christian sources to which Paul has added his characteristic emphasis on faith in the words *dia pisteōs* ("Zum Verständnis von Römer 3, 24–26", *ZNW* 43, 1950–51, 150 ff.; reprinted in *Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen*, I, 1968[5], 96 ff.; cf. also R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, I, 1952, 46 f.).

Several older exegetes connect the *hilastērion* here with the mercy seat, as in Heb. 9:5 (see above, 4 (a)). Thus, F. Büchsel, who points out that Paul's writings are saturated with allusions to the LXX, writes: "The indisputable centre of the earlier expiations of the Law is the Day of Atonement, when the *hilastērion*, or *kappōreṯ*, must be sprinkled with blood to mediate the remission of all sins. Paul obviously assumes that the church to which he writes is acquainted with the Mosaic Law, 7:1. Hence it is natural that he should depict Jesus in this context as a higher *kappōreṯ*

which is efficacious through faith rather than through purely external observance" (*TDNT* III 321; cf. Rom. 2:28; 1 Cor. 3:6). Similarly, T. W. Manson interpreted *hilastērion* against the background of the Day of Atonement rites and took it to mean either "an expiatory place or object", or more probably in the context of Jewish-Christian usage "the place where God shows mercy to man" ("*HILASTERION*", *JTS* 46, 1945, 1–10).

This attractive interpretation has, however, failed to find general assent. Among those who have contested it is E. Lohse, *Märtyrer und Gottesknecht. Untersuchungen zur urchristlichen Verkündigung vom Sühntod Jesu Christi*, *FRLANT* 46, 1955, 1963 [2], 151 f.). Leon Morris has also questioned it on the following grounds ("The Meaning of *hilastērion* in Rom. iii. 25", *NTS* 2, 1955–56, 33–43). When *hilastērion* means mercy seat it always has the definite article (as in Heb. 9:5). The only exception is Exod. 25:17, where *epithema* removes it from the general to the particular. Not all the instances of *hilastērion* which Manson regards as referring to places are certain: they also refer to the propitiatory nature and purpose of the object. Generally speaking, Rom. does not move in the sphere of Levitical symbolism (in the way that, e.g., Heb. does). The question has to be asked how readily the readers of the Jewish Christian community at Rome would have grasped the significance of *hilastērion* as a single unexplained reference to the tabernacle furnishings. Manson regarded Rom. 1–3 as an "elaborate confession of sin for all mankind". This could be compared with Aaron's confession of the iniquities of Israel over the live goat on the Day of Atonement (Lev. 16:21) but for the fact that these chapters are not a confession of sin to God but a demonstration of God's condemnation of sin before men. Morris regards it as harsh to make Christ, at one and the same time, the priest, victim and place of sprinkling. On the other hand, this latter point is not an insuperable objection, for Paul evidently regards Jesus Christ as the one who made the offering, the victim whose blood actually does take away sins, and therefore he himself was the locus in which all this was effected.

An alternative model for Paul's thought might be 4 Macc. 17:22 (quoted above, OT 3 (c)). H. Rashdall went so far as to think it "highly probable" that "this was the source of St. Paul's thought and expression" (*The Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology*, 1919, 132). Leon Morris is more cautious and prefers to think of a community of thought to which both Paul and 4 Macc. belong. Among the ideas common to both passages are the following which are listed by D. Hill (op. cit., 42): (1) Both contexts speak of the active wrath of God; (2) Both refer to the shedding of blood and the surrender of life; (3) The death in both cases deals with sin; (4) In both cases death brings about deliverance, although with Paul it is not political but moral and theological; (5) In both passages the death is vicarious; (6) In both places it is God who provides the means of atonement.

Hill goes on to suggest that Paul was directly influenced by 4 Macc. (op. cit., 43–46). He follows M. Hadas in dating 4 Macc. in the middle or end of the reign of Caligula (A.D. 37–41) (*The Third and Fourth Books of Maccabees*, 1953). Paul probably wrote Rom. during his three-month stay in Greece mentioned at Acts 20:2 f. some time between late A.D. 55 and early 59. He therefore regards it as chronologically probable that 4 Macc. was written before Rom. Moreover, he does not think that the Alexandrian origin of 4 Macc. and its use of Gk. philosophical ideas militate against the theory that Paul knew the work and was influenced by it.

The work itself celebrates the glory and worth of martyrdom, with its emphasis on supreme obedience to the demands of God, its atoning worth, and the merit which avails for others. Similar ideas were current in Judaism (Ass.Mos.; Pss.Sol. 10:2; Test.Ben. 3:8; cf. W. H. C. Frend, *Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church*, 1965, 31–68; W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*, 1955 ², 265–73; H. J. Schoeps, *Paul: The Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish Religious History*, 1961, 128–33; and E. Lohse, op. cit.). There are clear traces of a martyr-theology in Paul (Rom. 5:13–18; Phil. 2:8). Moreover, Hill thinks it not too fanciful to suggest that Paul's writing of Rom. coincided with the Feast of the Dedication (Hanukkah) which began on 25 Chisleu and which was a winter festival. The feast commemorated the rededication of the temple in 165 B.C. This point has particular significance if 4 Macc. was or contained "a Memorial Address" composed for the feast (cf. B. W. Bacon, "The Festival of Lives given for the Nation in Jewish and Christian Faith", *Hibbert Journal* 15, 1917, 256–78).

Hill admits that a good deal of this is an undemonstrable hypothesis. But the point must be stressed that, if Paul has 4 Macc. in mind in writing Rom. 3, he was not saying that Jesus was just one of a long line of Jewish martyrs whose deaths had atoning value. Rather, his stress on the uniqueness of Christ's death and efficacy make it clear that the deaths of the Jewish martyrs do not possess the atoning value ascribed to them. This point is reinforced by Rom. 3:25b which declares that God had passed over former sins, i.e. he had not punished them, but that now he shows his righteousness in visiting sin and justifying those who have faith in Jesus (v. 26; → Patience, art. *anechomai* NT 2; cf. M. Black, *Romans*, *New Century Bible*, 1973, 70; C. E. B. Cranfield, *The Epistle to the Romans*, *ICC*, I, 1975, 211 ff.).

If the objection be made that to think of *hilastērion* in Rom. 3:35 in terms of the mercy seat involves an abrupt introduction of the idea without explanatory reference to the context, the same objection could be made to linking it to the thought-world of 4 Macc. And yet the word and its associated ideas are common factors in all three contexts. Must we choose between them? It might seem that it would make Paul's thought impossibly complicated, if we suggest that Paul was thinking of both the Day of Atonement with all its tabernacle symbolism and the Jewish tradition of the atoning death of the martyrs. But to put the matter this way might be to put it the wrong way round. There are a number of common factors in the Day of Atonement ritual and the Jewish beliefs: the need for atonement, that this is brought about by death, and that of an innocent victim, that this benefits the people. Such beliefs were not exclusively associated with either the Day of Atonement or the death of the martyrs. It may well be that Paul deliberately chose a term which was common to both to show that Christ's death is the ultimately valid means of atonement by which both the OT rites and contemporary Jewish beliefs about the deaths of the martyrs were once and for all superseded.

If this is so, it might well explain the grammatical problems posed by supposing that Paul was drawing on either context; i.e. his anarthrous use of *hilastērion*, whereas it normally has the definite article when it means mercy seat; the fact that *hilastēriou* in the best reading of 4 Macc. 17:22 appears to be adjectival. Thus Paul is using the word in a way which corresponds grammatically to neither set of passages exactly; but the substance of the idea is common to both.

At the same time Paul emphasizes once more the importance of → faith in the

words "by faith [*dia pisteōs*]". The words "by his blood [*en tō autou haimati*]" recall the Last Supper, the tradition of the → Lord's Supper (Matt. 26:28 par. Mk. 14:24, Lk. 22:20; 1 Cor. 10:16; 11:25), the primitive → proclamation of the *kērygma* (1 Cor. 15:3), and the references to blood elsewhere in NT teaching (Rom. 5:9; Acts 20:28; Eph. 1:7; 2:13; Col. 1:20; Heb. 9:11 ff.; 10:19, 29; 13:12, 20; 1 Pet. 1:2, 19; 1 Jn. 1:7; 5:6; Rev. 1:5; 5:9; 7:14; 12:11 (cf. C. E. B. Cranfield, *The Epistle to the Romans, ICC*, I, 1975, 210 f.). It re-establishes the broken covenant through God's covenant faithfulness, his *dikaiosynē*, → righteousness (cf. E. Käsemann, op. cit., 99; and "The Saving Significance of the Death of Jesus in Paul", *Perspectives on Paul*, 1971, 32–59).

H.-G. Link, C. Brown

καταλλάσσω

καταλλάσσω (*katallassō*), reconcile; καταλλαγή (*katallagē*), reconciliation; ἀπαλλάσσω (*apallassō*), set free, release; διαλλάσσομαι (*diallassomai*), become reconciled; ἀποκαταλλάσσω (*apokatallassō*), reconcile; μεταλλάσσω (*metallassō*), to exchange; ἀντάλλαγμα (*antallagma*), what is given or taken in exchange.

CL *katallassō* is a compound of *allassō*, to alter, exchange (derived from *allos*, another; → Other). Its original meaning is to change, exchange, etc.; transferred, it means to reconcile (Hdt. onwards; e.g. Hdt. 5, 95; 7, 145). The corresponding noun is *katallagē*, reconciliation (Aesch., *Sept.* 767; Dem. 1, 4). Other compounds of *allassō* found in the NT are: *apallassō*, set free, release; *diallassō*, change (someone's mind), reconcile (found in passive); *metallassō*, change, exchange; *apokatallassō* (only in Christian literature), to reconcile. From the same root is derived the noun *antallagma*, what is given in exchange, price of purchase (e.g. Eur., *Orestes* 1157).

katallassō (like *diallassō*, and *katallagē*, with its corresponding meaning) generally denotes in classical Gk. the restoration of the original understanding between people after hostility or displeasure (Xen., *Anab.* 1, 6, 1: Eur., *Helena* 1235; Aristotle, *Oeconomica* 1348b, 9). *katallassō* is rarely found in the sense of reconciliation in a religious setting (it occurs once in Soph., *Ajax* 744). It is not a term that can be used of propitiatory rites: in general the thought of a personal relationship to God is far removed from Gk. thought, as is also any forensic concept of a relationship with God.

OT The words of this group are rare in the LXX. In the canonical books they appear in their original sense, or in one closely associated therewith. *katallassō* is found only at Jer. 48(31):39, for *ḥāṯâh*, to be shattered, dismayed; and without Heb. equivalent at 2 Macc. 1:5; 7:33; 8:29; *katallagē* only at Isa. 9:4(5) where it deviates from the Heb. text and is hard to understand, and at 2 Macc. 5:20. *diallassō* stands for various vbs. in Job (12:20, 24, *sûr* hiph., to remove; *pārar* hiph. break, frustrate, 5:20; similarly *apallassō* for various vbs. in 9:34; 5:12, to destroy; cf. 7:15; 9:12; 10:19; 27:5; 34:5). See also Exod. 19:22; 1 Sam. 14:29; 22:1; Jer. 32(39):31; 3 Macc. 6:30; 4 Macc. 9:16. *antallagma* means price (*mᵉḥîr*, 1 Ki. 21(20):2; Job 28:15; Jer. 15:13); a change (*ḥᵃlīp̄âh*, Ps. 55[54]:19); ransom price (*kōp̄er*, Amos 5:12); exchange (*tᵉmûrâh*, Ruth 4:7). There is no corresponding Heb. in Ps.

89(88):57; Sir. 6:15; 26:14; 44:17. Later rabbinic usage is anticipated in 1 Sam. 29:4, where *diallassomai* deviates from its original sense to mean to make oneself acceptable. In translating the language of atonement taken from the technical priestly vocabulary, the LXX prefers similar cultic terms like *ekkathairō*, purify (→ Pure, art. *katharos*), frequently *exhilaskomai*, atone, expiate, or propitiate (→ *hilaskomai* for atonement and reconciliation in the OT). *katallassō* and its derivatives are not found at all in cultic and priestly contexts.

2. Judaism has a mood of repentance all its own (cf. the large number of penitential prayers). Confession of sins and repentance are means by which reconciliation with God is sought, i.e. the restoration of his favour. Thus *katallassō* appears with reference to God in 2 Macc. 1:5; 7:33; 8:29. Often the OT proclamation of the grace of God is here foreshortened (cf. e.g. Ps. 62[61]:12 with Prov. 24:12; Sir. 16:12). When the fulfilment of the → law becomes a means to the end of achieving → righteousness before God, the thought of reconciliation can find itself in close proximity with that of reward. *katallassō* and cognates are not unfamiliar, but are not very frequently found.

NT In the NT *katallassō* occurs only in the sense of to reconcile, or (passive) to be reconciled. It is used of the reconciliation of men with one another (1 Cor. 7:11; in the same sense *diallassomai* in Matt. 5:24), and of their relationship with God (only in Paul: Rom. 5:10; 2 Cor. 5:18–20; in Col. 1:20, 22 and Eph. 2:16 *apokatallassō* in the same sense). *katallagē* is also found in the sense of reconciliation (only in Paul: Rom. 5:11; 11:15; 2 Cor. 5:18, 19).

apallassō occurs in the act., meaning to free (Heb. 2:15), and in the passive or middle to get free, be released, settle with (Lk. 12:58; Acts 19:12). Similarly we find in their original sense *metallassō* (Rom. 1:25, 26) and the simple form *allassō* (Acts 6:14; Gal. 4:20; Heb. 1:12; Rom. 1:23; on 1 Cor. 15:51 f. → Resurrection, art. *anastasis*). *antallagma*, ransom money, is found only at Mk. 8:37 par. Matt. 16:26.

1. *katallassō* and *katallagē* occur only rarely in the NT even in Paul who is the sole NT writer to use these terms. Nevertheless, these words are among the basic concepts of Pauline theology. They serve to give greater theological and christological precision to Christ and his work than such soteriological concepts generally found in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts like → forgiveness (Gk. *aphiēmi*).

2. The subject of the reconciliation is God (2 Cor. 5:18 f.). This is the theological novelty in comparison with non-Christian religious thought, which knows the deity only as the object of the reconciling work of man. At the same time it is consistent with the OT message of God as the "merciful" and "gracious" one, who reveals "steadfast love" and "faithfulness" as belonging to his very being (Exod. 34:6 f.; cf. Ps. 103[102]:8 ff.), and who promises forgiveness and restoration of the → covenant as his sovereign work (Isa. 43:25; 54:7 ff.; Jer. 31:31 ff.). The *katallagē* created by God is thus a completed act which precedes all human action. "For if while we were enemies we were reconciled [*katēllagēmen*] to God by the death of his Son, much more now that we are reconciled [*katallagentes*], shall we be saved by his life" (Rom. 5:10). Man was thus an → enemy before the reconciliation took place. *A fortiori* the resurrection of Jesus is the guarantee of salvation. Human action, including even repentance and confession of sins, is not a work of man to bring about and initiate reconciliation, to which God reacts. Rather is it the reaction of man, and as such

necessary and demanded. That this is the state of affairs is confirmed further by Paul's characteristic order of indicative followed by imperative, which starts out from the act of God as the matter of primary importance, the good news which must be proclaimed as already complete. It is the ground of the believer's → joy in God: "Not only so, but we also rejoice in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom we have now received our reconciliation [*tēn katallagēn*]" (Rom. 5:11).

3. The reconciliation has been effected by the work of Christ. As we have already seen, Rom. 5:10 f. speak of its connexion with his death and with his resurrection. As the effect of this work, reconciliation is an expression of the new situation which this work has brought about, and which Paul usually indicates in terms like *dikaioō*, justify, *dikaiosynē*, righteousness, which are judicial terms (→ Righteousness). The fact that *katallassō* and *katallagē* can be used in parallel with these terms (cf. Rom. 5:9 with 5:10; and 2 Cor. 5:19 with Rom. 4:3 ff.) indicates the central place that they have in the preaching and theology of Paul. The *katallagē* is the expression of the transformation of the relationship (of enmity) between God and man, which has been brought about by the new → Adam (Rom. 5:12 ff.), Jesus Christ.

Perhaps the central theme of Rom. is the place of the Jewish nation in the divine economy of salvation. This explains why Paul is anxious to demonstrate from the OT scriptures that salvation has always been by grace through faith (cf. chs. 3 f.) and to show that the rôle of the → law was never intended to be a means of self-salvation (cf. chs. 2 f. with 7 f.). In chs. 9–11 Paul returns to the question whether God has forsaken Israel for ever in view of their rejection of Christ. In Rom. 11:15 he gives his answer in terms of reconciliation: "For if their rejection means the reconciliation of the world [*katallagē kosmou*], what will their acceptance mean but life from the dead?" The world here means the Gentiles (cf. M. Black, *Romans*, *New Century Bible*, 1973, 144). Black suggests that resurrection here is of the kind envisaged by the Targum on Hos. 6:2 ff. which included the resurrection of the faithful elect, both Jew and Gentile. The argument proceeds *a fortiori* from the Jewish rejection of Jesus; the unuttered premise is the unsearchable wisdom and love of God who will in his good time bring about his own purposes (cf. Rom. 11:33–36).

4. As God's unilateral act in Christ, reconciliation is his → gift, and the ministry of reconciliation is spoken of in these terms in 2 Cor. 5:18. Having depicted the act of new creation which takes place when a man is "in Christ" (→ New, art. *kainos* NT 2 (c)), Paul writes: "All this is from God, who through Christ reconciled us to himself [*katallaxantos hēmas heautō*] and gave us the ministry of reconciliation [*dontos hēmin tēn diakonian tēs katallagēs*]; that is, God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself [*kosmon katallassōn heautō*], not counting their trespasses against them [*mē logizomenos autois ta paraptōmata autōn*], and entrusting to us the message of reconciliation [*kai themenos en hēmin ton logon tēs katallagēs*]. So we are ambassadors for Christ, God making his appeal through us. We beseech you on behalf of Christ, be reconciled to God [*katallagēte tō theō*]. For our sake he made him to be sin who knew no sin [*ton mē gnonta hamartian hyper hēmōn hamartian epoiēsen*], so that in him we might become the righteousness of God [*hina hēmeis genōmetha dikaiosynē theou en autō*]" (2 Cor. 5:18–21).

Commenting on the reconciliation mentioned in v. 18, C. K. Barrett points out that reconciliation "is closely related to justification, and thus leads directly to the mention of God's righteousness in verse 21. To reconcile is to end a relation of en-

mity, and to substitute for it one of peace and goodwill. It is not necessarily implied that the enmity existed on one side only, but it is plainly stated that in this case the initiative to reconciliation was God's who found in the death of his Son (Rom. iii. 25 f.) a way in which his love for the sinner and his wrath against sin could be accommodated, so that he might both be righteous himself, and justify the man – the sinful man – who relies on faith in Jesus" (*The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, *BNTC*, 1973, 175),

The ministry of reconciliation might be contrasted with that of the Qumran community which believed that by its obedience to the Torah it made atonement for the whole land (1QS 8:5–10; → *hilaskomai* OT 4). There is at least a triple contrast: in the case of the Qumran community, the atonement affects only the land of Israel, whereas that brought about by Christ affects mankind; in the case of Qumran, it was the obedience of men, whereas with God it is nothing less than the death of his Son in the place of sinful man; in the case of Qumran it is something that man does, whereas the reconciliation wrought by Christ is the work of God himself. But the ministry of reconciliation does not end there. It has to be proclaimed and received. Elsewhere Paul defined his task in terms of preaching the word of the → cross (1 Cor. 1:8). It is the message of God's love for sinners and reconciliation (Rom. 5:8 ff.). What Paul calls "the message of reconciliation" (2 Cor. 5:19) is the → gospel itself. And the proclamation of the gospel is laid on the whole church. At the same time, it may be noted that the appeal to "be reconciled to God" (2 Cor. 5:20b) is addressed to the → church. The church, no less than the world (v. 19), needs to enter into this reconciliation and live it out.

On the grammatical questions raised by 2 Cor. 5:19 see C. K. Barrett, op. cit., 176 f., who points out that, "The only new thought (as we move from verse 18 to 19) is that *us* is expanded into the world; this says no more than verse 14, *he died on behalf of all.* The absence of the article (*kosmon katallassōn*) has the effect of emphasizing the nature rather than the particularity of the object of the verb – it was the whole world he reconciled – including perhaps the rebellious powers of Col. i. 19 f."

In 2 Cor. 5:19 reconciliation is understood as justification. It is expressed first of all negatively ("not counting their trespasses against them"). There may be a play on words between the participle used here *logizomenos* and the word translated by the RSV as "message" (*logos*; cf. 1 Cor. 1:18; → Word). The same vb. is used in Rom. 4:3–8 in the context of justification, where Paul argues from OT passages that justification comes about when God does not reckon iniquities to man, but reckons him righteous by faith (cf. Rom. 4:3 with Gen. 15:6; Gal. 3:6; Jas. 2:23; and Rom. 4:7 with Ps. 32[31]:1 f.). It is expressed positively in v. 21, where Christ is said to have assumed our sin so that "we might become the righteousness of God." This is no legal fiction. For in Christ the believer actually assumes his righteousness, just as Christ assumed the believer's sin. "Since transgressions no longer counted against men (cf. Exod. xxix. 10) the way was open for reconciliation; nothing remained but for men to take it. This however they could not do unless they were informed of the possibility now open to them" (Barrett, op. cit., 177).

The word translated as "ambassadors" in v. 20 is actually the 1st person plur. of the vb., and C. K. Barrett appropriately translates the phrase "We therefore act as ambassadors [*presbeuomen*]." The same vb. is found at Eph. 6:20, where having asked for prayer to proclaim boldly the mystery of the gospel Paul adds "for which I

am an ambassador [*presbeuō*] in chains; that I may declare it boldly, as I ought to speak" (→ Bishop, art. *presbyteros*). In Phlm. 9 the noun *presbytēs* is used: "yet for love's sake I prefer to appeal to you – I, Paul, an ambassador and now a prisoner also for Christ Jesus." Elsewhere Paul thinks of himself as a *kēryx*, herald (1 Tim. 2:7; 2 Tim. 1:11; cf. also 2 Pet. 2:5; → Proclamation, art. *kērysso̅*). The loftier concept of ambassador presents an even more marked contrast with Paul's outward circumstances (cf. 2 Cor. 2:14 ff.; 11:1–12:10). But it is particularly appropriate in the present context. For Paul and his colleagues are acting "on behalf of Christ [*hyper Christou*]", in his interest, virtually in his stead, for Christ is no longer physically present with his church. It is "as if [*hōs*]" God were exhorting the readers through Paul (on *parakaleō* → Exhort). The substance of this exhortation ("be reconciled to God") draws attention to the fact that reconciliation is incomplete until it is accepted by both sides. Moreover, it needs to be realized by those who are already in the church and who presumably have made some form of profession of faith. These verses throw light on Paul's concept of his → apostleship, both in terms of the content of his message and in terms of his activity both within and without the church.

The content of Paul's apostolic message of reconciliation is definitively expressed in v. 21 which sets it out in a parallelism which exhibits chiasmus (Barrett, op. cit., 179; cf. J. Jeremias, *Abba*, 1966, 278):

a	b	c	d
ton mē gnonta hamartian	*hyper hēmōn*	*hamartian*	*epoiēsen*
"him who knew not sin"	"for our sake"	"sin"	"he made"

hina
"that"

a	d	c	b
hēmeis	*genōmetha*	*dikaiosynē theou*	*en autō*
"we"	"might become"	"the righteousness of God"	"in him"

On the sinlessness of Christ and the messiah see Rom. 8:3; Jn. 8:46; cf. Pss.Sol. 17:40 f.; Test.Jud. 24:1; Test.Lev. 18:9. It is further implied in the narratives of Jesus' baptism (Matt. 3:13–17, especially 14 f. par. Mk. 1:9 ff., Lk. 3:21; Jn. 1:29–34). Yoma 22b speaks of a one-year-old child that has not tasted sin. "It is only as sinless that Christ can, in Paul's view, bear the sins of others. . . . Paul does not say, for by definition it would not have been true, that Christ became a sinner, transgressing God's law; neither does he say, for it would have contradicted all experience (not least in Corinth) that every believer becomes immediately and automatically morally righteous, good as God is good. He says rather that Christ became *sin*; that is, he came to stand in that relation with God which normally is the result of sin, estranged from God and the object of his wrath" (Barrett, op. cit., 180).

2 Cor. 5:21 occupies the same theological place in 2 Cor. as Rom. 3:25 does in Rom. The term *hilastērion* in the latter may be compared with the *hamartia* here, although Barrett rejects the suggestion that it might be translated "sin offering". O. Cullmann refers the verse to Isa. 53:6: "All we like sheep have gone astray; we

have turned every one to his own way; and the LORD has laid on him the iniquity of us all [LXX: *kai kyrios paredōken auton tais hamartiais hēmōn*]" (cf. O. Cullmann, *The Christology of the New Testament*, 1963 ², 76). It may be too specific to say that Paul is thinking here of Christ as a "sin offering". The normal LXX expression for "sin offering" is *peri hamartias* (e.g. Lev. 14:31 for *ḥaṭṭā't*; Ps. 40:6[39:7] for *ḥ^aṭā'âh*; Isa. 53:10 for *'āšām*; Lev. 9:2 for *l^eḥaṭṭā't*, "for a sin offering". The term *peri hamartias* is actually found at Rom. 8:3, but commentators generally prefer to take it in the wider sense of "for sin" rather than the narrower one of a particular OT type of sacrifice (cf. C. E. B. Cranfield, *The Epistle to the Romans, ICC*, I, 1975, 382). Nevertheless, the thought of both 2 Cor. 5:21 and Rom. 8:3 requires us to say that what Christ did on the cross comprehends and supersedes the OT sin offerings. In Gal. 3:13 f. Paul did not use the concept of reconciliation but expressed the atoning work of Christ on the cross in terms of the removal of the curse. The fact that Jesus died on the cross is itself proof that he bore the curse of God: "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us – for it is written, 'Cursed be every one who hangs on a tree' – that in Christ Jesus the blessing of Abraham might come upon the Gentiles, that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith" (Gal. 3:13 f.; cf. Deut. 21:23 → Curse, art. *anathema*). Here again there is the thought of the benefit to others achieved by Christ in his death on their behalf. Although some scholars wish to see Christ's action as that of a representative rather than of a substitute (cf. M. D. Hooker, "Interchange in Christ", *JTS* New Series 22, 1971, 349–61), these verses make it impossible to see his work as representative without at the same time being vicarious.

5. The substance of the reconciliation lies in the ending of the enmity between God and man (Rom. 5:10), in that God "did not count their trespasses against them" (2 Cor. 5:19). Reconciliation consists therefore in the fact that "we have peace with God", a phrase which is used in Rom. 5:1 to indicate the effect of justification (→ Peace, art. *eirēnē*). In this sense reconciliation is the precondition of our → salvation (Rom. 5:10b) and the basis for the all-embracing "new creation" (2 Cor. 5:17 ff.), which is clarified in Rom. 5:1 ff., "because God's love has been poured into our hearts through the Holy Spirit which has been given to us" (v. 5b).

6. The "message of reconciliation" (2 Cor. 5:19) is matched by the "ministry of reconciliation" (2 Cor. 5:18, 20; → Serve, art. *diakoneō*), in which the apostle himself is engaged. This cannot, after all that has gone before, mean any longer a cultic ministry designed to bring about reconciliation or to re-enact it, but rather reconciling activity in the everyday world and the call to accept the reconciliation as it is preached, i.e. a call to faith (v. 20).

7. Col. 1:20, 22 and Eph. 2:16 have instead of *katallassō* the otherwise unknown vb. *apokatallassō*; but this ties up with the above-mentioned Pauline use of *katallassō* and has, basically, the same meaning. "For in him all the fullness of God was pleased to dwell, and through him to reconcile to himself all things [*di' autou apokatallaxai ta panta eis auton*], whether on earth or in heaven, making peace by the blood of his cross. And you, who once were estranged and hostile in mind, doing evil deeds, he has now reconciled in his body of flesh by his death [*apokatēllagēte en tō sōmati tēs sarkos autou dia tou thanatou*], to present you holy and blameless and irreproachable before him" (Col. 1:19–22). There are here many of the features of reconciliation which we have seen in the earlier Pauline literature: the need for recon-

ciliation; the fact that it is effected from God's side; the fact that it is not only that man needs to be reconciled to God, but that there is the estrangement caused by sin which has to be dealt with before God can be reconciled with man; that fact that it is the death of Christ referred to in terms of his "blood" and "cross"; and the purpose in presenting man as righteous before God. The ground of this victory in cancelling the debt of the law on the cross, thus depriving the principalities and powers of their hold on man, is further explained in Col. 2:13 ff. But to the thought that "God was in Christ" (2 Cor. 5:19) is added the thought that "in him all the fullness of God was pleased to dwell" (Col. 1:19; cf. 2:9; → Fullness, art. *plēroō* NT 5 (b)). Moreover, the scope of reconciliation is given a cosmic dimension. The passage may well be Paul's adaptation of a christological hymn, reflecting Jewish beliefs about angels and cosmic powers (cf. E. Lohse, *Colossians and Philemon, Hermeneia*, 1971, 59; R. P. Martin, "Reconciliation and Forgiveness in the Letter to the Colossians", in R. Banks, ed., *Reconciliation and Hope: New Testament Essays on Atonement and Eschatology presented to L. L. Morris*, 1974, 104–25). The passage presupposes a cosmic catastrophe caused by the powers of evil. He, who is the creator and sustainer of all, is he who has triumphed over the powers of evil on the cross and is therefore the reconciler of all (Col. 1:16 ff.; cf. 2:15). Within this cosmic context is set the reconciliation of believers (Col. 1:21 f.). But it should be noted that the reconciliation is conditional upon continuing in the faith (Col. 1:23).

Eph. 2:16 sees the reconciliation in the context of its effect on the relationship of Jews and Gentiles before God. The Gentiles were at one time "separated from Christ, alienated from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers to the covenants of promise, having no hope and without God in the world" (Eph. 2:12). But they have been "brought near in the blood of Christ" (Eph. 2:13). His death has, however, not only reconciled the Gentiles; it has also reconciled the Jews, providing a way of salvation to them which they did not have before. At the same time the act of reconciling Jew and Gentile to God reconciles them to each other and makes a new humanity. "For he is our peace, who has made us both one, and has broken down the dividing wall of hostility, by abolishing in his flesh the law of commandments and ordinances, that he might create in himself one new man in place of the two, so making peace, and might reconcile us both to God in one body through the cross, thereby bringing the hostility to an end [*kai apokatallaxē tous amphoterous en heni sōmati tō theō dia tou staurou, apokteinas tēn echthran en autō*]. And he came and preached peace to you who were far off and peace to those who were near; for through him we both have access in one Spirit to the Father" (Eph. 2: 14–18).

8. Reconciliation on a human level is discussed in two important passages. In 1 Cor. 7:10 f. Paul discusses the question of → divorce: "To the married I give charge, not I but the Lord, that the wife should not separate from her husband (but if she does, let her remain single or else be reconciled to her husband [*ē tō andri katallagētō*]) – and that the husband should not divorce his wife." The teaching is in line with Jesus' interpretation of the OT on this matter (Matt. 19:3–12, par. Mk. 10:2–12, Lk. 16:18; cf. Matt. 5:27–32; Deut. 24:1–4), and hence may properly be said to be a charge from the Lord. The use of two separate vbs. (*chōristhē*, of the wife, and *aphienai* of the husband, which was the normal term for divorce) might reflect the fact that in Judaism only the husband had the right to divorce (but on this see D. Daube, *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*, 1956, 362–65). In con-

trast with 1 Cor. 7:13–16, where Paul deals with the question of whether divorce should take place on the grounds that one party is a believer and the other is not, Paul's judgment here seems to refer to the question of divorce in general. His answer is that separation and divorce do not put the former partners outside the church. In the first instance, the two courses open are either to separate and remain single or to be reconciled. In the former case, it would seem that Paul recognizes that there are cases where there is no real alternative but for the break-up of a marriage. It may even be that both former partners remain in the church. The fact that a believer may find himself or herself married to an unbeliever is no grounds for separation, as the believing partner consecrates the other partner and provides the possibility of saving him or her (vv. 12–16). It is thus not a case for Paul of the believer having to separate himself from the unbeliever. Remarriage with a believer is a possibility that can certainly be contemplated after the death of the former partner (cf. v. 39). On the other hand, it is not a sin to marry, when one is "free" from a marriage partner (cf. vv. 27 f.; → Redemption, art. *lyō* NT 6 (f); → Separate, art. *chōrizō*).

The unique vb. *diallassomai* occurs in Matt. 5:24: "So if you are offering your gift at the altar, and there remember that your brother has something against you, leave your gift there before the altar and go; first be reconciled [*diallagēthi*] to your brother, and then come and offer your gift" (Matt. 5:23 f.). According to the Mishnah tractate Yoma, "For transgressions that are between man and God the Day of Atonement effects atonement; but for transgressions that are between a man and his fellow the Day of Atonement effects atonement only if he has appeased his fellow" (Yoma 8:9). But D. Hill claims that in contemporary Judaism this idea of reconciliation "was overshadowed by the desire to avoid desecrating the Temple or defiling one's self (cf. CD vi. 14–vii. 4)" (*The Gospel of Matthew*, *New Century Bible*, 1972, 122). Jesus' teaching here is of a piece with his teaching on the two great commandments and the parable of the Good Samaritan which lay down man's vocation to love God with the whole of his being and at the same time to love his neighbour as himself (Matt. 22:34–40 par. Mk. 12:28–34; cf. Lk. 10:25–37; Deut. 6:4; Lev. 19:18; → Brother, art. *plēsion*; → Command, art. *entolē* NT 1; → Hear, art. *akouō* NT 3; → Love, art. *agapaō*). The teaching of Matt. 5:23 f. clearly shows that no sacrifice is acceptable to God without repentance and reconciliation.

The following saying (Matt. 5:25 f.) is paralleled in Lk. 12:58 f.: "As you go with your accuser before the magistrate, make an effort to settle with him on the way [*dos ergasian apēllachthai ap' autou*; cf. Matt. *isthi eunoon to antidiko sou tachy*. "Make friends quickly with your accuser"], lest he drag you to the judge, and the judge hand you over to the officer, and the officer put you in prison. I tell you, you will never get out till you have paid the very last copper." The need for human reconciliation is parabolic of man's need of reconciliation with God (cf. also the parable of the unforgiving servant in Matt. 18:23–35). The context of Lk. brings this out even more clearly. The saying is preceded by Jesus' denunciation of those who pretend to be able to discern the weather but are unable to discern the times (Lk. 12:54 ff.). It is followed by the discussion of the Galileans butchered by Pilate and those killed by the fall of the tower of Siloam. Jesus draws the conclusion that they were no worse sinners than the rest on whom judgment had not yet fallen; "I tell you, No; but unless you repent you will all likewise perish" (Lk. 13: 3, 5). This is then followed by the parable of the fig tree which has failed to bear fruit, and is given just one more

chance (Lk. 13: 6–9; → Fruit, art. *sykē*; cf. also Lk. 13:22–30). All this reinforces the point of Lk. 12:58 f. which is to come to terms with the accuser (Jesus with his message of repentance in view of the coming of the impending judgment), for when → judgment falls it will be irrevocable and relentless.

apallassō is found in the active transitive sense of free, release, deliver in Heb. 2:15 of the incarnation: "Since therefore the children share in flesh and blood, he himself likewise partook of the same nature, that through death he might destroy him who has the power of death, that is, the devil, and deliver [*apallaxē*] all those who through fear of death were subject to lifelong bondage" (Heb. 2:14 f.). It also occurs in Lk. 9:40 D of release from an evil spirit. In Acts 19:12 it has a similar connotation and is used in the intransitive of diseases mentioned in parallel with evil spirits, which left people.

antallagma, that which is given in exchange, occurs only in Mk. 8:37: "For what can a man give in return for his life? [*ti gar doi anthrōpos antallagma tēs psychēs autou*]" (cf. par. Matt. 16:26). For what does it profit a man, to gain the whole world and forfeit his life?" The par. in Lk. 9:25 employs a circumlocution. The synoptic context is that of the call for complete renunciation as the pre-condition of discipleship and acceptance with the Father. "For whoever would save his life will lose it; and whoever loses his life for my sake and the gospel's will save it" (Mk. 8:35 f.; cf. par. Matt. 16:25 f.; Lk. 9:24 f.; Jn. 12:25). There is the implication that man can give nothing in exchange for his life, and therefore even to take up the → cross in utter self-abandonment is far more important than to gain the whole world. The Pharisaic work written shortly after A.D. 70, Syr. Bar., contains a similar saying: "For what, then, have men lost their life, and for what have those who were on earth exchanged their souls?" (51:15). But the saying also recalls Ps. 49:7 f., 15 (48:8 f., 16): "Truly no man can ransom [*lytrōsetai*] himself [*v.l.* "no man can ransom his brother], or give to God the price of his life [*exhilasma*], for the ransom of his life is costly [*kai tēn timēn tēs lytrōseōs tēs psychēs autou*], and can never suffice. . . . But God will ransom my soul [*lytrōsetai tēn psychēn mou*] from the power of Sheol, for he will receive me" (→ Redemption, arts. *lyō* and *lytron*). Like the other sayings in the Synoptic Gospels, the saying here does not offer a theology of reconciliation in the Pauline sense. Rather, it states in the sharpest possible terms man's need for reconciliation, whilst implying at the same time that reconciliation is available to those who are concerned enough to seek it.

H. Vorländer, C. Brown

→ Anger, → Cross, → Forgiveness, → Holy, → Judgment, → Redemption, → Sacrifice, → Sin

(a). G. Aulén, *Christus Victor: An Historical Study of the Three Main Types of the Idea of Atonement*, 1931; B. W. Bacon, "The Festival of Lives given for the Nation in Jewish and Christian Faith", *Hibbert Journal* 15, 1917, 256–78; D. M. Baillie, *God Was in Christ: An Essay on Incarnation and Atonement*, 1961² ; C. K. Barrett, *The Epistle to the Romans*, *BNTC*, 1957; "The Background of Mark 10:45", in A. J. B. Higgins, ed., *New Testament Essays: Studies in Memory of Thomas Walter Manson*, 1959, 1–18; and *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, *BNTC*, 1973; K. Barth, *CD* IV, 1–3, *The Doctrine of Reconciliation*; G. C. Berkouwer, *The Work of Christ*, 1970; H. D. Betz, *Galatians, Hermeneia*, 1978; G. Bornkamm, "The Revelation of God's Wrath (Romans 1–3)", in *Early Christian Experience*, 1969, 47–70; and "The Revelation of Christ to Paul on the Damascus Road and Paul's Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation", in R. J. Banks, ed., *Reconciliation and Hope: New Testament Essays on Atonement and Eschatology Presented to L. L. Morris*, 1974, 90–103; F. F. Bruce, "Paul and Paulinism", *Vox Evangelica* 7, 1971, 5–16; and *Paul and Jesus*, 1977; A. Büchler, *Studies in Sin and*

Atonement in the Rabbinic Literature of the First Century, 1928; F. Büchsel, *allassō* etc., *TDNT* I 251–59; R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, I, 1952, 285 ff., 292–305; and "Adam and Christ according to Romans 5", in W. Klassen and G. F. Snyder, eds., *Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation: Essays in Honor of Otto A. Piper*, 1962, 143–65; S. Cave, *The Doctrine of the Work of Christ*, 1937; L. Cerfaux, *Christ in the Theology of St. Paul*, 1959; C. E. B. Cranfield, *The Epistle to the Romans*, I, *ICC*, 1975; R. G. Crawford, "Is the Penal Theory of Atonement Scriptural?", *SJT* 23, 1970, 257–72; O. Cullmann, *The Christology of the New Testament*, 1963[2]; R. W. Dale, *The Atonement: The Congregational Union Lecture for 1875*, 1896 [18]; E. R. Dalglish, *Psalm Fifty-One in the Light of Ancient and Near Eastern Patternism*, 1962; W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*, 1955[2]; J. Denney, *The Death of Christ*, 1902, revised by R. V. G. Tasker, 1950; *The Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation: The Cunningham Lectures for 1917*, (1917) 1959; and *The Atonement and the Modern Mind*, 1903; F. W. Dillistone, *The Significance of the Cross*, 1945; *Jesus and His Cross: Studies on the Saving Work of Christ*, 1953; and *The Christian Understanding of Atonement*, 1965; N. Dimock, *The Doctrine of the Death of Christ; in Relation to the Sin of Man, the Condemnation of the Law, and the Dominion of Satan*, 1903[2]; C. H. Dodd, "*hilaskesthai*, its Cognates, Derivatives and Synonyms in the Septuagint", *JTS* 32, 1931, 352–60 (reprinted with minor alterations in "Atonement", *The Bible and the Greeks*, 1935, 82–95); *The Epistle to the Romans*, 1932; *The Johannine Epistles*, 1946; J. Downing, "Jesus and Martyrdom", *JTS* New Series 14, 1963, 279–93; J. D. G. Dunn, "Paul's Understanding of the Death of Jesus", in R. J. Banks, ed., op. cit., 125–41; E. E. Ellis, "Christ Crucified", in R. J. Banks, ed., op. cit., 69–75; P. T. Forsyth, *The Cruciality of the Cross*, 1909; and *The Work of Christ*, (1910) 1965; R. S. Franks, *The Work of Christ; A Historical Study of Christian Doctrine*, (1918) 1962; and *The Atonement: The Dale Lectures for 1933*, 1934; B. Gerhardsson, "Sacrificial Service and Atonement in the Gospel of Matthew", in R. J. Banks, ed., op. cit., 25–35; L. W. Grensted, *A Short History of the Doctrine of the Atonement*, 1920; L. W. Grensted, ed., *The Atonement in History and in Life: A Volume of Essays*, 1929; A. T. Hanson, "The Reproach and Vindication of the Messiah", in *Studies in Paul's Technique and Theology*, 1974, 13–66; M. Hengel, *Crucifixion in the Ancient World and the Folly of the Message of the Cross*, 1977; J. Herrmann and F. Büchsel, *hileōs* etc., *TDNT* III 300–23; W. Herrmann, *The Communion of the Christian with God*, 1971; F. C. N. Hicks, *The Fullness of Sacrifice: An Essay in Reconciliation*, 1946[3]; D. Hill, *Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings: Studies in the Semantics of Soteriological Terms, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series* 5, 1967, 23–48; H. A. Hodges, *The Pattern of Atonement*, 1955; L. Hodgson, *The Doctrine of Atonement: The Hale Lectures, 1950*, 1951; M. D. Hooker, *Jesus and the Servant*, 1959; and "Interchange in Christ", *JTS* New Series 22, 1971, 349–61; T. H. Hughes, *The Atonement: Modern Theories of the Doctrine*, 1949; J. Jeremias, *The Central Message of the New Testament*, 1965; R. J. Johnson, *Sacrifice and Penitence in Israel*, 1965; E. Käsemann, "The Saving Significance of the Death of Jesus in Paul", *Perspectives on Paul*, 1971, 32–59; and "Some Thoughts on 'The Doctrine of Reconciliation in the New Testament' ", in J. M. Robinson, ed., *The Future of our Religious Past: Essays in Honour of Rudolf Bultmann*, 1971, 49–64; O. Kaiser and R. Pesch, "Reconciliation", *EBT* II 730–38; G. W. H. Lampe, *Reconciliation in Christ*, 1956; S. H. Langdon, "The Hebrew Word for 'Atone' ", *ExpT* 22, 1910–11, 320–27; E. Lohse, *History of the Suffering and Death of Jesus Christ*, 1967; and *Colossians and Philemon, Hermeneia*, 1971; W. R. Maltby, *Christ and His Cross*, 1935; T. W. Manson, "HILASTERION", *JTS* 46, 1945, 1–10; I. H. Marshall, "The Development of the Concept of Redemption in the New Testament", in R. J. Banks, ed., op. cit., 153–69; and *The Work of Christ*, 1971; R. P. Martin, "Reconciliation and Forgiveness in Colossians", in R. J. Banks, ed., op. cit., 104–24; *Colossians: The Church's Lord and the Christian's Liberty*, 1972; and *Colossians and Philemon, New Century Bible*, 1974; J. Macdonald, *The Theology of the Samaritans*, 1964; R. C. Moberly, *Atonement and Personality*, 1901; J. Moltmann, *The Crucified God*, 1974; L. Morris, *The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross*, (1955) 1965[3]; "The Meaning of *hilastērion* in Romans iii. 25", *NTS* 2, 1955–56, 33–43; and *The Cross in the New Testament*, 1967; J. K. Mozley, *The Doctrine of Atonement*, 1915; J. Murray, *Redemption – Accomplished and Applied*, 1955; and *The Epistle to the Romans, NLC*, I–II, 1960–65; R. R. Nicole, "C. H. Dodd and the Doctrine of Propitiation", *WTJ* 17, 1955, 117–57; A. Oepke, *apokathistēmi, apakatastasis*, *TDNT* I 387–93; J. I. Packer, "What Did the Cross Achieve? The Logic of Penal Substitution", *TB* 25, 1974, 3–45; R. S. Paul, *The Atonement and the Sacraments: The Relationship of the Atonement to the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper*, 1961; S. Perubčan, *Sin in the Old Testament*, 1963; G. von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, I–II, 1962–65; H. Rashdall, *The Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology, Being the Bampton Lectures for 1915*, 1919; H. N. Ridderbos, "The Earliest Confession of the Atonement in Paul", in R. J.

Banks, ed., op. cit., 76–89; A. B. Ritschl, *A Critical History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation*, 1872; and *The Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation*, (1900) 1966; H. W. Robinson, *The Cross of the Servant*, 1926; and *The Cross in the Old Testament*, 1955; E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*, 1977; H. J. Schoeps, *Paul: The Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish Religious History*, 1961, 126–67; C. Ryder Smith, *The Bible Doctrine of Salvation: A Study of the Atonement*, 1971; D. Sölle, *Christ the Representative: An Essay in Theology after "The Death of God"*, 1967; E. Speiser, "Ritual Expiation in Mari and Israel", *BASOR* 149, 1958, 17–25; K. Stendahl, *Paul Among Jews and Gentiles, and Other Essays*, 1977; G. B. Stevens, *The Christian Doctrine of Salvation*, 1905; A. M. Stibbs, *The Meaning of the Word "Blood" in Scripture*, 1954[2]; V. Taylor, *Jesus and His Sacrifice; A Study of the Passion Sayings in the Gospels*, 1937; *Forgiveness and Reconciliation: A Study of New Testament Theology*, 1941; and *The Atonement in New Testament Teaching*, (1940) 1958[3]; S. H. Travis, *Divine Retribution in the Thought of Paul* (Dissertation, Cambridge), 1970; H. E. W. Turner, *The Meaning of the Cross*, 1959; B. B. Warfield, "The New Testament Terminology of Redemption", *Princeton Theological Review* 15, 1917, 201–49; M. Warren, *Interpreting the Cross*, 1966; J. S. Whale, *Victor and Victim: The Christian Doctrine of Redemption*, 1960; D. E. H. Whiteley, *The Theology of St. Paul*, 1974[2] 130–54; H. W. Wolff, *Anthropology of the Old Testament*, 1974, 60 ff.; B. G. Worrall, "Substitutionary Atonement in the Theology of James Denney", *SJT* 28, 1975, 341–57; F. M. Young, "Sacrifice", *ExpT* 86, 1974–75, 305–9; and *Sacrifice and the Death of Christ*, 1975.

(b). D. von Allmen, "Réconciliation du Monde et Christologie cosmique, de II Cor. 5:14–21 à Col. 1:15–23", *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses* 48, 1968, 32–45; P. Althaus, *Die letzten Dinge*, 1949[5]; C. Andresen and P. Althaus, "Wiederbringung Aller", *RGG*[3] VI 1693 ff.; E. Bammel, "Zum jüdischen Märtyrerkult", *TLZ* 78, 1953, 119–26; H. Beintker, "Versöhnung", *EKL* III 1652 ff.; H. Braun, *Gerichtsgedanke und Rechtfertigungslehre bei Paulus, Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament* 19, 1930; J. Clavier, "Notes sur un Mot-clef du Johannisme et de la Sotériologie biblique: *Hilasmos*", *NovT* 10, 1968, 287 ff.; P. Cornehl, *Die Zukunft der Versöhnung*, 1971; J. Dupont, *La Réconciliation dans la Théologie de Saint Paul*, 1953; G. Fitzer, "Der Ort der Versöhnungslehre nach Paulus", *TLZ* 22, 1966, 161 ff.; J. Friedrich, W. Pöhlmann and P. Stuhlmacher, eds., *Rechtfertigung. Festschrift für Ernst Käsemann zum siebzigsten Geburtstag*, 1976; W. Fürst, "2 Kor. 5, 11–21. Auslegung und Meditation", *EvTh* 28, 1968, 221 ff.; H. Gollwitzer, *Von der Stellvertretung Gottes. Zum Gespräch mit D. Sölle*, (1967) 1968[2]; L. Goppelt, "Versöhnung durch Christus", *Lutherische Monatshefte* 6, 1967, 263 ff.; J. Herrmann, *Die Idee der Sühne im Alten Testament*, 1905; S. Herner, *Sühne und Vergebung in Israel*, 1942; H. J. Iwand, "Zur Versöhnungslehre", in *Das tat Gott. 50 Jahre Bahnau*, 1956, 208 ff. (reprinted in *Um den rechten Glauben, ThB* 9, 1965, 214 ff.); and *Predigtmeditationen*, 1963, 547 ff. (on 2 Cor. 5:19 ff.); M. Kähler, *Zur Lehre von der Versöhnung*, (1898) 1937; E. Käsemann, "Zur Verständnis von Römer 3, 24–26", *ZNW* 43, 1950–51, 150 ff. (reprinted in *Exegestische Versuche und Besinnungen*, I, 1968[5], 96 ff.); K. Koch, "Sühne und Sündenvergebung um die Wende von der exilischen zur nachexilischen Zeit", *EvTh* 26 (Neue Folge 21), 1966, 217 ff.; W. Kreck, *Die Zukunft des Gekommenen*, (1961) 1966[2], 139 ff.; G. Lanczkowski *et al.*, "Versöhnung", *RGG*[3] VI 1367 ff.; E. Lohse, *Märtyrer und Gottesknecht. Untersuchungen zur urchristlichen Verkündigung vom Sühntod Jesu Christi, FRLANT* 46, 1955; S. Lyonnet, "De Notione Expiationis", *Verbum Domini* 36, 1958, 129–48; ibid. 37, 1959, 336–52; ibid. 38, 1960, 65–75, 241–61; and "L'Hymme christologique de l'Épître aux Colossiens et la Fête juive du Nouvel An", *RSR* 48, 1960, 92–100; F. Maas, *kāpar, THAT* I 842–58; *Die Mauer ist abgebrochen. Zur Predigt der Versöhnung. Hirtenbrief der niederländisch-reformierten Kirche*, 1968; A. Merx, *Der Messias oder Taëb der Samaritaner*, 1909; W. Michaelis, *Die Versöhnung des Alls*, 1950; J. Michl, "Die 'Versöhnung' (Kol. 1, 20)", *ThQ* 128, 1948, 442–62; J. Moltmann, "Gott versöhnt und macht frei", *EvKomm* 3, 1970, 515 ff.; L. Moraldi, *Espiazone sacrificiale e riti espiatori nell' ambiente biblico e nell' AT*, 1956; F. Mussner, *Christus, das All und die Kirche. Studien zur Theologie des Epheserbriefes, Trierer Theologische Studien* 5, 1955; A. Nygren, *Die Versöhnung als Gottestat*, 1932; J. J. Stamm, *Erlösen und Vergeben im Alten Testament*, 1940; *Versöhnung. Das deutch-russische Gespräch über das christliche Verständnis der Versöhnung, Herausgegeben vom Aussenamt der Evangelischen Kirche Deutschlands*, Studienheft 5, 1967; B. N. Wambacq, " 'per eum reconciliare . . . quae in caelis sunt' (Col. 1, 20)", *RB* 55, 1948, 35–42; O. Weber, "Das dogmatische Problem der Versöhnungslehre", *EvTh* 26 (Neue Folge 21), 1966, 258 ff. (reprinted in *Die Treue Gottes und die Kontinuität der menschlichen Existenz*, 1967, 82 ff.).

Redemption, Loose, Ransom, Deliverance, Release, Salvation, Saviour

Whenever men by their own fault or through some superior power have come under the control of someone else, and have lost their freedom to implement their will and decisions, and when their own resources are inadequate to deal with that other power, they can regain their freedom only by the intervention of a third party. In the NT, depending on the aspect envisaged, the Gk word-groups associated with *lyō*, *sōzō*, *rhyomai*, are used to express such intervention. *lyō*, to free (42 times in the NT) is used to express liberation from bonds or by payment of a ransom (*lytron*), but it has other shades of meaning which are also discussed here. *sōzō* (106 times in the NT) is the commonest term and has the widest range of meaning. Predominantly it means to save, preserve and rescue. The least used, *rhyomai* (16 times), has the narrowest range of meaning, i.e. to rescue, deliver, and thus save from a threatening or acute danger. *sōtēr*, derived from *sōzō*, means deliverer, saviour, and was in general use to denote someone who so acted. Hence it is used in the NT as a title of honour for God and Christ. In the NT these terms are used pre-eminently of the redemptive work of Christ.

λύω

λύω (*lyō*), to loose, untie, set free, release, annul, abolish; λύσις (*lysis*), release, divorce; καταλύω (*katalyō*), destroy, demolish, abolish; κατάλυμα (*katalyma*), lodging, guest room; ἀκατάλυτος (*akatalytos*), indestructible; ἐκλύω (*eklyō*), become loose, become weary, become weak; ἀπολύω (*apolyō*), set free, release, discharge, pardon, let go, send away, dismiss, divorce.

CL *lyō* (from Homer onwards) means to loose, make free. When used with a personal object it means to set free, ransom, both literally and metaphorically. The meaning to dissolve gives the further sense of to destroy. Already in Homer (Od. 5, 397; 13, 321) it was used of the salvation which the gods give to men, e.g. from difficulties and need, but without any recognizable link with → sin. Numerous compound forms are found in cl. Gk. *W. Mundle*

OT The LXX uses *lyō* to translate 7 different Heb. vbs. The most common is *pāṯaḥ* (7 times in the qal, niphal and piel) which is the regular vb. for to open (Gen. 42:27; Job 39:5; Ps. 102[101]:20; Isa. 5:27; 14:17; 58:6; Jer. 40[47]:4). It stands twice for *nāṯar* in the hiphil, meaning to free, loose those in bondage (Pss. 105[104]:20; 146[145]:7); and twice for *nāšal*, draw off sandals (Exod. 3:5; Jos. 5:15). In the Aram. section of Daniel it stands for *šᵉrā'*, as a past participle meaning loosed (Dan. 3:92[25] LXX and Theod.), and fig. to loosen knots, i.e. solve difficulties (Dan. 5:12). It stands for *rāṣâh* in the niphal which means to be pleased with, accept favourably, in Isa. 40:2, in the message to Jerusalem that her inquity is pardoned. It also occurs once each for *nāśā'*, lift up, take away, of the Lord taking away sins because of Job (Job 42:9); and *sᵉṯar*, of the destruction of the house of God (Ezr. 5:12; the other reading has *katelysen*). It has no Heb. equivalent in 1 Esd. 1:55; 9:13, 46; Tob. 3:17; Jud. 6:14; 9:2; Job 39:2; Sir. 28:2; 3 Macc. 1:4; 6:27, 29; 4 Macc. 3:11; 7:13; 12:8 f.

katalyō is used 39 times for 14 Heb. equivalents but is generally without particular

theological significance. It frequently stands for *lûn* and *lîn*, lodge, pass the night, especially in historical narratives (e.g. Gen. 19:2; 24:23; Num. 22:8; Ruth 4:14; 2 Sam. 17:8). It is seldom used with the meaning to pull down (Ezr. 5:12 *v.l.*, see above; 2 Ki. 25:10 for *nāṯaṣ*), or to dissolve, abolish (2 Macc. 2:22).

eklyō stands for 19 different Heb. vbs. It commonly has the meaning of losing one's strength, letting one's heart faint, of relaxing one's hands or allowing them to become feeble (e.g. Deut. 20:3; Jos. 10:6; 18:3; 2 Sam. 4:1; 2 Chr. 15:7; Isa. 13:7; 29:9; Jer. 4:31; Lam. 2:12, 19; Ezek. 7:17). However, in Job 19:25 it stands for *gā'al*, redeem, act as a kinsman, in a participial form used as a noun, i.e. redeemer: "For I know that my Redeemer [MT *go'ᵃlî*; LXX *ho eklyein me mellōn*] lives, and at last he will stand upon the earth [lit. "dust" as RSV mg.; MT *'al-'apar*; but LXX *epi gēs*, as RSV]." The *gō'ēl* in Heb. was the kinsman redeemer, who as the closest relation was the avenger of blood, the one who had to redeem the blood of the murdered victim, buy back family possessions, redeem from bondage, and take a kinsman's widow (→ *lytron* OT 1(c)). The translation of Job 19:25 f. is notoriously difficult (for a review of interpretations see J. Speer, *ZAW* 25, 1905, 47 ff.; and H. H. Rowley, *From Moses to Qumran*, 1963, 179 ff.). Rowley thinks that the term "vindicator" is more appropriate than "redeemer" here. For the context is not concerned with deliverance from Sheol but with the vindication of Job's name before men (*Job, New Century Bible*, 1970, 172). The verse may take up the thought of Job 16:19: "Even now, behold, my witness is in heaven, and he that vouches for me is on high." Job is thinking of God himself as his *gō'ēl*. The same Heb. word is used of God in Ps. 19:14 (MT v. 15; LXX 18:15): "Let the words of my mouth and the meditation of my heart be acceptable in thy sight, O LORD, my rock and my redeemer [MT *ṣûrî wᵉgō'ᵃlî*; LXX *boēthe mou kai lytrōta mou*]." In both cases the main emphasis is on vindication and help. Whether there is also an element of buying back will depend on the degree to which it is possible to speak of this factor in the general idea of the *gō'ēl*. However, there is the implication in the idea that the *gō'ēl* rescues that which was forfeited and restores justice to those who are not in a position to help themselves.

There has been considerable debate as to whether Job 19:25 f. looks to a life after death and even some form of → resurrection. V. 26 reads: "and after my skin has thus been destroyed [MT *wᵉ'aḥar 'ôrî niqqᵉpû zō't*; LXX *anastēsai to derma mou to anatlōn tauta*] then from my flesh I shall see God [MT *ûmibbᵉśarî 'eḥᵉzeh 'ᵉlôaḥ*; LXX *para gar kyriou tauta moi synētelesthē*]" (RSV mg.). The difficulties of the Heb. are reflected in the LXX translation which gives quite a different rendering: "For I know that he is eternal, who is about to dissolve me on earth, to raise this skin of mine which draweth up these things" (Job 19:25 f. LXX).

In the first half of the verse the vb. translated as "destroyed" is the Heb. *nāqap* in the niphal, and means lit. "they have struck off". This could be a reference to the ravages of disease. There is no justification in the text for the AV's insertion of "worms" as the subject of the vb. The meaning of *ûmibbᵉśārî* is equally disputed. The prep. *min* which is incorporated in the word means "from". This is taken by the RSV tx. to mean "without". But "in" (AV) is also possible. Thus the second half of the v. could mean either that Job expected to see God, his redeemer, in his flesh, i.e. in his lifetime, or that Job expected to see God without his flesh, i.e. in an after-life. The allusion to an after-life is questioned by those who claim that man in the OT had no firm expectations of → life after → death. The idea of some kind of incorporeal ex-

istence is also questioned by those who claim that it is unthinkable for OT man to conceive of a bodiless existence. Therefore, some form of resurrection life is envisaged here. (On this question generally see H. H. Rowley, "Death and Beyond", in *The Faith of Israel*, 1956, 150–76.)

In view of the difficulties of the verse, Rowley thinks it unlikely that we shall be able to achieve any convincing reconstruction within the limits of our present knowledge. "That it is in its original form is very improbable. To remove any trace of the thought of resurrection is as improper as it is to strengthen it. Two things seem to be clear. Job is assured that his Vindicator will arise to vindicate his innocence, and that he himself will see God. If, as seems probable, the Vindicator is God, this means that he will be aware of his vindication. That this vindication is not expected until after Job's death is likely, since he has cried for his blood to demand satisfaction. But in what form Job will be conscious of vindication must remain obscure" (*Job*, 174). Perhaps two further points may be added. On the one hand, although Job was vindicated by God (cf. Job 41), he did not actually → see God in any literal sense. On the other hand, seeing God is not something that man can do in this life according to the OT (cf. Exod. 33:20, 23).

NT 1. In the NT *lyō* is used in the lit. sense of untying the thong of a sandal (Mk. 1:7 par. Lk. 3:16; Jn. 1:27; Acts 13:25, John the Baptist speaking of Jesus; cf. Acts 7:33 with Exod. 3:5, of Moses by the burning bush), untying the ass's colt (Matt. 21:2 par. Mk. 11: 2, 4, 5; Lk. 19:30 f., 33), and of removing Paul's bonds (Acts 22:30). In Jn. 11:44 it is used of the unbinding of Lazarus from his grave-clothes. It is found in a weakened sense in Acts 13:43 of being released from the synagogue; cf. RSV "when the meeting of the synagogue broke up" (this rendering may be related to 4 below).

2. The sense of setting free, untying and thus loosing is applied to → angels (Rev. 9:14 f.) and → Satan (Rev. 20:3, 7). In the former case the context is the vision of the sixth angel with a trumpet who is commanded: " 'Release the four angels who are bound at the great river Euphrates.' So the four angels were released, who had been held ready for the hour, the day, the month, and the year, to kill a third of mankind." This causes a great, terrible army to be released. The river represents the boundary of Assyria and Babylon, the area from which the catastrophic invasions came in OT times. But in Rev. → Babylon represents the wicked world in its ongoing manifestations (cf. chs. 17 f.). The number four probably represents completeness. Possibly the angels are the same as in Rev. 7:1 who restrain the forces of nature. But this appears unlikely in view of the evil character of the angels here. As the angels are released, so too are the evil forces of destruction. The precise significance of the vision depends upon the way in which Rev. as a whole is interpreted. Some exegetes treat the visions as consecutive, in which case the vision refers to some specific event. But according to the parallelistic interpretation of Rev., the numerous series of visions relate to different aspects of ongoing history (→ Number, art. *hepta* NT 4). In this case the vision is that of God permitting war to afflict mankind down the ages with great destruction and loss of life. Nevertheless, the effect is not wholly negative. For it gives occasion for repentance, even though many do not take it (Rev. 9:20 f.). On the binding and loosing of Satan and the question of the millennium → Number, art. *chilias* NT 4.

3. Satan is mentioned in connexion with binding and loosing in Lk. 13:16 in the

description of the woman bent with a spirit of infirmity for eighteen years. There is probably a play on words here which underlines the hypocrisy of those who complained that Jesus had healed on the → sabbath. For the same word is used of those who untie their oxen and asses to lead them to water on the sabbath (v. 15). Jesus put the question to them: "And ought not this woman, a daughter of Abraham whom Satan bound for eighteen years, be loosed from this bond on the sabbath day?"

The same vb. is used in the case of the healing of the deaf man with an impediment in his speech: "And his ears were opened, his tongue was released, and he spoke plainly" (Mk. 7:35; → Heal; → Deaf, Dumb; → Magic, art. *mageia* NT 5). V. Taylor sees in Mk.'s language no more than a figurative description of the cure (*The Gospel according to St. Mark*, 1955, 355). But A. Deissmann maintains that *ho desmos tēs glōssēs*, "the bond of the tongue", was a technical expression illustrating the idea that such impediment of the speech was the work of demonic influences (*Light from the Ancient East*, 1927 [4], 304–8).

4. *lyō* has the sense of break, break up and thus destroy, in a number of passages. In Rev. 5:2 the scroll of ongoing history, held by God who is seated on his throne, is sealed with seven seals which no one is worthy to open and break (→ Number, art. *hepta*). However, "the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the Root of David, has conquered, so that he can open the scroll and its seven seals" (Rev. 5:5; cf. chs. 6 f. for the opening of the seals).

Acts 27:41 tells of the breaking up of the stern of the ship on which Paul was bound for Rome, whereas Acts 13:43 refers to the breaking up of a meeting of the synagogue at Antioch in Pisidia. On Jn. 2:19 and Eph. 2:14 see 6 (b) below.

On 2 Pet. 3:10–12 which describes the final conflagration see J. N. D. Kelly, *The Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, *BNTC*, 1969, 363–68. Kelly suggests that the present passive participle in v. 11 (which he translates as "are disintegrating") either "has a future force suggested by the context, or (more probably) the writer deliberately chooses it so as to highlight, by its suggestion that the process of dissolution has already started, the immediacy of his summons" (op. cit., 366). For the idea of the "elements" (*stoicheia*) melting cf. Isa. 34:4; 43:19; Test. Lev. 4:1; 2 Clem. 16:3. The proclamation of a → new → heaven and → earth goes back to Jesus himself (Matt. 19:28; cf. Mk. 14:25; Lk. 22:30). Paul saw the present creation as groaning in travail in expectation of a new order (Rom. 8:19–22). The new heaven and earth are pictured in Rev. 21 f. The vision of a new heaven and earth is proclaimed by Isa. 65:17; 66:22.

5. *lyō* in the sense of loosing or freeing from → death and → sin is found in Acts 2:24 and Rev. 1:5 respectively. In the former case it is applied to the resurrection of Jesus: "But God raised him up, having loosed the pangs of death [*lysas tas ōdinas tou thanatou*], because it was not possible for him to be held by it" (Acts 2:24). On the imagery of the cords of Sheol and death cf. 2 Sam. 22:6; Pss. 18:4 ff.; 116(114):3; Job 39:2 LXX.

Rev. 1:5 relates remission of sin to the death of Jesus in the phrase "and has freed us from our sins by his blood [*kai lysanti hēmas ek tōn hamartiōn hēmōn en tō haimati autou*]" (→ Blood; → Reconciliation). The AV follows the TR *v.l. elousen* ("washed us") instead of the better attested *elysen*. This may have arisen through a failure to understand the Hebraic use of *en* (lit. "in" but here meaning "by") to denote a price (Metzger, 731). Both ideas are paralleled elsewhere in the book:

washing robes in the blood of the → Lamb (Rev. 7:14); ransoming men by his blood (Rev. 5:9). But the context fits "the conception of redemption as a new exodus of the people of God. The beatitude of verse 4 itself expounds the name of God made known to Moses before the exodus. The doxology celebrates the greater redemption of which the first exodus is an anticipation. The sacrifice of the Lamb of God introduces an emancipation from the slavery of sin such as the sacrifice of the passover-lamb could only foreshadow" (G. R. Beasley-Murray, *The Book of Revelation*, *New Century Bible*, 1974, 57).

6. *lyō* is found in a variety of senses in connexion with the institutions of Judaism. In each case the divine origin of the institution is recognized either explicitly or implicitly. But the coming of Jesus demands a fresh understanding in the form either of a renewed attitude to what still stands or the realization that what was formerly regarded as valid and binding is now superseded.

(a) The Sermon on the Mount contains the statement: "Think not that I have come to abolish the law and the prophets [*mē nomisēte hoti ēlthon katalysai ton nomon ē tous prophētas*]; I have come not to abolish them but to fulfil them [*ouk ēlthon katalysai alla plērōsai*]. For truly, I say to you, till heaven and earth pass away [*parelthē*], not an iota, not a dot, will pass from the law until all is accomplished [*iōta hen ē mia keraia ou mē parelthē apo tou nomou heōs an panta genētai*]. Whoever then relaxes one of the least of these commandments and teaches men so, shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven [*hos ean oun lysē mian tōn entolōn toutōn tōn elachistōn kai didaxē houtōs tous anthrōpous elachistos klēthēsetai en tē basileia tōn ouranōn*]; but he who does them and teaches them shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven. For I tell you, unless your righteousness exceeds that of the scribes and Pharisees, you will never enter the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. 5:17–20).

T. W. Manson represents an older critical position on this passage. He sees no reason "why Jesus should not have uttered" the saying in v. 17 (which in form is paralleled by Matt. 10:34) (*The Sayings of Jesus as Recorded in the Gospels according to St. Matthew and St. Luke*, [1937] 1949, 153 f.). The passage is included in the Gospel because Palestinian Jewish Christians were sensitive to the Jewish attitude to the → law which was fundamental to the national heritage. "The difference between the teaching of Jesus and orthodox Jewish doctrine must be shown to be due not to heresy on the part of Jesus but to His deeper and fuller understanding of the Law. His pronouncements, so far from upsetting the Law, bring out its true meaning and purpose" (op. cit., 153). Manson shows that the attitude of Jesus here is essentially the same as that in Mk. 7:6–13; 10:1–12: 11:15–19; Lk. 11:45–52, in which Jesus upholds the intention and spirit of the law in contrast with the scribal interpretations which stultify its demands.

However, Manson thinks that the passage in its present form makes Jesus too sympathetic towards orthodox Judaism. He thinks that v. 18 cannot be attributed to Jesus in the light of such a passage as Mk. 10:1–12 (op. cit., 154). In reply, it may be pointed out that the latter passage which concerns → divorce is not critical of Moses in allowing divorce even though it implies violating the creation ordinance of marriage (Deut. 24:1–4; cf. Gen. 1:27; 2:24). Rather, the Mosaic law caters for a contingency brought about by man but which is contrary to the divine purpose in in-

stituting marriage: "For the hardness of your heart he wrote you this commandment" (Mk. 10:5). Hence, Mk. 10:1–12 is not a proof of an attitude to the law on the part of Jesus different from the one attributed to him in this whole passage. His teaching on divorce upheld precisely the creation ordinance on marriage and Mosaic provision for divorce.

A parallel to Matt. 5:18 occurs in another context in Lk. 16:17, both of which passages Manson attributes to Q: "But it is easier for heaven and earth to pass away, than for one dot [*keraian*] of the law to become void." The preceding verses in Lk. concern the law and the prophets being preached until John the Baptist, and the following verse pronounces as adultery any marriage contracted after divorce. Manson thinks that the Lucan form was nearer the original and that it was intended to be ironic, referring to the attitude of the scribes. He claims that the *keraia* (EVV "tittle", "dot") was not in fact part of the law itself, but stood "most probably" for scribal ornaments added to certain Heb. letters (op cit., 135; cf. SB I 248 f.). The rabbis gave them the terms *qôṣâh* or *qôṣ*, thorn, *tāḡā'* or *keṯer*, crown, and *nᵉqûddâh*, point. The term "crown" would thus give added point to the idea of falling from the law. However, these strokes formed part of the actual consonantal letter and served to distinguish the one from the other. The *iōta* (EVV "jot", "dot", "iota") was the Heb. letter *Yôḏ* (*y*) which was the smallest letter of the Heb. alphabet (cf. SB I 247 f. for rabbinic pronouncements on the letter). The letter was often omitted in Heb. and Aram. texts. Another possibility for the *keraia* is that it denotes the "hook (letter)", i.e. *Wāw* (*w*) which was also sometimes dispensed with (A. H. McNeile, *The Gospel according to St. Matthew*, 1915, 59). The *Wāw*, when placed in front of a word means "and". Both letters could also be used as vowels (*Yôḏ* = *y*; *Wāw* = *û*, or = *ô*), but unlike other vowels they would be written in the unpointed text (i.e. the normal text of the time which was written with consonants only). How such a text is read (i.e. whatever vowels are read into the text) obviously can make a considerable difference to the meaning. Whatever particular ideas may lie behind these terms, Manson would seem to be wrong in his interpretation of the evidence presented by SB in thinking that the *keraia* was a purely ornamental stroke which had no bearing on what the letter was actually meant to be. Although the stroke was a small one, it made a significant difference to the meaning of the text. And in view of what we know from elsewhere of Jesus' attitude to the law, the verse is best interpreted as an affirmation of the abiding significance of the law.

This last point is supported by the final statement of the verse about the necessity of fulfilment which is a recurrent theme especially in Matt. (→ Fullness, art. *plēroō* NT). The precise significance of this statement has been variously interpreted. The NEB gives the paraphrase: "till all that must happen has happened." W. D. Davies gives it an eschatological interpretation ("Matthew 5:17, 18", in *Mélanges Bibliques en l'honneur d'A. Robert*, 1957, 428–56; reprinted in *Christian Origins and Judaism*, 1962, 31–66, from which quotations are taken). Davies holds that the phrase *heōs an panta genētai* "in its present Matthaean form may well go back to Jesus" (op. cit., 65), and that it was not the Jewish-Gentile conflict of the early church which was responsible for this passage but the actual ministry and purpose of Jesus. Davies suggests that the phrase means: "that while this present order endures (*ho ouranos kai hē gē*) the old Law remains in force (although signs that it is to pass are already given during the Ministry and, indeed, for the new Messianic community it was

already in process of passing), but once the obedience of Jesus has finally issued in death and the New Covenant has thus been fully inaugurated (because the Ministry itself is its partial inauguration) then the old Law ceases to have authority" (op. cit., 60 f.). The difficulty with this view is the strain it puts on the clause "till heaven and earth pass away" which it identifies with the period of time up to the death of Jesus. The phrase does indeed imply the continued validity of the law for the duration of the present order until whatever is in the law is accomplished. But it implies that the present order will continue until the end of time and not the death of Jesus which is not mentioned in the passage (cf. A. M. Honeyman, "Matthew v. 18 and the Validity of the Law", *NTS* 1, 1954–55, 141 f.). The comment of R. Banks on Matt. 5:17 appears to fit the context much better: "This 'fulfilment' takes place not in the first instance through his suffering and death as some have sought to maintain, but in his teaching and practice, though these, of course, ultimately culminated in the Cross. It is *to* that ministry that the Law 'prophetically' pointed, and it is only in so far as it has been taken up *into* that teaching and completely transformed that it lives on" (*Jesus and the Law in the Synoptic Tradition, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series* 28, 1975, 242).

Manson suggests that *lysē* ("relaxes", i.e. "one of the least of these commandments", v. 19) represents the hiphil of *nāṭar* which means to free, untie, loose in the OT and also to permit, declare permitted (Shabb. 4a), and to free, surrender, outlaw, proscribe (San. 40b) in rabbinic Heb. The context suggests that the commandments referred to are those of the law (v. 18; cf. D. Hill, *The Gospel of Matthew, New Century Bible*, 1972, 118) rather than those of Jesus which follow (v. 41; cf. G. D. Kilpatrick, *The Origins of the Gospel according to St. Matthew*, 1946, 25f.). The Gk. text of Matt. contains a play on words between *katalyō*, destroy, demolish, do away with, abolish, and *lyō*, relax, which Hill paraphrases as "to show by example and teaching that a commandment was obsolete" (op. cit., 119). In v. 17 Jesus emphatically states that he has not come to *katalysai* the law and the prophets; in v. 19 he gives dire warning to anyone who would *lysē* the least of these commandments. V. 20 relates this to the scribes and Pharisees, and the Sermon proceeds to give examples of how commandments have been relaxed: murder and anger (Matt. 5:21 ff.; cf. Exod. 20:13; Deut. 5:17; 16:8); adultery and lust (Matt. 5:27 ff.; cf. Exod. 20:14; Deut. 5:18); divorce and adultery (Matt. 5:31 ff.; cf. Deut. 24:1–4; Matt. 19:9; Lk. 16:18; Mk. 10:11 f.; 1 Cor. 7:10 f.); swearing (Matt. 5:33–37; cf. Lev. 19:12; Num. 30:3; Deut. 23:21; Matt. 23:16–22; Jas. 5:12); justice and revenge (Matt. 5:38–42; cf. Exod. 21:24; Lev. 24:20; Deut. 19:21; Prov. 24:29; Lk. 6:29 f.; Rom. 12:17; 1 Pet. 2:19; 3:9); loving one's neighbour (Matt. 5:43 ff.; cf. Lev. 19:18; Prov. 25:21 f.; Lk. 6:27 f., 32–36 – the OT did not enjoin hating one's enemy, which was a mark of sectarian Judaism perhaps taught by a Targum, M. Smith, "Matt. v. 43: 'Hate Thine Enemy' ", *HTR* 45, 1952, 71 ff.; W. D. Davies, *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount*, 1964, 245 ff.). In all these points Jesus, far from relaxing the law, ratifies it and applies it to man's inner attitudes as well as his outward acts. For Jesus' teaching on the law elsewhere in Matt. see also 7:12; 11:13; 22:40. For his denunciation of those who make a mockery of the law by their hypocrisy see Matt. 15:1–11; 23:1–39.

A redaction-critical approach to this whole subject is given by G. Barth in "Matthew's Understanding of the Law", in G. Bornkamm, G. Barth and H. J. Held,

Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew, 1963, 58–164. Barth claims that Matt. 5:17 ff. "obviously stem from the Jewish-Christian congregation and are directed against a tendency to abandon the law, a representative place and a programmatic meaning. Along with the unabridged validity of the Torah the interpretation of the scribes is also axiomatically binding for him. This is seen in the antitheses that follow, where, above all, there is no question of setting Torah and scribal interpretation over against each other, but what was said 'to them of old time' is at times quoted in the form which was self-evident to the Jew, namely that which tradition gave to the word of Scripture. In fact, Matt. 23.2 grants to the scribes and Pharisees that they sit on the *kathedra* of Moses; their teaching is not attacked but declared to be binding (23.3). What is attacked is the discrepancy between what they teach and what they do, their hypocrisy (23.4 ff.; 6.1 ff.)" (op. cit., 24).

The difficulty with this view is that it is too wholesale. Although Barth goes on to take note of the criticism of tradition in Matt. 15:3–9 (par. Mk. 7:6–13, Lk. 11:39 ff.) which condemned the scribes and Pharisees not for failing to keep their tradition, but "for the sake of your tradition, you have made void the word of God" (Matt. 15:6, cf. 9 quoting Isa. 29:13 and par.), he fails to see the bearing of this for Matt.'s presentation of Jesus' attitude to the law. Similarly he fails to appreciate the significance of Jesus' denunciation of the → blind leaders of the blind (Matt. 15:14), and the warning against the → leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees (Matt. 16:6, 11) which he admits to be their teaching. If we study these later pasages alongside Matt. 5, a consistent picture emerges. Jesus is presented not only as one who upholds the law, but as one who insists that the law must be rightly interpreted and applied. To that extent the true disciple is also a *grammateus*, scribe (Matt. 23:34), but one who has to be "trained for the kingdom of heaven", so that he might bring out of his treasure things old and new (Matt. 13:52; → Possessions, art. *thēsauros* NT 1 (f); → Scribe, art. *grammateus*). The point is that not all interpretation and application are wrong. Jesus and the disciples engage in it. It is wrong, however, where it fails to bring out the true meaning of the law and when it substitutes human tradition for the word of God. Barth is clearly wrong in claiming that, according to Matt., scribal interpretation is "axiomatically binding". The antitheses of Matt. 5 distinguish sharply between the intention of Scripture and accepted interpretations. The root difference between the two is formulated in Matt. 5:19 f. which focuses on two concepts. On the one hand, misguided interpretation is seen as relaxing (*lysē*) the commandments. On the other hand, this is in the last analysis a question of → righteousness (*dikaiosynē*). A man's attitude to the commandments determines his place in the kingdom; because of their attitude, which involves a fundamental lack of righteousness, the scribes and the Pharisees are excluded from the kingdom. Moreover, the disciple is not exempt from the same danger.

The phrase "least in the kingdom of heaven" may be compared with Paul's description of himself as "the least of the apostles" (1 Cor. 15:9), but it is impossible to establish any literary interdependence. In any case, the underlying Aram. in Matt. could mean "little" (cf. also Matt. 11:11). Later rabbinic thought distinguished between "heavy" and "light" commandments (Sifre Deut. 187, 108b), but the more rigid school of Shammai refused to draw such a distinction (D. Hill, op. cit., 119; cf. Jas. 2:10). It is sometimes suggested that Matt.'s presentation of Jesus' attitude to the law is designed to be an anti-Pauline counterbalance to Paul's denigration of the law,

whether the latter be real or apparent (on Paul's teaching → Law, art. *nomos* NT 2). But in fact there is an affinity between the two positions (cf. Matt. 5:17 f., 48; 22:40; with Rom. 3:31; 1 Cor. 2:6; Gal. 5:14; cf. A. W. Argyle, " 'M' and Paul", *ExpT* 81, 1969–70, 340 ff.). Moreover, Matt.'s presentation of Jesus' understanding of the law does not differ essentially from that presented by the other Gospels, as may be seen from the parallels already noted. Clearly, of all the evangelists, Matt. is the one most concerned to articulate Jesus' position on the law. But, as Banks concludes, "Matthew is not imposing upon the tradition a weight that it cannot bear, but merely drawing out the specific consequences of that which is present in it" (op. cit., 251).

(b) *lyō* is twice used in connexion with the → temple. In Jn.'s account of the cleansing of the temple the Jews ask for a sign of Jesus' authority. "Jesus answered them, 'Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up [*lysate ton naon touton kai en trisin hēmerais egerō auton*]' " (Jn. 2:19). Commenting on the Jews' remark that the temple took forty-six years to build, Jn. points out that Jesus was referring to "the temple of his body" (v. 21), which the disciples understood after the resurrection and which in turn caused them to believe "the scripture and the word which Jesus had spoken" (v. 22). At his trial before the chief priests, elders and scribes, false witnesses claimed: "We heard him say this, 'I will destroy this temple that is made with hands, and in three days I will build another, not made with hands [*egō katalysō ton naon touton ton cheiropoiēton kai dia triōn hēmerōn allon acheiropoiēton oikodomēsō*]' " (Mk. 14:58; cf. the abbreviated par. Matt. 26:61 which also has *katalysō*). The destruction of the temple itself is foretold in Mk. 13:2 par. Matt. 24:2, Lk. 21:6. Dodd suggests that Jn.'s use of the imperative vb. with a conditional sense (i.e. "If you destroy . . .") and the unliterary *en trisin hēmerais* point to a primitive Semitic form of the saying (*The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, 1953, 302). Bultmann points out that *lyō* and *katalyō* are often used for the destruction of buildings (Matt. 27:40; Mk. 13:2; 14:58; 15:29; Acts 6:14, referring to the false witnesses and the onlookers at the crucifixion) as is *egeirō* for constructing them (*The Gospel of John*, 1971, 125). He suggests that there is more than just a conditional clause implied here; it is "cast in the ironic imperative of the prophetic style" (cf. Amos 4:4; Isa. 8:9 f.). The saying implies that Jesus' own person has already replaced the temple as the divinely appointed place of meeting between God and man. It further implies that Jewish disobedience is directly responsible for the destruction of this temple, just as it was for the destruction of the first one (2 Ki. 25:9, 13–17). It may be noted that it was the false witnesses who accused Jesus of threatening to destroy the temple. The theme of misunderstanding is a motif in Jn. (cf. 2:20; 3:3 f.; 4:10 ff., 32 f.; 6:32 ff.; 7:34 ff.; 14.4 f., 7 ff., 22 ff.; 16:17 f.).

Eph. 2:14 uses *lyō* to make a rather different point: "For he is our peace, who has made us both one, and has broken down the dividing wall of hostility [*kai to mesotoichon tou phragmou lysas*]." The term *mesotoichon* occurs only here in the NT. It is rare in secular Gk. and is not found at all in the LXX. It means a partition or dividing wall, and evidently refers to the stone wall in the temple with pillars "declaring the law of purity, some in Greek, and some in Roman letters, That *no foreigner should go within that sanctuary*" (Josephus, *War* 5, 5 [194]). The context of Eph. 2 evidently presupposes some knowledge of Jewish practices among the Gentiles of Asia Minor, and the climax of the chapter is reached in the assertion that the

Gentile Christians now grow "into a holy temple in the Lord" (v. 21). V. 14 points out that there is no longer a dividing wall between Jewish and Gentile believers before God. The reason is given in the following verses: "by abolishing in his flesh the law of commandments and ordinances, that he might create in himself one new man in place of the two, so making peace, and might reconcile us both to God in one body through the cross, thereby bringing the hostility to an end" (Eph. 2:15 f.; → Reconciliation, art. *katallassō* NT 7). The idea of the law as a protecting wall against the Gentiles is expressed in Aristeas 139: "Now our Lawgiver being a wise man and specially endowed by God to understand all things, took a comprehensive view of particular detail, and fenced us round with impregnable ramparts and walls of iron, that we might not mingle at all with any of the other nations, but remain pure in body and soul, free from all vain imaginations, worshipping the one Almighty God above the whole creation." In contrast with the Gospels where Jesus never actually says that he will destroy the temple, in Eph. 2:14 he is in fact the subject of the vb. The destruction of the dividing wall between Jewish and Gentile believers is the result of his reconciling death.

(c) In Jn. 5:18 *lyō* is used of breaking the → sabbath: "This was why the Jews sought all the more to kill him, because he not only broke the sabbath [*hoti ou monon elyen to sabbaton*] but also called God his Father, making himself equal with God." The occasion was the healing of the paralytic by the pool of Bethzatha. Jesus defended his action by claiming: "My Father is working still, and I am working" (Jn. 5:17). To the Jews the reply sounded like Adam's sinful attempt to be like God (Gen. 3:5 f.). But the answer is intended to show that there is a sense in which God is working on the sabbath both in general in sustaining the world and in particular in the case of this healing, in which Jesus is co-operating with the Father.

(d) The same incident is taken up again, but this time with reference to the law, in Jn. 7:23: "If on the sabbath a man receives circumcision, so that the law of Moses may not be broken [*hina mē lythē ho nomos Mōÿseōs*], are you angry with me because on the sabbath I made a man's whole body well?" There is an irony between the rite of circumcision performed on the male sexual organ which inevitably causes some pain and suffering and the healing of the whole body which banishes suffering. Jesus' stance implies that, just as in healing he was not breaking the sabbath, he is also not breaking the law.

The point is extended to scripture in Jn. 10:35 f.: "If he called them gods to whom the word of God came (and scripture cannot be broken [*kai ou dynatai lythēnai hē graphē*]), do you say of him whom the Father consecrated and sent into the world, 'You are blaspheming,' because I said, 'I am the Son of God'?" The statement about "gods" is an allusion to the previous v. which contains a quotation from Ps. 82(81):6, "You are gods," which agrees with both the MT and the LXX. The passage has been the subject of considerable discussion (cf. L. Morris, *The Biblical Doctrine of Judgment*, 1960, 34 ff.; and *The Gospel according to John*, *NLC*, 1971, 525 f.). J. A. Emerton has suggested that the "gods" in the Ps. "were regarded as angels by the Jews, but as gods by the gentiles", and that the passage is not conclusive evidence that in the OT men could be called "god" ("Some New Testament Notes", *JTS* New Series 11, 1960, 329–32). But Morris objects that this interpretion does less than justice to the context of the Ps. A. T. Hanson takes seriously the rabbinic view that the Ps. was spoken to Israel by God at Sinai ("John's Citation of Psalm lxxxii", *NTS*

11, 1964–65, 158–62). He thinks that Jn. believed that the Ps. was uttered by the pre-existent Word: "if to be addressed by the pre-existent Word justifies men in being called gods, indirect and mediated though that address was (coming perhaps through Moses, certainly written down only through David), far more are we justified in applying the title Son of God to the human bearer of the pre-existent Word, sanctified and sent by the Father as he was, in unmediated and direct presence" (op. cit., 161). Disagreement with this view has come from M. de Jonge and A. S. van der Woude who draw attention to the Qumran scroll 11Q Melchizedek in which → Melchizedek is regarded as the speaker of Ps. 82 and evil angels as addressees ("11Q Melchizedek and the New Testament", *NTS* 12, 1965–66, 301–26), and also from Emerton who claims the scroll as support for his view ("Melchizedek and the Gods: Fresh Evidence for the Jewish Background of John x. 34–36", *JTS* New Series 17, 1966, 393–401). But Hanson has replied to these criticisms and claims that his own position is vindicated ("John's Citation of Psalm lxxxii Reconsidered" (*NTS* 13, 1966–67, 363–67).

The RSV takes *kai ou dynatai lythēnai hē graphē* as a parenthesis, but Morris thinks it better to see it as dependent upon the previous *ei* ("if") which would then introduce two certainties as premises for the conclusion: if the passage calls men "gods" and if Scripture cannot be broken, then *a fortiori* is it proper for Jesus to claim to be "the Son of God" (v. 36). This is in fact confirmed by his → works "that you may know and understand that the Father is in me and I am in the Father" (v. 37; cf. v. 32). The works justify the title, pointing to the relationship with the Father. Morris suggests that the idea of Scripture being broken means that it "cannot be emptied of its force by being shown to be erroneous" (*The Gospel according to John*, 527). He cites in support Jn. 5:18; 7:23; Matt. 5:19. R. E. Brown follows R. Jungkuntz in holding that *lyō* is to be contrasted with *plēroō*, i.e. to keep from being fulfilled as opposed to being fulfilled (*The Gospel according to John*, I, *Anchor Bible*, 1966, 404; cf. R. Jungkuntz, "An Approach to the Exegesis of John 10:34–36", *Concordia Theological Monthly* 35, 1964, 556–65). In rabbinic usage *baṭṭēl*, nullify, render futile, appears to be the Aram. equivalent of *lyō*. Thus in Jn. 7:23 it means that a man receives circumcision on the sabbath, so that the fulfilment of the law will not be frustrated. The reason why judges are called "gods" in Ps. 82 is that they have the office of administering God's judgment as "sons of the Most High". In the context of the Ps. the men in question have failed to do this, and the Ps. ends by calling on God himself to arise and judge the earth. Perhaps the use of the quotation in Jn. 10 implies that this is now what is happening in the person of Jesus in his confrontation with the Jews. If this is so, then the breaking of Scripture in Jn. 10:34 is not simply a matter of showing Scripture to be erroneous. It is a claim that the Ps. finds fulfilment in Jesus. Whereas the Jews were accusing Jesus of blasphemy (vv. 33, 36), they were in fact committing it themselves. In trying to arrest him (v. 39) and in disregarding the testimony of his works (vv. 32, 38), they were judging unjustly like the judges in Ps. 82:2. In failing to appreciate how these works benefited the weak and needy and in not attempting to do anything about it, they were acting like the unjust judges of the Ps. (Ps. 82:4; cf. 3). In so doing, they showed that they had "neither knowledge nor understanding", and were walking about "in darkness", as the Psalmist had said (Ps. 82:5). On the other hand, Jesus fulfilled the rôle of a true judge as a "god" and "son of the Most High", which in the Ps., as in the OT, was not sim-

ply a matter of delivering judgment in court, but included the wider aspect of administering the community in righteousness.

It is sometimes suggested that the reference to Scripture in Jn. 10:35 is an *argumentum ad hominem* which did not represent Jesus' own view of Scripture, but was a premise that Jesus knew the Jews accepted. It was therefore an adroit way of winning an argument by turning the tables on his opponents. But, as B. B. Warfield contends, the argument is not *ad hominem* but *e concessu*: "Scripture was the common ground with Jesus and His opponents" (*The Inspiration and Authority of the Bible*, 140). This appeal to the authority of Scripture and its fulfilment is in line with other appeals testified to in various strata of the Gospels (cf. Jn. 5:39; 12:14; 13:18; 17:12; Matt. 26:31, 54; Mk. 9:12 f.; 14:27; Lk. 20:17; 24:25; see Warfield, op. cit., 141–65, for discussion of these and other passages). Moreover, if the above interpretation of *lythēnai* in relation to Ps. 82 is correct, then the point of the quotation is to show not only that the Ps. offers formal precedent for speaking of a man as a "god", but that there is a material fulfilment of the whole Ps. in the person of Jesus in his confrontation with his unrighteous opponents who were presuming to judge him.

(e) The binding and loosing with which Peter was authorized in Matt. 16:19 and which was given to the disciples and the church at large in Matt. 18:18 stands in contrast with rabbinic usage (cf. *deō* = Aram., *'asar*, bind; *lyō* = Aram. *šera'*, loose). The authority of the rabbis as teachers was shown by their being able to forbid or allow certain things. They were able to excommunicate, i.e. exclude a person from the synagogue, though this is relatively seldom mentioned in rabbinic writings. Their decisions claimed to have validity in heaven, i.e. with God (SB I 738 ff.; 702 f.). On the nature of the authority entrusted to the church → Bind; → Open, art. *kleis* NT 3. Clearly it is an authority which is quite independent of any Jewish institutions, but which has its own God-given power.

(f) *lyō* and the unique noun *lysis* occur in 1 Cor. 7:27 in connexion with → divorce: "Are you bound to a wife? Do not seek to be free [*dedesai gynaiki; mē zetei lysin*]. Are you free from a wife? Do not seek marriage [*lelysai apo gynaikos; mē zētei gynaika*]." D. Daube points out that *lysis*, "release", is a somewhat untechnical word for divorce (*The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*, 1956, 363), as compared with Paul's use of *chōrizesthai* of the wife who "separates" from her husband and *aphienai* of the husband who "dismisses" his wife, which corresponds to Jewish usage (cf. 1 Cor. 7:10 f.; → Reconciliation, art. *katallassō* NT 8). Perhaps Paul was using a more general term which would cover not only formal divorce but separation and even the death of the marriage partner. However, *apolyō* is used of divorce (Matt. 5:31 f. par. Lk. 16:18; Matt. 19:3–9 par. Mk. 10:2–12). C. K. Barrett claims that 1 Cor. 7:27 "contains Paul's advice on what, in the present circumstances, it is a *good thing* for a man to do; but it is in no sense a strict ruling which all must obey" (*The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, *BNTC*, 1968, 175). On the other hand, the ruling is in line with the charge from the Lord, not to separate but to seek reconciliation within marriage, and with OT teaching (1 Cor. 7:10 f.; cf. the Gospel passages quoted above; → Reconciliation, art. *katallassō* NT 8). And whilst Paul's teaching on the whole range of marriage questions in 1 Cor. 7 is clearly conditioned by circumstances (cf. vv. 29 ff.), it may be asked whether Paul envisaged those circumstances ever being altered except by the parousia. Nevertheless, it is not a sin for those who find themselves thus "free from a wife [*lelysai apo gynaikos*]" (v. 27) to

marry (v. 28). And this may, indeed, be right in view of the considerations discussed in vv. 2–7. For each has his or her particular gift. For fuller discussion → Separate, art. *chōrizō*.

7. Compounds of *lyō* are not infrequent in the NT.

(a) *apolyō* (which occurs in cl. Gk. from Homer onwards) means: (i) to set free, release, pardon a prisoner (Matt. 27:15–26; Mk. 15:6–15; Lk. 23:16–25; Jn. 18:39; 19:10, 12; Acts 3:13; 5:40; 16:35 f.; 26:32; 28:18); release a debtor (Matt. 18:27; cf. Lk. 6:37); be freed of diseases (Lk. 13:12); (ii) let go, send away, dismiss one's wife or betrothed, divorce (Matt. 1:19; 5:31 f.; 19:3, 7 ff.; Mk. 10:2, 4, 11; Lk. 16:18; cf. Deut. 24:1 ff.); of a woman divorcing her husband (Mk. 10:12 which accords with Greco-Roman custom, but not with Jewish, cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 15, 259); (iii) dismiss, send away crowds (Matt. 14:15, 22; 15:32, 39; Mk. 6:36, 45; 8:9), an assembly (Acts 19:40), and individuals (Matt. 15:23; Lk. 8:38; 14:4; cf. also Mk. 8:3; Acts 4:23; 15:30, 33); and as a euphemism for let die (Lk. 2:29).

(b) *katalyō* (in cl. Gk. from Homer onwards) means: (i) throw down, detach a stone from a building (Matt. 24:2; Mk. 13:2; Lk. 21:6), destroy, demolish, dismantle, of the temple (Matt. 26:61; cf. 27:40; Mk. 14:58; 15:29; Acts 6:14; see above 6 (b)), metaphorically of Paul demolishing the Jewish understanding of salvation and way of life (Gal. 2:18), of "the earthly tent", i.e. the human body at death which nevertheless leaves the believer with "a building from God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens" (2 Cor. 5:1), tearing down "the work of God", i.e. the church (Rom. 14:20; cf. v. 19) over questions of eating what is unclean; *akatalytos* (from 1st cent. B.C. onwards) is found in the NT only at Heb. 7:16, meaning indestructible hence endless, referring to the life of Jesus, the eternal high priest, for Jesus was not appointed by the carnal law which is "a system of earth-bound rules" (NEB) but after the order of → Melchizedek; (ii) do away with, abolish, annul, make invalid, of the law (Matt. 5:17; see above 6 (a)), of the church which Gamaliel said would fail, if it was of men, but which could not be overthrown if it was of God's plan (Acts 5:38 f.); (iii) halt (i.e. unharness the pack animals), hence to rest, find lodging (Lk. 9:12; 19:7). *katalyma* (2nd cent. B.C. onwards) means generally lodging, but more particularly a guest room or dining room (Mk. 15:14; Lk. 2:7; 22:11).

(c) *eklyō* (Homer onwards) means to become loose, become weary, become weak, of the hungry crowds in the desert (Matt. 15:32; Mk. 8:3), of the Christian's certainty of reaping the harvest of well-doing if he does not grow weary (Gal. 6:9), of not losing courage in adversity, for discipline is a sign of sonship (Heb. 12:5 quoting Prov. 3:11; cf. also Heb. 12:3). *C. Brown*

λύτρον

λύτρον (*lytron*), price of release, ransom, ransom price; *ἀντίλυτρον* (*antilytron*), ransom, ransom price; *λυτρόω* (*lytroō*), to ransom, redeem; *λύτρωσις, ἀπολύτρωσις* (*lytrōsis, apolytrōsis*), redemption, deliverance, release; *λυτρωτής* (*lytrōtēs*), redeemer.

CL *lytron* (from 5th cent. B.C. on) and *antilytron* (only post-biblical in secular Gk.) denote the means or money for a ransom. The suffix *-tron* denotes the instrument or means by which the action of the vb. is accomplished, i.e. means of releasing, or the payment, i.e. price of releasing (D. Hill, *Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings:*

Studies in the Semantics of Soteriological Terms, *Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series* 5, 1967, 49). The plur. *lytra* is common. We find also the meaning of recompense. Among the Gks. a ransom was often paid to free slaves, but the word is seldom found in cultic contexts. *lytroō* (from Plato on) means to free by a ransom, redeem. It is used only in act. in secular Gk., but is always mid. or pass. in biblical Gk. *lytrōsis* and *apolytrōsis*, synonyms meaning freeing, redeeming, are rare and found first in 1st cent. B.C. *lytrōtēs*, redeemer, is found only in biblical Gk.

W. Mundle

OT 1 (a). In the LXX the sing. *lytron* is found only in Lev. 27:31; Prov. 6:35; 13:8; otherwise it is always in plur. In addition to the passages mentioned, *lytron* translates Heb. *kōper*, covering, also in Exod. 21:30; 30:12; Num. 35:31, 32; Prov. 6:35; 13:8. *kōper* means the gift in exchange for a life, which according to the sacred law is forfeit or has come under the punishment of God. Normally it is not clear whether God, or men representing him, i.e. priests, are to be the recipients of the ransom money. A ransom was not to be paid for the murderer (Num. 35:31 f.). (On the important related vb. *kipper* → Reconciliation, art. *hilaskomai* OT 3.)

(b) *lytron* is used also to render *piḏyôn*, *piḏyôm*, *pᵉḏûyîm*, ransom (from *pāḏâh*, ransom, redeem; cf. Num. 3:46–51). In addition it is found in Lev. 19:20 and Num. 18:15 to strengthen the vb. *pāḏâh*, stressing the action of redeeming and its price. This has to be paid for those, like the first-born of man or animal, which by sacred law belong to God (→ First). It can be paid by animal sacrifice (Exod. 13:13, 15; 34:20) or sometimes by a money payment (Exod. 30:13–16; Num. 3:46–51; 18:15 f.). The suggestion that 1 Sam. 14:45 implies the ransoming of Jonathan's life by the life of another is highly improbable (cf. H. W. Hertzberg, *I & II Samuel*, 1964, 117 f.). Lev. 19:20 uses *lytra* for the ransoming of a slave girl.

(c) *lytra* also renders the noun *gᵉ'ullâh*, redemption (from the vb. *gā'al*, redeem, act as kinsman) in the case of the relative who was both entitled and under obligation to act (Lev. 25:24, 26, 51 f.). The redeemer (*gō'ēl*) was originally the closest relative who, as the avenger of → blood, had to redeem the blood of the murdered victim (Num. 35:19, 21, 24, 25, 27; Jos. 20:3, 5) and also the family possession that had been sold (Lev. 27:13, 15, 19 f., 31; cf. Jer. 32:7 where the LXX does not use *lytra*), and even the person whose economic plight had caused him to sell himself to a non-Jew (Lev. 25:48 f.). In Lev. 25:26, 51 f. the *gᵉ'ullâh* is the price of redemption. In Lev. 25:24 it means redemption, and in Lev. 25:29, 31 f., 48; Ruth 4:6; Jer. 32:8 it signifies the right of redemption. In Ezek. 11:15 "your fellow exiles" (RSV), "men of your kindred" (RSV mg.) are lit. "men of your redemption (MT *'anšê gᵉ'ullāṯeḵā*]". In Isa. 45:13 *lytra* renders *mᵉḥîr*, purchase price.

(d) D. A. Leggett points out that the duties prescribed by the OT laws are only understandable against the background of the covenant which made Israel Yahweh's unique possession (Exod. 19:5) among whom he dwelt (Exod. 25:8) (*The Levirate and Goel Institutions in the Old Testament with Special Attention to the Book of Ruth*, 1974, 292). The land was Yahweh's and given to Israel through Yahweh's saving intervention as Lord of history. Therefore the land was not to be sold in perpetuity (Lev. 25:23), but rather to be redeemed (Lev. 25:24). Yahweh had redeemed Israel out of → Egypt, by which act they had become his servants (Lev. 25:37, 55; cf. Deut. 15:15). Accordingly the impoverished Israelite who had sold himself into

slavery was to be redeemed (Lev. 25:55). If he was not redeemed by the appointed means, he was to be released in the year of jubilee (Lev. 25:50, 55).

The latter institution was part of the system of sabbatical years described in Lev. 25, which decreed that the land should be left fallow every seventh year (cf. Lev. 26:34–43; 2 Chr. 36:21; Neh. 10:31; Jer. 34:14–22; 1 Macc. 6:49, 53; Josephus, *Ant.* 12, 378; 14, 202). Unattended growth could be gathered by the poor or eaten by the beasts (Exod. 23:11; Deut. 15:2–18). Every fiftieth year (i.e. after 7 x 7 sabbath years) was a jubilee (so called from the Heb. *yôḇēl*, ram, thence the ram's horn trumpet which heralded the year, cf. Exod. 19:13). The LXX uses *aphesis*, release. Then the sanctions of the sabbatical year were enforced, and debts were remitted and slaves released. The institution brought together not only sound ecological and humanitarian principles in a primitive society; it grounded them in faith in a God who acts for salvation in history. (For critical discussion see J. Lilley, "Jubilee Year", *ZPEB* III 715 f.; R. North, *Sociology of the Biblical Jubilee*, 1954; H. Cazelles, *VT* 5, 1955, 321–24; W. Hallo, *BA* 23, 1960, 48 f.; N. Avigad, *BASOR* 163, 1961, 18–22.)

(e) Leggett sees the figure of the *gō'ēl* reflecting that of Yahweh in his relationship with Israel which is grounded in the covenant (op. cit., 293 f.). The vb. *gā'al* and the figure of the *gō'ēl* have particular prominence in the book of Ruth in which Ruth, the Moabitess and widowed daughter-in-law of Naomi, accompanies the latter to her home town of → Bethlehem. The two are destitute, but Ruth gleans in the field of Boaz who is a kinsman (Ruth 3:3). Naomi counsels Ruth to go to Boaz at the threshing floor at night. Boaz does not take Ruth at once. There is a nearer kinsman: "Remain this night, and in the morning, if he will do the part of the next of kin for you, well; let him do it; but if he is not willing to do the part of the next of kin for you, then, as the LORD lives, I will do the part of the next of kin for you. Lie down until the morning" (3:13). But upon the latter's refusal before the elders to take Ruth, Boaz does so by buying a field from the hand of Naomi (4:5). The background to this is the concept of the levirate marriage, according to which it was the duty of a kinsman to marry a widow "in order to restore the name of the dead to his inheritance" (4:5; → Marriage, art. *gameō* OT 5).

It should be noted that the LXX tones down the concept of redemption by avoiding *lytron* and cognates in the book of Ruth. Instead, it uses the noun *anchisteus*, kinsman (Ruth 3:9, 12; 4:1, 3, 6, 8, 14) and the vb. *anchisteuō*, be next of kin, act as next of kin, do a kinsman's office (Ruth 2:20; 3:13; 4:4; 6 f.). Nevertheless, the act of buying the field and the deliverance of Ruth and Naomi from destitution are integral features of the concept of redemption. The purpose of the book of Ruth has been widely debated (cf. O. Eissfeldt, *The Old Testament: An Introduction*, 1965, 477–83; R. K. Harrison, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, 1969, 1059–64; L. Morris in A. E. Cundall and L. Morris, *Judges, Ruth, TC*, 1968, 239–43). It is widely held to be a tract against Jewish exclusivism. The book closes with a brief genealogy tracing → David's descent from Boaz (Ruth 4:18 ff.). Leggett sees in the book the theme of redemptive, messianic typology. "In the actions of Boaz as goel we see foreshadowed the saving work of Jesus Christ, his later descendant. As Boaz had the right of redemption and yet clearly was under no obligation to intervene on Ruth's behalf, so it was with Christ. As Boaz, seeing the plight of the poor widows, came to their rescue because his life was governed by Yahweh and his

laws, so also of the Messiah it is prophesied that his life would be governed by the law of God and that he would deal justly and equitably with the poor and with those who were oppressed (Ps. 72:2, 4, 12, 13; Isa. 11:4)" (op. cit. 298).

(f) In the cases discussed so far there is the idea of release through buying back either through some act or by an appropriate payment. The plur. *lytra* denotes what is given in replacement which results in release. The thought that something has to be done or paid implies the need to come to terms. But the idea of reconciliation is particularly prominent in those passages where *lytra* translates *kōper*, price of a life, ransom (Exod. 21:30; 30:12; Num. 35:31 f.; Prov. 6:35; 13:8). This Heb. noun is a cognate of the vb. *kipper*; → Reconciliation, art. *hilaskomai* OT 3. *kōper* occurs in the MT as the price for ransom of a life (Exod. 21:30; cf. 30:16; Job 33:24; 36:18; Prov. 13:8), a ransom (Num. 35:31 f.; Prov. 6:25; Ps. 49[48]:8, LXX *exhilasma*, guilt offering; Isa. 43:3). It means a bribe (1 Sam. 12:3, LXX *exhilasma*; Amos 5:12), where it is perhaps connected with the root idea of covering, i.e. that which covers the eyes. In Exod. 30:12 it is the half shekel of the sanctuary paid by all males above the age of twenty at the census to avert the plague (→ Tax). But the word is not found in the Day of Atonement ritual (Lev. 16). For the concept of reconciliation in later Judaism → Reconciliation, arts. *apokatastasis* OT 3 f.; *hilaskomai* OT 1 (b), 3 (c), 4; cf. H. Herrmann and F. Büchsel, *hileōs, hilaskomai* etc. *TDNT* III 301 ff.

2. The vb. *lytrousthai* is found more frequently in the LXX than the noun *lytron*. In the majority of cases Yahweh is the subject. It renders *pāḏâh*, ransom, 42 times: Exod. 13:13, 15; 34:20; Lev. 19:20; 27:29; Num. 18:15, 17; Deut. 7:8; 9:26; 13:5(6); 15:15; 21:8; 24:18; 2 Sam. 4:9; 7:23; 1 Ki. 1:29; 1 Chr. 17:21; Neh. 1:10; Pss. 25(24):22; 26(25):11; 31(30):5; 34(33):22; 44(43):26; 49(48)7, 15; 55(54):18; 71(70):23; 78(77):42; 119(118):134; 130(129):8; Hos. 7:13; Mic. 6:4; Zech. 10:8; Isa. 51:11; Jer. 15:21; 31(38):11 (in several of these passages it occurs more than once). *lytrousthai* translates *gā'al*, redeem, act as a kinsman, 45 times: Exod. 6:6; 15:13; Lev. 25:25, 30, 33, 48 f., 54; 27:13, 15, 19 f., 27–31, 33; Pss. 69(68):18; 72(71):14; 74(73):2; 77(76):15; 103(102):4; 106(105):10; 107(106):2; 119(118):154; Prov. 23:11; Hos. 13:14; Mic. 4:10; Zech. 3:1; Isa. 35:9; 41:14; 43:1, 14; 44:22 ff.; 52:3; 62:12; 63:9; Jer. 50(27):34; Lam. 3:58 (again in some verses more than once). It is also used to translate 7 other words: *'ārāp̄*, break the neck of an animal (Exod. 13:13?); *pallēṭ*, deliverance (Ps. 32[31]:1); *pāṣâh*, part, open, snatch away (Ps. 144[143]:10); *pāraq*, tear away a yoke (Lam. 5:8) and the Aram. *pᵉraq* (Dan. 4:24); *qānâh*, get, acquire (Exod. 15:16 *v.l.*); *śāḡaḇ*, rise up (Ps. 59[58]:1); Aram. *šêziḇ*, deliver (Dan. 6:28[27]). There is no corresponding Heb. in Sir. 48:20; 49:10; 50:24; 51:2 f.; 1 Macc. 4:11.

The basic idea of making free by a ransom can be seen in Exod. 34:20; Lev. 19:20; 25:25; but already in Deut. 7:8; 9:26; 13:5(6), etc. *lytrousthai* (*pāḏâh*) no longer refers to a material price paid, but means the redeeming activity of God, which freed Israel from → Egypt, the house of bondage. It is the use of his power in the service of his love and faithfulness which redeems from bondage. In Isa. the work of God as the Redeemer is stressed (*gō'ēl*, *lytroumenos* or *rhysamenos*, deliverer; Isa. 41:14; 47:4). Here the deliverance is in the first place the freeing of Israel from Babylonian captivity and the return of the people. The foreign nations are to receive no ransom for them; in fact God gives them as ransom for Israel (Isa. 43:3 f.; 45:13).

The thought of deliverance rather than the ransom paid is often uppermost (cf. D. Hill, op. cit., 54). *lytrousthai* is used interchangeably in the Pss. for *gā'al* and *pāḏâh* (Pss. 25[24]:22; 72[71]:14; 119[118]:134, 154).

D. Hill points out that while the deliverance from Egypt is often described in terms of redemption (2 Sam. 7:23; Deut. 7:8; 9:26; 13:5; 15:15; 24:18; 1 Chr. 17:21; Ps. 78[77]:42), the "redeeming" from exile is not often described by *pāḏâh* (Isa. 35:10; 51:11). Moreover, the specific idea of a ransom tends to fall into the background. "To stress the costliness of the deliverance in terms of Yahweh's strength and activity in order to keep alive the notion of ransom price (cf. Neh. 1:10 and 2 Sam. 7:23) would be to place an undue strain on the evidence: wherever there is need to emphasise the exercise of Yahweh's power in saving his people, it is stated explicitly in the context. We have no right to read it into every occurrence of the verb in order to make the word retain a presumed original and single unchanging sense. The meanings of words are seldom static and semantic development is often influenced by the events of history. It seems probable that the words *gā'al* and *pāḏâh* which had a close association with the idea of releasing slaves and of reclaiming persons and things, were taken up into the vocabulary of Israel's writers as the most suitable terms to describe the liberation from slavery of those whom Egypt and Babylon had conquered, and the reclaiming by Yahweh into his rightful ownership of 'the people of his possession'. This semantic development does no more than extend and emphasise what was already the essential theme of *gā'al* and *pāḏâh* in their specialised use, namely that of bringing persons into freedom" (op. cit., 55 f.).

3. In the intertestamental period the expectation of redemption continued (Sir. 50:24). Since the dominion of the foreigners over Israel continued, the term received a political and nationalistic connotation (Pss.Sol. 9:1; 12:6). The Qumran texts also stress this aspect (1QM 1:12 f.; 14:5 f.). Redemption was often conceived of in a wider sense. Especially in the Pss. the thought is of the individual: God redeems him from oppression and wrong (Pss. 31[30]:5[6]; 72[71]:14; 119[118]:134), and also from destruction (Ps. 103[102]:4; Sir. 51:2) and sin (Ps. 130:8).

4. *lytrōsis* renders *gᵉ'ullâh* in Lev. 25:29, 48, and *gᵉ'ûlîm* in Isa. 63:4. Otherwise it translates *pāḏâh* and its derivatives. In Lev. 25:29, 48 it means the right of redemption of property that has been sold. Ps. 49(48):8 states that there is no ransom from death. In Isa. 63:4 the judgment on the heathen appears to Israel as a "year of redemption". Ps. 111(110):9 thinks of Israel's redemption in general, and Ps. 130(129);7 of redemption from sin. *apolytrōsis* is used in the LXX only in Dan. 4:34(31) of the freeing of Nebuchadnezzar from his madness. God is twice called *lytrōtēs*, Redeemer, in the Pss. (19[18]:14; 78[77]:35). *lytrōtos*, redeemable (for Heb. *gᵉ'ullâh*) occurs only in Lev. 25:31 f.

5. Judaism reflected much on the OT statements about ransom money. Above all, the good deeds of the martyrs appeared as a ransom with atoning power (4 Macc. 6:28 f.; 17:22; → Reconciliation, art. *hilaskomai* OT 3 (c), NT 4 (b)). On the other hand, it is stressed that there is no ransom for the Gentiles in the final judgment (Eth. Enoch 98:10; cf. SB I 750; III 644).

gā'al is used only once in the Qumran texts as kinsman or protector (CD 14:16); *pāḏâh* is more important. In 1QH the author praises God for delivering him from his enemies (1QH 2:32, 35) and from destruction (1QH 3:19). 1QM calls the community "the people of the divine redemption" (1QM 1:12; 14:5) and "the poor of his

redemption" (1QM 11:9). Cf. also 1QH 17:20; Fragment 45 1:2; 4QpPs37; CD 16:8; 1QM 11:9; 13:14; 14:10; 15:1; 17:6; 18:11; Fragment 22 4:2; 4QM 8. The same semantic development which Hill observed in the OT appears to have taken place in the Dead Sea Scrolls, viz. that *paḏâh* means primarily to release, save or deliver (D. Hill, op. cit., 56).

Although *gā'al* was avoided in the Qumran writings, it is often used of the exodus deliverance in rabbinic literature. Both vbs. are frequent in the Mishnah in cases of legal and cultic redemption: *gā'al* of the redemption of property (Arakhin 9:1–4, dealing with the sabbath year and year of jubilee) and of things dedicated to the Lord (Arakhin 7:3 ff.); *pāḏâh* of the redemption of standing corn (Peah 4:7), dough (Hallah 3:3), dedicated produce (Terumoth 6:5; Pesahim 2:5), captive slaves (Ketuboth 1:2, 4; 3:1), persons from Gentile ownership (Gittin 4:9). Hill points out that in these passages the ideas which belong to the use of the words in the Pentateuch are dominant (op. cit., 57). But the tractate Pesahim (Feast of Passover) contains, as might be expected, examples of *gā'al* used of the exodus deliverance (10:5 f.), though none suggest the notion of ransom price in terms of the exertion of Yahweh's power. In rabbinic literature *gā'al* is applied to Israel's future deliverance when all afflictions will be ended. This is exemplified in the seventh of the Eighteen Benedictions which may well date from the Maccabean period: "Look upon our afflictions and defend our cause, and redeem us [*ûgᵉ'ālēnû*] for thy name's sake. Blessed art thou, O Lord, the Redeemer [*gō'ēl*] of Israel" (→ Prayer, art. *proseuchomai* OT 6). The thought here that is uppermost appears to be that of deliverance, perhaps with overtones of the avenger of blood. The rabbis used *gō'ēl* for the coming messiah, the redeemer of the glorious future (Hill, op. cit., 58; cf. H. Cazelles et al., *Moïse: L'Homme de l'Alliance*, 1955, for the messiah as a Moses-like deliverer).

The emphasis on deliverance rather than the ransom price of the later biblical writings outside the Pentateuch appears to be continued in the Palestinian Apocryphal writings (Sir. 48:20; 49:10; 50:24; 51:2 f.; 1 Macc. 4:11; cf. also Eth. Enoch 98:10 where "ransom" could mean "[way of] deliverance"). In the case of Philo, Hill detects the following procedure: "he finds the words in his biblical texts and quotes them in his work with the ransom significance which their contexts in legal codes required. When he explains the *meaning* of the passages, the strict ransom sense is missing and the idea of freedom is dominant" (op. cit., 60; *Sacr.* 114, 117 ff.; *Rer.Div.Her.* 44, 124, 186; *Spec.Leg.* 1, 77; 1, 135; 2, 95; 2, 116, 121 f.; 3, 145; *Omn.Prob.Lib.* 114; *Congr.* 109; *Leg.All.* 3, 21).

Apart from the *lytron* word-group, attention may be drawn to Jewish beliefs about the atoning value of suffering and martyrdom in the immediate pre-Christian era (cf. Hill, op. cit., 65 f.; A. Büchler, *Studies in Sin and Atonement in the Rabbinic Literature of the First Century*, 1928; 175–89; Moore, *Judaism*, I, 546–52; S. Schechter, *Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology*, 1909, 307–11). Traditionally atonement was achieved through the sacrifices of the cult and the Day of Atonement, but after the destruction of the temple and the cessation of sacrifice, it came to be thought of in terms of obedience and suffering, especially death. Hill claims that the idea of a man's death atoning for his own sins is not traceable in pre-Christian Judaism, but the idea of representative atonement is pre-Christian. Thus Jacob is said to have addressed Benjamin: "In thee shall be fulfilled the prophecy of heaven,

which says that the blameless one shall be defiled for lawless men, the sinless one shall die for ungodly men" (Test. Ben. 3:8, cf. Isa. 53; the longer *v.l.* is even more explicit). The representative value of suffering is expressed in the old Jewish tradition concerning the binding of Isaac (Akedah) which may have influenced Paul's doctrine of atonement (H. J. Schoeps, *Paul: The Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish Religious History*, 1961, 141–49; G. Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism*, 1961, 193–227). The deaths of Saul and Jonathan caused God to be entreated for the land (Pes. 27, 174b). The atoning value of the deaths of the martyrs features in 2 Macc. 7:37; 4 Macc. 6:28; 17:21 f. (on this → Reconciliation, art. *hilaskomai* OT 3 (c), NT 4 (b)). Both 4 Macc. 6:28 and 17:21 use the rare word *antipsychon*, life given as a substitute.

NT 1. In the NT *lytron* is found only in the saying of Jesus which, apart from the introductory conjunctions, is found with identical wording in Matt. 20:28 and Mk. 10:45: "even as [*hōsper*, Matt.; "for", Mk. *kai gar*] the Son of man came not to be served but to serve, and to give his life a ransom for many [*ho hyios tou anthrōpou ouk ēlthen diakonēthēnai alla diakonēsai kai dounai tēn psychēn autou lytron anti pollōn*]." Lk. does not have the saying, but in his narrative of the Last Supper he gives the saying: "For which is the greater, one who sits at table, or one who serves? Is it not the one who sits at table? But I am among you as one who serves [*egō de en mesō hymōn eimi hōs ho diakonōn*]" (Lk. 22:27).

The conclusion has been drawn that the Lucan saying is more original than the Marcan. R. Bultmann, for example, sees the Marcan versions as a product of the early church in the form of an utterance attributed to the exalted Christ (*The History of the Synoptic Tradition*, 1963, 149). In particular, it "has formed its conception of Jesus from the redemption theories of Hellenistic Christianity" (op. cit., 144; cf. W. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, [1913], ET 1970, 39). But the theory is indemonstrable, and the ascription of prophetic utterances in the early church to the historical Jesus is open to serious objections (→ Prophet, art. *prophētēs* NT 4). Other exegetes have demonstrated the probability of a Palestinian background (cf. J. Jeremias, "Das Lösegeld für viele", *Judaica* 3, 1948, 249 ff.; E. Lohse, *Märtyrer und Gottesknecht*, 1955). This is indicated by the designation of Jesus as → Son of man (cf. Dan. 7:13) and the Semitic form of expression (e.g. the use of "many", Heb. *rabbîm*, instead of "all"; cf. the use of "all" in 1 Tim. 2:6 which speaks of Jesus giving himself "as a ransom for all [*antilytron hyper pantōn*]"; → All, art. *polloi*).

Mk. 10:45 has often been interpreted in the light of the Suffering Servant of Isa. 53, especially vv. 10–12: "Yet it was the will of the LORD to bruise him; he has put him to grief; when he makes himself an offering for sin, he shall see his offspring, he shall prolong his days; the will of the LORD shall prosper in his hand; he shall see the fruit of his soul and be satisfied; by his knowledge shall the righteous one, my servant, make many to be accounted righteous; and he shall bear their iniquities. Therefore I will divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong; because he poured out his soul to death, and was numbered with the transgressors; yet he bore the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors."

W. L. Lane notes that "The sacrifice of the one is contrasted with those for whom it is made, in allusion to Isa. 53:11 f." (*The Gospel of Mark*, *NLC*, 1974, 384). Here

too "many" are referred to. This would further underline the Jewish background of the thought. But Lane also draws attention to the fact that at Qumran "the many" is "a technical term for the elect community, the eschatological people of God" (ibid.; cf. R. Marcus, "*Mebaqqer* and *Rabbim* in the Manual of Discipline vi, 11–13", *JBL* 75, 1956, 298–302; H. Huppenbauer, "*rbym, rwb, rb* in der Sektenregel (1QS)", *ThZ* 13, 1957, 136 f.). The thought of Mk. 10:45 seems to combine the substitutionary redemption of Isa. 53 by the one on behalf of many with the idea that the many are the elect community.

The link with Isa. 53 has been disputed by some scholars (cf. M. D. Hooker, *Jesus and the Servant: The Influence of the Servant Concept of Deutero-Isaiah in the New Testament*, 1959, 74–9; C. K. Barrett, "The Background of Mark 10:45", in A. J. B. Higgins, ed., *New Testament Essays: Studies in Memory of Thomas Walter Manson*, 1959, 1–18). It is argued, for example, that Isa. 52:13 and 53:11 speak of "my servant" and not the Son of man which recalls rather Dan. 7 and 12:3. The reminiscence of the Isaianic Servant in Eth. Enoch 37–71 which refer to the Son of man do not make a link with suffering. Isa. 53:10 speaks of an "offering for sin" rather than a "ransom". On the other hand, the idea of a ransom suggested by *lytron* and its cognates is found in Exod. 21:30; 30:12; cf. 21:23; 2 Ki. 10:24; 49[48]:8; Isa. 52:3; cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 14, 107. But what this shows is that there are certain verbal dissimilarities when Mk. 10:45 and Isa. 53 are compared, and that the NT passage is not based exclusively on any single OT passage. The idea of a guilt offering is found in Lev. 5:14–6:7; Num. 5:5–8. The reconciling significance of Jesus' passion which in Mk. 10:45 is designated by the word *lytron* corresponds to what in Heb. was expressed by the *kipper* word-group (→ Reconciliation, art. *hilaskomai*). In the earliest form of NT proclamation it was expressed in the formula that "Christ died for our sins in accordance with the scriptures" (1 Cor. 15:3). Whereas the atoning value of the sufferings of the Jewish martyrs is celebrated in 2 Macc. 7:37; 4 Macc. 6:28; 17:21 f., the present passage offers a parallel and a stark contrast. It affirms that atonement is made by suffering, but it implicitly denies that such atonement was made by the Jewish martyrs. It insists that it is brought about by Jesus alone. "With the preposition *anti* [for] Jesus contrasts what he surrenders with what he gains. He surrenders his life and obtains the many who are liberated. The thought is also in the background that by his death Jesus stands in the place of those who are in bondage to sin and death, and suffers in their stead that which sets them free" (A. Schlatter, *Der Evangelist Matthäus*, 1963⁶, 603 f.). "The genuineness of the saying has been much discussed ... but no argument has yet been advanced which is so strong as to make it impossible for us to believe that Jesus could have spoken of his death in the kind of terms reproduced here – of vicarious and representative suffering for his people, in the terms of the old Jewish martyr theology" (D. Hill, *The Gospel of Matthew*, *New Century Bible*, 1972, 289).

As Schlatter observes above, the ransom has not only an atoning but also a liberating aspect. The many are set free not only from → guilt, but also at the same time from its consequences, → death and → judgment. "Deliverance from guilt and deliverance from death is the same process" (Schlatter, op. cit., 603). In Mk. 8:37 Jesus puts the question: "For what can a man give in return for his life?" (→ Reconciliation, art. *katallassō* NT 8). The question finds its answer here in Mk. 10:45. This answer stands in sharp contrast to Eth. Enoch 98:10: "And now, know ye that ye

are prepared for the day of destruction: wherefore do not hope to live, ye sinners, but ye shall depart and die; for ye know no ransom; for ye are prepared for the day of the great judgment, for the day of tribulation and great shame for your spirits." The same Jesus who completes his service in giving up his life is the Son of man who will come in glory (Matt. 25:31). Jesus does not say who will receive the ransom. Since Mk. 8:33 pictures Satan as endeavouring to prevent Jesus' path of suffering, we can think only of God in this context.

2. The rare word *antilytron*, ransom, which is not found at all in the LXX occurs in the NT only at 1 Tim. 2:6 in the context of an exhortation to prayer for all men, including kings and those in high positions. For "God our Saviour . . . desires all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth. For there is one God and there is one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself as a ransom for all [*ho dous heauton antilytron hyper pantōn*], the testimony to which was borne at the proper time" (1 Tim. 2:4 ff.). The saying points back to Mk. 10:45. J. Jeremias has shown that the saying differs from the words of Jesus only in that it has been stripped of its Semitic linguistic form of expression ("Das Lösegeld für viele", *Judaica* 3, 1948, 260). C. Spicq points out that the first motive for intercessory prayer for all men lies in the character of God. The second is based on the mission of Jesus Christ (*Les Épîtres Pastorales*, 1947, 59). He points out that whereas Mk. 10:45 par. Matt. 20:28 speak of a *lytron anti* ("a ransom for") Paul uses a noun which combines the noun and preposition in a single word, which thus appears stronger than the simple *lytron*, suggesting a ransom which has been completely paid, an atonement that has been effected. The use of *anti* as a prefix may even accentuate the notion of exchange (cf. *antimisthia*, reward, return, in Rom. 1:27; 2 Cor. 6:13). D. Guthrie comments: "The addition of the preposition *anti*, 'instead of', is significant in view of the preposition *huper*, 'on behalf of', used after it. Christ is conceived of as an 'exchange price' on behalf of and in the place of *all*, on the grounds of which freedom may be granted. Yet not all enjoy that freedom. The ransom, it is true, has infinite value, but the benefits require appropriation. The apostle is implying here that since the ransom is adequate for all, God must desire the salvation of all" (*The Pastoral Epistles*, *TC*, 1957, 72).

However, the alternative interpretation may be noted which takes the word → all (*pas*) to denote not all, in an absolute and inclusive sense, but all kinds of. On this view, Paul is saying that he does not exclude any class of men from salvation (and thus from the sphere of intercessory prayer). For he desires all kinds of men (including pagan rulers, whom some Christians might deem to be beyond the pale) to be saved. In NT literature *pas* is used for *pantodapos* and *pantoios* which are absent from the NT. Other instances of *pas* in this sense include Matt. 4:23; 23:27; Lk. 11:42; Acts 2:5; 7:22; 13:10; Rom. 1:18, 29; 7:8; 1 Cor. 1:5; 6:18; 2 Cor. 7:1; 9:8; 10:5; Eph. 1:3, 8, 21; 4:19; 5:3; Phil. 1:9; 2 Thess. 2:17; Tit. 1:16; 3:1; Heb. 13:21. The question may be asked whether the use of the word *pas* ("all") here in the context of the Gentile mission significantly extends that of the *polloi* ("many") in Mk. 10:45 par. which occurs in a Jewish Palestinian setting. On the one hand, *polloi* can have a more inclusive sense, but the Qumran background suggests that the "many" may refer to the elect eschatological community. On the other hand, the "all" in 1 Tim. 2:6 may mean that Christ gave himself for all men absolutely or for all kinds of men. What is clear in 2 Tim. 2:6 is that Paul extends the "many" of the Gospels to

include not only the Gentiles who have actually responded to the gospel but to pagan rulers who at the time might even be hostile.

Similar thoughts on Christ's death as a ransom given in love may be found elsewhere in Paul. His self-giving in death is grounded in love (Gal. 2:20; Eph. 5:2). Believers are bought with a price (*timē*, 1 Cor. 6:20; 7:23), paid to atone from sin and its consequences (Gal. 1:4; Eph. 1:7; Col. 1:14). Christ's death is a propitiation (Rom. 3:25) which brings about → reconciliation (2 Cor. 5:18–21).

The final clause in 1 Tim. 2:6 ("the testimony to which was borne at the proper time") is not immediately clear. If *to martyrion* is taken in apposition to the preceding statement, it could be understood as referring to the gospel of salvation. The noun would thus be a metonymy in which the abstract stands for the concrete, the testimony for the thing testified. But the proper meaning of *martyrion* is not the thing testified but the testimony (cf. Heb. 3:5). Spicq, therefore, prefers to see *to martyrion* in apposition to the entire train of thought in vv. 4–6 and "to understand that the great expiatory sacrifice of Christ for all is itself the attestation, the great sign, the most manifest proof which is as indisputable as a fact, of the will of God to save all men" (op. cit., 61). This is the sense of the word in 1 Tim. 6:13. This revelation and proof of God's redeeming love was manifested in God's own appointed time (cf. Tit. 1:3; 1 Tim. 6:15; Rom. 5:6; Gal. 4:4).

3. *lytrōsis*, deliverance, release, redemption, occurs twice in the birth and infancy narratives of Lk. and once in Heb. Zechariah, the father of John the Baptist, "was filled with the Holy Spirit, and prophesied" at the birth of his son in a psalm which begins: "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, for he has visited and redeemed his people" (Lk. 1:68). V. 69 develops this theme in speaking of "the horn of salvation [*keras sōtērias*] which God has raised up for us in the house of his servant David", and vv. 71 and 73 celebrate this in terms of being "saved [*sōtērian*]" and "delivered [*rhysthentas*]" from our enemies. Similarly, the prophetess Anna gave thanks to God on seeing the infant Jesus in the temple "and spoke of him to all who were looking for the redemption of Jerusalem" (Lk. 2:38). D. Hill comments: "the word is being used in the sense of the long-awaited intervention by God to save and deliver his people into freedom and blessing. This applies also to the remark by the Emmaus-road pilgrims (Luke 24:21), 'We had hoped that he was the one to deliver Israel (*ho mellōn lytrousthai Israēl*)' " (*Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings: Studies in the Semantics of Soteriological Terms*, *Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series* 5, 1967, 67). Hill thinks that the idea of ransoming or purchasing has here completely receded, and that the emphasis is entirely on God's deliverance of his people. Even though Zechariah's psalm goes on to relate this deliverance to the rôle of John in preparing the ways of the Lord "to give knowledge of salvation to his people in the forgiveness of sins" (Lk. 1:77), the deliverance that Zechariah and Anna appear to envisage is one which sees it in terms of the promised restoration of the fortunes of → Israel in terms of OT prophecy concerning the historic people of God (cf. Lk. 1:76 with Mal. 4:5; Lk. 1:78 with Mal. 4:2; Lk. 1:79 with Isa. 9:2).

It is questionable how far the idea of ransoming is present in Heb. 9:12, though clearly atonement is here made by → blood. The death, resurrection and ascension of Jesus is here understood in terms of the Day of Atonement ritual of Lev. 16: "But when Christ appeared as a high priest of the good things that have come, then through the greater and more perfect tent (not made with hands, that is, not of this

creation) he entered once for all into the Holy Place, taking not the blood of goats and calves but his own blood, thus securing an eternal redemption [*aiōnian lytrōsin heuramenos*]" (Heb. 9:11 f.). The sacrifices of the Day of Atonement were not strictly speaking a *ransom*, although the shedding of blood made propitiation (Lev. 17:11; → Reconciliation, art. *hilaskomai*). In the light of Heb. 9:22, 25 f., 28, Hill concludes: "As the blood of bulls and goats in the Day of Atonement ceremony cleansed and freed the assembly of Israel from sin for one year, the blood of the great High Priest himself is the means (not the price) of bringing deliverance from sin and a renewed relationship with God (*v.* 14) to all men for ever" (op. cit., 69).

4. *lytrōtēs* occurs only in Stephen's speech where it is applied to → Moses: "This Moses whom they refused, saying 'Who made you a ruler and a judge?' God sent as both ruler and deliverer [*archonta kai lytrōtēn*] by the hand of the angel that appeared to him in the bush" (Acts 7:35; cf. Exod. 2:14). The point of the argument is to show that the Jews' treatment of Jesus is consistent with the Jews' attitude to the divinely appointed leaders and deliverers down the ages. But, in fact, Moses whom the Jews regard as the leader and deliverer *par excellence* is in this double aspect a type of Christ: he is a ruler and deliverer on the one hand, and he was rejected by the Jews on the other hand (cf. v. 52). E. Haenchen also points out that "*archonta* matches *archēgos* in 3.15 and 5.31, and *lytrōtēn* has its counterpart in Luke 24:21" (*The Acts of the Apostles*, 1971, 282).

5. *apolytrōsis* occurs 10 times in the NT. The sole instance in the Gospels is in Lk. 21:28. Otherwise it is found 7 times in the Pauline writings and twice in Heb. These occurrences attest the Hellenistic preference for the compound form over the simple *lytrōsis*. In the Pauline writings it figures largely to designate the deliverance from sin and its penalty brought about by the propitiatory death of Christ. In this sense it is a present reality grounded exclusively in Christ: "they are justified by his grace as a gift, through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 3:24; cf. v. 25 → Reconciliation, art. *hilaskomai*); "In him we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of our trespasses, according to the riches of his grace" (Eph. 1:7); "in whom we have redemption, the forgiveness of sins" (Col. 1:14): "He is the source of your life in Christ Jesus, whom God made our wisdom, our righteousness and sanctification and redemption" (1 Cor. 1:30).

But it also has a future aspect, for the full realization of redemption will only come with the parousia: "and not only the creation, but we ourselves, who have the first fruits of the Spirit, groan inwardly as we wait for adoption as sons, the redemption of our bodies" (Rom. 8:23; cf. Phil. 3:21). The context there is probably that of a charismatic enthusiasm which Paul counters by drawing attention to present imperfection (→ Prayer, art. *entynchanō*; on this verse see also P. Benoit, "Nous gémissons, attendant la délivrance de notre corps", *RSR* 39, 1951, 267–80). Similarly, Eph. 1:14 sees the present sealing by the → Spirit as the guarantee of our inheritance until we acquire possession of it [*eis apolytrōsin*; lit. "unto redemption"], to the praise of his glory." The sole instance in the Gospels has also a future reference: "Now when these things begin to take place, look up and raise your heads, because your redemption is drawing near" (Lk. 21:28; cf. also 18:7 f.; → Present, art. *The Parousia and Eschatology in the NT*).

In Heb. 9:15 the thought combines the Pauline association of redemption and the death of Christ with the characteristic theme in Heb. of the comparison of the new

covenant with the old: "Therefore he is the mediator of a new covenant, so that those who are called may receive the promised eternal inheritance, since a death has occurred which redeems them from the transgressions under the first covenant." In Heb. 11:35 *apolytrōsis* is used in the secular sense of "release" (cf. Dan. 4:32 LXX): "Some were tortured, refusing to accept release, that they might rise again to a better life." The allusion appears to be the story in 2 Macc. of the mother and her seven sons who prefer torture and death to denying the law, expressing their hope in a resurrection life (2 Macc. 7:9, 11, 14; for other instances of torture see F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, *NLC*, 1964, 337 ff.).

6. The vb. *lytrousthai* (middle and passive) is found only in three passages. Lk. 24:21 is noted above (see under 3 above). Tit. 2:14 interprets christologically the thought of Ps. 130:8 (cf. also Ezek. 37:23; Deut. 14:2). The passage describes the Christian life as renouncing irreligion and worldy passions and living in a godly way, awaiting the appearing of Christ, "who gave himself for us to redeem us from all iniquity and to purify for himself a people of his own who are zealous for good deeds." 1 Pet. 1:18 f. refers both to that from which the believer is ransomed and to the means of the ransom: "You know that you were ransomed from the futile ways inherited from your fathers, not with perishable things such as silver or gold, but with the precious blood of Christ like that of a lamb without blemish or spot." The words "futile" and "vain" are used of idolatry (Lev. 17:7 LXX; Jer. 8:19; Acts 14:15; cf. Rom. 1:21), and in a general sense life without God is one of futility and emptiness (→ Empty, art. *mataios*). The allusion to silver and gold recalls Isa. 52:3: "You were sold for nothing, and you shall be redeemed without money" (→ Gold). On → blood as the means of redemption see Eph. 1:7; Heb. 9:12, 22; Rev. 1:5; cf. 5:9. The image of the → lamb recalls Isa. 53:7. The passover lamb and animal sacrifices were expected to be without blemish (Exod. 12:5; 29:1; Lev. 22:17–25; Ezek. 43:22 f.; cf. Heb. 9:14).

Other ways of expressing the idea of ransom include that of being bought with a price (1 Cor. 6:20; 7:23; → Buy, art. *agorazō*; → glory, art. *timē*). *C. Brown*

ῥύομαι

ῥύομαι (*rhyomai*), rescue, deliver, preserve, save.

CL *rhyomai* is a middle deponent vb. found in cl. Gk. from Homer onwards and also in inscriptions and papyri. It is used of deliverance and keeping by both the gods and men.

1. Ajax prayed to "Father Zeus" to save the Achaians from the dark night (Homer, *Il.* 17, 645). "Only Zeus and the other gods saved thee", cried Achilles to Aeneas (*Il.* 20, 194). Such deliverance extends not only to individuals in battle, but to various dangers, afflictions and also the protection of property (*Il.* 15, 257, 290; Hdt. 1, 87 *ek tou kakou*, "from evil"; 5, 49; 9, 76; 4, 187; 6, 7; 7, 217; other instances in W. Kasch, *rhyomai*, *TDNT* VI 1000).

2. On the human level the vb. is applied to the action of princes in delivering cities and countries (Homer, *Il.* 9, 396), women and children (*Il.* 17, 224), the outcast (Soph., *OC* 285). Moreover, it can be used of inanimate objects. Thus, walls (*Il.* 18, 515), helmets (*Il.* 10, 259), and armour (*Il.* 23, 819) are said to protect. On the other hand, Odysseus cannot save his comrades who have destroyed themselves by sin

(*Od.* 1, 6f.), and there are cases where not even the gods can save (*Il.*, 15, 141; *Od.* 12, 107; Aesch., *Sept.* 91; cf. W. Kasch, ibid.).

OT In the LXX *rhyomai* mostly renders the hiphil form of *nāṣal* in the sense of rescue, deliver (84 times), the niphal form in the sense of to save oneself (4 times), and the hophal form twice. The Gk. vb. → *sōzō*, save, translates *nāṣal* only 23 times. *rhyomai* is used 11 times in the later passages of Isa. and also in Gen. 48:16 to translate *gā'al*, redeem, buy back, deliver (→ *lyō* OT). It also translates several other vbs.: *pālaṭ* in the piel, bring to safety, save (10 times); *yāša'* in the hiphil, save, deliver, set free (7 times; *yāša'* is translated by *sōzō* 138 times); *pādâh*, redeem (5 times); *ḥālaṣ*, save (5 times); *nāṣar*, watch, keep guard (twice); *pāṣâh*, snatch from deliver (once), and the Aram. *šêziḇ* (once). W. Kasch sees two main groups of passages. In the first, *rhyomai* is used in a way corresponding to cl. Gk. usage, except that Yahweh fulfils the rôle which in Gk. literature is ascribed to the gods. In the second, a distinctive OT usage may be seen. (On the Heb. terms see further J. F. A. Sawyer, *Semantics in Biblical Research: New Methods of Defining Hebrew Words for Salvation*, *SBT* Second Series 24, 1972.)

1. The following group of passages exhibits marked similarities with Gk. usage, except that the deliverance is seen as the work of Yahweh and not of the gods. The Psalmists sing of deliverance from persecutors (Ps. 7:2[1]), wicked neighbours (Ps. 34[33]:4), false and evil men (Ps. 43[42]:1; cf. Isa. 25:4), those who hate the innocent (Ps. 69[68]:14), from murder (Ps. 18[17]:29), → blood (Ps. 51[50]:14), the sword (Ps. 22[21]:20), the snares of the fowler (Ps. 91[90]:3), death and famine (Ps. 33[32]:19; cf. Pss. 56[55]:13; 57 [56]:4; 86[85]:13; 89[88]:48; Job 5:20), Sheol (Ps. 86[85]:13; cf. 56[55]:13; Hos. 13:14; → Hell), the ungodly (Ps. 17[16]:13; cf. 59[58]:3; 71[70]:4; 97[96]:10), tribulations (Ps. 34[33]:17, 19), and from sins and their consequences (Pss. 39[38]:8; 40[39]:13; 79[78]:9). Dan. 3:88 LXX speaks of deliverance from destruction (cf. Job 33:17), and Ezek. 13:21, 23 of deliverance from false divination.

But the prophetical, historical and wisdom writings, as well as the Torah, celebrate the deliverance by Yahweh of his people both as a whole (Exod. 6:6; 14:30; Jdg. 6:9 B; 8:34; 2 Ki. 18:32; 2 Esd. 8:31; Mic. 4:10; 5:5; Isa. 36:15; 44:6; 48:17; 49:7, 25; 54:5, 8; Ezek. 13:21, 23; 1 Macc. 16:2) and as individuals (2 Sam. 12:7; 22:18, 44, 49; Job 5:20; 22:30; 33:17; Pss. 6:4; 7:1; 17[16]:13; 25[24]:20). Sometimes this is related to the specific historical context of the great saving acts of God, especially the exodus (Exod. 6:6; 14:30) and the settlement in Canaan (Jdg. 6:9 B; 8:34). Other instances are 2 Ki. 18:32; Isa. 36:15; Mic. 4:10; 5:5; 2 Sam. 12:7; 22:18; 2 Ki. 18:32; 3 Macc. 6:10.

The OT, like secular Gk. literature, knows of human deliverers. But there is always the implication that these act in the name of Yahweh and in his power. Thus, Moses saved the daughters of the priest of Midian (Exod. 2:17, 19). Gideon is called a saviour of Israel (Jdg. 9:17 B). The king saves Israel (2 Sam. 19:9). The king is appealed to as a deliverer (2 Sam. 14:16). It is the task of the judge to deliver (Ps. 82[81]:4; on this Ps. → *lyō* NT 6(d)). In Sir. 40:24 the brother or companion may be a saviour. A thief will be willing to give up all his goods in order to save himself (Prov. 6:31 LXX), and a man can save himself by giving money (3 Macc. 2:32).

2. W. Kasch holds that there is a distinctive OT emphasis in those passages where

a theocentric understanding replaces the anthropocentric understanding of secular Gk. Deliverance is no longer determined by the laws of being which obtain for both gods and men but by "the creating and sustaining word of Yahweh for whom the salvation of the people and the individual is part of His creative action in the salvation history commenced by Him" (op. cit., 1001). He delivers according to his mercies (Neh. 9:28; cf. Ps. 33[32]:18f.), for his name's sake (Ps. 79[78]:19). In Theodotion's text of Dan. 3:96, Nebuchadnezzar confesses that "There is no god who can save thus" (but cf. 2 Ki. 18:33, where the Rabshakeh taunts Hezekiah with the question: "Has any of the gods of the nations ever delivered his land out of the hand of the king of Assyria?"; and similarly Isa. 36:19). But in the later chapters of Isa. Yahweh is celebrated as the one who delivers his people from bondage: "Thou, O LORD, art our Father, our Redeemer from of old is thy name" (Isa. 63:16; cf. 44:6; 47:4; 48:17, 20; 49:7; 51:10; 52:9; 54:5, 8; 59:20; 63:16). In all these passages of Isa. *rhyomai* translates *gā'al*. This usage is confined to Isa., apart from Gen. 48:16, though Isa. 49:25 f. and 63:5 use it for *yāša'* and Isa. 50:2 has it for *pāḏâh*.

Deliverance in the OT has nothing magical about it. Because it has to do with historical situations, it occurs in history. On one occasion, Moses could even reproach Yahweh for failing to deliver the people (Exod. 5:23; cf. 3 Macc. 6:11). However, the deliverance came in Yahweh's good time.

Kasch draws attention to the faith which corresponds to Yahweh's deliverance and to which Yahweh responds: "In thee our fathers trusted; they trusted, and thou didst deliver them" (Ps. 22[21]:4; cf. v. 8; Pss. 33[32]:18f.; 34[33]:7). Unbelief amounts to the denial that Yahweh can save (Isa. 36:14–20; Wis. 2:18ff.). On the other hand, Yahweh delivers those who fear him and hope in his steadfast love (Ps. 33[32]: 18f.; Ezek. 14:20; cf. Job 22:30; 1 Macc. 2:60), and those who consider the → poor (Ps. 41; cf. Sir. 40:24). Israel so easily forget their God who rescued them from all their enemies on every side (Jdg. 8:34). But the Pss. contain the deepest expression of individual awareness of guilt and the heartfelt cry for deliverance from transgression (Pss. 39[38]:8; 40[39]:13; 79[78]:9). In the last analysis, salvation is grounded in Yahweh's mercy (Pss. 31[30]:1; 71[70]:2; 86[85]:13).

NT The vb. is found relatively seldom in the NT – only 15 times compared with 106 instances of → *sōzō*. Moreover, seven of these occur in quotations or allusions to the OT; in each case God is the deliverer.

(a) The taunt of the bystanders at the crucifixion echoes Ps. 22:8 (21:9): "He trusts in God; let God deliver him now, if he desires him; for he said, 'I am the Son of God' " (Matt. 24:43). The mockers evidently took the sufferings of Jesus and the failure of God to deliver him as conclusive disproof of his claims. The allusion to the Ps. is seen by Matt. as proof of a deeper working of God. Although God does not deliver Jesus from death in the way that might have been expected, he delivers him in a deeper sense in the resurrection. (On the use of Ps. 22 in Matt.'s passion narrative → God, art. *theos*, NT 6 (d).) The psalm of Zechariah at the birth of John the Baptist sees the promised deliverance from the hand of Israel's enemies to serve God without fear as a fulfilment of the promise to Abraham (cf. Gen. 22:16f.). The psalm sees this as now imminent and the child is the promised herald of salvation.

In dealing with the question of whether God has finally rejected Israel, Paul argues (Rom. 11:26) that the present hardening is merely a temporary part of God's pur-

pose and that Isa. 59:20f. has yet to be fulfilled: "and so all Israel will be saved; as it is written, 'The Deliverer will come from Zion, he will banish ungodliness from Jacob.' " The quotation may also take up the thought of Ps. 14:7: "O that deliverance for Israel would come out of Zion! When the LORD restores the fortunes of his people, Jacob shall rejoice, Israel shall be glad." Isa. 27:9 speaks of the expiation of the guilt of Jacob, and the forgiveness of Israel's iniquity is a feature of the new → covenant (Jer. 31:34). (On the name Jacob → Israel, art. *Iakōb.*) Zion was originally the City of David but is here understood eschatologically in a way comparable to the "heavenly Jerusalem" (Gal. 4:26; → Jerusalem). The LXX reads "on account of Zion" and the MT "to Zion". The Pauline variant may be indebted to Pss. 14:7 and 52:7 LXX. What Paul gives is evidently a reinterpretation of Isa. 59:20, combined with the other passages mentioned, showing how OT prophecy has been fulfilled and will be fulfilled. (For a comparable adaptation and interpretation of the OT in the case of Eph. 4:8 [cf. Ps. 68:18] → Heaven, art. *anabainō* NT 5.)

Paul's account of his afflictions in Asia is expressed in language which recalls the Psalmist's praise of Yahweh's deliverance from death: "he delivered us from so deadly a peril, and he will deliver us; on whom we have set our hope that he will deliver us again" (2 Cor. 1:10). The allusion may be to the riots in Ephesus, the capital of the Roman province of Asia, which may have been more serious than might appear at first sight from Acts 19:23–40. But Paul may also be speaking of a serious illness (cf. 2 Cor. 12:7; → Fruit, art. *skolops*; cf. C. K. Barrett, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, *BNTC*, 1973, 64). The request for prayer to be "delivered from wicked and evil men; for not all have faith" (2 Thess. 3:2) also recalls OT language (cf. Isa. 24:4 LXX, Ps. 140 [139]:1). In view of 1 Thess. 2:15f., this may be a reference to the Jews, especially if the letter was written from Corinth at a time when Paul was experiencing opposition there from the Jews (cf. Acts 18:5ff.). OT language is again found in 2 Tim. 3:11 in reference to Paul's sufferings at Antioch, Iconium and Lystra (cf. Acts 13:14–52; 14:1–20; 16:1–5); "yet from them all the Lord rescued me." 2 Tim. 4:17f. evidently describes a preliminary hearing of Paul's case at Rome. Although it was the custom for friends of the defendant to appear with him to give him support, no one stood by Paul. "But the Lord stood by me and gave me strength to proclaim the word fully, that all the Gentiles might hear it. So I was rescued from the lion's mouth. The Lord will rescue me from evil and save me for his heavenly kingdom. To him be glory for ever and ever. Amen." The situation recalls Dan. 6:20 and Ps. 22:21 (21:22), but doubtless refers also to the Roman practice of exposing criminals to wild beasts in the arena. It is doubtful whether this could have been the Colosseum in this case, as it was formally inaugurated by Titus only in A.D. 70. D. Guthrie, however, supposes that the lion here is metaphorical for Nero (*The Pastoral Epistles*, *TC*, 1957, 177). The absence of any further explanation makes it unlikely to be a symbolic reference to Satan (as in 1 Pet. 5:8). The expectation of future deliverance in v. 18 looks forward to deliverance through death and whatever terrifying circumstances may attend it (cf. vv. 6ff.; 1:12; 2:11ff.; Phil. 1:20ff.).

In addition to the above passages with their OT allusions, 2 Pet. 2:9 occurs in a hortatory passage which illustrates its point from the OT: "then the Lord knows how to rescue the godly from trial, and to keep the unrighteous under punishment until the day of judgment." The examples cited are → Noah and the flood (v. 5; cf. Gen. 6:1–8:22), the judgment on Sodom and Gomorrah (v.6; cf. Gen. 19:24), and the

rescue of Lot (v. 7; cf. Gen. 19:16, 29). In each case the righteous is saved from the judgment which befalls the ungodly, and this is both an encouragement and a warning.

(b) Only once is *rhyomai* used with a clear reference to the deliverance which believers have already experienced: "He has delivered us from the dominion of darkness and transferred us to the kingdom of his beloved Son" (Col. 1:13). A similar thought is expressed in Eph. 2:5–8 where believers are said to have been made alive after having been dead in trespasses and sins, and are now "saved through faith [*sesōsmenoi dia pisteōs*]." The passage may be understood to refer to → baptism, if this in turn be understood in terms of all that baptism stands for in the light of the cross and Christian experience of life in Christ (cf. Col. 2:12–15; 3:1–4). It could equally be said to be the true meaning of → circumcision (cf. Col. 2:11, 13). Col. 1:14 relates this deliverance to → redemption, and the → forgiveness of sins. The → kingdom in v. 13 is the reign of Christ which is contrasted with the dominion of darkness. E. Lohse points out that the passage does not mean "that those baptized have been taken up into a transcendent realm of light. There is no mention of an enthusiastic anticipation of the consummation. Rather, just as darkness designates those who are lost, light characterizes the rule of Christ, which here and now shapes the life and conduct of those who are baptized" (*Colossians and Philemon*, *Hermeneia*, 1971, 38). On the background ideas → Light and → Darkness. In whatever terms this deliverance may be expressed, the common factor of all these passages in Col. and Eph. is that it is entirely the work of Christ.

There has been considerable debate on the interpretation of Rom. 7:24: "Wretched man that I am! Who will deliver me from this body of death?" Man is subject to death because of sin (Rom. 5:12, 21; 6:23; cf. Gal. 6:7f.). On the question whether this passage refers to the cry of the unredeemed or that of the godly man who is all too aware of his sinful nature, so long as he remains in this world, → I Am, art. *egō eimi*, NT 2 (c). The answer to the question is given in Rom. 7:25: "Thanks be to God through Jesus Christ our Lord! So then, I of myself serve the law of God with my mind, but with my flesh I serve the law of sin." It suggests that the believer's life in this world remains one of conflict. The answer is further developed in ch. 8. God has done in his Son what the law was powerless to do; "he condemned sin in the flesh, in order that the just requirement of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not according to the flesh but according to the Spirit" (Rom. 8:3b, 4). The believer is not to set his mind on the flesh, but to live according to the Spirit (Rom. 8:5, cf. 6–17). Even so, the deliverance is not complete in this life. "We know that the whole creation has been groaning in travail together until now; and not only the creation, but we ourselves, who have the first fruits of the Spirit, groan inwardly as we wait for adoption as sons, the redemption of our bodies" (Rom. 8:22f.). What we have now is only an anticipation of the eschatological fulfilment.

The Lord's Prayer contains the petition: "But deliver us from evil [*alla rhysai hēmas apo tou ponērou*]" (Matt. 6:13). The petition is omitted from the par. in Lk. 11:2ff. On the interpretation of the petition → Evil, art. *ponēros* NT 2 (b). Whether this is taken as a reference to being delivered from "the evil one" or from "evil" generally, the disciple is asking to be freed from the power which dominates this age and is constantly threatening him. But there is also an eschatological note. The thought of eternal salvation as the goal of deliverance is also present.

Rom. 11:26 and 1 Thess. 1:10 are also thoroughly eschatological. The former passage has already been noted in connection with its use of the OT. The latter expresses the Christian hope as waiting for God's "Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead, Jesus who delivers us from the wrath to come" (→ Anger, art. *orgē*; → Judgment). *J. Schneider, C. Brown*

σώζω

σώζω (*sōzō*), save, keep from harm, preserve, rescue; *σωτηρία* (*sōtēria*), salvation, deliverance, preservation; *διασώζω* (*diasōzō*), bring safely through, save, rescue.

CL 1. In the first instance both the vb. and the noun denote rescue and deliverance in the sense of averting some danger threatening life. This can happen in war (e.g. Homer, *Il.* 15, 290 f.; Plato, *Symp.* 220 d) or at sea (Homer, *Od.* 5; 130; Lucian, *Dialogi Deorum* 26, 2). But that which one is delivered from may also be an illness (*SIG*[3] II 620, 13 f.; III 1173, 9). Where no immediate danger is mentioned, they can mean to keep or preserve (Homer, *Od.* 1, 83; 3, 185; 22, 357). The vb. (Homer, *Il.* 9, 393; Epictetus, *Dissertationes* 2, 17, 37 f.; Lucian, *Dialogi Meretrici* 9, 1) and the noun (Plutarch, *Lacaenarum Apophthegmata* 11) can even mean safe return home. (For further examples see W. Foerster, *TDNT* VII 966; Liddell-Scott, 1748, 1751.)

2. In religious contexts the gods save men from the various perils of life. They are regarded as saviours (→ *sōtēr*) and protectors, able to turn away the fate that threatens men.

3. For the gnostics it is knowledge given by divine revelation which frees the soul from the power of death (cf. *Corp.Herm.* 1, 26; 1, 29; 7, 1 f.; → Knowledge, art. *ginōskō* CL 2).

4. In the mystery religions deliverance comes through the initiate's sharing in the experience of the dying and rising god through the actions of the mystery cult. The 4th cent. A.D. Latin author, Julius Firmicus Maternus of Syracuse, who was a convert to Christianity from Neo-Platonism and an opponent of the mystery cults, spoke of the "initiates of the saved deity [*mystai tou theou sesōsmenou*]" (*De Errore Profanarum Religionum* 22, 1). The initiate participates in the divine being and thus attains a life which extends beyond death (Apul., *Met.* 11, 21). It is highly unlikely that the NT teaching on baptism was influenced by the mystery religions, not least in view of the fact that these practices considerably postdate the apostolic church (→ Baptism, art. *baptizō* NT 7). (For a survey of the cults and their rites see G. Wagner, *Pauline Baptisms and the Pagan Mysteries: The Problem of the Pauline Doctrine of Baptism in Romans VI. 1–11, in the Light of its Religio–Historical "Parallels"*, 1967.)

5. In the philosophical and religious spheres, *sōzō* and *sōtēria* are used to denote the divine preservation of all things. Plato expressed belief in such an ordering in *Leg.* 10, 903 b. According to Cornutus of Leptis, Zeus is the one through whom all things come into being and are preserved (*sōzetai*) (*Theologia Graeca* 2 [3, 9]). The Stoic philosopher emperor of the 2nd cent. A.D., Marcus Aurelius, comforted his soul with the thought of a higher divine ordering and preservation *(sōtēria)* of life (*Meditations* 10, 1, 3). In the Hellenistic–Roman period, when belief in fate replaced that of a

divine harmony, the *sōzein* of the gods came to include their power to save and keep from an inscrutable destiny (*TDNT* VII 969).

6. In the gnosticism attested by the post-Christian Hermetic literature, it is knowledge (*gnōsis*) which saves. It is imparted to the gnostic by revelation or by a mediator (*Corp.Herm.* 1, 26; 1, 29). Its content is the salvation of man from the power of death. The → soul is saved (*Corp. Herm.* 7, 1). On gnosticism → Knowledge, art. *ginōskō* CL 2; for texts see W. Foerster, *Gnosis: A Selection of Gnostic Texts*, I. *Patristic Evidence*, 1972, II. *Coptic and Mandaic Sources*, 1974.

OT In the LXX *sōzō* translates no less than 15 different Heb. vbs., but the most important are *yāša'*, used in the hiphil for to deliver and save, and *mālaṭ*, niphal to slip away, escape, piel to deliver, save. The noun *sōtēria*, which is also common especially in the historical books, Job, the Pss. and Isa., stands for 6 different Heb. formations, but chiefly they are connected with the vb. *yāša'*. For a linguistic study see J. F. A. Sawyer, *Semantics in Biblical Research: New Methods of Defining Hebrew Words for Salvation, SBT* Second Series 24, 1972. Sawyer's work is set against the general contentions that an adequate definition of context must precede every semantic statement; that semantic statements must be primarily synchronic, i.e. the exegete must analyse the statement in terms of the relevant point in time; that semantic universals operate in OT Hebrew as in any other language; that a structural approach is required as much for semantic description as for philological and grammatical analysis; and that semantic analysis must be monolingual, i.e. the study of comparative etymology and grammar is often irrelevant to ascertaining the meaning and usage of a word in another language.

1. *sōzō* and *yāša'*. (a). Deliverance may come about through men. In some cases it may lack any particular theological significance (e.g. 1 Sam. 23:5; cf. Gen. 47:25, *ḥāyâh*; Jos. 6:25). It may be the relief of a besieged city (1 Sam. 11:3) or help in battle (Jdg. 12:2 f.; 13:5), though human agency does not necessarily exclude Yahweh's ultimate agency, and sometimes men are powerless to save (Jer. 14:9; Hos. 13:10). Judges, Nazirites and especially the kings had the task of delivering Israel (Jdg. 8:22; 13:5; 2 Sam. 3:18; 14:4; 2 Ki. 6:26; Hos. 13:10). The king was not only a deliverer of the nation but the deliverer of the → poor, needy and oppressed within the nation (Ps. 72[71]:4, 13).

On the other hand, the OT gives repeated, sharp reminders about human limitations. Gideon's band was reduced to three hundred men, for "The LORD said to Gideon, 'The people with you are too many for me to give the Midianites into their hand, lest Israel vaunt themselves against me, saying, "My own hand has delivered me"' " (Jdg. 7:2; cf. v. 7). It is by the power and name of Yahweh that Israel has won the land and been saved from his enemies (Ps. 44[43]:3, 6 f.). In the last analysis, victory in battle is Yahweh's work (Ps. 33[32]:16 f.; cf. 146[145]:3; Hos. 1:7; 14:4). Therefore, Isa. 30:15 counsels: "For thus said the Lord God, the Holy One of Israel, 'In returning and rest you shall be saved; in quietness and in trust shall be your strength.' " It is important to do Yahweh's work by Yahweh's appointed means. It was only by Yahweh's intervention that David was saved from bloodguilt (1 Sam. 25:26, 31, 33). Moreover, the astrologers are powerless to save (Isa. 47:14; → Magic). So too are the idols (Isa. 45:20; 46:7; Jer. 2:27 f.; 3:23; 11:12; Hos.

14:3a; → Image, art. *eidōlon*) and the nations (Hos. 14:3b).

(b) While Yahweh employs human agents, the pious Israelite was aware of the fact that deliverance comes ultimately from Yahweh himself. The vb. *yāša'* is particularly prominent in the Pss., where men look both backwards to past and forward to future deliverance from enemies and trouble. Often the Psalmist cries *hôšî'âh*, "Save!" or "Help!" (Pss. 12[11]:1; 20[19]:9; 28[27]:9; 60[59]:5; 86[85]:16; 108[107]:6; cf. also the formations with other suffixes in Pss. 3:7; 6:4; 7:2; 22[21]:22; 31[30]:16; 54[53]:1; 59[58]:2; 69[68]:1; 71[70]:2; 106[105]:47; 109[108]:26; 118[117]:25; 119[118]:94). Deliverance or salvation (Heb. *y'šû'âh* and cognates) is the work of God, but its precise content varies according to context and circumstances (cf. F. F. Bruce, " 'Our God and Saviour': A Recurring Biblical Pattern", in S. G. F. Brandon, ed., *The Saviour God*, 1963, 54–65). In Ps. 74(73):12 *sōtēria* denotes the victory over the powers of chaos at the → creation (cf. Ps. 65:5–8 [64:6–9]). But it can also denote victory over historical enemies (Pss. 60[59]:11; 144[143]:10). Other senses of the noun and vb. are vindication (Pss. 72[71]:4; 76[75]:9), help (69[68]:14; 119[118]:81), and freedom from troubles and calamities (cf. the various terms used in Pss. 18[17]:19; 85[84]:7; 91[90]:16; Job 30:15). Occasionally, there are eschatological overtones: "May God be gracious to us and bless us and make his face to shine upon us, that thy way may be known upon earth, thy saving power [MT *y'šû'āṯeḵā*; LXX *to sōtērion sou*] among all nations" (Ps. 67:1 f. [66:2 f]; cf. on these various points A. A. Anderson, *The Book of Psalms*, *New Century Bible*, I, 1972, 277).

The theme of salvation and deliverance is by no means confined to the Pss., although both in the Pss. and elsewhere salvation has often cultic associations. At the climax of the blessing attributed to Moses reviewing Yahweh's dealings with the several tribes, Israel is seen as a unique nation: "Happy are you, O Israel! Who is like you, a people saved by the LORD, the shield of your help, and the sword of your triumph! Your enemies shall come fawning to you; and you shall tread upon their high places" (Deut. 33:29; cf. Exod. 15:2; 2 Sam. 11:13; 14:23, 39; 2 Sam. 8:6, 14 for other expressions of gratitude for deliverance in battle). Conversely, Israel's failure to trust Yahweh's saving power provokes his wrath (Ps. 78[77]:22; LXX *to sōtērion autou*; cf. Num. 10:9; Deut. 20:4; Isa. 17:10; Hab. 3:13). The absence of the ark prevents Yahweh from saving (1 Sam. 4:3), as does turning to other gods (Jdg. 10:12 ff.). For in the historical writings and the prophets victory comes from Yahweh (Isa. 33:3; Jer. 14:8; 15:20; 17:14; Zeph. 3:17).

Solomon's prayer at the dedication of the temple in 2 Chr. 6:41 contains the petition: "And now arise O LORD God, and go to thy resting place, thou and the ark of thy might. Let thy priests, O LORD God, be clothed with salvation, and let thy saints rejoice in thy goodness." The par. in Ps. 132[131]:9 → "righteousness" instead of "salvation", but that in v. 16 has "salvation". The thought expresses a heartfelt desire that the priests should be characterized by righteousness (cf. Isa. 11:5; 61:10) and thus be instruments of the divine blessing, which is at once pure and holy and at the same time brings deliverance to the people (cf. 2 Chr. 6:36–39). H.-J. Kraus suggests that there may be an underlying allusion to the function of the priests as the givers of oracles of salvation (*Psalmen*, *BKAT* 15, 1960, 886). Something of the sort would fit the context, for the preceding verses deal with the possibility of repentance and restoration after the people have gone astray. It would therefore be appropriate

for the priests to lead the people into the ways of righteousness which bring deliverance from trouble. A. A. Anderson rightly rejects the suggestion of W. O. E. Oesterley that the priests must be clothed in "fitting – i.e. festal – garments" (op. cit., II, 883; cf. Oesterley, *The Psalms*, 1939, 532). For whilst the appropriate cultic dress was the prerequisite of temple worship, the whole context suggests that more than liturgical propriety is at stake here. Correct outer vestments should correspond to an inner righteousness which comes from Yahweh alone. For similar parallelism see Isa. 61:10.

Another expression with cultic overtones is "the cup of salvation" (Ps. 116:13 [115:4]; cf. 16:5). In reply to his own question, "What shall I render to the LORD for all his bounty to me?" (v. 12), the psalmist can only receive with gratitude what Yahweh freely gives him and rededicate himself: "I will lift up the cup of salvation and call on the name of the LORD, I will pay my vows to the LORD in the presence of his people." Anderson suggests four possible interpretations of the "cup" (op. cit., II, 794): (1) a drink offering of wine which was part of the thank offering (cf. Num. 28:7); (2) a metaphor of deliverance, and the opposite of the cup of Yahweh's wrath (cf. Isa. 51:17; Jer. 25:15); (3) a cup connected with some particular ordeal (cf. Num. 5:16–28); (4) a cup of wine used at the thanksgiving meal (cf. Ps. 23:5). Anderson prefers the first of these alternatives in view of its association with something rendered to Yahweh. However, the suggestion is attractive that such a cup necessarily stands in contrast with the cup of Yahweh's wrath, and therefore this idea may also be present. Similarly in Exod. 14:13 man's rôle is that of trusting response in which the exodus provides a pattern: "And Moses said to the people, 'Fear not, stand firm, and see the salvation of the LORD, which he will work for you today; for the Egyptians whom you see today, you shall never see again. The LORD will fight for you, and you have only to be still."

Here the salvation in question is an earthly and historical one. S. R. Driver suggests that salvation and deliverance "seldom, if ever, express a spiritual state *exclusively*: their common theological sense in Hebrew is that of *a material deliverance attended by spiritual blessings* (e.g. Is. 12, 2; 45, 17)" (*Notes on the Hebrew Text and Topography of the Books of Samuel,* 1913², 119). However, certain passages in the prophets have an eschatological dimension. In the last days Yahweh will bring full salvation for his people (e.g. Isa. 43:5 ff.; Jer. 31:7; 46:27; Zech. 8:7; → Present, art. *hēmera* OT). Then Israel "will draw water from the wells of salvation" (Isa. 12:3), and the whole world will share in this salvation (Isa. 45:22; 49:6).

Finally, it may be noted that the Heb. vb. *yāša'* and the divine name are combined in certain proper names which celebrate Yahweh as the deliverer: e.g. Isaiah (Heb. *yᵉša'yāhû*, Salvation of Yah) which was the name given to the prophet (Isa. 1:1; 2 Ki. 19:2; 2 Chr. 26:22; 32:20, 32 etc.) and various others (1 Chr. 25:3, 15; 26:25); Joshua (Heb. *yᵉhôšûa'*, *yᵉhôšua'*, and later *yēšûa'*, Yah or Yahweh is salvation), the name given to Moses' successor (Exod. 17:9 ff.; Deut. 1:38; 3:21, 28; 31:3 ff.; Jos. 1:1 etc.) and numerous others (e.g. 1 Sam. 6:14, 18; Hag. 1:12, 14; Ezra 2:6, 40); and cf. Hosea (Heb. *hōšēa'*, salvation), the original name of Joshua (Num. 13:8, 16), the last king of Israel (2 Ki. 15:30; 17:1, 3, 4, 6; 18:1, 9 f.), the prophet (Hos. 1:2) and different chiefs (1 Chr. 27:20; Neh. 10:24). In some cases the person so named was a living testimony to Yahweh's saving power; in others the life was a denial of

the name. The name of Jesus derives from Joshua (→ Jesus Christ, art. *Iēsous*; → also Name; cf. BDB 221, 447).

2. The vb. *mālaṭ* means in the niphal to slip away, slip through (1 Sam. 20:29; 2 Sam. 4:6), and so to escape (e.g. Jdg. 3:29; 1 Sam. 19:10–17; 30:17; 1 Ki. 18:40; 20:20; 2 Ki. 10:24; Isa. 10:6; 49:24 f.; Jer. 46:6; 48:8, 19; Ezek. 17:15, 18; Amos 9:1; Jon. 3:5; Zech. 2:11; Mal. 3:15). In the piel it means to deliver or save (1 Sam. 19:11; 2 Sam. 19:6; 1 Ki. 1:12; Ps. 41:2; Job 22:30; 29:12; Ps. 107[106]:20), and in particular to save life (1 Sam. 19:11; 2 Sam. 19:6; 1 Ki. 1:12; Jer. 48:6; 51:6, 45; Ezek. 33:5; Amos 2:14 f.; Job 20:20; Pss. 89[88]:49; 116[114]:6). It is the testimony of the fathers of Israel that they trusted in God to deliver them: "To thee they cried, and were saved; in thee they trusted, and were not disappointed" (Ps. 22[21]:5; cf. 8, 21). Job's comforter, Eliphaz the Temanite argued that "God abases the proud, but he saves the lowly. He delivers the innocent man; you will be delivered through the cleanness of your hands" (Job 22:29 f.). The implication was drawn that Job's sufferings were divine retribution for some sin that he had not put right. But the message of the Book of Job is that suffering is not necessarily the direct effect of such a cause and that God's ways are more marvellous than man can comprehend (cf. chs. 38–41). In the end God delivered Job and restored to him more than he had at first (Job 42), rebuking the folly of the comforters with their facile explanations.

Numerous passages warn against turning for deliverance to things which, in worldly wisdom, man would naturally expect to save him from calamity: an army or the strength of a war horse (Ps. 33[34]:16 f.), the might of a foreign state (Isa. 20:6), wealth (Job 20:20; Eccl. 8:8, where wickedness is also a possible reading), or one's own understanding (Prov. 28:26). The true wisdom which saves is different from man's native understanding (Prov. 28:26; Eccl. 9:15). But there is no escape for the worshippers of Baal (1 Ki. 19:17) or even the whole nation of Israel in its guilt (Amos 2:14 f.; 9:1), the king (Jer. 32:4), and the Babylonian makers of idols (Isa. 46:2). In the coming deliverance prophesied by Isa. 49:24 f., the captives will be delivered from those who held them captive. In the last days those who call on the name of the Lord will be saved (Joel 2:32 [3:5]). In Dan. 12:1 it is they whose names are written in the book of life.

3. In the apocryphal books *sōzō* is seldom used of one person rescuing another (exceptions are 1 Macc. 6:44; 9:21; 3 Macc. 7:20). It is more often found in the middle and passive of being saved through flight (e.g. 1 Macc. 2:44; 9:9; 10:83; 11:48). It is the theme of 4 Macc. that deliverance cannot be found by abandoning the law (9:4; 15:2, 8, 27; cf. Jud. 10:15; 11:3; for further discussion see W. Foerster, *TDNT* VII 981). The vb. is always used in the context of dire threat to life. The vast majority of cases have to do with God's rescuing of the godly (Wis. 9:18; 16:7; 18:5; 1 Macc. 3:18; 4:9, 11; 9:46; 2 Macc. 1:25; 8:27; 4 Macc. 4:14; 17:22; Sir. 48:8). Conversely, the heathen gods cannot save (Ep. Jer. 49). The noun *sōtēria* is found e.g. in Wis. 5:2; 6:24; 16:6; 18:7; Sir. 4:23; 40:7; 46:1; 1 Macc. 3:6; 4:25; 5:62; 2 Macc. 3:29, 32; 7:25; 11:6; 12:25; 13:3; 14:3; 3 Macc. 6:13, 33, 36; 7:16, 22; 4 Macc. 9:4; 12:6; 15:2, 8, 27). The idea of an eternal salvation which comes from God, as contrasted with an earthly one which comes from man with its attendant compromises, is present in 4 Macc. 15:3; cf. Wis. 5:2; Tob. 14:4, 7 *v.l.*; Bar. 4:24, 29.

In Eth. En. 106:16 the idea of being saved occurs in reference to the flood. But the

idea occurs most frequently in statements to the effect that the ungodly have no salvation or hope of salvation (Eth. En. 5:6; 98:10, 14; 99:1; 102:1; cf. also 5:6; 48:7; 50:3; 62:13). In Test. XII salvation is applied to the individual in both temporal deliverance (Test. Reub. 3:9; Test. Jos. 10:3; Test. Lev. 2:4; Test. Gad 4:7; 5:7; Test. Dan 6:9) and eternal salvation (Test. Ben. 4:1; Test. Ash. 5:2; cf. 6:6; Test. Lev. 4:1; Test. Reub. 5:5; Test. Gad 7:5; Test. Zeb. 10:3). Over against the eternal salvation stands eternal punishment, in which the wicked are cast into the fire. The godly individual attains salvation by his prayers and piety and by God's help. But Test. XII also speak of the eschatological salvation of Israel in which even the nations also participate (Test. Jud. 22:2; Test. Ash. 7:3; Test. Ben. 10:5). In particular the salvation springs from Levi and Judah (Test. Jos. 19:11; Test. Dan 5:10; Test. Lev. 2:10; Test. Naph. 8:2 f.; Test. Sim. 7:1 f.)

Pss. Sol. contain the same two lines of thought of salvation for the godly individual (16: 4f.; 3:5; 6:1; 13:2, 7; 15:6) and the nation (Pss. Sol. 17 and 18; cf. 10:8; 12:6), but there is no unambiguous expression of eternal salvation (W. Foerster, *TDNT* VII 985). 2 Esd. speaks of the saving intervention of God in the history of Israel (14:29) and in the last days (9:7; 13:23; 14:34). 2 Esd. 5:45 and 14:35 refer to the quickening of the creation. "Many have been created, but few shall be saved" (2 Esd. 8:3; cf. 8:41; 9:13; see further W. Foerster, *TDNT* VII 985 f.).

5. Josephus generally uses both th noun and the vb. in the sense of rescuing someone from death, a city from an enemy, or the land and the temple from destruction (W. Foerster, *TDNT* VII 986; cf. *War* 5, 480; 7, 67; *Ant.* 8, 115). There are possible eschatological overtones in *War* 6, 285, though the utterance is attributed to a false prophet, and in general Josephus does not use *sōzō* and *sōtēria* in a theologically pregnant manner. Similarly, Philo frequently uses them in the sense of rescuing from danger or preservation in a temporal sense. But his main interest lies in the relationship between God and the godly man (e.g. *Sobr.* 55; *Migr. Abr.* 122–125). God is the saviour (→ *sōtēr*) who not only preserves order but saves and helps in the struggles of the soul against the passions. "If Philo's allegorising entails an importing of alien Gk. thoughts into the text of the Torah, his use of the *sōzō* group, esp. *sōtēria*, shows that Gk. thinking was not able to destroy entirely the influence of the OT. For Philo the content of *sōtēria* is not that man maintains his own humanity but that in Platonic fashion he acquires a share of the divine forces by subduing the passions. The ref. to God's help permits him to speak of a *pantelēs sōtēria* which God grants: God is *boēthos* to the contemplative soul *hōs charisasthai pantelē sōtērian autē*, Ebr. 111; cf. Som. 1, 86; Migr. Abr. 2 and 124; Ebr., 72" (W. Foerster, *TDNT* VII 989).

6. The Qumran literature frequently refers to God's saving and helping in the history of Israel (1QM 4:13; 10:4 f.; 11:3; 14:4 f.; 18:7; CD 5:19; 1QS 1:18 f.). But God's saving also figures in the personal life of the godly. The Hymns testify to the experiences enjoyed by the one who trusts in the help of God: "Thou hast saved me from the zeal of lying interpreters, and from the congregation of those who seek smooth things" (1QH 2:32). "I will praise Him when distress is unleashed and will magnify Him also because of His salvation" (1QS 10:17; cf.; 1QH 5:11 f.; 11:23 f.). God has created the righteous to "enlarge his straitened soul to eternal salvation" (1QH 15:16). Regarded eschatologically, it is not the individual but God's people as a whole which is the object of salvation. 1QM 1:12 speaks of the "time of [great]

tribulation for the people which God shall redeem" (cf. 14:5). God saves his people from the power of darkness with a view to eternal salvation (1QH frag. 18:5; cf. 1QH 15:15). Redemption is eternal (1QM 1:12; 18:11) and correspondingly destruction is certain for the nations of wickedness (1QM 15:1 f.). For further discussion see W. Foerster, *TDNT* VII 982 f.

7. In rabbinic writings *yāša'* tends to recede in favour of *nāṣal*. The helping intervention of God is more prominent than the saving work of men. The most frequent reference is to the bringing of Israel out of → Egypt, which serves as a type of eschatological redemption (SB II 139, 141; cf. *TDNT* VII 987).

NT The vb. *sōzō* is found in the NT 106 times and the compound vb. *diasōzō* 8 times; the noun *sōtēria* occurs 45 times.

1. The meaning of deliverance from immediate physical danger to life is comparatively rare. It is found, e.g., in the account of Paul's shipwreck (Acts 27:20, 31, 34). It may be noted that 5 out of the 8 instances of *diasōzō* come in the account of how Paul escaped various dangers including shipwreck on his way to Rome (Acts 23:24; 27:43, 44; 28:1, 4). The remaining three examples of the compound vb. refer to the sick who touched Jesus' garment being made well (Matt. 14:36), the plea of the centurion to heal his slave (Lk. 7:3), and to the eight souls, including → Noah, who were "saved through water" (1 Pet. 3:20). The last instance refers to physical danger but has soteriological overtones and is seen as a parallel to → baptism with its symbolism of cleansing and death and resurrection (v. 21). Otherwise, *sōzō* occurs in Peter's cry, "Lord, save", in the stilling of the storm (Matt. 8:25) and "Lord, save me", in the walking on the water (Matt. 14:30). Some scholars think that the words, which are found only in Matt., have a liturgical ring about them (cf. D. Hill, *The Gospel of Matthew, New Century Bible*, 1972, 166). No doubt, they point beyond their immediate narrative context to the condition of the hearer and reader. A number of passages use *sōzō* in the sense of saving from death, but again there are overtones of divine deliverance. At the crucifixion the bystanders derided Jesus, saying, " 'Aha! You who would destroy the temple and build it in three days, save yourself, and come down from the cross!' So also the chief priests mocked him to one another with the scribes saying, 'He saved others; he cannot save himself' " (Mk. 15:29 ff. par. Matt. 27:39 f.; cf. Mk. 13:2; 14:58; Jn. 2:19). In Lk.'s account, "One of the criminals who were hanged railed at him, saying, 'Are you not the Christ? Save yourself and us!" (Lk. 23:39). But the other criminal sought salvation in terms of repentance and mercy and was promised by Jesus that he would be with him that day in → paradise (Lk. 23:43). Jesus' cry of dereliction prompted some to say, "Wait, let us see whether Elijah will come to save him" (Matt. 27:49; → Elijah; → God, art. *theos* NT 6 (d)). In Gethsemane Jesus prayed, "Now is my soul troubled. And what shall I say, 'Father, save me from this hour'? No, for this purpose I have come to this hour" (Jn. 12:27). Jesus' Gethsemane prayer is reflected upon in Heb. 5:7: "In the days of his flesh, Jesus offered up prayers and supplications, with loud cries and tears, to him who was able to save him from death, and he was heard for his godly fear." Finally, the saving of → Noah is seen as God's response to Noah's faith: "By faith Noah, being warned by God concerning events yet unseen, took heed and constructed an ark for the saving of his household; by this he condemned the world and became an heir of the righteousness which comes by faith" (Heb. 11:7). In these

passages the saving in question is the saving from physical death. The passion narratives show that God has purposes which transcend such saving. The word-group is never found in the NT with the meaning of simply protecting or maintaining life.

2. In the Synoptic accounts of Jesus' → miracles of → healing, the vb. *sōzō* is used 16 times and *diasōzō* twice (see 1 above). The noun *sōtēria* is found in Lk. (1:69, 71, 77; 19:9) and Jn. (4:22), but not in Matt. or Mk. The healing in these stories is always of the whole man. The → faith of the person is of great importance for its achievement. It makes effective Christ's saving power: "Your faith has made you well" (Mk. 10:52; Lk. 8:48; 17:19; 18:42); "Your faith has saved you" (Matt. 9:22 par. Mk. 5:34, Lk. 8:48; Lk. 7:50). Here *sōzō* has the sense of making well, delivering from the evil, physical affliction. Commenting on the healing of the woman, D. Hill writes: "The faith that made her well is the expectant admission, by reason of her presence and action, that only Jesus can deal with her condition. This confidence is the ground on which Jesus authoritatively banishes her illness. It is the word of Jesus which heals, not the woman's action or faith" (op. cit., 179). Jesus' acts of healing were continued in those of the → apostles. They were carried out in the → name of → Jesus Christ (Acts 4:10) and similarly presupposed the faith necessary for healing (Acts 14:9; cf. Jas. 5:15).

The particular theological and soteriological significance of the word-group is largely latent in the Synoptic tradition. Zechariah's psalm at the birth of his son, John, makes three references to the salvation which the child will herald, but does so in terms of the OT thought-world. He blesses God for raising up "a horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David" (Lk. 1:69). "As an animal's strength is in its horn so God is a 'horn' in effecting his mighty act of salvation (Ps. 18:2; cf. Dt. 33:17; 1QH 9:28f.). The ancient title for God is applied to Messiah. In the Old Testament there is an undefined fusion of Yahweh and his 'messenger'. This may be present here. Cf. Jg. 6:11–23; 13:21 f.; Mal. 3:1" (E. E. Ellis, *The Gospel of Luke, New Century Bible*, 1966, 76). The salvation is construed as being "saved from our enemies, and from the hand of all that hate us" (Lk. 1:71; → *rhyomai* NT). The child is sent by God "to give knowledge of salvation to his people in the forgiveness of their sins" (Lk. 1:77; cf. Mal. 4:5; Mk. 1:4). Whereas in the OT cleansing from sin was a precondition of physical salvation from one's enemies, this psalm suggests that it is the precondition of light and peace (Lk. 1:78 f.; cf. Mal. 4:2; Isa. 9:2), which are now understood primarily in terms of a personal relationship with God in Christ. Matt. 1:21 explains the name Jesus: "for he shall save his people from their sins."

Jesus is a form of Joshua, but whereas Joshua was God's agent in saving ancient Israel from his enemies, Jesus is God's saviour from sin (see above OT 1 (b); → Jesus Christ, art. *Iēsous* OT).

Certain passages in the Synoptic Gospels imply eschatological salvation. In a saying following his challenge to take up one's → cross, Jesus declares: "For whoever would save his life will lose it; and whoever loses his life for my sake and the gospel's will save it" (Mk. 8:35 par. Matt. 16:25, Lk. 9:24; cf. Jn. 12:25). "Jesus' words envision men before a court where denial of association with him will bring release while affirmation of 'Jesus and the gospel' issues in martyrdom. He thoroughly appreciates the frailty of human life threatened by death, but warns that the man who seeks to secure his own existence by denial of his Lord brings about his own destruction.

Paradoxically, the man who yields his life in loyalty to Jesus safeguards it in a deeper sense ... In the second half of Mark 'the gospel' always denotes the message announced by the Church, of which Jesus is the content (Chs. 8:35; 10:29; 13:10; 14:9), precisely as in Ch. 1:1. Mark knew experientially that for the gospel men abandoned their goods (Ch. 10:29) and gave their lives (Ch. 8:35). It is possible that he has preserved an early Christian slogan, 'for Christ and the gospel', for which believers suffered and overcame" (W. L. Lane, *The Gospel of Mark*, *NLC*, 1974, 308 f.). Following the saying about the camel and the eye of a needle, the disciples asked "Then who can be saved?" (Mk. 10:26 par. Matt. 19:26, Lk. 18:26; → Animal, art. *Animals in the NT*; → Possessions). Jesus replied: "With men it is impossible, but not with God; for all things are possible with God" (Mk. 10:27 par.). "Salvation is completely beyond the sphere of human possibilities; every attempt to enter the Kingdom on the basis of achievement or merit is futile. Yet even the rule of the impossibility of entrance into the Kingdom for the rich is limited by the sovereign action of God himself" (W. L. Lane, op. cit., 370).

This salvation has, however, become a present fact through the actions of Jesus which bring forgiveness of sins. It is brought out by Lk. in his account of the change that came over Zacchaeus. "And Jesus said to him, 'Today salvation has come to this house, since he also is a son of Abraham. for the Son of man came to seek and to save the lost' " (Lk. 19:9 f.; cf. Lk. 15:1–32).

3. In the proclamation of the primitive church, *sōzō* and *sōtēria* gained a central importance through their application to Christ as the basis, content and goal of the → gospel. They are used to sum up the essential characteristic of his mission. This is clearly expressed in Acts. In Acts 4:12 Peter declares to the assembled religious leaders that "there is salvation in no one else, for there is no other name under heaven given among men by which we must be saved." E. Haenchen is doubtless correct when he says that here "*sōtēria* embraces both 'healing' and 'salvation' " (*The Acts of the Apostles*, 1971, 217). The occasion was Peter's defence after being arrested for healing the lame man in the temple in the → name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth (Acts 3:6; cf. 4:9 f.). Peter had taken the opportunity to preach Jesus as the servant foretold by the prophets and whom God had raised up and "sent to you first, to bless you, in turning every one of you from your wickedness" (Acts 3:26). Acts 4:12 makes an absolute and universal claim for the Christian message of salvation. The apostolic kerygma which was addressed first to the Jews (Acts 13:26) and then to the Gentiles (Acts 16:17 etc.) excludes every other way of salvation (Acts 13:38; 15:10 f.), for salvation can be gained only by faith in Christ (Acts 16:31). The salvation given to the one who believes consists in the forgiveness of sins (Acts 10:43; cf. 26:18) and a new relationship with God.

In Acts, statements about salvation focus on the immediate present. The offer of salvation is linked with the demand, "Save yourselves from this crooked generation" (Acts 2:40). A mention of future salvation is found in Acts 2:20, alluding to Joel 2:32 (MT 3:5): "And it shall be that whoever calls on the name of the Lord shall be saved." The Joel prophecy refers to the end-time, and its use implies that the end time has now dawned. It should be noted that "the name" for Joel was that of Yahweh, whereas in Acts it is applied to Jesus. In him God is personally present in a saving way. *C. Brown*

4. In his major epistles addressed to specific churches, Paul uses *sōzō* and *sōtēria* exclusively for the saving activity of God. The message of saving grace comes to men through the kerygma. The → gospel brings salvation (Eph. 1:13). "It is the power of God for salvation to every one who has faith" and brings deliverance from destruction (Rom. 1:16; cf. 1 Cor. 1:21). The word of the → cross especially is the power of God for those who are being saved (1 Cor. 1:18). In 1 Cor. 15:2 Paul states that Christians have obtained deliverance; they have been saved by the grace of God through faith (Eph. 2:8). In Eph. 1:13 we have a comprehensive picture of the process of salvation; the believers addressed in the epistle have heard the gospel before their deliverance, they came to faith and were sealed with the Holy → Spirit. Paul's statements about the goal of his missionary activity correspond to this. He was intent on bringing the news of salvation to as many Jews and Gentiles as possible through the preaching of the gospel (Rom. 1:15; 11:14; 1 Cor. 9:22; 10:33; 1 Thess. 2:16; cf. also 1 Cor. 7:16). Those who have been saved through faith are contrasted with those who are perishing (1 Cor. 1:18; 2 Cor. 2:15). The apostle testifies to the fact that salvation is a present reality through the divine means of grace presented and offered to men, when he adds to his quotation of Isa. 49:8 the words "now is the day of salvation" (2 Cor. 6:2).

From Rom. 8:24, "For we have been saved, though only in hope [*tē gar elpidi esōthēmen*]" (NEB), we can see how strongly Paul was conscious of the inner relationship between present and future salvation. The very fact that we have already been saved makes the expectation of final eschatological salvation the greater reality. Moreover, the final verdict is passed at that time (1 Cor. 3:15; 5:5; cf. 2 Cor. 5:10). This future salvation, which is "nearer to us now than when we first believed" (Rom. 13:11), is the goal towards which Christians press. All present warning, discipline and punishment have as their purpose that we should not forfeit this eschatological salvation (cf. 1 Cor. 5:1–13; 9:24–27; 2 Cor. 2:10; → Discipline, art. *enkrateia*; → Destroy, art. *olethros*). Accordingly, in Phil. 2:12 those who have been saved by God's grace are exhorted to work out their future, and therefore final, salvation by a sanctified life in fear and trembling. According to God's plan of salvation, all Israel will share in the future salvation after the fullness of the Gentiles has come in (into the church of God) (Rom. 11:25 f.). In this final, eschatological salvation (Phil. 2:12; 1 Thess. 5:8 f.; 2 Thess. 2:13) we are concerned firstly with deliverance from the coming wrath of God (Rom. 5:9; 1 Cor. 3:15; 5:5; 1 Thess. 1:10; 5:9; → Anger) and secondly with the granting of the divine → glory (*doxa*). Then Christians are conformed to the → image of the Son of God, and so God's activity, begun with his choice of believers for salvation from the beginning, reaches its conclusion (Rom. 8:29; 2 Thess. 2:13 f.).

5. In the Pastoral Epistles there is a whole series of statements about salvation which shows a comprehensive understanding of it.

(a) God desires the salvation of all. He desires all men to be saved and to come to a → knowledge of the truth (1Tim. 2:4; on the use of "all" in connexion with Christ's ransom death in 1 Tim. 2:6 → *lytron* NT 2).

(b) The task of Jesus was to save sinners; that is why he came into the world (1 Tim. 1:15). This confessional statement is strengthened by the apostle's personal testimony that he himself had experienced the saving power of grace, knowing himself to be the chief of sinners.

(c) The present experience of salvation is testified to in a number of passages. God has saved us and called us with a holy calling (2 Tim. 1:9). In this → call, operative through divine → grace, lies the basis for our appropriation of salvation. We find the thought that God has saved us, not because of the deeds we have done, but in virtue of his own mercy, also in Tit. 3:5. Here salvation is linked with → baptism and renewal of life through the Holy Spirit (→ Birth, art. *palingenesia*). 2 Tim. 3:14 f. declares that knowledge of the Scriptures can bring to salvation through faith in Jesus Christ (cf. Jn. 5:39; 2 Cor. 3:14; Heb. 4:2).

(d) 2 Tim. 4:18 speaks of the coming salvation. The apostle is confident that the Lord will rescue him into his → Kingdom (here called *epouranion*, heavenly, i.e. eschatological). In 2 Tim 2:10 Paul affirms that his sufferings are a necessary service for the elect, so "that they also may obtain the salvation which in Christ Jesus goes with eternal glory." In 1 Tim. 4:16 the future perfection of salvation is promised to Timothy and his hearers, provided he shows discipline and faithfulness in teaching and life. 1 Tim. 2:15 points out that women will obtain it through faith, love and holiness without abandoning their sexual rôle as mothers. This may be aimed at demands for emancipation, or against a despising of the physical. But it may also be designed to counter a misunderstanding of Gen. 2:3, 16, especially in view of the allusion to Eve in vv. 13 f. (For a review of interpretations see D. Guthrie, *The Pastoral Epistles, TC*, 1957, 77 ff.; C. Spicq, *Les Épîtres Pastorales*, 1947, 72 ff.; M. Dibelius and H. Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles, Hermeneia*, 1972, 47 ff.).

6. In 1 Pet. the apostle uses *sōtēria*, along with a number of other expressions, to express final salvation. Christians are guarded by God's power through faith for this salvation, which is already there, but which will be revealed only in the last time (1:5). Christians "grow up" to this salvation through the spiritual food which they receive through preaching and teaching (2:2), so that finally they reach the goal of their faith, i.e. *hymōn sōtēria psychōn* ("your souls' salvation"), the glorification which is to be theirs (1:9). Already the prophets had pondered on and prophesied about it (1:10).

In 1 Pet. the vb. *sōzō* is found only in 4:18 (quoting Prov. 11:31) and 3:21. In the latter passage → baptism expresses the saving power of God; it saves now because of the → resurrection of Jesus Christ from the destruction to which men become subject because of their sins. In this sense it is an antitype of the saving of → Noah and his family "through water" (3:20). It is noteworthy that although 1 Pet. repeatedly mentions present salvation, the apostle seldom uses the word-group we are considering; he employs such terms as *elytrōthēte* (1:18), "you were ransomed", *anagennēsas* (1:3), "born anew".

In 2 Pet. 3:15 the readers are exhorted to take God's forbearance, the chief reason for the delay in the parousia, as motive to be concerned with their final salvation, which is guaranteed only if they do not give up their efforts for sanctification. Eschatology and ethics are, as with Paul, closely linked.

7. In Hebrews Christ is the pioneer (*archēgos*), the source (*aitios*) and intermediary *(mesitēs)* of the *sōtēria*, salvation (Heb. 2:10; 5:9; 7:25; → Beginning, art. *archē* NT 4; → Covenant, art. *mesitēs* NT 2). At his first coming Jesus laid the foundation for the future saving activity of God by his atoning sacrifice. As the one who lives for ever, he can save those who come to God through him (Heb. 7:25). At his second coming he will appear as the perfecter of salvation (Heb. 9:28). In all aspects

salvation is the goal of God's activity with men. The salvation brought by Christ is perfect and eternally valid (Heb. 5:9). Heb. points also to the fact that the saving activity of God in Christ began already with Christ's → proclamation (Heb. 1:1 f.). From him it came to the hearers of his word, who passed it on, while it was confirmed by God by signs, wonders, various miracles and by gifts of the Holy Spirit (Heb. 2:3 f.). The → angels also have been appointed by God to serve in his revelation of salvation; they are instruments in God's will to save (Heb. 1:14). In Heb. 6:9 *ta kreissona kai echomena sōtērias* means "the better things that belong to salvation". That is the better things to which the writer refers after his earnest exhortation, having left "the elementary doctrines" of vv. 1 f.

8. In James, which uses only the vb. *sōzō*, deliverance in the final judgment is always meant, except in Jas. 5:15 where it means to heal. The same is true of Jude, where both the noun (v. 3) and the vb. (v. 23) are found. In v. 5 the rescue of Israel from → Egypt is the subject.

9. The word-group is little represented in the Johannine writings. Doubtless this is connected with the fact that in John "eternal life" is the determinative concept of the statements about salvation (→ Life, art. *zōē*). *sōtēria* is found only once in the Gospel in the remark to the Samaritan woman: "Salvation is from the Jews" (Jn. 4:22; → Samaritans; → *sōtēr* NT 1). *sōzō* in the sense of salvation – bringing action occurs 4 times. In Jn. 3:17 and 12:47 Jesus says that he has come not to judge but to save the world; in Jn. 5:34 the word is applied to the Jews, in Jn. 10:9 to believers. The Son of God is the true and only mediator of salvation. In Jn. 11:12 and 12:27 the vb. has the general meaning of being delivered from physical and emotional need.

In Rev. only the noun is found, in all 3 cases in liturgical passages of worship. In Rev. 7:10 the great multitude attributes salvation to God and the → Lamb; this is heard again in Rev. 12:10 after the fall of the → dragon, and in Rev. 19:1 after the fall of → Babylon. The songs of triumph and victory proclaim that now, after the conquest of all enemies of God, salvation, glory and power belong to God alone.

J. Schneider

σωτήρ

σωτήρ (*sōtēr*), saviour, deliverer, preserver; σωτήριος (*sōtērios*), saving, delivering, preserving, bringing salvation, means of deliverance, deliverance.

CL 1. The noun *sōtēr*, formed from *sōzō*, includes the connotations of *sōzō* and *sōtēria*. It is applied almost exclusively to the gods or men. But there are exceptions, such as when it is applied to a personified river (Hdt., 8, 138, 1).

2. The gods are saviours from the dangers of life and also protectors and preservers of men. In the oldest text attesting *sōtēr*, Poseidon is addressed as the saviour of men (*Hymni Homerici, Ad Neptunum*, 22, 5. It could even be applied to a female, Leda (*Hymni Homerici, Ad Castores*, 33, 6 f.). The title was accorded to numerous gods, but especially to Zeus (Pindar, *Ol.* 5, 17; *Fragment* 30, 5; *IG* II^{2}410, 18; Plato, *Rep.* 9, 583b; cf. Liddell-Scott, 1751; W. Foerster, *TDNT* VII 1004 f.). Isis and Serapis were also frequently called saviours (e.g. Artem., *Oneirocriticum* 2, 39). Also in the Hellenistic-Roman period Asclepius was regarded as a saviour of the sick (Clem.Alex., *Protrepticus* 2, 26, 8; cf. *TDNT* VII 1005).

3. Men could also be called saviours, in saving others from trouble and danger,

and also in the case of doctors (Soph., *OT* 302–4). Plato could call the ideal ruler who governed and preserved the state a *sōtēr* in the sense of a protector (*Rep.* 5, 463b). The term could also be applied to philosophers, particularly Epicurus (Polystratus, *Herc.* 346, p. 80, 5). It was widely applied to statesmen and rulers. Thus, Philip of Macedon was hailed by the inhabitants of Thessaly as friend, benefactor and saviour (Dem., *Orationes* 18, 43). But it is difficult to ascertain what religious overtones such an appellation had (cf. *TDNT* VII 1008). Use of the term is also found in Cicero (*In Verrem* 2, 2, 63, 154; *Tusculanae Disputationes* 1, 14, 32; *De Re Republica* 1, 7, 12) and various other sources.

In the Hellenistic ruler cult the lord became part of the official title of kings, and divine honours were accorded them. *theos sōtēr* was regularly incorporated into the Ptolomaic and Seleucid royal titles (for details, see *TDNT* VII 1009). This development found its strongest expression in the Roman imperial cultus. The term *sōtēr tēs oikoumenēs*, saviour of the (inhabited) world, was first applied to Caesar (*IG* 12, 5, 1, 557), and *sōtēr tou kosmou*, saviour of the world, is attested from the time of Hadrian, but is probably older (*TDNT* VII 1010; cf. W. Weber, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Kaisers Hadrian*, 1907). However, *sōtēr* was not incorporated into the official titles of the Roman rulers. The inscriptions hail Hadrian as *sōtēr* of a particular city. The appellation "saviour of the world" was a generalization. It was rare for an emperor to allow himself to be called *sōtēr* on coins. The idea of the emperor as a benefactor was also linked with that of the golden age of peace, order and prosperity inaugurated by his beneficent rule. Thus the decree from Halicarnassus, which probably dates from the later years of Augustus in the 1st century B.C. and may be the copy of a general decree of the province of Asia, proclaims: "Whereas the eternal and immortal nature of the Universe, in its grace to men, has added a thing of the greatest good to the exceeding benefits already given, having brought to us Caesar Augustus, who in the happy life of our time is father of his own country, *dea Roma*, Zeus the Paternal, Saviour (*sōtēr*) of the whole race of men, and whose providence has not only fulfilled but even exceeded the prayers of all – for there is peace on land and sea; the cities flourish in obedience to law and in concord (*homonoia*) and prosperity; and there is a culmination and abundance of all good, of bright hopes for the future and joy in the present, with men filled to overflowing with [delight in] games and offerings and sacrifices and hymns . . . ." (E. Barker, ed., *From Alexander to Constantine: Passages and Documents Illustrating the History of Social and Political Ideas 336 B.C. – A.D. 337*, [1956] 1959, 213). Similarly, the Priene Inscription (*c.* 9 B.C.) hails Augustus as "a saviour for us" (op. cit., 212; for text → Gospel, art. *euangelion* CL 2 (c)). Although the emperor is a saviour in a thoroughly this-worldly sense, he has been empowered in this office by the gods or divine providence.

4. The adj. *sōtērios*, saving, delivering, bringing safety or deliverance to, is found in cl. Gk. applied both to men, e.g. someone who brings safety to the state (Soph., *OC* 487 codd.), and to the gods (*BGU* 362, 5, 1 [3rd cent. A.D.]), including Zeus (Soph., *El.* 281; *Fragment* 425) (Liddell-Scott, 1751).

OT *sōtēr* occurs in the LXX some 36 times for the Heb. *yᵉšû'âh, yēša'* or the participle *môšîa'* of the vb. *yāša'* in the hiphil. On *yᵉšû'âh* as the proper name Joshua → *sōzō* OT *1 (b)*.

1. In Jdg. 3:9, 15 "saviour" might be taken as a technical term for the judges. At the time of the judges, Yahweh raised up such "saviours" for Israel who rescued them from their enemies (cf. 12:3). "Then the LORD raised up judges, who saved [*esōsen*] them out of the power of those who plundered them" (Jdg. 2:16). Similarly Ezra, reviewing the course of God's dealings with his people, commented on Israel's rebellion thus: "Therefore thou didst give them into the hand of their enemies, who made them suffer; and in the time of their suffering they cried unto thee and thou didst hear them from Heaven; and according to thy great mercies thou didst give them saviours who saved them [*sōtēras kai esōsas*] from the hand of their enemies" (Neh. 9:27). Nevertheless, Jdg. 2:18 stresses that it was Yahweh who is the ultimate source of the saving: "Whenever the LORD raised up judges for them, the LORD was with the judge, and he saved them from the hand of thir enemies all the days of the judge; for the LORD was moved to pity by their groaning because of those who afflicted and oppressed them." Samuel took the desire for a king as a rejection of "your God who saves you [LXX *hos autos estin hymōn sōtēr*]" (1 Sam. 10:19), and the term is hardly ever used of the kings (cf. 2 Ki. 13:5).

2. *sōtēr* is applied above all to Yahweh, though not as a technical term. Isa. 45 contrasts the mysteries of Yahweh's working with the impotence of the idols. He has anointed the Persian king Cyrus to liberate Israel from captivity in Babylon (Isa. 45:1). He promises the wealth of the nations to the captive Israel. The prophet cries: "Truly, thou art a God who hidest thyself, O God of Israel, the Saviour" (Isa. 45:15). Israel is saved by Yahweh "with an everlasting salvation" (v. 17). Turning to those who carry idols, the prophet issues the challenge: "Declare and present your case; let them take counsel together! Who told this long ago? Who declared it of old? Was it not I, the LORD? And there is no other god besides me, a righteous God and a Saviour; there is none besides me. 'Turn to me and be saved, all the ends of the earth! For I am God, and there is no other' " (Isa. 45:21 f.). Whereas v. 15 celebrates the mysterious working of Yahweh in history to liberate his people from exile, v. 21 has a universal, eschatological dimension.

Yahweh is presented as saviour in Deut. 32:15; 1 Chr. 16:35; Pss. 24(23):5; 25(24):5; 27(26):1, 9; 62(61):2, 6; 65(64):5; 79(78):9; 95 (94):1; Prov. 29:25 *v.l.*; Mic. 7:7; Hab. 3:18; Isa. 12:2; 17:10; 25:9; 62:11. Often the LXX speaks concretely of (e.g.) "God my saviour [*ho theos ho sōtēr mou*]", whereas the MT speaks of "the God of my salvation".

The messiah is not called *sōtēr*, even though the promised king in Zech. 9:9 is described by the participle *sōzōn* in the LXX (on this passage → Humility, art. *prayÿs* OT 2). In Isa. 49:6 LXX the Servant of Yahweh is said to be *eis sōtērian heōs eschatou tēs gēs* "for salvation to the end of the earth" (cf. RSV "that my salvation may reach to the end of the earth").

In the apocryphal books the title *sōtēr* is confined to God (Wis. 16:17; Sir. 51:1; Bar. 4:22; 1 Macc. 4:30; 3 Macc. 6:29; 32; 7:16). In the Qumran literature there is nothing corresponding to the Gk. *sōtēr* concept. Josephus used it only for human saviours, e.g. Jonathan (*Ant.* 6, 240; cf. *TDNT* VII 1014), though Philo saw God as the saviour of his people, the sustainer of the race and the cosmos, and the saviour of the soul in its struggle with the passions (*TDNT* VII 1015; → *sōzō* OT 5). Apart from one isolated instance in rabbinic writings, the messiah was not called a saviour. Elsewhere, God and the messiah are described by the word *gō'ēl*, redeemer (→

lytron OT). "There is no evidence that 'Redeemer' or 'Saviour' was a current Messianic title in the NT period" (W. Foerster, *TDNT* VII 1014).

NT *sōtēr* occurs 24 times in the NT, and in 16 of these instances it is applied to Christ. The remaining 8 are applied to God. It is never used of ordinary men. It is thus much less common than either *sōzō* or *sōtēria*. The title is used almost exclusively in the relatively late writings of the NT (10 times in the Pastoral Epistles, 5 times in 2 Pet.) which belong to the churches in the Hellenistic world.

1. (a) The angel who announced the birth of Jesus to the shepherds told them not to be afraid, "for to you is born this day in the city of David, a Saviour, who is Christ the Lord" (Lk. 2:11). The use of *sōtēr* here takes up the descriptions given to the national leaders and to God in the OT and Judaism (E. E. Ellis, *The Gospel of Luke, New Century Bible*, 1966, 80; cf. P. Winter, *StTh* 12, 1958, 106). In Lk. the word occurs elsewhere only in the Magnificat, where it is applied to God: "and my spirit rejoices in God my Saviour" (Lk. 1:47). The latter passage echoes Hab. 3:18. It is significant that in Zechariah's psalm *sōtēria* is linked with the promised intervention of God (→ *sōzō* NT 2). Ellis thinks that the use of *sōtēr* may also reflect the Christian response to the emperor cult (see above CL 3). Whereas in the Halicarnassus inscription Augustus was celebrated as the *sōtēr* who brought peace, Jesus is the true bringer of peace (Lk. 2:14; on this v. → Please, art. *eudokeō* NT 3 (c)).

(b) In the proclamation of the primitive church to the Jews, Jesus is presented as the saviour of Israel: "God exalted him at his right hand as Leader and Saviour, to give repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins" (Acts 5:31); "Of this man's posterity God has brought to Israel a Saviour, Jesus, as he promised" (Acts 13:23; → David). This preaching clearly draws a distinction between Jesus and God. At the same time, it draws attention to the uniqueness of Jesus as the divinely appointed and empowered one whom God had chosen as the instrument of salvation. It was precisely this that was the point of conflict between the church and the Jews.

(c) In Jn. it is left to the → Samaritans to conclude: "It is no longer because of your [the Samaritan woman's] words that we believe, for we have heard for ourselves, and we know that this is indeed the Saviour of the world" (Jn. 4:42). This contrasts with Jesus' reminder to the Samaritan woman: "You worship what you do not know; we worship what we know, for salvation is from the Jews" (Jn. 4:22). In the latter v. Jesus draws attention to the futility of Samaritan worship (→ Prayer, art. *proskyneō* NT 4), and that salvation is bound up with Judaism and comes from within it. But paradoxically Jn. 4:42 brings out its universal aspect. There is also the further paradox implied by Jn., that the Samaritans have seen this and responded to it in the person of Jesus, whereas the Jews have not.

2. (a) In the Pauline Epistles to churches *sōtēr* is found only twice. Phil. 3:20 reminds its readers of their eschatological existence and expectation in the midst of the trials of the present life: "But our commonwealth is in heaven, and from it we await a Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, who will change our lowly body to be like his glorious body, by the power which enables him even to subject all things to himself" (on "commonwealth" → People, art. *polis* NT 5).

Eph. 5:21–33 is an exhortation to mutual love and respect within the → marriage relationship which is seen as an image of Christ and the church: "For the husband is the head of the wife as Christ is the head of the church, his body, and is himself its

saviour" (Eph. 5:23x; → Head; → Body). Christ is the saviour, because he gave himself up to death for his church and cleansed her by the washing of water and the word, in order to present her for himself pure and glorious, when salvation is perfected (vv. 25 ff.).

(b) In the Pastoral Epistles *sōtēr* occurs relatively more frequently than in any other NT writings: 6 times for God and 4 times for Christ. This title for God links with the usage of the LXX (e.g. Pss. 25(24):5; 27(26):9; Hab. 3:18; Sir. 51:1).

(i) The statements in the Pastorals about God as Saviour show that God's offer of salvation is universal. They are in contrast to the exclusive attitude of the synagogue and of the gnostics, who promised salvation only to the righteous or to those possessing knowledge. The true and living God is the saviour of all men (1 Tim. 4:10), and he has instituted preaching, that the message of salvation might become known to all men, so that they might come to faith (Tit. 1:3). But God is in particular *our* saviour, because Christians have accepted salvation and stand in faith (1 Tim. 4:10; cf. Tit. 1:3). They must live a life that adorns the doctrine of God our saviour (Tit. 2:10). But already in the next sentence (v. 11), Paul declares that the grace of God is revealed above all in its power, bringing salvation to all men, by the new life of the church-members, even of the slaves, being seen. The saving plans of God embrace all, and he is concerned to make them a reality in every way possible. In the introduction to 1 Tim. (1:1), God and Christ are called Saviour in the same way.

(ii) The passages which speak of the Saviour Christ are, apart from 2 Tim. 1:10, all in Tit. They furnish an all-embracing picture of God's activity for our salvation.

To the world God has manifested his purpose to save men, made before eternal ages, through the first appearing of Jesus Christ (2 Tim. 1:10). In the Saviour Christ, the goodness and loving kindness of God appeared (Tit. 3:4), which are qualities which were specially praised in Hellenistic rulers, but are here transferred to God. According to 2 Tim 1:10, the saving work of Christ consisted in his abolishing death and bringing immortal → life to light.

Through his free purpose, decided before eternal ages, and through his grace revealed in Christ – and hence not on the basis of their works – believers are already saved. Through cleansing and regeneration God has saved us according to his mercy. The pouring out of the Holy → Spirit has come richly through our Saviour Jesus Christ (Tit. 3:5 f.; → Birth, art. *palingenesia*).

Believers, as those justified by the grace of God, wait for the perfection of salvation (Tit. 3:7), and for the fulfilment of their hope, which they will receive through the appearing of the great God and of our Saviour Jesus Christ (Tit. 2:13, cf. AV, RV mg., RSV mg., NEB mg.). The translation, "Awaiting our blessed hope, the appearing of the glory of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ" (cf. RV tx., RSV tx., NEB tx.; Funk § 276 (3); Moule 109 f.), is linguistically possible but contradicts the otherwise rigorously maintained distinction in the Pastorals between God and Christ. The transference to Jesus of the attribute of God, "great God", firmly rooted in late Judaism would be unique in the NT (J. Jeremias in J. Jeremias, *Die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus, NTD* 9, 1968, 65). In spite of this, the majority of British exegetes prefer the latter rendering. Apart from the fact that it is the natural grammatical rendering, it is pointed out that nowhere else is *epiphaneia*, appearing, used of God (→ Revelation).

The term "Jesus Christ our Saviour" cannot be derived directly from the OT, for

there the messiah is never called saviour (see above OT 2). Jesus never called himself *sōtēr*. Nor do we find the term so used in the older strata of NT tradition, rooted in Palestinian concepts. The designation of Jesus as *sōtēr* is found "first hesitatingly, then increasingly in the Hellenistic sphere" (J. Jeremias, *NTD* 9, 45). From the assumption that expressions from the imperial cultus are repeatedly applied to Christ (e.g. 2 Tim. 1:10; Tit.3:4), the conclusion was drawn that the designation of Jesus as *sōtēr* was borrowed from this cultus. J. Jeremias considers that this explanation covered only part of the facts. "The roots of this designation of Jesus as Saviour are older." Matt. 1:21 shows that "the oldest churches, using Aram. or Syr., explained the name Jesus, literally 'Yahweh is salvation', as 'Bringer of salvation'. This explanation of the name of Jesus could be the reason that Jesus was called Saviour (*sōtēr*) in the Gk.-speaking areas, the oldest extant example being Phil. 3:20" (J. Jeremias). The title Saviour was necessary to help the Greeks understand what the title messiah (→ Anoint) implied for the Jews.

3. 2 Pet. uses *sōtēr*, generally linked with the title *kyrios* (→ Lord), comparatively frequently to identify Christ. The letter is addressed "To those who have obtained a faith of equal standing with ours in the righteousness of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ: May grace and peace be multiplied to you in the knowledge of God and of Jesus our Lord" (2 Pet. 1:1 f.). The readers are exhorted to confirm their call and election, "so there will be richly provided for you an entrance into the eternal kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ" (2 Pet. 1:11). 2 Pet. 2:20 contains a warning against being enslaved to the passions: "For if, after they have escaped the defilements of the world through the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, they are again entangled in them and overpowered, the last state has become worse than the first." 2 Pet. 3:2 seeks to arouse the "sincere mind", "that you should remember the predictions of the holy prophets and the commandment of the Lord and Saviour through your apostles." Here Christianity may be seen in terms of a new law (cf. 2:21). The letter closes with a prayer taking up again the theme of knowledge which doubtless includes that of the commandment of Christ: "But grow in the grace and knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. To him be the glory both now and to the day of eternity. Amen" (2 Pet. 3:18). Similarly, Jude 25 concludes: "to the only God, our Saviour through Jesus Christ our Lord, be glory, majesty, dominion, and authority, before all time and now and for ever. Amen."

4. *sōtērios* is used as an adj. in Tit. 2:11 which may be translated: "for the grace of God has appeared, bringing salvation to all men" (Arndt, 809). Elsewhere it is used in the neut. as a noun in the NT and early Christian literature of messianic salvation and the one who mediates it (Lk. 2:30; 3:6 [= Isa. 40:5]; Acts 28:28 [= Ps. 67:2]).

J. Schneider, C. Brown

→ Anger, → Cross, → Faith, → Forgiveness, → Holy, → Judgment, → Present, → Reconciliation, → Sacrifice, → Sin

(a). R. Banks, "Matthew's Understanding of the Law: Authenticity and Interpretation in Matthew 5:17–20", *JBL* 93, 1974, 226–42; and *Jesus and the Law in the Synoptic Tradition, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series* 28, 1975; R. S. Barbour, "Salvation and Cosmology: The Setting of the Epistle to the Colossians", *SJT* 20, 1967, 257–71; J. B. Bauer, "Redemption", *EBT* II 738–41; T. Boman, *Hebrew Thought Compared with Greek*, 1960; S. G. F. Brandon, ed., *The Saviour God: Comparative Studies in the Concept of Salvation presented to Edwin Oliver James*, 1963; J. R. Branton, "Paul and Salvation", *Crozier Quarterly* 24, 1947, 228–40; F. F. Bruce, "Paul and the Law of Moses", *BJRL* 57, 1975, 259–79; and *Paul and Jesus*, 1977; A. Büchler, *Studies in Sin and Atonement in the*

Rabbinic Literature of the First Century, 1928; L. Cerfaux, *Christ in the Theology of St Paul*, 1959; C. E. B. Cranfield, "On Some of the Problems in the Interpretation of Romans 5:12", *SJT* 22, 1969, 324–41; and *The Epistle to the Romans, ICC*, I, 1975; O. Cullmann, "Eschatology and Missions in the New Testament", in W. D. Davies and D. Daube, eds., *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology. In Honour of Charles Harold Dodd*, 1956, 409–21; *The Christology of the New Testament*, 1963[2]; *Christ and Time: The Primitive Christian Conception of Time and History*, 1951; and *Salvation in History*, 1967; W. Dantine, "Creation and Redemption: Attempt at a Theological Interpretation in the Light of the Contemporary Understanding of the World", *SJT* 18, 1965, 129–47; D. Daube, *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism, Jordan Lectures 1952*, 1956, 268–84; R. Davidson, "Universalism in Second Isaiah", *SJT* 16, 1963, 166–85; W. D. Davies, "Matthew 5:17, 18", in *Christian Origins and Judaism*, 1962, 31–66; J. D. M. Derrett, "The Trial of Jesus and the Doctrine of Redemption", in *Law in the New Testament*, 1970, 389–460; J. Downing, "Jesus and Martyrdom", *JTS* New Series 14, 1963, 279–93; D. J. Doughty, "The Presence and Future of Salvation in Corinth", *ZNW* 66, 1975, 61–90; J. W. Drane, *Paul – Libertine or Legalist? A Study in the Theology of the Major Pauline Epistles*, 1975; J. C. Fenton, "Destruction and Salvation in the Gospel according to St Mark", *JTS* New Series 3, 1952, 56 ff.; W. Foerster and G. Fohrer, *sōzō* etc., *TDNT* VIII 965–1024; J. G. Gibbs, "Interpretations of the Relation between Creation and Redemption", *SJT* 21, 1968, 1–12; *Creation and Redemption: A Study in Pauline Theology, Supplements to NovT* 26, 1971; and "The Cosmic Scope of Redemption according to Paul", *Biblica* 56, 1975, 13–29; E. M. B. Green, *The Meaning of Salvation*, 1965; G. W. Grogan, "The Experience of Salvation in the Old and New Testaments", *Vox Evangelica* 5, 1967, 4–26; F. Hahn, *The Titles of Jesus in Christology*, 1969; M. Hengel, *Crucifixion in the Ancient World and the Folly of the Message of the Cross*, 1977; D. Hill, *Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings: Studies in the Semantics of Soteriological Terms, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series* 5, 1967; A. R. Johnson, "The Primary Meaning of *g'l*", *VT Supplements* 1, 1953, 67–77; W. Kasch, *rhyomai*, *TDNT* VI 998–1003; E. F. Kevan, *Salvation*, 1963; D. A. Leggett, *The Levirate and Goel Institutions in the Old Testament with Special Attention to the Book of Ruth*, 1974; E. Lohse, *History of the Suffering and Death of Jesus Christ*, 1967; S. Lyonnet and L. Sabourin, *Sin, Redemption, and Sacrifice: A Biblical and Patristic Study, Analecta Biblica* 48, 1970; M. E. McIver, "The Cosmic Dimensions of Salvation in the Thought of St Paul", *Worship* 40, 1966, 156–64; I. H. Marshall, "The Development of the Concept of Redemption in the New Testament", in R. J. Banks, ed., *Reconciliation and Hope: New Testament Essays on Atonement and Eschatology presented to L. L. Morris*, 1974, 153–69; J. S. Mbiti, "*ho sōtēr hēmōn* as an African Experience", in B. Lindars and S. S. Smalley, eds., *Christ and Spirit in the New Testament. In Honour of Charles Francis Digby Moule*, 1973, 397–414; J. P. Meier, "Salvation–History in Matthew: In Search of a Starting Point", *CBQ* 37, 1975, 203–15; L. Morris, *The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross*, (1955) 1965[3]; and *The Cross in the New Testament*, 1967; W. G. Most, "A Biblical Theology of Redemption in a Covenant Framework", *CBQ* 29, 1967, 1–19; J. Munck, *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind*, 1959; J. Murray, *Redemption – Accomplished and Applied*, 1955; and *The Epistle to the Romans, NLC*, I–II, 1960–65; S. Neill, *Salvation Tomorrow*, 1976; R. E. Nixon, *The Exodus in the New Testament*, 1963; W. Pannenberg, "Redemptive Event and History", in *Basic Questions in Theology*, I, 1970, 15–80; A. D. Nock, "Sōtēr and Euergetēs", *The Joy of Study*, Festschrift for F. C. Grant, 1951, 126–48; O. Procksch and F. Büchsel, *lyō* etc., *TDNT* IV 328–56; G. von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, I–II, 1962–65; H. F. Rall, *Religion as Salvation*, 1953; H. N. Ridderbos, "The Earliest Confession of the Atonement in Paul", in R. J. Banks, ed., op. cit., 76–89; H. Ringgren, *gā'al* etc., *TDOT* II 350–55; J. T. Ross, *The Conception of sōteria in the New Testament*, 1947; H. H. Rowley, *The Servant of the Lord and Other Essays on the Old Testament*, 1965[2]; E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*, 1977; J. F. A. Sawyer, *Semantics in Biblical Research: New Methods of Defining Hebrew Words for Salvation, SBT* Second Series 24, 1972; H. J. Schoeps, *Paul: The Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish Religious History*, 1961, 126–67; E. G. Selwyn, "Eschatology in I Peter", in W. D. Davies and D. Daube, eds., op. cit., 394–401; R. Sklba, "The Redeemer of Israel", *CBQ* 34, 1972, 14 ff.; C. Ryder Smith, *The Bible Doctrine of Salvation*, 1946[2]; K. Stendahl, *Paul among Jews and Gentiles, and other essays*, 1977; G. B. Stevens, *The Christian Doctrine of Salvation*, 1905; V. Taylor, *Jesus and His Sacrifice: A Study of the Passion Sayings in the Gospels*, 1937; *Forgiveness and Reconciliation: A Study of New Testament Theology*, 1941; *The Atonement in New Testament Preaching*, (1940) 1958[3]; *The Names of Jesus*, 1954; W. C. van Unnik, *"Dominus vobiscum:* The Background of a Liturgical Formula", in A. J. B. Higgins, ed., *New Testament Essays: Studies in Memory of Thomas Walter Manson*, 1959, 270–305; R. de Vaux, *Ancient Israel: Its Life and*

Institutions, 1961; B. B. Warfield, *The Plan of Salvation*, revised edition 1955; D. E. H. Whiteley, *The Theology of St Paul*, 1974[2], 130–54; R. McL. Wilson, *"SOTERIA", SJT* 6, 1953, 406–16; the World Council of Churches Bangkok Assembly dealt with the theme of *Salvation Today* (relevant to it are the following: T. Wieser, ed., *Biblical Perspectives on Salvation: A Selection of Biblical Texts with Comments*, 1972; *Salvation Today and Contemporary Experience*, 1972; *Salvation Today: Bangkok, 29 December 1972 to 8 January 1973*, 1972; *Bangkok Assembly 1973: Minutes and Report of the Assembly of the Commission on World Mission and Evangelism of the World Council of Churches, December 31, 1972 and January 9–12, 1973*, 1973; *International Review of Mission* 57 and 61, issues for October 1968 on "Salvation Today" and January 1972 on "Salvation Today II"; P. Webb, *Salvation Today*, 1974; R. Winter, ed., *The Evangelical Response to Bangkok*, 1973; and P. Beyerhaus, *Bangkok 73: The Beginning or End of World Mission?*, 1974, containing documents, detailed critique and extensive bibliography); R. Zehnle, "The Salvific Character of Jesus' Death in Lucan Soteriology", *TS* 30, 1969, 420–44.

(b). F. Bammel, H.-J. Kraus, P. Vielhauer, C. Andresen and L. Richter, "Erlösung", *RGG*[3] II 576–99; C. Barth, *Die Errettung vom Tode in den individuellen Klage- und Dankliedern des Alten Testaments*, 1947; L. Bieler, *theios anēr*, I, 1935, 120 ff.; M. Carrez, "La Signification actuelle pour 'Histoire du Salut' du visible et de l'invisible dans la Pensée Paulinienne", in F. Christ, ed., *Oikonomia. Heilsgeschichte als Thema der Theologie, Oscar Cullmann zum 65. Geburtstag gewidmet*, 1967; L. Cerfaux and J. Tondriau, *Le Culte des Souverains*, 1957; J. B. Colon, "La Conception du Salut d'après les Évangiles synoptiques", *RSR* 9, 1929, 472–507; ibid. 10, 1930, 1–38, 189–217, 370–415; ibid. 11, 1931, 27–70, 193–223, 382–412; G. Dautzenberg, "*Sōteria psychōn* (1 Petr. 1, 9)", *BZ* 8, 1964, 262 ff.; F. Dorner, *sōtēr*, Pauly-Wissowa, IIIa 1211–21; W. Elert, "Redemptio ab hostibus", *TLZ* 72, 1947, 265 ff.; E. Ellwein, *Heilsgegenwart und Heilszukunft im Neuen Testament, ThEH* 114, 1964; M. Goguel, "Le Caractère, à la Fois actuel et futur, du Salut dans la Théologie Paulinienne", in W. D. Davies and D. Daube, eds., op. cit., 322–41; H. Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit. Eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung über Gen. 1 und Apoc. Joh. 12*, 1895; A. H. Haerens, "Sōtēr et Sōtēria", *Studia Hellenica* 5, 1948, 57–68; P. Heinisch, *Christus der Erlöser*, 1955; S. Herrmann, *Die prophetische Heilserwartungen im Alten Testament*, 1965; A. Jepsen, "Die Begriffe des 'Erlösens' im Alten Testament", *Solange es "Heute" heisst. Festschrift für R. Herrmann*, 1957, 153–63; J. Jeremias, "Das Lösegeld für viele", *Judaica* 3, 1948, 249 ff.; E. Käsemann, "Zum Verständnis vom Röm. 3, 24–26", *ZNW* 43, 1950–51, 150 ff.; A. Kirchgässner, *Erlösung und Sünde*, 1950; G. Kittel, "Jesu Worte über sein Sterben", *Deutsche Theologie* 3, 1936, 166 ff.; G. Ladmer, "Erneuerung", *RAC* VI 241 ff.; E. Lohmeyer, *Der Begriff Erlösung*, 1928; H. Linsenn, *"theos sōtēr", Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft* 8, 1928, 1–75; E. Lohse, *Märtyrer und Gottesknecht. Untersuchungen zur urchristlichen Verkündigung vom Sühntod Jesu Christi, FRLANT* 46, 1955; L. De Lorenzi, "Alcuni temi di Salvezza nella letteratura di Qumran", *Riv. Bib. It.* 5, 1957, 197–253; S. Lyonnet, *De Peccato et Redemptione*, 1958; U. Mauser, "Galater iii. 20: die Universalität des Heils", *NTS* 13, 1966–67, 258–70; W. Otto, "Sōtēr", *Hermes* 45, 1910, 448–60; J. Roloff, "Anfänge der soteriologischen Deutung des Todes Jesu (Mk. X. 45 und Lk. XXII. 27)", *NTS* 19, 1972–73, 38–44; K. Prümm, "Herrscherkult und Neues Testament", *Biblica* 9, 1928, 3–25, 129–42, 289–301; K. H. Rengstorf, "Die Anfänge der Auseinandersetzung zwischen Christusglaube und Asklepiusfrömmigkeit", *Schriften der Gesellschaft zur Förderung der Westfälischen Landesuniversität zu Münster* 30, 1953, 8–19; L. Sabourin, *Rédemption Sacrificielle: Une Enquête Exégétique, Studia* 11, 1961; A. Schlatter, *Der Evangelist Matthäus*, 1963[6], 510 ff., 555 f., 604 ff.; W. Staerk, *Sōtēr*, I–II, 1933–38; J. J. Stamm, *Erlösen und Vergeben im Alten Testament*, 1940; and *pāḏâh, THAT* II 389–406; F. Stolz, *yāša', THAT* I 785–90; W. Wagner, "Über *sōzō* und seine Derivate im Neuen Testament", *ZNW* 6, 1905, 205–35; H. W. Wolff, *Jesaja 53 im Urchristentum*, 1953[3].

Remain

μένω

μένω (*menō*), remain; *ἐμμένω* (*emmenō*), stay or remain in, persevere, abide by; *ἐπιμένω* (*epimenō*), stay, remain, continue (in); *παραμένω* (*paramenō*), remain, stay on, continue in; *προσμένω* (*prosmenō*),

remain, stay with, remain longer; περιμένω (*perimenō*), wait; μονή (*monē*), staying, tarrying, dwelling (-place), room, abode.

CL *menō*, found already in Homer, is related to Lat. *maneo*; intrans. it means to remain in one place, at a given time, with someone. Metaphorically, it can mean to keep an agreement, to remain in a particular sphere of life (with *en*), to make a stand against difficult circumstances (e.g. illness or death), and changes in general (cf. *hoi menontes*, the fixed stars (Aristotle, Cael. 290 a, 21)). Hence *menō* can be used of that which remains valid in law, e.g. a *diathēkē*, a will (→ Covenant). In religious language, it is used for the gods, or that inspired by them (e.g. *nous*, mind; *ideai*, ideas), as having continuing existence. It is only seldom used trans., with the force of waiting for, or expecting someone or something.

OT In the LXX *menō* translates some 16 Heb. words, the commonest being *'āmaḏ* (stand, remain) and *qûm* (arise, stand). It only seldom means to remain in one place (e.g. Exod. 9:28; Lev. 13:23). Sometimes it means to wait (e.g. Gen. 45:9; Job 36:2). Generally it is concerned with the existence or continuing validity of something. A vow is valid (Num. 30:4 [5]; 30:9 [10]), or invalid (Num. 30:5, 12, [6, 13]). The wealth of the godless does not endure (Job 15:29). The salvation of the righteous endures for ever (Ps. 112[111]:3, 9).

It is, therefore, particularly used of God. His relationship with man (→ Righteousness) is not severed by him (Ps. 112[111]:3, 9), and hence his word (Isa. 40:8) and truth (Ps. 117[116]:2) endure. God waits to have mercy (Isa. 30:18). Especially in the Pss. and Isa. God's constancy is stressed as a characteristic in contrast to the changeability of the gods and the transitory nature of the world. We do not find this as a merely abstract theological statement, but always in the living context of the worship and praise of God. God is the living one who endures for ever (Dan. 6:26; Ps. 102[101]:12; *menō* represents *qûm*, arise, and *yāšaḇ*, dwell, respectively). Humanity, opposed to God, perishes under his → judgment and wrath, but the new → heavens, the new → earth and the people of God will remain (Isa. 66:22). Just as Yahweh abides, so does his → name (Ps. 72[71]:17, though here without *menō*), his plan or counsel (Ps. 33[32]:11; Isa. 14:24), his → righteousness (Ps. 111[110]:3) and his praise (Ps. 111[110]:10).

NT 1. Of the 118 instances of *menō*, 40 are found in Jn. and 24 in the Johannine Epistles. Here it is used with a special christological force (see 4, below). The normal secular Gk. uses of the word are also found in the NT.

(a) Intrans., *menō* means to remain, e.g., to stay in a place (Lk. 19:5), or with someone (Lk. 24:29; Matt. 26:38); to continue to exist for a specific time (Matt. 11:23); to live (Jn. 1:38); or metaphorically to hold fast, or remain steadfast, e.g., in a teaching (2 Tim. 3:14, 2 Jn. 9), in fellowship with (Jn. 14:10), in the unmarried state (1 Cor. 7:40), to stand firm, pass the test, e.g. when one's works are judged (1 Cor. 3:14); to live on, and not to have died (1 Cor. 15:6).

(b) Trans., *menō* means to wait for (Acts 20:5, 23).

2. The NT continues the thought of the OT and speaks of the unchanging character of God who maintains his word (1 Pet. 1:23; cf. Dan. 6:26; 1 Pet. 1:25, quoting Isa. 40:8) and his counsel, i.e. he continues and carries through his plan of election in

human history (Rom. 9:11). In the NT, God's constancy has been made visible in the sending and life of Jesus, the messiah, who continues for ever (Heb. 7:24). Those who have been born anew through the abiding word of God (1 Pet. 1:23) receive from the Holy → Spirit not only ecstatic experiences from time to time, but the power of God abides continually in them (1 Jn. 2:27). He who confesses that Jesus is the Son of God abides in God, i.e. is bound to him by God's love (1 Jn. 4:14 f.). He does not seek for an abiding city here (Heb. 13:14), but has abiding possessions in heaven (Heb. 10:34).

Paul points out that, in contrast to the service by → Moses, which was transitory, the new service of the Spirit and of righteousness is permanent (2 Cor. 3:7–11), and with it faith, hope and love (1 Cor. 13:15), above all love (cf. 13:8) by which he knew himself controlled (cf. 2 Cor. 5:14).

3. Since the final and lasting state which Christ will bring is coming, human effort for change and for self-fulfilment in this transitory life loses its attraction, and man is freed from it. Since there is a new focus for Christians, they can and should give up their personal social advancement as their goal in life and the expectation that → marriage will fulfil every hope. It is best to remain quietly as they are. That is why Paul could advise the Christians in Corinth, "Were you a slave when called? Never mind" (1 Cor. 7:21). The unmarried and widows should remain unmarried unless they cannot exercise self-control, otherwise "it is better to marry than to be aflame with passion" (1 Cor. 7:8 f.). All their energies should be concentrated on the dawning kingdom of God and all their efforts should be given to remaining in love and true faith (1 Tim. 2:15; 2 Tim. 3:14).

4. In Jn. the secular Gk. *menō en* gained a meaning parallel to the Pauline conception of Christ's dwelling in the believer (Rom. 8:9 ff.) and his dwelling in Christ. It is even expanded and strengthened (cf. F. Hauck, *TDNT* IV 576).

(a) On the one hand, *menō* expresses the closest possible relationship between Father and Son: "The Father who dwells in me [*en emoi menōn*] does his works" (Jn. 14:10). The unbroken fellowship of Jesus with the Father "causes the word of Jesus to be the word of God and his work to be the work of God" (A. Schlatter, *Der Evangelist Johannes*, 1960³, 295). Christ was not called, like a prophet, for a particular task and a limited period; his whole person remains in lasting and special nearness to the Father (Jn. 1:32), just as the son, in contrast to the slave, continues for ever in the father's → house (Jn. 8:35). "His fellowship with men would be powerless and valueless, had he not as recipient of the Spirit acted in oneness with the Father" (A. Schlatter, op. cit., 51, on Jn. 1:32). For further discussion of this relationship → Son of God.

(b) Then there is depicted the closest possible relationship between Christ and the believer; Jesus calls men to remain in this fellowship, and guarantees for the believer that he also will remain in it (Jn. 15:4 f.). Here a distinction is made between Jesus' being with them (*menō en*, Jn. 15:4 f.) and his being in them after his death and resurrection (*menō en*, Jn. 15:4 f.). This abiding of Jesus in the believer was proclaimed in the promise that the Holy Spirit would abide in them (Jn. 14:17; 1 Jn. 2:27; → Advocate, art. *paraklētos*).

The statement that Christ abides in the believer is a statement with an indubitably mystical element; it creates an inner unity, a *unio mystica*. (One of Paul's ways of expressing this relationship is to use the picture of the body, which is not found in Jn.)

But this does not mean that God is absorbed in man, and so could be found in him by a mystic plumbing of the depths of personality. Rather Christ's abiding in his own is inseparably linked with the abiding of his → word in them (Jn. 15:7; 1 Jn. 2:24; cf. Jn. 8:31) and with the continual acceptance of the reconciling power which flows from the death of Jesus. This is expressed in Jn. above all in the words: "He who eats my flesh and drinks my blood abides in me, and I in him" (Jn. 6:56). This concept expresses the real meaning of the → Lord's Supper for Jn. In this inner fellowship between Christ and the believer "the loyalty that is demanded is not primarily a continued being *for*, but a being *from*; it is not the holding of a position, but an allowing oneself to be held, corresponding to the relationship of the *klēma* [branch] to the *ampelos* [vine]. In this sense the relationship can be a reciprocal one; indeed it *must* be" (R. Bultmann, *The Gospel of John*, 1971, 535 f., on Jn. 15:4).

(c) Such an abiding in Christ makes a man Christ's property right down to the depths of his being. It is not confined to spiritual relationship or agreement, but means present experience of salvation and hence → life (Jn. 6:57). Therefore "he who says he abides in him ought to walk in the same way in which he walked" (1 Jn. 2:6). The indwelling Christ, or life through the word of Christ, demands and forms a life conforming to his spirit and nature, and wills and brings about sanctification. "He who does the will of God abides for ever" (1 Jn. 2:17). Abiding in Christ is the same as bearing → fruit (Jn. 15:5). If there is no fruit, it is a sign that the fellowship has already been interrupted (Jn. 15:6; 1 Jn. 3:6). Where this is true, the wrath of God rests upon the unbeliever (Jn. 3:36). "The relationship of a man to God is finally determined by the way in which he is related to the word of Jesus" (A. Schlatter, op. cit., 112). Jn. makes this clear once more in 15:9–17 which is par. to 15:1–8. "To abide in love, which is what is demanded of the disciple, means continuing in the love he has received, in the state of being loved; it means – and this has already been stated in v. 4 – that his existence is to be based completely on the Revealer's service, as the foot washing had already made clear symbolically" (R. Bultmann, op. cit., 540, on Jn. 15:9; cf. Jn. 13:1–20). Abiding in love becomes a reality in action (Jn. 15:10), in the bearing of continuing fruit (Jn. 15:16), which for example becomes visible in unbounded love of the brethren (1 Jn. 2:10; 3:14 f.). *K. Munzer*

5. (a) The compound *emmenō*, stay or remain in, persevere, continue in, is found in secular Gk. It occurs in the LXX for *ḥāḳâh* in the sense of the righteous waiting on God (Isa. 30:18; Dan. 12:12), and 8 times for *qûm*, especially in sayings about abiding by one's word and agreements (Num. 23:19; Deut. 19:15; 27:26; Isa. 7:7; 8:10; 28:18; Jer. 44[51]:25, 28). It is without Heb. equivalent at Sir. 2:10; 6:20; 7:22; 11:21; 28:6; 39:11; 1 Macc. 10:26 f.; Dan. 6:13(12) LXX. In the NT it occurs only 4 times. After their initial missionary work, Paul and Barnabas returned to Lystra, Iconium and Antioch, "strengthening the souls of the disciples, exhorting them to continue in the faith [*emmenein tē pistei*], and saying that through many tribulations we must enter the kingdom of God" (Acts 14:22). The Book of Acts ends with Paul remaining in Rome two whole years at his own expense, welcoming all who came to him, preaching the kingdom of God and teaching openly and unhindered about the Lord Jesus Christ (Acts 28:30 f.). *emmenō* has the sense of "abide by" in Gal. 3:10, where Paul cites Deut. 27:26 to show the impossibility of keeping the law as a way of salvation: "For all who rely on the law are under a curse; for it is

written, 'Cursed be every one who does not abide by all things written in the book of the law, and do them.' " In Heb. 8:9 (alluding to Jer. 31:32) it has the sense of "continue in": "not like the covenant that I made with their fathers on the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt; for they did not continue in my covenant, and so I paid no heed to them, says the Lord." In its place, Yahweh promises a new → covenant written on the heart (v. 10), and Heb. argues that this has now been established by Christ (Heb. 8:6–13; 10:14–18).

(b) *epimenō*, stay, remain, is found in secular Gk. from Homer onwards, but occurs in the LXX only at Exod. 12:39 (for *māhaḥ*, linger, tarry). It is used in a lit. sense in Acts 10:48; 21:4, 10; 28:12, 14; 1 Cor. 16:7 f.; Gal. 1:18. The reason for the stay is frequently connected with Christian service. In Phil. 1:24 Paul, reflecting on his possible imminent execution, writes: "But to remain in the flesh [*to de epimenein [en] tē sarki*] is more necessary on your account." Hence, he is convinced that his life will be spared for the sake of continued service. On the other hand, to die is gain (Phil. 1:21) because it brings release from earthly troubles and brings one into the more immediate presence of Christ. Nevertheless, Paul is willing to reject this "gain" for the sake of his pastoral care (cf. D. W. Palmer, " 'To Die is Gain' (Philippians 1:21)", *NovT* 17, 1975, 203–18).

epimenō has the fig. sense of continue, persist (in), persevere, with the dat. Thus, Peter continued knocking on the door after his escape from prison (Acts 12:16). In the pericope concerning the woman taken in adultery, the Jews continued to ask Jesus until he gave the reply: "Let him who is without sin among you be the first to throw a stone at her" (Jn. 8:7; cf. Lev. 20:10; Deut. 13:10; 17:7; 22:2 ff.; Sanhedrin 7:4; 11:1; Sotah 47; on this see further J. D. M. Derrett, "The Woman Taken in Adultery", in *Law in the New Testament*, 1970, 156–88).

The fig. use is found in theological contexts in the sense of continuing in sin (Rom. 6:1), which Paul rejects on the grounds that to desire to do so is utterly incompatible with dying and rising with Christ as represented by baptism. The liberty we have through justification by faith is not a liberty to sin but to live out the life of Christ. Later on in Rom. Paul discusses the status of the Jews as the people of God with regard to the saving purposes of God, using the image of pruning and grafting into the → olive tree. "Note then the kindness and the severity of God: severity toward those who have fallen, but God's kindness to you, provided that you continue in his kindness [*ean epimenēs tē chrēstotēti*]; otherwise you too will be cut off. And even the others, if they do not persist in their unbelief [*ean mē epimenōsin tē apistia*], will be grafted in, for God has power to graft them in again" (Rom. 11:22 f.). Thus, Paul envisages the possibility of the Jews being once more incorporated into the people of God through a return to faith. But for the present they are no longer the people of God, and they will never again become the people of God in the sense that they were before. The church is the new people of God, though there is the possibility of the Jews being grafted into this people (perhaps comparable with the way in which Gentiles were grafted into the Jewish nation prior to Christ). However, the continuance of the Gentiles is also conditional upon their continuance in God's kindness (→ Good, art. *chrēstos*). The warning is comparable with that in Heb. 3:15 ff.; 4:1–13; 6:1–8 (cf. Ps. 95:7 f.).

A similar warning is issued in Col. 1:23. It follows the reminder: "And you, who were once estranged and hostile in mind, doing evil deeds, he has now reconciled in

his body of flesh by his death, in order to present you holy and blameless and irreproachable before him, provided that you continue in the faith [*ei ge epimenete tē pistei*], stable and steadfast, not shifting from the hope of the gospel which you heard, which has been preached to every creature under heaven, and of which I, Paul, became a minister" (Col. 1:21 ff.). In all these passages, where *epimenō* is used in connexion with salvation there is a paradox: reconciliation and redemption are the free gifts of God, but they need to be appropriated and lived out. Continuance and perseverance are essential features of the life of faith.

In 1 Tim. 4:16 Timothy is exhorted to "Take heed to yourself and to your teaching: hold to that [*epimene autois*], for by so doing you will save both yourself and your hearers." Again there is the same stress on perseverance, but it is now expressly linked with teaching (*didaskalia*; → Teach, art. *didaskō*). In Col. and 1 Tim. the perseverance is related to "the faith" (Col. 1:23) and "teaching" (1 Tim. 4:16). These expressions suggest a situation in which it was felt that it was not enough for believers to be exhorted to persevere. In view of the false teaching and dangers of the times it was necessary for them to be guided by a defined body of truth.

(c) *paramenō*, remain, stay on, continue in, is found from Homer onwards. In the LXX it translated *yāšaḇ* (dwell, remain) at Gen. 44:33 and *ʿāmaḏ* (stand) at Prov. 12:7 and Dan. 11:17 (Theodotion). It is without Heb. equivalent at Jud. 12:7, 9; Sir. 6:8, 10; 11:17; 38:19. In the NT Paul, faced with the prospect of execution, tells the Philippians that he would prefer to be with Christ, but that it is more necessary to remain in the flesh on their account. "Convinced of this, I know that I shall remain and continue with you all, for your progress and joy in the faith" (Phil. 1:25). This may be compared with the use of *menō* with *para* (see above). Heb. 7 argues for the superiority of Christ's priesthood which is after the order of → Melchizedek. This is shown *inter alia* by Christ's permanent and continuing ministry as contrasted with the temporary nature of the Levitical priesthood. "The former priests were many in number, because they were prevented by death from continuing in office; but he holds his priesthood permanently, because he continues for ever" (Heb. 7:23 f.). In the course of his argument that the true believer shows his faith by his works (Jas. 2:22), James argues: "But he who looks into the perfect law, the law of liberty, and perseveres [*paremeinas*], being no hearer that forgets but a doer that acts, he shall be blessed in his doing" (Jas. 1:23 f.). The vb. also occurs in 1 Cor. 16:6 in the physical sense of "stay" in the discussion of Paul's future plans.

(d) *prosmenō*, remain, stay with, stay longer, is found in secular Gk., but occurs in the LXX only at Jdg. 3: 25A; Tob. 2:2; Wis. 3:9; 3 Macc. 7:17. It is used of the crowds who had been with Jesus for three days (Matt. 15:32 par. Mk. 8:2). Similarly, it is used in a physical sense in Acts 18:18 and 1 Tim. 1:3. Barnabas exhorted the believers at Antioch "to remain faithful to the Lord with steadfast purpose" (Acts 11:23), while Paul and Barnabas urged their followers from the Jews and proselytes in the synagogue at Pisidian Antioch "to continue in the grace of God" (Acts 13:43). 1 Tim. 5:5 describes the righteous widow: "She who is a real widow, and is left all alone, has set her hope on God and continues in supplications and prayers night and day" (→ Woman, art. *chēra*).

(e) *perimenō*, expect, await, in cl. Gk., occurs in the LXX only twice (Gen. 49:18; Wis. 8:12) and only once in the NT, where it signifies waiting "for the promise of the Father", i.e. the Holy → Spirit (Acts 1:4). The disciples were not to depart from

Jerusalem until they had received it (cf. Lk. 24:49; → Pentecost).

(f) For *hypomenō* → Patience.

(g) The noun *monē* is found in secular Gk. with a variety of meanings including abiding, tarrying, persistence, continuance, permanence (cf. Liddell-Scott, 1143; F. Hauck, *TDNT* IV 579). But perhaps the meanings which come closest to the 2 instances in the NT are a place of halt on a journey, an inn (Pausanias, 10, 31, 7), a watch-house in a police district (E. J. Goodspeed, *Greek Papyri from the Cairo Museum*, 1902, 15, 19), a hut for watching in a field (J. Maspéro, *Papyrus Grecs d'époque Byzantine*, 1911 ff., 107, 10). However, these examples are late. *monē* may represent some form of the Aram. *'wn'*, meaning a night-stop or resting place on a journey (cf. R. E. Brown, *The Gospel according to John*, II, *Anchor Bible*, 1971, 618). Origen took the NT references to refer to stations on the road to God (*De prin.* 2, 11, 6), and this may lie behind the Vulg. *mansio* and Eng. mansion which meant a dwelling place rather than a sumptuous large house. F. Hauck takes Jn. 14:2 to refer to the movement from below up to God. "The word seems to be deliberately chosen to express the fact that our earthly state is transitory and provisional compared with eternal and blessed being with God. On the other hand, 14:23 (the movement is from above downwards) depicts salvation after the departure of the Saviour as a permanent abiding of Christ and God in believers" (*TDNT* IV 580). However, C. K. Barrett rejects the idea that life in heaven involves a progression, and claims that v. 23 implies a permanent abiding-place or mode of abiding (*The Gospel according to St John*, 1955, 381; cf. 1 Macc. 7:38). In Jewish belief there were various compartments or dwelling places in heaven (Eth. Enoch 39:4 ff.; cf. 15:7, 10; 22:9 ff.; 71:15 f.; Sl. Enoch 61:2; *TDNT* IV 580 f.). Hence, the RSV: "In my Father's house are many rooms [*monai polloi*]; if it were not so, would I have told you that I go to prepare a place for you?" (Jn. 14:2); "Jesus answered him, 'If a man loves me, he will keep my word, and my Father will love him, and we will come to him and make our home [*monēn*] with him' " (Jn. 14:24). This corresponds to the use of *menō* in Jn. (see above 4). The former passage stresses the certainty of the coming salvation and fellowship with Jesus; the latter the present salvation which comes from the indwelling of the Father and the Son. (→ also House, art. *oikos.*) *C. Brown*

ἀδιάλειπτος

ἀδιάλειπτος (*adialeiptos*), unceasing, constant; *ἀδιαλείπτως* (*adialeiptōs*), unceasingly, constantly.

CL & OT Both the adj. and the adv. are comparatively rare in secular Gk. (cf. Liddell-Scott, 22; Arndt, 16). In the LXX only the adv. occurs and that exclusively in the Maccabean literature (1 Macc. 12:11, 2 Macc. 3:26; 9:4; 13:12; 15:7; 3 Macc. 6:33). It is also found in Test. Lev. 13:2; Josephus, *War* 3, 164; 3, 241), whilst the adj. occurs in Arist. 84 and Josephus, *War* 2, 155; 5, 31.

NT *adialeiptos* describes in Rom. 9:2 Paul's unceasing anguish of heart (*adialeiptos odynē tē kardia mou*) for the Jews, for whose sake he could wish himself accursed and cut off from Christ (v. 3). For though they are descended from → Israel and have all the formal promises, they are not truly of Israel. Paul's yearning for the salvation of Israel may be compared with Jesus' concern for → Jerusalem (Matt. 23:37 ff. par.

Lk. 13:34 f.). In 2 Tim. 1:3 it is used of Paul's constant remembrance of Timothy in his → prayers.

The adv. *adialeiptōs* is likewise only found in the Pauline literature. In Rom. 1:9 it is used of Paul's intercession for the Roman Christians and similarly in 1 Thess. 1:2 for the Thessalonians. Likewise, Paul thanks God constantly for the response of the Thessalonians to the word of God (1 Thess. 2:13) and urges them to pray unceasingly (1 Thess. 5:17).

Thus all the contexts in which these words are found in the NT express unremitting concern for others, particularly in prayer and praise. *C. Brown*

(a). R. Bultmann, *The Gospel of John*, 1971; F. Hauck, *menō* etc., *TDNT* IV 574–88; J. E. Russcop, *Abiding in Christ: Studies in John 15*, 1973.
(b). J. Heise, *Bleiben. Menein in den johanneischen Schriften*, 1967; A. Schlatter, *Der Evangelist Johannes*, 1960³.

Remember, Remembrance

μιμνήσκομαι

μιμνήσκομαι (*mimnēskomai*), recall to mind, remember; *μνεία* (*mneia*), remembrance, memory, mention; *μνήμη* (*mnēmē*), recollection, memory; *μνημονεύω* (*mnēmoneuō*), remember, mention; *μνημόσυνον* (*mnēmosynon*), memory, recollection; *ἀνάμνησις* (*anamnēsis*), reminder, remembrance; *ὑπόμνησις* (*hypomnēsis*), recollection; *ἀναμιμνήσκω* (*anamimnēskō*), remind; *ὑπομιμνήσκω* (*hypomimnēskō*), remind.

CL 1. *mimnēskomai* is derived from the Indo-European root **mēn*, to think. The words from this root cover three areas of meaning: (a) *me-*, *mn-*, to intend, want, require (Gk. *memona*); (b) to be enraptured, to rave (Gk. *mainomai*; → Ecstasy); (c) *menā-*, *menei-*, to be mindful of (Gk. *memnēmai*), might, power, ferocity, liveliness, etc. (Gk. *menos*), to remember, recall, mention (Gk. *mimnēskō*, *-omai*), counsellor (Gk. *mnēmōn*); memorial (Gk. *mnēma*). See E. Boisacq, *Dictionnaire Étymologique de la Langue Grecque – Étudiée dans ses Rapports avec les autres Langues Indo-Européennes*, 1916, 625. Hence there arises, in Indo-European languages generally, the following complex of meanings: (a) to remember (referring to the intellectual ability, and its exercise, of linking the past to the present); (b) to consider, weigh up (where the present is linked to the future); (c) to be mindful, take into account, mention (assessing how the present relates both to past and future). This range of meanings can be seen in English, e.g., in the various uses of the word "mind": to remind, call to mind, give one's mind to, bear in mind, have a mind to, etc. (see further E. Boisacq, op. cit., 627, 638).

The various simple and compound forms of both vbs. and nouns in Gk. (Liddell-Scott give no less than 45!) are used interchangeably. No fundamental difference in meaning exists between, on the one hand, compounds such as *anamnēsis* and *hypomnēsis*, and, on the other hand, simple forms such as *mimnēskō* and *mnēmē*, apart, of course, from their being different parts of speech (cf. J. Behm, *anamnēsis* etc., *TDNT* I 348 and O. Michel, *mimnēskomai*, *TDNT* IV 678 ff.). In view of this strong inter-connexion of meaning and the resulting difficulty of distinguishing the sense of one word from that of another, many theologians translate all derivatives of

the stem *mnē-* by memory, to remember, etc., with the unfortunate result that significant shades of meaning are obscured.

2. In Gk. literature (from Homer to the inscriptions and papyri of the Hellenistic period) the following principal meanings are attested:

(a) to remind oneself or someone else, to remind once again (especially in Plato *anamimnēskesthai* and *anamnēsis*), recollection, memory. These meanings apply to 50% of the relevant words. The commonest prefixes before trans. vbs. are: *ana-*, *epi-* and *hypo-*.

(b) to consider, think of, ponder, reflect (meanings not found in all the writers and works investigated) (5%).

(c) to remember for good or ill, concern oneself with, to want, strive after, desire (10%; in Homer almost 50%).

(d) to be mindful of, take into account, comply with (10%).

(e) to mention (verbally or in writing), make known, call, name; to warn; deed, document (compounds often formed with *hypo-*) (25%).

anamnēsis has special significance in Plato. From the fact that it is possible to probe behind the externals of things, events etc., and to recall their "idea", he deduces a bodiless, free, purely spiritual pre-existence of the → soul, and its survival after death (see especially *Phdr.* 73c; *Theaetetus* and *Meno*; cf. G. Vlastos, "Anamnesis in the *Meno*", *Dialogue*, IV, 1965, 143–67; on memory in philosophy see S. Shoemaker, "Memory", in P. Edwards, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, V, 1967, 265–76). (→ also Resurrection, art. *anastasis* CL.)

3. From the time of Homer until the time of Christ and beyond, *mnēmē* is one of the ideas central to the ancient Gk. and Hellenistic Gk. cults and religio-philosophical systems (*TDNT* IV 679).

(a) In Homer, Hades is the kingdom of *lēthē*, i.e. oblivion and forgetfulness. Its inhabitants are mute and unremembered. The situation may be expressed in the form of two equations: forgetting = silence = death; remembering = speech = life (Homer, *Od.* 11, 71, 97 ff., 140 ff., 147 ff.).

(b) Whereas in Homer remembering and forgetting are mental phenomena, in Orphism *mnēmē* is personified as a goddess *Mnēmosynē*; but also, under the figures of water from a divine spring, or a "passport" for the dead, it is a gift of the goddess, i.e. the divine immortality of the human soul (A. Olivieri, *Lamellae Aureae Orphicae, Kleine Texte* 133, 1915). Here then memory is not only a natural power but also the process which this power sets in motion.

(c) In gnosticism the human soul has left its heavenly home and so become separated from the unity of the divine (→ One, art. *heis*). Its sentence and fate is to forget its divine origin, through contamination by earthly evil. Recollection occurs in similar bodily fashion, being the soul's first step in returning to its heavenly home. This recollection is evoked by the arrival of the redeemer (in the form of the "call", the "heaven-sent epistle", the "messenger", etc.). The "call" is, as it were, the magic formula which sets the process in motion (and is so represented in the "Hymn of the Pearl" [i.e. the soul] in the *Acts of Thomas*, text in Henn.-Schn., II, 498–504; similarly in the Manichaean literature). (For gnostic texts see W. Foerster, *Gnosis: A Selection of Gnostic Texts*, I *Patristic Evidence*, 1972, II *Mandaic Sources*, 1974.)

(d) This line is carried further in the mystery cults, where the fortunes of the particular god being worshipped are recalled in sensual fashion by means of ceremonies

frequently based on a mixture of mysticism and → magic. (See further G. Wagner, *Pauline Baptism and the Pagan Mysteries: The Problem of the Pauline Doctrine of Baptism in Romans VI. 1–11, in the light of the Religio-Historical "Parallels"*, 1967.)

These remarks should make it clear that the NT use of words from the stem *mnē-* cannot be made to originate in these areas (as in many works of the so-called "Benedictine School" of Dom Odo Casel and others, and also of those Lutheran theologians who try to interpret "remembrance" as a sacramental "representation" of the exalted Christ (cf. K. H. Bartels, "Der theoretische Quellort der 'Sammlung' und ihre Parole 'Katholische Reformation' ", *EvTh* 20, 1960, 364 ff.).

OT In the LXX words from *mnē-* generally correspond to derivatives of the Heb. vb. *zāḵar* and are used as in ordinary Gk. Meanings: (a) to remember, etc. (Gen. 40:23; Wis. 12:2; Gen. 8:1); (b) to consider, etc. (Isa. 47:7; Sir. 41:1 f.); (c) to remember for good or ill, used mainly (53 times) of God, rarely (4 times) of men (Gen. 30:22; Jer. 40:8 LXX). In particular Deut. "especially develops a theology of remembering" (O. Michel, *TDNT* IV 675; cf. Deut. 5:15; 7:18; 8:2, 18; 9:7; 15:15; 16:3, 12; 24:18, 20, 22; 32:7); (d) to be mindful of (Deut. 15:15 and passim; Michel, ibid.); (e) to mention, etc. (Dan. 5:10 LXX; Est. 2:23; 2 Ki. 18:18 LXX). Then there is a specifically biblical use, partially foreshadowed in profane Gk., but undoubtedly going back to early oriental and Heb. influences which had a lasting effect upon the vocabulary and style of the LXX. Hence the distribution of meanings of *mnē-* in the OT differs characteristically from that in profane Gk. and in rabbinic Judaism (the latter being exposed to other influences). The following percentages refer to the meanings given above, profane Gk. being given in brackets: (a) 24 (50) %; (b) 5 (5) %; (c) 18 (10) %; (d) 30 (10) %; (e) 23 (25) %.

2. Specifically biblical meanings have already been enumerated. They are:

(a) To mention in prayer to God, call to God's remembrance (→ Prayer, art. *proseuchomai*; for *epikaleomai* → Call). Ps. 109 (LXX 108):14 may be paraphrased thus: "Let the accuser [Job 2:1, → Satan] make mention [LXX *anamnēstheiē*; MT *yizzāḵēr*] of the inquity of his fathers before the judgment seat of God." In the LXX of Ps. 62:7; Ezek. 33:13, "to think of" and "to be thought of" mean to mention or be mentioned in intercession before God (cf. also Isa. 48:1; O. Michel, *homologeō TDNT* V 204 f.; Bartels, *Gedächtnis*, 13 f., and notes 86–97).

(b) To proclaim, to celebrate, to solemnize (→ Feast, art. *heortē*; → Proclamation, art. *angellō*). The existence of the people of Israel, their faith in Yahweh as their saviour and redeemer, their obedience to him as their sovereign and as Lord of history, their public worship – all these things are grounded in their experience of his gracious help in the past. Hence, at their festivals the people of God are publicly called upon to remember, and as they do so, the same God who did such great things for them in the past, speaks to them once again at the present. In this way, at daily worship and at the recurring festivals, the words spoken, sung or heard take up redemptive history and turn it into something requiring present commitment (H. W. Wolff, "Das Alte Testament und das Problem der existentialen Interpretation", *EvTh* 23, 1963, 10, 14 f.). Hence, the words of this group may be used like *angellō*, i.e. to convey the idea of authorized proclamation (as did the Heb. *zāḵar* before them; cf. W. Schottroff, *"Gedenken" im Alten Orient und im Alten Testament*, 1964, 23), oc-

casional examples being found already in Aristotle. A typical passage is Ps. 70(71):15–17, where v. 16b ("I praise thy righteousness, thine alone") is literally: "I remember [i.e. declare, proclaim] thy righteousness ...." Here the reference is to *oral* "remembrance", but elsewhere (e.g. Exod. 13:8; Jos. 4:6 f.) God's mighty acts are commemorated by tangible objects (→ Miracle, art. *sēmeion*), or, as in Exod. 12:14, by a holy day, the *mnēmosynon* (Heb. *zikkaron*) being nothing less than the celebration of a festival (cf. G. von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, I 1962, 242 f.; K. H. Bartels: *Dies tut zu meinem Gedächtnis. Zur Auslegung von 1 Kor. 11, 24.25*, Dissertation, Mainz, 1959, 14–17 and notes 98–124).

(c) To believe, obey, become converted, turn about. To remember God in this sense means to serve him, to adore him, to obey and follow him, to recognize him as Creator and Lord (Num. 15:39 f.; Tob. 1:11 f.; cf. H. Graf Reventlow, "Das Amt des *mazkîr*", *ThZ*, Basel, 1959, 161 ff., especially 165). The phrase "to remember God" can be a formula summing up a man's religious standing (Jud. 13:19; Tob. 2:2). Thus in Ps. 22(21):28 f. *mnēsthēsontai* (*yizkᵉrû*), used in parallel with *epistraphēsontai* (*yāšûḇû*), probably refers to the act of turning in faith to the Lord (cf. Pss. Sol. 4:21; Bartels, *Gedächtnis*, 18 f. and notes 125–130).

(d) To confess with praise and adoration, give adoring testimony (→ Confession; → Thank, art. *aineō*; → Blessing, art. *eulogia*). Whenever words of the *mnē-* group are used as synonyms or metonyms of *homologeō*, to confess (Heb. *yāḏâh* in hiphil, *tôḏâh*), they always at least include the idea of the public confession or acknowledgment of God. Examples are Pss. 30(29):4; 97(96):12; 45(44):17; 6:5 (cf. Sir. 17:27 f., Bar. 2:17; Bartels, *Gedächtnis*, 24) and Tob. 14:7 ff., and especially the titles of Pss. 38 (37) and 70 (69). Both titles probably refer to the content of their respective psalms (38:19; 70:4) (cf. the titles of Pss. 60, 80 and 145), and so represent liturgical rubrics (cf. Schottroff, op. cit., 334 ff.), in which case they are to be translated "for a testimony", i.e. to God's goodness – such testimony being borne through the public recital of the psalm (Bartels, *Gedächtnis*, 23–26 and notes 188–208). This usage has been transferred from the Heb. *zāḵar* to the Gk. of the LXX; no analogy exists in profane Gk.

3. In rabbinic Judaism, however, the specifically biblical usage recedes. Remembrance for good or ill comes to be heavily rationalized, e.g. the Midrash on Gen. 30:22, where God's remembrance is interpreted as his recollection of Rachel's good works: "What did he remember? Her silence toward her sister.... Of what did he think? Of the fact that she had brought the concubine into her home" (*Ber. Rabbah* 355). On the other hand, the biblical meaning to help, to be gracious, lived on in the liturgy (cf. the so-called *zikrōnôṯ* in the liturgy for the new year's day; P. Fiebig, *Rosch-ha-schana*, 1914). The meaning to mention occurs frequently in the formula "his memory was kept in honour" (Yoma 3:9b and passim). The use of *'azkārâh* in the place of the divine name is significant (O. Michel, *TDNT* IV 682 n.; R. Meyer, *TDNT* III 982 f.; Schottroff, op. cit., 333 and n. 1). Here remembrance stands for *šēm*, → name (as it does occasionally in the OT: Exod. 20:24 LXX, where *onomazein* stands for the Heb. *zāḵar*). In the Qumran texts the idea persists of God "remembering" for good and is more prominent than in the rabbinic literature. Thus, it is stated that God thought of the old covenant and gave the new covenant for his elect, while in the eschatological war he will remember the sons of light and help them against the sons of darkness. For instances of *zāḵar* see 1QS 6:27; 1QM 10:7;

17:2; 1QH 4:34 f.; 1Q 34 2:5; 32, 5; 6QD 3:5; CD 1:4; 6:2; 15:2.

K. H. Bartels

4. The theological interpretation of memory and remembering has been the subject of investigation in OT scholarship. In 1926 J. Pedersen put forward a theory of the Hebrew psychology of memory which claimed that the Hebrew viewed reality with the purpose of discovering a totality (*Israel: Its Life and Culture*, I–II, 99 ff.). Man is a *nepeš* (soul). Abstract thought is something alien to the primitive Hebrew approach to life. "When the soul remembers something, it does not mean that it has an objective memory image of some thing or event, but that this image is called forth in the soul and assists in determining its direction, its action. When man remembers God, he lets his being and his actions be determined by him.... The peculiarity about the Israelite is that he cannot at all imagine memory, unless at the same time an effect on the totality and its direction of the will is taken for granted" (op. cit., 106 f.). The general attack on Pedersen's method by James Barr in *The Semantics of Biblical Language*, 1961, has been followed up by a detailed critique by B. S. Childs in *Memory and Tradition in Israel, SBT* 37, 1962.

Childs gives what is perhaps the most detailed study in English of *zāḵar*, and claims that Pedersen has imposed his own preconceived ideas on the material he has examined. He rejects the method of listing the occurrences of the root in an attempted chronological order, as this takes too much account of the accidental appearances it makes in writing, and too little of its function within the particular contexts of life and worship. Employing the techniques of form-criticism, Childs studies the use of the vb. in the setting of the cult, the law court, prophecy, narrative etc. He agrees with Pedersen that features of OT thought exhibit similarities with that of other contemporary, primitive peoples. But "the biblical evidence simply does not confirm his theory that event is conceived of merely as a manifestation of the soul and effected independently of external factors" (op. cit., 29). The Hebrews were certainly aware that thoughts did not always lead to a corresponding action, as in the complaint to Moses, "O that we had meat to eat. We remember the fish we ate in Egypt for nothing ... and there is nothing at all but this manna to look at" (Num. 11:5; cf. Est. 4:13 for a similar example of where the thought is quite different from the reality). "But one can go a step beyond this. Israel developed a sense of history because of its understanding of Yahweh's relation to the world which broke the primitive pattern. God controls the external world through the dimension of the historical" (op. cit., 29 f.; cf. Gen. 50:20; Isa. 10:7 ff.).

(a) When the vb. is used of God, Childs notes two distinct formulae: "On the one hand, the imperative form has its context within the complaint psalm. An expansion of the form away from its cultic origin was traced in the complaints of Jeremiah and Job. The great break came with the prophetic adaptation for purposes of judgment and promise. On the other hand, the use of the finite form of the verb arose within the hymn. The Priestly school accommodated the form to express a theological interpretation of covenantal history" (op. cit., 44).

(i) The complaint Psalm may be both individual (Pss. 25[24]: 6 f.; 119[118]:49) or communal (Pss. 74[73]:2, 18, 22; 79[78]:8; 106[105]:4; 137[136]:7; cf. Isa. 64:8; Jer. 14:21; Lam. 5:1; Neh. 1:8). It may be negative or positive: "Do not remember against us the sins of our forefathers" (Ps. 79[78]:8); "Remember how the enemy

scoff" (Ps. 74[73]:18; cf. v. 22). Frequent appeals are made to the → covenant relationship (Jer. 14:21; Ps. 25[24]:6; cf. Pss. 119[118]:49; 74[73]:2). Outside the Psalms among the pre-exilic non-cultic material are the prayers of Hannah (1 Sam. 1:11), Samson (Jdg. 16:28) and Hezekiah (2 Ki. 20:3 par. Isa. 38:3). Other passages containing intercessory prayers are Exod. 32:13; Deut. 9:27; 2 Chr. 6:42; Pss. 20(19):4; 89(88):48, 51; 132(131):1.

(ii) In the pleas of Jeremiah for Yahweh to remember him, access to the divine presence through the cult has been replaced by a direct confrontation with Yahweh. His plea is grounded in the fact that he is the bearer of the prophetic word (Jer. 18:20; 20:8 ff.) which has brought about his isolation and rejection (Jer. 15:15–18). Job's complaints are "characterized by a poetic freedom which allows him wide latitude" (op. cit., 38; cf. Job 7:7–10). In Neh. "the imperative appears frequently in a stereotyped prose phrase (Neh. 5:19; 6:14; 13:14, 22, 29, 31). For examples of the prophetic oracle, adapting the complaint psalm, see Hos. 6:1–7:2; 8:8, 11 ff.; 9:9; Jer. 14:2–12; 31:15–20 (cf. also Isa. 43:25; Jer. 2:2; 31:34 which are not related to the complaint Psalm).

(iii) A different genre is the hymn, where instead of the imperative urging Yahweh to remember, the writer praises Yahweh in the indicative for remembering his covenant faithfulness and promises (Pss. 98[97]:3; 105[104]:8, 42; 106[105]:45; 111[110]:5; 136[135]:23; 1 Chr. 16:15). Yahweh's memory is not confined to past events; it is active in the present and will continue into the future (Pss. 105[104]:8; 103[102]:7, 14; 111[110]:5).

(iv) Finally, in passages which he ascribes to the Priestly writer Childs sees certain affinities with the hymn, but points out that God's remembering is uncultic in character and figures in a historical work in prose passages concerned with the history of redemption. "The use of the verb *zkr* reflects the Priestly writer's concern to present history as a witness to the unfolding of the purpose of the covenant God who is active in Israel's midst. This history is merely a working out of the one eternal act of divine grace" (op. cit., 43; cf. Gen. 8:1; 9:15 f.; 19:29; Exod. 2:24; 6:5; Lev. 26:42, 45; cf. also Ezek. 16:60). God's remembrance of his covenant includes a renewed promise of the land (Exod. 6:8; cf. Lev. 26:42, 45).

(b) But not only does Yahweh remember; Israel also remembers. Here Childs notes several distinctive types of usage.

(i) In the case of Deuteronomic usage "the writer has as his chief problem the relating of the new generation of Israel to the tradition of Moses. No longer has Israel direct access to the redemptive events of the past. Now memory takes on central theological significance. Present Israel has not been cut off from redemptive history, but she encounters the same covenant God through a living tradition. Memory provides the link between past and present" (op. cit., 55; cf. Deut. 7:18; 9:7; 24:9; 25:17). "The divine commands as event meet each successive generation through her tradition calling forth a decision, and in obedience Israel shares in the same redemption as her forefathers" (op. cit., 56; cf. Deut. 5:15; 15:15; 16:12; 24:18, 22). Here the → sabbath plays an important part, and the emphasis is rather different from Exod. 20:8. "Memory does not serve to arouse a psychological reaction of sympathy for slaves. Rather, quite the reverse is true. Israel observes the Sabbath *in order to* remember her slavery and deliverance" (op. cit., 53). In so doing

there is an actualization of redemptive history. "Israel in every generation remembers and so shares in the same redemptive time" (op. cit., 54).

(ii) In Mic. 6:5 "the prophet appeals to Israel's memory as a means of actualizing Yahweh's original purpose for his people" (op. cit., 57). The appeal to memory is characteristic of a defendant's speech in a law court. The present rupture with Yahweh stems from Israel's failure to understand the saving acts.

(iii) In Isa. 43:18, 44:21 and 46:9 there is "both the continuity and the discontinuity of history. There is a continuity between the past and the future because of the one purpose of God. There is a discontinuity because of Israel's failure. Israel's past response evokes the need of a radical new quality within history. In both instances Israel's memory is an active response in faith which links her to the redemptive action of God's entrance into history" (op. cit., 59).

(iv) Ezekiel focuses attention on the problem of Israel remembering his sins (Ezek. 6:9; 16:22, 61; 20:43; 23:19, 27; 36:31). Remembering is also connected with the formula "they [or you] shall know that I am Yahweh" (Ezek. 6:10; 16:62; 20:44; 36:23).

(v) The Psalms contain the largest number of instances of *zāḵar*, the overwhelming majority of which occur in the individual complaint Pss. (e.g. 42[41]:5; 77[76]:4; 119[118]:52, 55; 143[142]:5). Allied to this is the communal complaint (Ps. 137[136]:1, 6) and → Jonah's psalm (Jon. 2:8). "The fact that the psalmist can remember a situation different from his present plight evokes his bitter complaint and fervent plea for aid" (op. cit., 60). Ps. 42 pictures the individual cut off from the temple, and thus apparently from the divinely appointed means of access to Yahweh, and thirsting for his presence. In Ps. 77 the Psalmist grieves that Yahweh has changed his attitude towards him. "Memory as a psychological process is the same in the two parts of the psalm. The difference is that in vv. 2–11 the psalmist's remembering results in bitter frustration, whereas in vv. 12 ff. he encounters God through his memory .... The act of memory forms a bridge which links the psalmist with the God of the forefathers, not because of a Herculean act of self-projection, but because the events of the tradition possess a power which continues to meet Israel in her struggle" (op. cit., 63). In the case of Ps. 63, Childs thinks that an experience which was originally cultic in nature is actualized through a process which is no longer cultic, whereas Ps. 137 expresses bitter sorrow for → Jerusalem's destruction.

(c) The LXX uses the noun *mnēmosynon* chiefly to translate various forms from the root *zkr*. In particular, the MT uses two Heb. nouns *zikkārôn* and *zēḵer*.

(i) *zikkārôn*, memorial sign, is derived from the qal stem of *zkr* (J. Barth, *Die Nominalbildung in den semitischen Sprachen*, 1894², 324). It occurs 23 times (including once in an Aram. cognate). It is found 14 times in the Pentateuch, 12 of which Childs locates in the Priestly source (op. cit., 66). Childs sees two broad categories of meaning. In the passive sense it means a *memorandum*, a thing worthy to be remembered: memorable deeds (Est. 6:1), sayings (Job 13:12), remembrance (Eccl. 1:11; 2:16), a record (Ezr. 6:2), a memorial written in a book which will serve to bring to mind the defeat of the Amalekites (Exod. 17:14), a book of memorial(s) (Mal. 3:16; Est. 6:1). In the active sense it means a memorial which calls something else to remembrance. In 9 cases it is a cultic object: the altar covering (Num. 16:40; 17:5), booty (Num. 31:54), onyx stones (Exod. 28:12, twice), atonement money (Exod. 30:16), breastpiece (Exod. 28:29), cereal offering (Num. 5:15, 18). It is twice

used of the cultic activity of blowing trumpets (Num. 10:10; Lev. 23:24), and once of a cultic festival, the passover (Exod. 12:14). "According to the usual Priestly idiom the *zikkārôn* is a 'memorial for the children of Israel before Yahweh'. One has only to recall the role of the cult for the Priestly writer to recognize the full significance of the phrase. God has established a covenantal relationship with Israel which expresses itself in his eternal ordinances (*ḥuqqaṯ 'ôlām*, Num. 10:8). Signs and memorials serve within this dispensation of grace both to guarantee and maintain for each generation this eternal relationship. The cultic acts of Israel continually remind God of this eternal covenantal order. The cultic objects and rites act to guarantee that the covenant is not forgotten" (B. S. Childs, op. cit., 67). Other instances are the crown in the temple (Zech. 6:14), its pejorative use of an idolatrous cult symbol (Isa. 57:8), the unleavened bread (Exod. 13:9) and the stones set up in the Jordan to be "to the people of Israel a memorial for ever" (Jos. 4:7).

(ii) The Heb. *zēḵer*, remembrance, memorial, occurs 23 times. It is used as a parallel for *šēm*, name, in 5 cases (Exod. 3:15; Isa. 26:8; Ps. 135[134]:13; Job 18:17; Prov. 10:7), and the contexts of 4 other passages suggest a similar meaning (Hos. 12:6, Pss. 30[29]:5; 97[96]:12; 102[101]:13). Because the → name expresses a person's essence in Heb. thought, the destroying of one's name is the same as to annihilate someone (Jer. 11:19; Job 18:17). Thus a number of passages deal with the destruction of the enemy, cutting off all mention of the name (Exod. 17:14; Deut. 15:19; 32:26; Isa. 26:14; Pss. 9:7; 34[33]:17; 109[108]:15; 112[111]:6; Eccl. 9:5; Est. 9:28). In Ps. 6:6 the psalmist complains that "in death there is no remembrance of thee; in Sheol who can give thee praise?" Childs relates Est. 9:28 to the problem of actualizing the past and thus translates the verse: "that the days of Purim should not fall into disuse among the Jews nor should the recounting of them cease among the descendants" (op. cit., 72). He also suggests that *zēḵer* in Ps. 111(110):4 refers primarily to the act of proclaiming, which in turn leads to the acts being remembered. Childs concludes that *zēḵer* "is not used primarily as a means of renewing the redemptive traditions of Israel, and that it should be carefully distinguished from *zikkārôn*" (op. cit., 73).

(d) Whether one assigns certain passages to the Priestly writer will depend on the view one takes of the authorship and composition of the Pentateuch. This in turn will have a bearing on how the appeal to memory is seen as developing in the worship and history of Israel. Childs sees memory as deeply related to Israel's cult "as a means of actualizing the past. In times of crisis, when the role of the cult was threatened, Israel's memory assumed a new significance in renewing her tradition" (op. cit., 80). S. Mowinckel saw this process of actualization against the wider background of the mythopoeic thought of the ancient Near East (cf. *The Psalms in Israel's Worship*, I–II, 1962). The cult serves to renew the structure of the world by re-enacting the sacred drama of the myth. The content of the myth is renewed and the participants experience its elemental power. Childs is among those who object to this on the grounds that it fails to do justice to the fact that in Israel the myth was replaced by historical events (op. cit., 82; cf. G. von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, II, 1965, 99–125). Moreover, these events could not be repeated; they were fixed in time. A view which is diametrically opposed to Mowinckel's sees the process of actualization as the recital in the cult of the great historical events of the past which established Israel's existence. "Actualization occurs when the worshipper experiences

an identification with the original events. He bridges the gap of historical time and participates in the original history" (B. S. Childs, op. cit., 82; cf. M. Noth, "The 'Representation' of the O.T. in Proclamation", in C. Westermann, ed., *Essays on Old Testament Interpretation*, 1963, 76–88; H.-J. Kraus, *Worship in Israel*, 1962).

Childs himself wishes to combine the two positions, while laying greater emphasis on the latter, though he believes that remembering in the OT is more than a mental event. The historical redemptive event "causes a continued reverberation beyond its original entry" (op. cit., 83). On the one hand, it was unique in time and space. But on the other hand, redemptive history continues. "It means more than that the influence of a past event continued to be felt in successive generations, which obvious fact no one could possibly deny. Rather, there was an immediate encounter, an actual participation in the great acts of redemption .... Actualization is the process by which a past event is contemporized for a generation removed in time and space from the original event. When later Israel responded to the continuing imperative of her tradition through her memory, that moment in historical time likewise became an Exodus experience. Not in the sense that later Israel again crossed the Red Sea. This was an irreversible, once-for-all event. Rather, Israel entered the same redemptive reality of the Exodus generation" (op. cit., 84 f.).

There is much in Childs' work which commands assent. Nevertheless, it may be questioned whether the concept of actualization may not be taken too far. For the data which Childs examines do not warrant the conclusion that the past event is somehow made present. Rather, it is the living God, Yahweh, who is ever present. Past history serves to give the present its shape. And reflection on the past serves to remind the believing Israelite that Yahweh can be counted upon to remain true. In this respect, the appeal to memory has a double function: it serves as a basis of appeal to Yahweh in prayer; and as such it also serves to encourage the believing Israelite that, however black his present predicament may be, he can still count on Yahweh. (For further discussion on the rôle of history in biblical thought see C. Brown, ed., *History, Criticism and Faith*, 1977, especially 13–75, 147–224.)

5. In the LXX *mnēmosynon* also translates the Heb. *'azkārâh*, the memorial meal offering which was burnt with oil and frankincense as a pleasing odour to Yahweh (Lev. 2:2, 9, 16; 6:8[15]; Num. 5:26; → Sacrifice). In the case of the very poor it could serve as a sin offering (Lev. 5:12). All the passages where *'azkārâh* occurs are widely attributed to P. On the use of *anamnēsis* to translate the term in Lev. 24:7 see below, 9. On the offering see R. de Vaux, *Studies in Old Testament Sacrifice*, 1964, 30.

6. The LXX uses *mneia*, remembrance, for phrases with the vb. *zāḵar* (Deut. 7:18; Job 14:13; Isa. 26:13; Jer. 31[28]:20; Ezek. 21:37[32]: 25:10; Zech. 13:2), for *zēḵer* (Ps. 111[110]:4; Isa. 28:6), and without equivalent in Isa. 32:10; Bar. 4:27; 5:5; Wis. 5:14.

7. The LXX uses *mnēmē* for *zēḵer* (Pss. 30[29]:4; 97[96]:12; 145[144]:7; Prov. 10:7; Eccl. 9:5), for *ziḵrôn*, memorial (Eccl. 1:11; 2:16) and without Heb. equivalent (Prov. 1:12; Wis. 4:1, 19; 8:13; 10:8; 11:12; 2 Macc. 2:25; 7:20).

8. Two cognate nouns are found in the LXX in the sense of memorial, grave: *mnēma* for *qeḇer* (Exod. 14:11; Num. 11:34 f.; 19:16, 18; 33:16 f.; Deut. 9:22; 2 Chr. 16:14; 34:4, 28; Job 10:19; Isa. 65:4; Jer. 26[33]:23; Ezek. 32:26; 37:12) and *q^{e}ḇûrâh* (Ezek. 32:23 f.); and *mnēmeion* for the same pair of words, *qeḇer* (Gen.

23:6, 9; 49:30; 50:5, 13; Neh. 2:3, 5; Isa. 22:16; Jer. 26[33]:23; Ezek. 39:11) and *qᵉḇûrâh* (Gen. 35:20). (→ further Bury, Grave, Tomb.)

9. The noun *anamnēsis*, remembrance, which features in the words of institution in the → Lord's Supper is comparatively rare. In Lev. 24:7 it stands for *'azkārâh*, which was a memorial offering (see above, 5): "And you shall put pure frankincense with each row, that it may go with the bread as a memorial portion [MT *lᵉ'azkārâh*; LXX *eis anamnēsin*] to be offered by fire to the LORD." This particular *'azkārâh* was evidently intended to be a perpetual reminder of the → covenant, to be offered every → sabbath: "Every sabbath day Aaron shall set it in order before the LORD continually on behalf of the people of Israel as a covenant for ever. And it shall be for Aaron and his sons, and they shall eat it in a holy place, since it is for him a most holy portion out of the offerings by fire to the LORD, a perpetual due" (Lev. 24:8 f.). There would seem to be no propitiatory element in this offering. On the other hand, the memorial aspect of it seems to have had a double reference, i.e. a God-ward and a man-ward reference. Just as Yahweh may be said to remember and was called upon to remember, the offering may have been regarded as an appeal to Yahweh's covenant faithfulness. At the same time it was a reminder to Israel of Yahweh's covenant faithfulness. The fact that only the → priests might eat it indicates not only the holy character of the offering but their representative rôle on behalf of the people.

Num. 10:10 has also a cultic context but the Heb. noun is *zikkārôn* (see above, 4 (c) (i)): "On the day of your gladness also, and at your appointed feasts, and at the beginning of your months, you shall blow the trumpets over your burnt offerings and over the sacrifices of your peace offerings; they will serve you for remembrance before your God [MT *wᵉhāyû lāḵem lᵉzikkārôn lip̄ᵉnê YHWH 'ᵉlōhêḵem*; LXX *kai estai hymin anamnēsis enanti tou theou hymōn*]: I am the LORD your God." The expression "before the LORD" coupled with the context of the previous verse suggests that the remembering here too has a God-ward reference which indeed is primary, although the man-ward reference is implicit: "And when you go to war in your land against the adversary who oppresses you, then you shall sound an alarm with the trumpets, that you may be remembered before the LORD your God [MT *wᵉnizkartem lip̄ᵉnê YHWH 'ᵉlōhêḵem*; LXX *kai anamnēsthēsesthe enanti kyriou*], and you shall be saved from your enemies" (Num. 10:9; → Trumpet).

anamnēsis occurs in the titles of Ps. 38 (LXX 37; "A Psalm of David, for the memorial offering" RSV) and Ps. 70 (LXX 69; "To the choirmaster. A Psalm of David, for the memorial offering"). On the titles of the Pss. see A. A. Anderson, *The Book of Psalms, New Century Bible*, I, 1972, 43–51. Their origin and value with regard to the interpretation of the Pss. are very uncertain. The contents of neither Ps. make explicit reference to the cult, and S. Mowinckel thinks that the purpose was to remind Yahweh of the distress of the worshippers (*The Psalms in Israel's Worship*, 1962, II, 212). The MT uses the hiphil of the vb. *zāḵar*.

In the Apocrypha *anamnēsis* occurs only in Wis. 16:6 with a clear man-ward reference: "But for admonition they were troubled for a short space, having a token of salvation, to put them in remembrance of the commandment of thy law [*eis anamnēsin entolēs nomou sou*]."

The vb. *anamimnēskō*, remember, is a little more frequent than the noun, and always stands for *zāḵar* where there is a Heb. equivalent (Gen. 8:1; 41:9; Exod. 23:13; Num. 5:15; 10:9; 2 Sam. 18:18; 20:24; 1 Ki. 4:3; 17:18; 2 Ki. 18:18, 37;

Neh. 9:17; Job 24:20; Ps. 109[108]:14; Jer. 4:16; Ezek. 21:28 f. |24 f.|; 23:19; 29:16; 33: 13, 16). There is no corresponding Heb. in 1 Ki. 3:1; Sir. 3:15; 4 Macc. 16:18. *C. Brown*

NT 1. Altogether 72% of all the passages in the NT reflect normal Gk. usage. They bear the following meanings:

(a) To remember, call to mind (20% of NT instances; 50% in profane Gk.). Thus, "Peter remembered [*emnēsthē*] the saying of Jesus, 'Before the cock crows, you will deny me three times.' And he went out and wept bitterly" (Matt. 26:75; here *mimnēskomai* is used as a reflexive vb., to remind oneself, i.e. to remember, with the object in the gen.). In the par. passages the other synoptic evangelists use different cognates: "Peter remembered [*anemnēsthē*]" (Mk. 14:72; the passive of *anamimnēskō*, remind); "Peter remembered [*hypemnēsthē*]" (Lk. 22:61; the passive of *hypomimnēskō*, remind). Similarly, Matt. 16:9: "Do you not yet perceive? Do you not remember [*mnēmoneuete*] the five loaves of the five thousand, and how many baskets you gathered?" (cf. par. Mk. 8:18). 2 Pet. 1:15 uses a verbal phrase: "And I will see to it that after my departure you may be able at any time to recall these things [*tēn toutōn mnēmēn poieisthai*]." In 2 Tim. 1:6 the vb. *anamimnēskō* means to remind, and governs the acc. of the person and the infinitive: "Hence I remind you to rekindle the gift of God that is within you through the laying on of my hands." This basic secular sense is used in all these passages to draw theological lessons. Peter's memory of Jesus' warning about his denial underlines the folly of self-confidence, the loving way in which Jesus handled Peter, and the part of remorse in repentance and restoration. In the case of Matt. 16:9 par. Mk. 8:18, memory of Jesus' past actions should have sustained the disciples' faith in present difficulties. And in the other two passages cited, remembering plays an important part in sustaining the life of faith.

(b) To consider (6.5% of the NT instances; 5% in profane Gk.). "Remember [*mnēmoneuete*] Lot's wife" (Lk. 17:32; cf. Gen. 19:26; Wis. 10:6 ff.; 2 Pet. 2:7 f.; SB III 769 ff.). The object is in the gen. The example of Lot's wife in refusing to give herself totally to escaping the → judgment on Sodom and Gomorrah served as a warning to be considered in both Jewish and Christian teaching. In Heb. 10:32 the object is in the acc.: "But recall [*anamnēskesthe*] the former days when, after you were enlightened, you endured a hard struggle with sufferings." The allusion is uncertain, but Heb. 12:4 suggests a persecution which had stopped short at martyrdom. This could have been the expulsion of Jews from Rome in A.D. 49, when rioting among the Jewish colony may have been caused by the introduction of Christianity (cf. Suetonius, *Claudius* 24, 4; Acts 18:2; F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, *NLC*, 1964, 266–70; and "Christianity under Claudius", *BJRL* 44, 1961–62, 309 ff.). In Lk. 16:25 *mnēsthēti* is followed by a dependent clause: "But Abraham said, 'Son, remember that you in your lifetime received your good things, and Lazarus in like manner evil things; but now he is comforted here, and you are in anguish" (on the parable see especially J. D. M. Derrett, "Dives and Lazarus and the Preceding Sayings", in *Law in the New Testament*, 1970, 78–99). Here again, remembering in the form of considering, plays – or should play – an important part in the conduct of life.

(c) To remember for good, to remember in a way which will benefit the person concerned in some way or other (14.5% of the NT instances; 10% in profane Gk.).

Here the passages are either OT quotations or have strong OT overtones. Mary's psalm *The Magnificat* recalls: "He has helped his servant Israel, in remembrance of his mercy [*mnēsthēnai eleous*]" (Lk. 1:54; cf. Ps. Sol. 10:4; → Mercy). Zechariah's psalm blesses God for fulfilling his promises "to perform the mercy promised to our fathers, and to remember [*mnēsthēnai*] his holy covenant" (Lk. 1:72; cf. Exod. 2:24; 6:5; Pss. 105[104]:8; 106[105]:7. 45). Heb. 8:12 also operates within the theology of the → covenant, taking up the promise of Jer. 31:34: "For I will be merciful toward their iniquities, and I will remember [*mnēsthō*] their sins no more." The same passage is again cited in Heb. 10:17. The plea of the penitent thief means in effect, "Save me!": "Jesus, remember me [*mnēstheti mou*] when you come in your kingly power" (Lk. 23:42; → Paradise). Gal. 2:10 refers to the eagerness of James, Peter and John, in extending the right hand of fellowship to Paul and Barnabas in their mission to the Gentiles, to "have us remember the poor [*tōn ptōchōn hina mnēmoneuōmen*], which very thing I was eager to do" (Gal. 2:10). On this aspect of the Christian mission → Poor, art. *ptōchos*. Rev. 18:5 expresses the converse aspect of this kind of remembering in the oracles against → Babylon: "for her sins are heaped high as heaven, and God has remembered [*emnēmoneusen*] her inquities."

(d) To be mindful of (26% of the NT instances; 10% in profane Gk.). In most of these cases the translation "to remember" would be too weak. Rather, the remembering is seen as a positive force which affects one's behaviour (cf. 1 Esd. 4:22 LXX). Thus Heb. 11:15 might be paraphrased: "If their hearts had still been [*mnēmoneuousin*] in that land from which they had gone out, they would have had opportunity to return." The allusion is to the departure of → Abraham from Ur and his sojourning in the land with his dependants prior to the settlement of Israel in the promised land (Gen. 11:31 ff.). 2 Pet. was written expressly "that you should remember [*mnēsthēnai*] the predictions of the holy prophets and the commandment of the Lord and Saviour through the apostles" (2 Pet. 3:2). O. Michel claims that this "is not meant in a historicizing or intellectual sense .... To remind the congregation is to bear witness to the Gospel; to remind oneself is to place oneself under the Word of Jesus. Here, too, the whole man is embraced" (*TDNT* IV 678). Similarly Timothy is exhorted: "Remind them of this [*tauta hypomimnēske*], and charge them before the Lord to avoid disputing about words, which does no good, but only ruins the hearers" (2 Tim. 2:14). In 1 Cor. 11:2 *hoti memnēsthe* means *"that you have regard for* me to such an extent that [epexegetical *kai*] you maintain the tradition even as I delivered it to you." In 2 Tim. 1:5 *hypomnēsin labōn* conveys the force of "having become convinced". According to 1 Cor. 4:17, Timothy has been sent to the Corinthians "to remind [*hos anamnēsei*] you of my ways in Christ, as I teach them everywhere in every church." For similar meanings which go beyond the merely intellectual exercise of bringing the past to mind, see 2 Pet. 1:12 f.; Jude 5, 17; 2 Pet. 3:1; Acts 11:16; Heb. 13:3.

(e) To mention (5% of the NT instances; 25% in profane Gk.). This may be the sense in 2 Cor. 7:15, although the context implies that what Titus is doing here is not something casual: "And his heart goes out all the more to you, as he remembers [*anamimnēskomenou*] the obedience of you all, and the fear and trembling with which you received him." *hypomnēsō* in 3 Jn. 10 means "I will bring up", i.e. the elder will raise the question of the actions of Diotrephes before the church council. In the vision of Rev. 16:19 great → Babylon "was remembered before God [*emnēsthe*

enōpion tou theou], i.e. arraigned before God, her condemnation being expressed by the infinitive clause "to make her drain the cup of the fury of his wrath" (cf. Rev. 18:5 see above (c); Ps. 109[108]:14).

2. The specifically biblical usage occurs only in 28% of the NT passages.

(a) To mention in prayer, to remember in → prayer. The two phrases *mneian poioumenoi* "mentioning" and *mnēmoneuontes* "remembering" in 1 Thess. 1:2 f. both mean to intercede. In Acts 10:4 Cornelius the centurion is told by an angel of God, "Your prayers and your alms have ascended as a memorial before God [*anebēsan eis mnēmosynon emprosthen tou theou*]." E. Haenchen thinks that the meaning here is simply that the prayers and alms are remembered before God, and that the connexion with the burnt part of the meal offering is too remote to see any association (*The Acts of the Apostles*, 1971, 347; cf. OT 5 above). On the other hand, F. F. Bruce sees in the use of *mnēmosynon* a "sacrificial efficacy" in Cornelius's conduct (*The Acts of the Apostles*, 1952², 216; cf. Ps. 111[110]:2; Phil. 4:18; Heb. 13:15 f.; Tob. 12:12). In Acts 10:31 *emnesthēsan* ("have been remembered") is substituted in the case of the alms, and the prayer is simply said to have been heard. The passage may be compared with the prayer of the righteous for vengeance in Eth. Enoch 47:1 f.

(b) To proclaim. "Therefore I intend always to remind [*hypomimnēskein*] you of these things, though you know them and are established in the truth that you have [*en tē parousē alētheia*]. I think it right, as long as I am in this body, to arouse you by way of reminder [*en hypomnēsei*]" (2 Pet. 1:12 f.). Here the reminding is understood in terms of presenting again the known truth of the gospel. According to Jn. 14:26, such reminding is the work of the Holy Spirit as the paraclete: "But the Counselor [*paraklētos*], the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, he will teach you all things, and bring to your remembrance [*kai hypomnēsei hymas*] all that I have said to you" (→ Advocate). As Christ's hearers bring to mind the message which they have heard from him and which therefore in some measure remains within them, the Holy Spirit enables them to proclaim the Lordship of Christ in ways which are relevant to each succeeding generation. There are overtones of this sense of proclamation in 1 Cor. 4:17 (see above (d)). There is a sense in which Paul himself is being proclaimed to the Corinthians, for the apostle is part and parcel of the eschatological event (cf. R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, I, 1952, 303 ff.).

Similarly, the woman who anointed Jesus becomes part of the NT proclamation: "And truly, I say to you, wherever the gospel is preached in the whole world, what she has done will be told in memory of her [*eis mnēmosynon autēs*]" (Mk. 14:9; cf. Matt. 26:13). J. Jeremias has argued that the verse refers not to the church's mission in the world but to the last judgment, where the woman will be remembered by God ("Mc. 14, 9", *ZNW* 44, 1952–53, 103–7). J. H. Greenlee takes it to mean that the action served as her memorial to Jesus in view of his impending death ("*eis mnēmosynon autēs*, 'For her memorial', Mt. xxvi. 13; Mk. xiv. 9", *ExpT* 71, 1959–60, 245). For further discussion see A. L. Moore, *The Parousia in the New Testament, Supplements to NovT* 13, 1966; and W. L. Lane, *The Gospel of Mark*, *NLC* 1974, 494 f. Lane draws attention to Ps. 41(40):2, where the one who protects the poor is assured of the blessing of Yahweh. The disciples might at first sight appear to be well qualified for this benediction in view of their suggestion about selling

the ointment and using the proceeds for the poor. "It is the woman, however, who receives Jesus' praise for her response to the poor man above all others who is about to suffer for the people of God" (Lane, op. cit., 494). Jesus' pronouncement in v. 8, that "She has done what she could; she has anointed my body beforehand for burying", indicates that Jesus anticipated that he would suffer a criminal's death, for only in such circumstances would there be no anointing of the body (D. Daube, "The Anointing at Bethany and Jesus' Burial", *Anglican Theological Review* 32, 1950, 187 f.). V. 9 looks beyond the crucifixion to the post-resurrection church situation of the → proclamation of the → gospel.

Exhortation in the form of *anamnēsis* or *hypomnēsis* is a marked feature of the Christian message: "Hence I remind [*anamimnēskō*] you to rekindle the gift of God that is within you through the laying on of my hands" (2 Tim. 1:6; → Gift; → Hand, art. *epitithēmi*); "Remind [*hypomimnēske*] them to be submissive to rulers and authorities, to be obedient, to be ready for any honest work" (Tit. 3:1).

(c) To believe. "Remember Jesus Christ [*mnēmoneue Iēsoun Christon*], risen from the dead, descended from David, as preached in my gospel" (2 Tim. 2:8). What is to be remembered is a short credal statement (→ Confess; → Proclamation). It may be compared with the somewhat longer form in Rom 1:3 f., where the order is chronological. Stress is laid on the fact that these truths are integral to the apostolic gospel. See further J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, 1972[3], 1–29; V. H. Neufeld, *The Earliest Christian Confessions, New Testament Tools and Studies* 5, 1963; O. Cullmann, *The Earliest Christian Confessions*, 1949; E. Stauffer, *New Testament Theology*, 1955, 244–48.

(d) To confess. Referring to the sacrifices under the old covenant, Heb. 10:3 declares: "But in these sacrifices there is a reminder of sin [*anamnēsis hamartiōn*] year after year." Here the allusion may well be to the Day of Atonement ritual (Lev. 16), which involved public acknowledgment of sins committed in the past year (cf. J. A. Bengel, *Gnomon of the New Testament*, IV, 1866[6], 4219 ff.; F. F. Bruce, op. cit., 228 f., who draws attention to Num. 5:15, where the ordeal of jealousy involves "a meal-offering of memorial, bringing iniquity to remembrance", and Jub. 34:19, where the Day of Atonement is the anniversary of the day on which Joseph was sold by his brothers, and "has been ordained that they should grieve for all their sins, and for all their errors, so that they might cleanse themselves on that day once a year"). As the OT sacrifices cannot remove sin, their effect is to expose it, so that he who brings an offering for sin year by year, is thereby confessing that he is, and remains, a sinner (cf. K. H. Bartels, *Gedächtnis*, 26 and notes 209 f.).

3. The only other NT instances of *anamnēsis* occur in the Pauline and Lucan accounts of the Last Supper (→ Lord's Supper): "and when he had given thanks, he broke it, and said, 'This is my body which is for you. Do this in remembrance of me [*touto poieite eis tēn emēn anamnēsin*].' In the same way also the cup, after supper, saying, 'This cup is the new covenant in my blood. Do this, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of me [*touto poieite, hosakis ean pinēte, eis tēn emēn anamnēsin*]' " (1 Cor. 11:24 f.); "And he took bread, and when he had given thanks he broke it and gave it to them, saying, 'This is my body which is given for you. Do this in remembrance of me [*touto poiete eis tēn emēn anamnēsin*]' " (Lk. 22:19 RSV mg.; for discussion of the textual variants in Lk. see Metzger, 173–77).

Traditionally, these words have been generally understood to mean that the Lord's

Supper was Jesus' appointed means of being present in the hearts and minds of the community of the church. At one end of the scale, there was the Zwinglian interpretation which saw the Lord's Supper as a kind of *aide mémoire*, a stimulus to the act of mental recollection of Jesus' atoning death. Whether this does full justice to Zwingli himself is open to question (cf. Zwingli *On the Lord's Supper*, 1526, in G. W. Bromiley, ed., *Zwingli and Bulinger, Library of Christian Classics* XXIV, 1953, 176–238). Zwingli believed that the physical body of Christ was risen, ascended, and seated at the right hand of the Father, and therefore could not be present in the Lord's Supper. Moreover, he held that it is the Spirit that gives life (Jn. 6:63), and therefore the access that we have to Christ in remembering him is through the Spirit. At the other end of the scale is the Catholic interpretation which speaks of the real presence of Christ in the eucharist, involving the doctrine of transubstantiation in which the substance of the bread and the wine is changed into the substance of the body and blood of Christ, though the accidents (i.e. the outward appearances) remain. It was defined *de fide* by the Lateran Council of 1215 (cap. 1), received classical formulation by Thomas Aquinas (*Summa Theologiae* 3a, QQ. 75–77), and reaffirmed by the Council of Trent (Session 13, 1551, cap. 4). This was also closely linked with the doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice, in which the eucharist was seen as the means of making present to the church the atoning death of Christ. More recently Catholic theologians have attempted to restate the doctrine of the eucharist. Thus Gregory Dix saw the essence of the early church's understanding of the eucharist as "the recalling before God of the one sacrifice of Christ in all its accomplished and effectual fulness so that it is here and now operative by its effects in the souls of the redeemed" (*The Shape of the Liturgy*, 1945, 243). The Protestant writer, Max Thurian, who is a member of the Taizé community, takes the words *eis tēn emēn anamnēsin* to mean: " 'with a view to my memorial, in memorial of me, as the memorial of me.' This memorial is not a simple subjective act of recollection, it is a liturgical action. But it is not just a liturgical action which makes the Lord present, it is a liturgical action which recalls as a memorial before the Father the unique sacrifice of the Son, and this makes Him present in His memorial, in the presentation of His sacrifice before the Father and in His intercession as heavenly High Priest. The eucharistic memorial is a recalling to us, a recalling by us to the Father and a recalling of the Son to the Father for us. Hence the eucharistic memorial is a proclamation by the Church; it is a thanksgiving and intercession of Christ for the Church" (*The Eucharistic Memorial*, II, *The New Testament, Ecumenical Studies in Worship* 8, 1961, 35 f.).

A somewhat different line of approach, which nevertheless sees these words of Jesus as having a God-ward reference, is taken by J. Jeremias in *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, 1966, 249–55. Jeremias takes the phrase to mean: "that God may remember me." He claims that in such passages as Mk. 14:9 (par. Matt. 26:13), Acts 10:4 and in the OT and Palestinian memorial formulae, it is almost always God who remembers (op. cit., 251 f.; cf. 246–49). He also cites the Passover Haggadah prayer which may in essence go back to the time of Jesus: "Our God and God of our fathers, may there arise, and come, and come unto, be seen, accepted, heard, recollected and remembered, the remembrance of us and the recollection of us, and the remembrance of our fathers, and the *remembrance of the Messiah, son of David, thy servant (zikrôn māšîaḥ ben Dāwiḏ 'aḇdekā)*, and the remembrance of Jerusalem

thy holy city, and the remembrance of all thy people, the house of Israel. May their remembrance come before thee, for rescue, goodness ..." (op. cit., 252). In other words, Jeremias contends that the command for repetition may be understood as " 'This do, that God may remember me'; *God remembers the Messiah in that he causes the kingdom to break in by the parousia"* (ibid.). Paul's explanation in v. 26 ("For as often as you eat this bread and drink the cup, you proclaim the Lord's death until he comes") is taken by Jeremias to mean: *"As often as the death of the Lord is proclaimed at the Lord's supper, and the maranatha rises upwards, God is reminded of the unfulfilled climax of the work of salvation* 'until (the goal is reached, that) he comes' " (op. cit., 253; → Present, art. *maranatha*).

It should be observed that Jeremias is making a point which is rather different from the older Catholic interpretations and even that of Thurian. There is nothing in his argument which suggests a doctrine of the real presence of Christ or a eucharistic sacrifice which either repeats or extends that of Christ on the cross. Its emphasis is eschatological. The Lord's Supper would thus be an enacted prayer comparable with Ps. 132(131):1: "Lord, remember David [*mnēsthēti, kyrie, Dauid*]." It might also be compared with the vision of the fifth seal in Rev. 6:9 f., where the souls of the martyrs under the altar "cried out with a loud voice, 'O Sovereign Lord, holy and true, how long before thou wilt judge and avenge our blood on those who dwell upon the earth?' " Jeremias sees this interpretation as essentially Jewish and Palestinian in outlook, making it "very probable that the command goes back to Jesus himself" (op. cit., 255).

However, Jeremias's view has not been universally endorsed. Although he can point to Did. 10:5 f. for supporting testimony to prayer in the early church for the eschatological remembrance of God and to the OT for the idea of God remembering, his view does not rule out other interpretations. *touto poieite* ("This do") may be regarded as a summary of the procedure to be followed by participants in the Lord's Supper. They are to act as Jesus did, when instituting the Supper on the eve of his passion, according to the Synoptic account. All the words and actions are intended to be *eis tēn emēn anamnēsin.* Comparison with the passages discussed in OT 2 (d) and with Heb. 10:3 suggests that this command to repeat the words and actions may be paraphrased as follows: "Do this, by eating the bread and drinking the cup (i.e. by participating in my life and death), by the preaching of the word (1 Cor. 11:26) and the singing of praise." The word *anamnēsis* covers all these ideas. For a detailed analysis see Bartels, *Gedächtnis*, 27–42 and notes 212–334, where the most important literature on the subject is also discussed (→ further Body; → Blood; → Fellowship; → Song; cf. Mk. 14:26).

In the early church liturgies of the Lord's Supper, which give a fuller interpretation of the words of institution, the *anamnēsis* is expanded into a credal statement which is sometimes quite extensive. Evidence of this is found as early as Justin Martyr (*Dial.* 70, 4) and in the so-called Church Order of Hippolytus (cf. Bartels, *Gedächtnis*, 42–49 and notes 336–39). Accordingly in the ancient church it was the legal duty of baptized church members to participate in the Lord's Supper (*Apostolic Constitutions* 8, 47, 9), such participation being forbidden to all who were not full members (*Apostolic Constitutions* 12, 1 f.).

4. The original meanings of the *mimnēskō* word-group were entirely non-religious, ranging from sexual desire to the heights of philosophy. However, as a result of their

adoption into the Gk. scriptures as renderings of Heb. and ancient eastern equivalents, the Gk. words underwent a significant expansion of meaning, particularly along the lines of public worship (Schottroff, op. cit., passim). In this matter the NT followed implicitly in the footsteps of the OT, largely defying common Gk. usage.

What makes this so significant is the fact that the Gk. of the NT possesses so many other words relating to public worship, and yet this, the *mnē-* group, is introduced into early Christian vocabulary for use in this special area, with the result that what has been an altogether peripheral meaning in profane Gk. now becomes central. This is a sure sign that existing NT words were felt to be inadequate. In both OT and NT, the public worship of God (including sacrifice) belongs to the sphere of the historical. God's revelation, unlike the nature religions, does not follow the birth-and-death cycles of nature; it is no automatically unfolding process as in the mystery religions or in gnosticism. Rather, it occurs within the course of history (although not confined to history, cf. R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, I, 1952, 25 f.) stretching from yesterday, through today, and on into the future, from Sinai to Calvary, from the OT covenant people to the church of Christ, then on to us and eventually to the end of the age and God's eternal kingdom. Hence, all the church's worship is and always has been historical, verbal and personal, rather than nature-orientated, mystical or dramatic. This is true of the preaching of the word, which aims to give outward expression to something which has happened in the past, by removing it from the wrappings of memory or of oral or written tradition and so recalling it to men's minds. The same applies also to the Lord's Supper, instituted at a precise time and place to be a "remembrance" of Christ throughout a definite period in the church's history, namely, "till he come" (1 Cor. 11:26). The Supper has its roots in the historical event of Christ's passion, so, as in the case of preaching, each time it takes place it is "in remembrance of" Jesus Christ. We give outward, visual expression to what we inwardly remember in order once again to "feed on him in our hearts by faith".

God's "remembrance" of his people (expressed in preaching) dovetails with his people's "remembrance" of him in praise and testimony. Within the context of revelation, God's remembrance is expressed verbally, i.e. it is addressed to men's minds and is personal, but it is not therefore mere words. "God's remembering is thus an efficacious and creative event" (O. Michel, *TDNT* IV 675). It can bring → blessing (Gen. 30:22) or → judgment (Rev. 16:19). Man's response is similarly "remembrance", expressed not only verbally in the ordinance of public worship, but in a manner which involves the whole person as only eating and drinking can do, i.e. in the Lord's Supper; and, over and above all this, expressed tangibly in collecting money for the poor (Gal. 2:10). Hence, words of the *mnē-* group cover a concept which is fundamental to the Bible and which embraces the whole of divine and human life: the "Word" of revelation and the "response" of faith.

5. Finally, the instances in the NT of the following nouns may be noted: *mneia*, remembrance (1 Thess. 3:6; 2 Tim. 1:3), mention, in the NT only in prayer (Rom. 1:9; Eph. 1:16; 1 Thess. 1:2; Phil. 1:3; Phlm. 4); *mnēma*, lit. a sign of remembrance, especially for the dead, and thus a grave or tomb (Mk. 5:3 par. Lk. 8:27; Mk. 15:46 par. Lk. 23:53; Mk. 16:2 par. Lk. 24:1; Acts 2:29; Rev. 11:9); *mnēmeion*, lit. a token of remembrance, especially for the dead, and hence a monument or memorial

(probably Lk. 11:47) and a grave or tomb (Matt. 8:28 par. Mk. 5:2; Matt. 23:29 par. Lk. 11:47; Matt. 27:52 f., 60 par. Mk. 15:46, Jn. 19:41 f.; Matt. 28:8 par. Mk. 16:8; Mk. 6:29; 16:2 f., 5; Lk. 11:44; 23:55; 24:2, 9, 12 *v. l.*, 22, 24; Jn. 5:28; 11:17, 31, 38; 12:17; 20:1–4, 6, 8, 11; Acts 13:29). *hypomnēsis* (2 Tim. 1:5; 2 Pet. 1:13; 3:1) is virtually identical in meaning with *anamnēsis* in the act. sense. For further discussion → Bury; → Lord's Supper, → Proclamation; → Resurrection *K. H. Bartels*

(a). J. Behm, *anamnēsis* etc., *TDNT* I 348 f.; E. P. Blair, "An Appeal to Remembrance: The Memory Motif in Deuteronomy", *Interpretation* 51, 1961, 41 ff.; B. S. Childs, *Memory and Tradition in Israel, SBT* 37, 1962; G. Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, 1945; J. Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, 1966²; D. Gregg, *Anamnesis in the Eucharist*, 1976; D. Jones, *"anamnēsis* in the Septuagint and the Interpretation of 1 Cor. xi. 25", *JTS* New Series 6, 1955, 183 ff.; E. Käsemann, "The Pauline Doctrine of the Lord's Supper", *Essays on New Testament Themes*, 1964, 108–35; A. Oepke and R. Meyer, *kryptō* etc., *TDNT* III 957–1000; O. Michel, *mimnēskomai* etc., *TDNT* IV 675–83; M. Noth, "The 'Representation' of the O.T. in Proclamation", in C. Westermann, ed., *Essays on Old Testament Interpretation*, 1963, 76–88; J. J. Petuchowski, " 'Do this in Remembrance of Me' (1 Cor. 11:24)", *JBL* 76, 1957, 293 ff.; M. Thurian, *The Eucharistic Memorial*, I *The Old Testament*, II *The New Testament, Ecumenical Studies in Worship* 7 and 8, 1961.
(b). K. H. Bartels, *Dies tut zu meinem Gedächtnis. Zur Auslegung von 1 Kor. 11, 24, 25* (Dissertation, Mainz, with extensive bibliography), 1959; and "Der theoretische Quellort der 'Sammlung' und ihre Parole 'Katholische Reformation' ", *EvTh* 20, 1960, 364 ff.; J. Begrich, "*sôpēr* und *mazkîr*" *ZAW* Neue Folge 17, 1940–41, 1 ff.; P. A. H. de Boer, *Gedenken und Gedächtnis in der Welt des Alten Testaments*, 1962; P. Bonnard, "Die Anamnesis, eine grundlegende Struktur des Urchristentums", in *Zeichen der Zeit*, 1971, 81–88; P. Brunner, "Zur Lehre vom Gottesdienst", *Leiturgia* 1, 1954, 84 ff.; N. A. Dahl, "Anamnesis: Mémoire et Commemoration du Christianisme primitif", *StTh* 1, 1947, 69–95; O. Haggenmüller, "Erinnern und Vergessen Gottes und der Menschen", *Bibel und Leben* 3, 1962, 1 ff.; J. Jeremias, "Mk. 14, 9", *ZNW* 44, 1952–53, 103 ff.; P. Neuenzeit, *Das Herrenmahl. Studien zur paulinischen Eucharistieauffassung*, 1960; H. Graf Reventlow, "Das Amt des *mazkîr*", *ThZ* Basel 15, 1959, 161 ff.; G. Schmidt, *"MNESTHETI"*, in *Viva Vox Evangelii*, Festschrift W. Meiser, 1951, 259 ff.; W. Schottroff, *"Gedenken" im Alten Orient und im Alten Testament, Wissenschaftliche Monographien* 15, 1964; and *zākar*, *THAT* I 507–18.

Remnant, Leave

λεῖμμα

λείπω (*leipō*), leave, leave behind, lack; λοιπός (*loipos*), remaining, other; λεῖμμα (*leimma*), remnant; καταλείπω (*kataleipō*), leave, leave behind, leave over; κατάλειμμα (*kataleimma*), remnant; ὑπόλειμμα (*hypoleimma*), remnant.

CL The basic Gk. vb. *leipō* (found as early as Mycenaean Gk., related to Lat. *linquere*, Eng. *leave*) means to leave, leave behind, leave over. As an intrans. active, it can assume the meaning of to be lacking (e.g. *soi polla leipei*, you lack much). There are various compound derivatives: *kataleipō*, to leave behind, leave remaining; *hypoleipō*, to leave remaining; *perileipomai*, to survive (all these are found in Homer, e.g. *Il.* 10, 238; *Od.* 16, 50; *Il.* 19, 230); and *dialeipō*, to cease (Xenophon, *Apology* 16). Later derivatives are the adjectives *loipos*, remaining (Pindar); and *kataloipos*, left over (Plato). The rare noun *leimma*, remnant, residue, occurs from Hdt. onwards; the LXX has also *kataleimma*, with the same meaning. Neither the vbs. nor the nouns acquired in Gk. any special nuance or religious meaning, apart from the general meaning of to leave, leave remaining, remnant, residue (of persons and

things). This is true even in the writings of Josephus who, instead of the nouns, generally used *to leipsanon*, the remainder (cf. Eur. *Medea* 1387; Josephus, *Ant.* 11, 213; *War* 4, 414).

OT 1. In the LXX *leipō* and its derivatives are used in most cases for the following Heb. verbs and their derivatives: (a) *šā'ar* (niphal, to be left remaining; hiphil, to leave remaining; some 200 times in the MT); (b) *'āzaḇ*, to forsake (niphal, to be forsaken; some 200 times); *pālaṭ*, to escape (22 times in piel meaning to save); (e) *śāraḏ*, to run away (once only, Jos. 10:20; the derivative *śārîḏ*, survivor, occurs however 28 times).

The noun *leimma* is found only once (2 Ki. 19:4, for *šᵉ'ērîṯ*, remnant); the vb. *leipō* in all 8 times (3 times for 3 different Heb. verbs, 4 times in the Apocrypha, and at Prov. 11:3 giving a different sense from that of the MT); but the adj. *loipos* more than 120 times (mostly for *yeṯer*, remnant, and 10 times for *šᵉ'ār* or *šᵉ'ērîṯ*, remnant). Most frequent of all, however, with nearly 300 instances, is *kataleipō*, chiefly for *šā'ar*, to be left remaining, to leave remaining; *'āzaḇ*, to forsake; and *yāṯar*, to be left remaining, to leave remaining. The adj. *kataloipos* (over 90 times) is used in most cases for *šᵉ'ār* or *yeṯer*, remnant; the noun *kataleimma* (21 times) usually for *šᵉ'ār* or *šᵉ'ērîṯ*, remnant, but also twice for *śārîḏ*, escapee. *hypoleipō* (c. 90 times) is likewise used for *šā'ar*, *yāṯar* and other Heb. vbs. Less frequent is the noun *hypoleimma*, remnant, which occurs 9 times in all, rendering in 6 instances derivatives of *šā'ar* and once *śārîḏ*, survivor. *perileipō* and *periloipos* translate derivates of *šā'ar* and *yāṯar*. Differences of meaning between the various compounds of *leipō* used to translate Heb. words are especially marked in the case of *dialeipō*, to cease (10 times for various Heb. vbs.), and *ekleipō*, to cease, come to an end (over 150 instances), neither of which are ever used for *šā'ar* or *yāṯar*.

2. In the general sense most of these vbs. are used of things to describe total destruction with nothing remaining (e.g. Exod. 10:15, where the locusts leave nothing remaining; Exod. 10:19, the locusts are not left remaining, i.e. they are totally removed), or to refer to a remnant which survives (e.g. Isa. 10:19, where the remnant of the forest trees can be counted by a child; Isa. 44:17, 19, where the rest of a tree is fashioned into an idol).

(a) Important uses of the words are the concepts of the remnant in the case of the noun, and to leave remaining in the case of the vb., in the context of the holy → war. Here it is a matter of the total annihilation of peoples or specific groups (Og of Bashan, Num. 21:35; the inhabitants of Ai, Jos. 8:12 ff., or the leaving of survivors after a campaign, a few Anakim in Gaza, Gath and Ashdod, Jos. 11:12).

The terms "remnant" and "survive" can be used to describe the activity of Yahweh in preserving what he has created. Thus in the flood story (10th century B.C.) we find the words: "Only Noah was left [MT *wayyiššā'er;* LXX *kai kateleiphthē*], and those that were with him in the ark" (Gen. 7:23; → Noah).

(b) The military use of the word *šā'ar* is combined with the preserving activity of Yahweh towards the end of the 9th century B.C., in the promise of Yahweh to → Elijah (1 Ki. 19:18) at a time when Israel was threatened from within by apostasy and outwardly by the Syrian Hazael: "Yet I will leave [MT *wᵉhiš'arti*; LXX *kai kataleipseis*] seven thousand in Israel, all the knees that have not bowed to Baal, and every mouth that has not kissed him."

3. (a) The first suggestions of the idea of a remnant of Israel are found in the early prophets. Thus in Amos 5:14 f. we can see the "vague hope of a remnant as yet unspecified" (S. Herrmann, *Die prophetischen Heilserwartungen im Alten Testament*, 1965, 124 f.), when the prophet says that "it may be" (!) that Yahweh will be gracious to "the remnant of Joseph". In Isaiah the military concept of a remnant is given a theological content. In the context of the prophet's exhortation to King Ahaz not to be afraid (cf. Isa. 30:15) and to trust in Yahweh, we find the name of the prophet's son Shear-jashub (*šᵉ'ār yāšûḇ*, "A remnant shall return" (Isa. 7:3). The object of the prophet's exhortation is to save the people from a catastrophe in which, while the people of God will not be totally destroyed, only a remnant will survive. Here the concept of the remnant serves to underline and confirm the dreadfulness of the catastrophe. Those who cannot muster up confidence in Yahweh become a worthless residue (cf. Isa. 30:15 ff.). Herrmann holds that "the concept of the remnant is peripheral to Isaiah's message" (op. cit., 130), but in Isaiah a "forerunner of the doctrine of the remnant" can be seen (U. Stegemann, "Der Restgedanke bei Jesaja", *BZ* Neue Folge 19, 1969, 186). Some scholars hold that the mention of a remnant in Isaiah led in the later, post-exilic period to the addition of various sayings (Isa. 6:13; 10:20 ff.; 11:11 ff.; 28:5 f.), which seek to tone down the prophet's message of → judgment by the thought of the remnant, and to place more emphasis on the remnant in the prophet's message generally.

(b) Even in the first half of the 6th century B.C., the time of the catastrophic downfall of the Southern Kingdom in 597 and 587 B.C., there is no mention of a remnant of Israel which could maintain the hope of a new beginning. Jeremiah threatens that Yahweh will let Judah be annihilated (Jer. 19:11). He compares those who have been left in the land under Zedekiah (*hanniš'ārîm bā'āreṣ*) to bad figs (24:8; → Fruit, art. *sykē*). The remnant of Judah under Gedaliah forfeits the possibility of remaining in the land, when Gedaliah is murdered by Ishmael (Jer. 40:11–15).

In Ezekiel, the concept of the remnant is either excluded (Ezek. 9:8; 11:13; 17:21), or used in an entirely different way. There is a remnant remaining in → Jerusalem after the judgments of Yahweh (war, famine, wild beasts, pestilence); but the only purpose is to bring home to the exiles a proof of the massive destruction of Jerusalem and its inhabitants (cf. W. Eichrodt, *Ezekiel: A Commentary*, 1970, 190 f. on Ezek. 14:22; cf. 12:16, where the survivors are to "confess all their abominations among the nations where they go", i.e. the self-condemnation of Israel).

For Jeremiah and Ezekiel alike, the true remnant is represented by the company of exiles, i.e. by those who have survived the catastrophe through deportation. They are the ones, according to Ezekiel, to whom God appears.

(c) A somewhat more optimistic attitude to the remnant is seen in Deuteronomy. Although at Deut. 28:62, like Lev. 26:36, the survivors are warned of calamity and fear in the land of their enemies, Deut. 4:27 ff. reminds those who remain of the mercy of Yahweh, should they repent. They are promised consolation in an unusually emphatic way.

(d) It was during the period of the exile that the concept of the remnant acquired a fixed theological content, viz. the hope of Yahweh's preserving and saving work. Behind this was the discovery that, although in the national catastrophe Yahweh had executed a terrible judgment, even this judgment was limited by Yahweh's will to

maintain and preserve his people. We have a witness to this hope in Isa. 46:3 f. when the prophet makes Yahweh address the exiles as "the remnant of the house of Israel", whom he will "bear, carry and save" (Isa. 46:4). In these chapters we also find another, different thought: the concept of a remnant is applied to the "survivors of the nations" (Isa. 45:20) who, embarrassed as a result of their idolatry, take counsel before Yahweh.

(e) In the late exilic and post-exilic periods, i.e. in the second half of the 6th century B.C., when the → temple was rebuilt by the returned exiles, the concept of the remnant gained increasingly in importance. To this period belong probably the sayings of Mic. 2:12 f.; 5:7 f.; 7:18, and Zeph. 2:7, 9, where the recovery of the coastal strip is promised to the remnant of Judah (v. 7), or of the people generally (v. 9). In Obadiah (v. 17) we find, already during the exilic period, the concept of the remnant linked with the hope for → Jerusalem or Zion; and Zechariah announces the return of Yahweh to Zion, and awakes in the survivors the hope of the preservation of Jerusalem (8:3; 8:11 f., "a sowing of peace", i.e. secure tenure).

(f) In Joel 2:32 the concept of the remnant is still linked to Zion (cf. also Ezr. 9:8) at a still later date (4th or 3rd century B.C.). In the books of Ezra and Nehemiah (4th or 3rd century B.C.) the idea of the remnant is several times applied to the exiles who have returned (Ezr. 9:8; 9:15; Neh. 1:2 f.). After 300 B.C. the later parts of the book of Zechariah speak of a remnant which will be purified (Zech. 13:8 f.), and which will survive on the day when the nations assemble to fight against Jerusalem (14:2, linked with apocalyptic ideas about the day of Yahweh).

(g) A completely new kind of saying is found concerning the Philistines at Zech. 9:7: "it too shall be a remnant for our God; it shall be like a clan in Judah." Isa. 66:18 ff. (which could be as late as 160 B.C., cf. C. Westermann, *Isaiah 40–66: A Commentary*, 1969, 295–308, 423 f.) speaks of a mission of survivors to the nations – in the context of apocalyptic sayings, a line of thought which extends the idea of the remnant to the nations, and has its ultimate continuation in the NT!

4. (a) In the extra-canonical, apocalyptic writings, the remnant concept is only occasionally applied to the whole creation: "And now, my son, arise and make a petition to the Lord of glory, since thou art a believer, that a remnant may remain on the earth, and that He may not destroy the whole world" (Eth. Enoch 83:8). 2 Esd. 13:26 speaks of "a Man coming from the heart of the sea" through whom "the Most High" will deliver his creation "and the same shall order the survivors". Much more frequent are the remnant sayings which refer to → Israel or the synagogue: 2 Esd. 9:7 f. refers to "my salvation in my land, and within my borders" in connexion with those who have been saved (cf. 2 Esd. 12:34; 13:48; Eth. Enoch 90:30). According to Syr. Bar. 40:2, the messiah will "protect the rest of My people which shall be found in the place which I have chosen."

(b) The tying of the remnant concept to Israel led, in Palestinian Judaism, to the making of exclusive claims for particular groups, and consequently to an intensification. The Qumran community, for instance, saw in itself the holy remnant promised in the OT (CD 1:4), and enjoying God's assistance (1QM 13:8; 14:8 f.), while their enemies are utterly destroyed with none remaining (1QM 1:6; 4:2; 14:5; cf. also 1QS 4:1–5:13; CD 2:6). Likewise, the → Pharisees attempted, by voluntary submission to priestly ordinances regarding cleansing, to set themselves up as the holy remnant

(cf. J. Jeremias, "Der Gedanke des 'Heiligen Restes' im Spätjudentum und in der Verkündigung Jesu", in *Abba*, 1966, 122).

(c) In rabbinic Judaism the condition for belonging to the remnant was held to be observance of the Torah. "So . . . shall great deeds be done . . . (but only) for the remnant, who have not sinned" (Targum Isa. 10:22 f.). "Those who survive will return to Zion, and those who have kept the Torah will remain in Jerusalem" (Targum Isa. 4:3). Here the concept of the remnant is quite clearly associated with the keeping of the → law.

NT 1. In the NT the noun *leimma*, remnant, is found only once (Rom. 11:5), and the vb. *leipō* 6 times, with the meaning to lack, be in want of (Lk. 18:22; Tit. 1:5; 3:13; Jas. 1:4 f.; 2:15). The adj. *loipos*, remaining, other, which is used chiefly in the plur., the others, the rest, or adverbially, in other respects, is found altogether 55 times; occasionally with a critical undertone, when it refers to those who are hardened (Lk. 8:10; Rom. 11:7), who do not believe (Mk. 16:13; 1 Thess. 4:13), who act as hypocrites (Gal. 2:13), or who do not repent (Rev. 9:20).

As in the LXX, the most common compound is *kataleipō*, again with various meanings such as to leave (a region, Matt. 4:13; people, Matt. 19:5 par., Mk. 10:7; cf. Gen. 2:24; possessions, Lk. 5:28); to fall behind, neglect (Acts 6:2); to leave, leave behind (someone somewhere, e.g. Acts 18:19). The following appear once each: *kataloipoi*, rest (Acts 15:17 = Amos 9:12 LXX); *dialeipō*, to leave off, cease (Lk. 7:45); *hypoleipomai*, to be left remaining; and *hypoleimma*, remnant (Rom. 9:27 = citation of Isa. 10:22; in the TR *kataleimma*).

2. (a) In the NT, the OT remnant concept is taken up only in Rom. 9–11. Here Paul is dealing with the fact that the majority of Jews refuse to believe in Christ. Indeed, the central theme of Rom. is the question of the standing of the Jewish people in relation to the salvation that is in Christ alone. Chs. 1–8 deal with the ground of salvation showing that the OT anticipates the way of salvation in Christ. Chs. 9–11 deal with the position of the Jews as the chosen people in the light of their rejection of Christ and God's overall purposes. What attitude, then, should be adopted towards this fact by the early Christian church, composed as it is of both Gentile and Jewish Christians? Does this rejection of Christ mean that the → election of Israel no longer applies? Paul holds on to the special position of Israel among the nations. This special position, however, is based on God's free elective grace, *kat' eklogēn*, "according to election" (Rom. 9:11; 11:5), just as is the calling of the Gentiles into the community of the new people of God (9:24).

To show that the Gentiles are accepted as children of God, Paul cites Hos. 2:23 and 1:10 (Rom. 9:25 f.). This is followed immediately (9:27) by the warning of Isa. 10:22 f., which speaks of the decimation of Israel down to a remnant that repents; like the LXX, Paul does not say "A remnant will return", but "A remnant will be saved." To this he adds in v. 29 a citation of Isa. 1:9, where the LXX has already introduced a greater note of hope: for the Heb. *śārîḏ*, remnant, both LXX and Paul have *sperma*, lit. "seed", i.e. descendants. This combination of OT citations displays clearly the direction of Paul's reinterpretation of the remnant. In setting a reference to the remnant of Israel alongside the prophecy of the Gentiles' acceptance as the children of God, Paul is altering the status of the former. The remnant of OT prophecy merges into the new people of God, constituted on the basis of faith in

Christ. The remnant of Israel is not eliminated; but it stands alongside those Gentiles who are called to be members of God's new people. The remnant (Isa. 1:9 MT), or the descendants (Isa. 1:9 LXX), are those whom God has called, together with the Gentiles, into the church of Christ. In Rom. 11:3, 4, 5, the concept of the remnant is introduced by a reference back to Elijah's complaint on Mount Horeb (1 Ki. 19:10), and Yahweh's reply (1Ki. 19:18). This reference is used by Paul as evidence that God has not rejected Israel. The *leimma kat' eklogēn charitos*, remnant chosen by grace (→ Election, art. *haireomai*; → Grace, art. *charis*), is however based not on Israel's efforts, but on God's set purpose (Rom. 11:5); and it is characterized by faith in Christ. Paul's hope is that through this remnant, and through the Gentile Christians who with them form the church, the "fullness" (*plērōma*, Rom. 11:12 AV) of Israel can be won for Christ. Thus in the remnant of Israel, which confesses faith in Christ, there is a new beginning for all Israel. This remnant is a challenge to all the Jews.

God's gracious activity is directed towards all nations and towards the whole of Israel, with the aim of making them part of the new people of God. Paul takes up the concept of the remnant and weaves it into an elaborate argument in these chapters, where he appears as the spokesman of Israel. His purpose is not to take over into the Christian church the ideas about the remnant which were current in 1st century Judaism, and to suggest that the church is the holy remnant. Nor is he attacking the idea of the remnant. He is reinterpreting and developing it further, to show that the OT prophecy of the remnant is fulfilled in a community consisting of Jews and Gentiles.

(b) The adj. *loipos*, remaining, is twice used by Paul of those who mourn because they have no hope (1 Thess. 4:13), or who are asleep in the sense that they are not expecting the parousia (1 Thess. 5:6) (→ Present, art. *parousia*). In Rom. 1:13 it is used of other nations, or Gentiles, in contrast to those being addressed in the letter, and in Gal. 2:13 it refers to other Jewish Christians who joined Peter in acting hypocritically, in that at first they had fellowship at table with the Gentiles in Antioch, but later abandoned it out of fear.

Otherwise Paul uses the adj. without any specialized meaning, and in this he is not unlike other NT writers: other (the rest of the Gentiles, Rom. 1:13; the rest of the Jews, Gal. 2:13; and the rest of the churches, 2 Cor. 12:13; the other co-workers, Phil. 4:3; the other apostles, 1 Cor. 9:5, cf. Acts 2:37; cf. the other virgins, Matt. 25:11; the rest of the scriptures, 2 Pet. 3:16); the others (Rom. 11:7; 1 Cor. 7:12; Eph. 2:3; 1 Tim. 5:20; cf. Matt. 22:6, 27; Mk. 16:13; Lk. 8:10; 18:9, 11; 24:10; Acts 5:13; 16:30 D; 17:9; 27:44; Rev. 19:21; 20:5); all the others (2 Cor. 13:2; Phil. 1:13; cf. Lk. 24:9; Acts 28:9); the other things, the rest (1 Cor. 11:34; 15:37; cf. Mk. 4:19; Lk. 12:26; Rev. 3:2).

loipos is used adverbially in various expressions of time: *(to) loipon*, from now on, in the future, henceforth (1 Cor. 7:29; 2 Tim. 4:8; cf. Matt. 26:45; Mk. 14:41; Heb. 10:13); *loipon*, finally (Acts 27:20); *tou loipou*, from now on, in the future (Gal. 6:17), finally (Eph. 6:10). *(to) loipon* is also used adverbially in the sense of beyond that, as far as the rest is concerned, finally (1 Cor. 1:16; 2 Cor. 13:11; Phil. 3:1; 4:8; 1 Thess. 4:1; 2 Thess. 3:1); and in this connexion, then, furthermore (1 Cor. 4:2).

3. In the Synoptic Gospels the adj. is also occasionally used to describe those who are outside the rule of God. Thus in the parable of the royal wedding feast

(Matt. 22:1–13), *hoi loipoi*, the others, the rest, are those who mock and kill the servants sent by the king to invite them; and in Matt. 25:1–12 the "other [*loipai*] maidens " (v. 11) are those excluded from the wedding feast. Jesus' cry of dereliction from the cross (Matt. 27:46) is finally received by "the others [*hoi loipoi*]" with the words: "Wait, let us see whether Elijah will come and save him" (Matt. 27:49). In Lk. 8:10 the "others" are contrasted with the disciples. *loipoi* here means those who are outside the band of disciples and do not understand the meaning of the → parables, because they are → hardened (cf. also Rom. 11:7). The parable of the Pharisee and the publican (Lk. 18:9–14) is addressed to those who, in their own faithful observance of the law, despise others (*loipous*, v. 9). The expression "other men", used by the Pharisee, is here a judgment on those who do not keep the law (v. 11). Whether the polemic of the gospels against the → Pharisees (cf. Matt. 23, especially v. 13) is connected with their claim to be the remnant community (cf. J. Jeremias, op. cit., 129 f.), and whether the absence of reference to the remnant in the Gospels may be traced to this, is a question which cannot be answered with certainty. All that can be said is that neither the OT concept of the remnant, nor its narrower Judaistic counterpart, is to be found in the Gospels.

4. The vb. *leipō* is used in Lk. 18:22 of the decisive shortcoming which hinders the rich man from the life of discipleship, namely his riches: "One thing you lack [*eti hen soi leipei*], sell all that you have and distribute to the poor, and you will have treasure in heaven; and come, follow me" (→ Poor; → Possessions). In Jas. 1:4, 5 and 2:15 the vb. means to lack, have need of, in the literal sense. In Tit. 3:13 it has the sense of lack, and in Tit. 1:5 it is used of the defects which Titus is to amend in the church in Crete.

5. In the Revelation the adj. *loipos* is found 8 times; in two cases it has a meaning reminiscent of the remnant idea. In Rev. 11:13 we read of the "rest" who survive the judgment on the city unharmed, and give glory to God. Rev. 12:17 speaks of the war waged by the dragon on the "rest" of the offspring of the woman, "who keep the commandments of God and bear testimony to Jesus", and against whom in Rev. 13 both the beasts fight. Although we may see behind these sayings a wealth of Jewish apocalyptic material, the reference here is not to the remnant in the sense of a new beginning.

6. The place in early Christian theology for the concept of the remnant in its proper sense is in dealing with the relationship of the church to Israel. The return to an understanding of it in the sense of a kind of *ecclesiola in ecclesia*, a church within the church, is a repetition of the narrowing of the doctrine which took place in Jewish apocalyptic. It ignores two facts: firstly, that we are told that God's purpose for the remnant is his purpose for the whole people; and secondly, that in the confrontation between Israel and the message of Jesus Christ, the idea of a specially qualified remnant became modified and reinterpreted, finding in this message its ultimate fulfilment in an unexpected way (→ Redemption, art. *sōzō* NT; → Elect, art. *eklegomai*; → Take, art. *lambanō* NT). *W. Günther, H. Krienke*

→ Church, → Israel

(a). J. G. Baldwin, *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi*, *TC*, 1972; K. Barth, *CD* II, 2, 269–305; H. Berkhof, *Christ the Meaning of History*, 1966; J. C. Campbell, "God's People and the Remnant", *SJT* 3, 1950, 78–85; W. D. Davies, *The Gospel and the Land: Early Christianity and Jewish Territorial Doctrine*, 1974; W. Eichrodt, *Ezekiel*, 1970; G. Fohrer, "The Stems *plṭ* and *mlṭ* in the Old Testament", in *sōzō*

etc., *TDNT* VI 978 ff.; L. Goppelt, *Jesus, Paul and Judaism*, 1964; H. Gross, "Remnant", *EBT* II 741 ff.; G. F. Hasel, "Linguistic Considerations Regarding the Translation of Isaiah's *Shear-Jashub*: A Reassessment", *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 9, 1971, 36–46; "Semantic Values of Derivatives of the Hebrew root *š'r*", ibid. 11, 1973, 152–69; *The Remnant: The History and Theology of the Remnant Idea from Genesis to Isaiah*, 1974²; and "Remnant", *IDB Supplementary Volume*, 1976, 735 f.; E. W. Heaton, "The Root *š'r* and the Doctrine of the Remnant", *JTS* New Series 3, 1952, 27–39; J. Jocz, *A Theology of Election: Israel and the Church*, 1958; R. Martin-Achard, *A Light to the Nations*, 1962; B. F. Meyer, "Jesus and the Remnant of Israel", *JBL* 84, 1965, 123–30; J. Morgenstern, "The Rest of Nations", *JSS* 2, 1957, 225–31; J. Munck, *Christ and Israel*, 1967; J. Murray, *The Epistle to the Romans, NLC*, II, 1965, 39 ff., 68 ff.; G. von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, II, 1965, 21 f., 165 ff., 187; P. Richardson, *Israel and the Apostolic Church, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series* 10, 1969; V. Herntrich and G. Schrenk, *leimma* etc. *TDNT* IV 194–214; C. Westermann, *Isaiah 40–66*, 1969; R. N. Whybray, *Isaiah 40–66, New Century Bible*, 1975; E. J. Young, *The Book of Isaiah, The New International Commentary on The Old Testament*, I–III, 1965–72; W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel*, I, *Hermeneia*, 1978.

(b). F. Dreyfus, "La Doctrine du Reste d'Israel chez le Prophète Isaie", *Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques* 39, 1955, 361–86; S. Herrmann, *Die prophetischen Heilserwartungen im Alten Testament*, 1965; J. Jeremias, "Der Gedanke des 'Heiligen Restes' im Spätjudentum und in der Verkündigung Jesu", *ZNW* 42, 1949, 184 ff. (reprinted in *Abba*, 1966, 121–32); U. Luz, *Das Geschichtsverständnis des Paulus*, 1968, 80-83; P. Meinhold, *Studien zur israelitischen Religionsgeschichte*, I, *Der heilige Rest*, 1903; C. Müller, *Gottes Gerechtigkeit und Gottes Volk. Eine Untersuchung zu Röm. 9–11, FRLANT* 86, 1964; W. E. Müller and W. E. Preuss, *Die Vorstellung vom Rest im Alten Testament*, 1973; G. Schrenk, *Die Weissagung über Israel im Neuen Testament*, 1951; U. Stegemann, "Der Restgedanke bei Jesaja", *BZ* Neue Folge 19, 1969, 161–86; R. de Vaux, "Le 'Reste d'Israel' d'après les Prophètes", *RB* 42, 1933, 526–39; H. Wildberger, *š'ār*, *THAT* II 844–55.

Rest

ἀνάπαυσις

ἀναπαύω (*anapauō*), give rest, mid. rest, take one's rest; ἀνάπαυσις (*anapausis*), rest; ἐπαναπαύομαι (*epanapauomai*), rest, take one's rest, rely on; καταπαύω (*katapauō*), bring to rest, rest, stop, resting; κατάπαυσις (*katapausis*), rest, place of rest.

CL In cl. Gk. *anapauō* is used in its act. form for: (a) make to cease, bring to an end, stop or hinder from something (Homer, *Il.* 17, 550); (b) to rest (trans.), make to halt, refresh (Xenophon, *Cyropaedia* 7, 1, 4). In mid. and pass. it means to cease, take rest from, recover, come to rest (Plato, *Critias* 106a); later also, to die. Thus the expression to take one's rest can be used of the dead (cf. *IG* 14, 1717). *katapauō* means to stop, put an end to; with reference to persons, to put an end to, hinder, depose, kill (Homer, *Il.* 16, 618; thus often with an unpleasant undertone); but also, to appease, calm (Homer, *Od.* 4, 583). In Judaism the term was taken up in the sense of to give someone a good rest (LXX). *anapausis* in cl. Gk. meant repose, relaxation, recreation, a rest from something.

OT 1. *Heb. equivalents.* The vb. *anapauō* is used in the LXX to translate no less than 14 different Heb. vbs. The most common of these is *nûaḥ*, rest, repose, be quiet, and in the trans. forms to lay down, let remain, leave. *nûaḥ* occurs in the following passages: Exod. 23:12; Deut. 5:14; 2 Sam. 7:11; 1 Ki. 5:18 (4); 13:20 A; 1 Chr. 22:9, 18; Neh. 9:28; Est. 9:16 ff., 22; Job 3:13, 17, 26; Prov. 21:16; 29:17; Eccl. 7:9 (10); Hab. 3:16; Zech. 6:8; Isa. 7:19; 11:2; 14:1, 3, 6; 32:18; Lam. 5:5; Dan. 12:13. *anapauō* stands for *bālaḡ*, look cheerful (Job 10:20); *yāšaḇ*, sit, remain, dwell (Mic.

4:4); *nāḥam*, comfort, console (Jer. 42[49]:10); *nāpaš*, be refreshed (Exod. 23:12); *rāḇaṣ*, lie down (Gen. 29:2; 49:14; Isa. 13:20 f.; 14:30; 27:10; Ezek. 34:14 f.); *rāgā'*, be at rest, repose (Deut. 28:65; Isa. 34:14; Jer. 47[29]:6); *rawaḥ*, be wide, spacious, find relief (Job 32:20); *šā'an*, be at ease, at peace, rest securely (Jer. 48[31]:11); *šāḇaṯ*, cease, desist, rest (Exod. 32:12; Isa. 14:4); *šaḵaḇ*, lie down (Num. 24:9); *šāḵan*, settle down, abide, dwell (Isa. 13:21; 32:16; 34:17; 57:15; Ezek. 17:23; 31:13); *šāqaṭ*, be quiet (Isa. 57:20; Jer. 49:23 [30:12]; Ezek. 16:42); and *'āḇar*, pass over (Job 13:13?). It is without Heb. equivalent in Jdg. 4:11; 1 Sam. 16:16; Job 2:9; Sir. 3:6; 18:16; 22:11; 31 (34):21; 39:11; 47:23; Lam. 1:6; Ad.Dan. Susannah 37.

The noun *anapauma* which does not occur in the NT is without equivalent in Job 3:23, and stands for *nûaḥ* in Isa. 28:2 and *mᵉnûḥâh*, rest, in Isa. 28:12, though it can also mean a resting-place.

anapausis stands chiefly for *mᵉnûḥâh* (Gen. 49:15; Num. 10:33; Ruth 1:9; 1 Chr. 22:9; 28:2; Pss. 23[22]:1; 132[131]:8; Mic. 2:10; Isa. 11:10; Jer. 45:3|51:33|), and other cognates of *nûaḥ*, i.e. *mānôaḥ*, resting-place, state or condition of rest (Gen. 8:9; Ruth 3:1; Ps. 116[115]:7; Isa. 34:14; Lam. 1:3), and *naḥaṯ*, quietness, rest (Eccl. 4:6; 9:5, 17), and the vb. *nûaḥ* (Isa. 23:12). It stands for *raḇaṣ*, repose (Isa. 17:2), *rēḇeṣ*, resting-place (Isa. 65:10); *reḡa'*, a moment (Job 7:18; 21:13); *šabbāṯ*, → sabbath rest (Exod. 16:23; Lev. 25:8), *šeḇeṯ*, cessation (Isa. 37:28), *šabbaṯôn*, sabbath observance (Exod. 31:15; 32:2; Lev. 16:31?; 23:3, 24, 39; 25:4 f.); and *šāḇaṯ*, cease, desist, rest (Exod. 23:12); *šāqaṭ*, be quiet (Isa. 32:17); and *nûaḥ* (Isa. 25:10; 28:2). It is without Heb. equivalent in Est. 9:17; Job 3:23; Ps. 132(131):4; Wis. 4:7; Sir. 6:28; 11:19; 20:21; 22:13; 24:7; 28:16; 30:17; 33:25 (30:34); 31(34):3 f.; 36:24(29); 38:14, 23; 40:5 f.; 51:27; Isa. 23:13 *v.l.*

The vb. *epanapauomai*, rest in or upon, stands for *nûaḥ* (Num. 11:25 f.; Jdg. 16:26; 2 Ki. 2:15; Isa. 11:2 *v.l.*, for *šā'an*, lean, support oneself on (2 Ki. 5:18; 7:2, 17; Mic. 3:11; Ezek. 29:7), and is without equivalent (1 Macc. 8:12).

In the LXX *katapauomai* translates no less than 16 different Heb. vbs. or nouns, but again the most common is *nûaḥ* (Exod. 20:11; 33:14; Deut. 3:20; 12:10; 25:19; Jos. 1:13, 15; 3:13; 21:42; 22:4; 23:1; 2 Sam. 21:10; 1 Chr. 23:23; 2 Chr. 14:5 f. [6 f.]; 15:15; 20:30; Eccl. 10:4). *šāḇaṯ* is also not uncommon (Gen. 2:2 f.; 8:22; Exod. 5:5; 31:17; 34:21; Deut. 32:26; Neh. 4:5|11|; 6:3; Hos. 1:4; Lam. 5:14; Ezek. 30:13; Dan. 9:27 Theodotion; 11:18). Other vbs. used are *'āsap̄*, gather (Ps. 85[84]:3, here in the sense of withdraw [anger]); *ḥāyâh*, live (Deut. 5:33); *yāšaḇ* (Ruth 2:7); *kālâh*, come to an end, cease (Gen. 49:33; Exod. 31:18; 34:33; Hos. 11:6); *lîn*, lodge, spend the night, abide (Jdg. 18:2); *nāḥal*, get through (2 Chr. 32:22); *rāḡa'* (Job 26:12); *rāp̄âh*, let drop (Ezek. 1:24); *śārap̄*, burn (Ps. 74|73|:8; the MT has "they burned all the meeting places of God in the land", whereas the LXX has "come, let us cause to cease from the land the festivals of the Lord"); *šûḇ*, turn back, return (Num. 25:11; 1 Ki. 12:24; Job 21:34); *šᵉḵāḇâh*, deposit, layer of dew (Exod. 16:13); *šāḵen*, dwell (Deut. 33:12; Ps. 55[54]:6); *šāqaṭ*, be undisturbed, be at peace, be quiet (Jos. 11:23); *nāp̄aš*, take breath, refresh oneself (Exod. 31:17). There is no Heb. equivalent at Exod. 35:2; Jdg. 8:3A; 20:43A; Ezr. 9:13 Symmachus; Jud. 6:1; Wis. 10:19 Symmachus; Sir. 5:6; 10:17; 24:8, 11; 38:23; 43:5, 13; 44:23; 45:3; 47:12 f.; Lam. 3:11; 1 Macc. 9:73; 2 Macc. 15:37).

katapauma, rest, occurs only at Sir. 36:15(18). *katapausis* stands for 3 Heb. sets of words: *nûaḥ*, rest (vb. Num. 10:36), *nôaḥ*, rest (2 Chr. 6:41), *mānôaḥ*, resting-

place (1 Chr. 6:16[31]), *mᵉnûḥâh*, resting-place (Deut. 12:9; Jdg. 20:43; 1 Ki. 8:56; Pss. 95[94]:11; 132[131]:14; Isa. 66:1); *ʾᵃḥuzzâh*, property (Lev. 25:28); *šāḇaṯ*, rest (Exod. 34:21). There is no Heb. equivalent in Exod. 35:2; Jud. 9:8; 2 Macc. 15:1.

2. *Theological usage.* The concept of rest is important in the OT, especially in connexion with the idea of the people of God being given rest by Yahweh from their many enemies. The vb. *nûaḥ* is frequently used in a lit. sense, meaning to settle down to rest, e.g. of an army or swarms of locusts (the Arabic par. is used of camels lying down). In the religious realm the use was extended to the idea of God's → Spirit resting on men and things (Num. 11:25; Isa. 11:2), the resting of God's → hand (Isa. 25:10), and of rest in the grave (Job 3:17). Probably the most important use theologically is that of the hiphil in the sense of to give rest to (Isa. 14:3; 28:12), usually with Yahweh as subject. He gives rest to his people by the provision of the promised land and the conquest of their enemies (Jos. 1:13, 15; 21:44; Deut. 3:20; 12:10; 25:19; cf. Deut. 12:9 *mᵉnûḥâh*). Typical of the concrete and this-worldly hopes of the OT faith in Yahweh is this promise of peace in the land, where Judah and Israel will dwell securely, "every man under his vine and under his fig tree" (1 Ki. 4:25).

At a later period the → sabbath rest (Heb. *šabbāṯ*; LXX *anapausis*, or *katapauō*) gained special significance for Israel. The first creation narrative, which is often attributed to the Priestly writer, accounts for this by reference to Yahweh's rest on the 7th day of creation (Gen. 2:2 f.; Exod. 20:22), in contrast to the soteriological explanation given in Deut. 5:12–15. Characteristically, the sabbath rest is by no means confined to the religious, worshipping community, or to a privileged class: male and female slaves, aliens, and even cattle are expressly included in the day of rest devoted to Yahweh (Exod. 16:23, 25; 20:10). Along with the curse of work (Gen. 3:17 ff.), the people of God are given the blessing of rest, in which to rejoice in their God and his works. *anapausis* is used in post-canonical Judaism, notably Sir., to refer to the rest promised to the disciples of wisdom; the refreshment that comes from the possession of wisdom given by God (cf. Sir. 6:28; 24:7; 30:17; 51:27).

NT 1. In the NT *anapauō* means: (a) to take one's rest in the normal bodily sense (Mk. 14:41; Matt. 26:45); (b) to calm someone who has become disturbed, to refresh by giving pleasure, comfort or compensation (1 Cor. 16:18; Phlm. 7, 20; 2 Cor. 7:13). This may come about through Christian love, fellowship or action, or news of such. Jesus called his disciples to come apart and rest for a while in body and spirit because of the many who were coming and going (Mk. 6:31). The unclean spirits also seek rest (Matt. 12:43; Lk. 11:24). Self-reformation only makes the last state worse than the first, for the spirit only returns with seven other spirits more evil than himself. Matt.'s account of this saying applies it to contemporary Judaism: "So shall it be with this evil generation" (Matt. 12:45c).

In the Book of Revelation the meaning is extended to signify rest from hardship and affliction in the eschatological consummation (Rev. 6:11; 14:13). The four living creatures praise God without rest (*anapausis*) (Rev. 4:8; → Cherub); by contrast, those who worship the beast have no rest from torment (Rev. 14:11; → Animal, art. *thērion*).

But the concept of rest finds its ultimate and deepest development in Matt. 11:28 ff. "To this rest are invited those who in truth have found in Judaism only a

burden" (O. Bauernfeind, *TDNT* I 351). Everyone, whether under the Law (Jews) or far off from God (Gentiles), everyone whose life is marked by a lack of peace and security, is called to become a disciple of Jesus: here true rest is found, not the invulnerability and calm of the Stoic, but peace, contentment and security in God, the Father God revealed by Jesus. (On this passage → Yoke.)

2. The concept of rest is of particular importance in Hebrews. In this letter the task given to Joshua, namely to bring God's people into their rest in the promised land (*katepausen*, Heb. 4:8), is regarded as having been fulfilled only in a limited sense, and is linked up with the true rest of God on the seventh day (Heb. 4:4; cf. Gen. 2:2; *katapausis* 3:11 [= Ps. 95, 11], 18; 4:1, 3, 5, 10 f.). Here the thought of Heb. shows a similarity to the interpretation given in some passages of Deut. to the fulfilment of the promise made to the people: this fulfilment is not a guarantee of permanent rest, but it gives rise to new promises, which accompany the people of God on their way through history and are realized in topical events (cf. Deut. 5:53; 12:10; Heb. 4:1 ff.). In Heb., God's people of the new → covenant are exhorted to claim now the ancient promise of God's rest, available to them in Jesus Christ, and to lay hold of it in hope, by faith in Christ as Lord.

3. 1 Pet. 4:14 stands in a context in which Christians are urged to be guiltless and thus not to give grounds for just punishment on their part. On the other hand, they are to rejoice in suffering in so far as they suffer for the sake of Christ and even share in his sufferings (v. 13). Indeed, suffering of this kind may be taken as a sign of being owned by God: "If you are reproached for the name of Christ, you are blessed, because the spirit of glory and of God rests upon you [*ei oneidizesthe en onomati Christou, makarioi hoti to tēs doxēs kai to tou theou pneuma eph' hymas anapauetai*]" (1 Pet. 4:14). The passage recalls Jesus' own promise (Matt. 5:11; Lk. 6:22). J. N. D. Kelly suggests that the idea of suffering "on behalf of" or "because of" or "in" Christ's → name was almost a technical expression in the early church (*The Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, *BNTC*, 1969, 186; cf. these vv. with Matt. 10:22; Mk. 13:13; Lk. 21:17; Jn. 15:21; Acts 9:16; 15:26; 21:13; Rev. 2:3; 3:8). The passage may be directed against certain charismatics in the early church who may have taught that those who truly enjoyed the → gifts of the → Spirit were exempt from → suffering (cf. Paul's thorn in the flesh; → Fruit, art. *skolops*). The point is countered by arguing almost the opposite; i.e. not that possession of the Spirit makes suffering inevitable, but that if it is suffering for the sake of Christ, it is a sign that the Spirit rests upon the believer. Note the connexion between Christ and the Spirit: the Spirit is the Spirit of Christ (cf. 1 Pet. 1:2, 11); the Christ who lived and died in history (1:19; 2:21–25; 3:18) is present to believers through the Spirit both before and after the coming of Christ (1:10 ff.; 3:8), and indeed it is the Spirit who made Christ alive after his death (3:18; cf. 1:13). The believer's life should be lived for Christ (1:4 ff.; 3:16; 5:1). The Spirit is bestowed especially on the persecuted, cf. the saying of Christ (Matt. 10:19 f.) and the description of Stephen whose face was "like an angel's face", being "full of the Holy Spirit", and seeing "the glory of God" (Acts 7:55; cf. 6:15; and *Mart. Poly.* 2, 2; Eusebius, *HE* 5, 1, 29 and 34).

1 Pet. 4:14 uses OT imagery. The → glory which manifested itself in the pillar of cloud and in other ways in the OT (cf. Exod. 33:9 f.; 40:34 f.; Isa. 40:1–7; Hag. 2:7) is now a present reality in the life of the persecuted Christian (cf. 1 Pet. 1:7; 5:4; 2 Cor. 4:17; Col. 3:4). The wording seems to be inspired also by Isa. 11:2: "And the

Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him [*kai anapausetai ep' auton pneuma tou theou*], the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and the fear of the LORD" (cf. Isa. 42:1; 48:16; 61:1; Matt. 3:16; Jn. 1:32; 16:13; 1 Cor. 1:30; Eph. 1:17 f.; 2 Tim 1:7). But what was in the first instance applied to the servant of Yahweh and then to Christ is here applied to the believer, for the believer belongs to Christ through the Spirit, and shares in his suffering and life. On the grammatical difficulties presented by the phraseology see Kelly, op. cit., 187.

4. *katapausis* occurs outside Heb. only at Acts 7:49, where Stephen's speech cites Isa. 66:1: "Heaven is my throne, and earth my footstool. What house will you build for me, says the Lord, or what is the place of my rest?" The context is a polemical attack on the idea of Yahweh being tied to the → temple. Similarly the vb. *katapauō* occurs only in Acts outside Heb., though here there is no special theological significance: "with these words they scarcely restrained the people from offering sacrifice to them" (Acts 14:18).

5. *epanapauō* is a late and rare word. In Lk. 10:6 it is used of the disciples' greeting of → peace as they go upon their evangelistic mission: "Whatever house you enter, first say, 'Peace be to this house!' And if a son of peace is there, your peace shall rest upon him; but if not, it shall return to you" (Lk. 10:5 f.; cf. Matt. 10:12 f.). The greeting was no mere formality. In the context of the mission it was decisive as to where the recipients stood in relation to Jesus. But even where it was spurned, it would not be made void. It would remain with those who brought this peace in all its fullness.

In Rom. 2:17 the vb. means to rest upon, i.e. place reliance on, the → law. In context Paul is addressing the Jew who relies on formal adherence to the law, and fails to see that his actions are at variance with it and that he is condemned by it.

R. Hensel, C. Brown

→ Sabbath, → Yoke

(a). C.K. Barrett, "The Eschatology of the Epistle to the Hebrews", in W. D. Davies and D. Daube, eds., *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology. In Honour of Charles Harold Dodd*, 1954, 363–93; J. B. Bauer, "Rest", *EBT* II 748 ff.; O. Bauernfeind, *anapauō* etc., *TDNT* I 350 f.; and *katapauō* etc., *TDNT* III 627 f.; H. D. Betz, "The Logion of the Easy Yoke and of Rest", *JBL* 86, 1967, 10–24; G. W. Buchanan, *To the Hebrews*, 1972; W. D. Davies, *The Gospel and the Land: Early Christianity and Jewish Territorial Doctrine*, 1974; E. Lohse, *sabbaton* etc.; *TDNT* VII 1–35; H. A. Lombard, *"Katapausis* in the Letter to the Hebrews", *Neotestamentica* 5, 1971, 60–71; M. Maher, " 'Take my yoke upon you' (Matt. xi. 29)", *NTS* 22, 1975–76, 97–103; G. von Rad, "There Remains Still a Rest for the People of God: An Investigation of a Biblical Conception", in *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays*, 1966, 94–102; R. Williamson, *Philo and the Epistle to the Hebrews*, 1970.

(b). J. B. Bauer, "Requiem Aeternam", *Heiliger Dienst* 8, 1954, 91–96; and "Das milde Joch und die Ruhe, Matt. 11, 28–30", *ThZ* 17, 1961, 99–106; G. Braulik, *"mᵉnûḥâh.* Die Ruhe Gottes und des Volkes im Lande", *BuK* 23, 1968, 75–78; J. Cadet, "Repos dominical et Loisir humain", *La Maison-Dieu* 83, 1965, 71–97; E. Käsemann, *Das wandernde Gottesvolk, FRLANT* 55, 1939, 40 ff.; O. Hofius, *Katapausis. Die Vorstellung vom endzeitlichen Ruheort im Hebräerbrief, WUNT* 11, 1970; T. Ohm, *Ruhe und Frömmigkeit*, 1955; M. Philippe, "Le repos du Père et l'Alliance éternelle", *Verbum Caro* 20, 79, 1966, 9–25; C. Spicq, *L'Épître aux Hébreux*, II, 1953, 95–104; F. Stolz, *nûaḥ, THAT* I 43–6; P. Vielhauer, "*Anapausis.* Zum gnostischen Hintergrund des Thomasevangeliums", in *Apophoreta*, Festschrift for E. Haenchen, 1964, 169 ff. (reprinted in *Aufsätze zum Neuen Testament, ThB* 31, 1965, 215 ff.).

Resurrection

The NT uses two words groups when it deals with the resurrection, one connected with *anhistēmi* and the other with *egeirō*. They are not substantially different in meaning; which is used depends mainly on whether the stress is on the active or the passive aspect. The theological differentiation in use is discussed under *anhistēmi* NT 1.

ἀνάστασις

ἀνάστασις (*anastasis*) resurrection; *ἐξανάστασις* (*exanastasis*), resurrection; *ἀνίστημι* (*anhistēmi*), raise, intrans. rise; *ἐξανίστημι* (*exanhistēmi*), raise up, awaken, intrans. rise; *ἀναζάω* (*anazaō*), come to life again.

CL The vb. *anhistēmi*, a compound of *histēmi*, → stand, meant in secular Gk. (already in Homer) to make to stand up, raise, awaken, rouse (of persons lying down or sleeping). In one direction, its meaning was widened to include appointing to an office or task; in the other, when used intrans., it could mean to stand up, rise, start, appear, with the connotation of a revolt or political uprising. Especially with the part. it also expresses the beginning of an action, or readiness for it, e.g., of a conference, the beginning of a reign, of a movement. In post-Homeric writings it is also used of things, e.g., for the setting up or repairing of statues, altars, etc. Occasionally it means to get well. *exanhistēmi* (Soph. onwards) has the same meaning. *anastasis* (Aesch. and Hdt. onwards) and *exanastasis* (Hippocrates onwards) have the intrans. meaning of getting up, rising up (also from the dead). (For general usage see further Liddell-Scott, 121, 144 f., 584 f.) *L. Coenen*

anabiōskomai, come to life again, is used of the transmigration of souls (Plato, *Phd.* 71e onwards; cf. Aristides, *Orationes* 20[21], 19: Hierocles, *In Carmen Aureum* 26, p. 479 M; Sannyrio, 3D; Philostr., *VA* 4, 45; used as the causal of *anabioō*, bring back to life in, e.g., Plato, *Cri.* 48c; *Phd.* 89b; Aelianus, *De Natura Animalium* 2, 29; Themistius, *Orationes* 8, 115c). The vb. *anabioō*, come to life again, occurs, e.g., in Plato, *Rep.* 614b; Aristophanes, *Ranae* 177; Andocides, 1, 125; and the noun *anabiōsis*, return to life, in Plutarch, *Lucullus* 18; Appianus, *Keltikē* 1, 3 etc.

The doctrine of the transmigration of the soul into some other body appears in Greece as a philosophical doctrine (*OCD*, 1089). The earliest exponent known is Pherecydes of Syros (Cicero, *Tusculanae Disputationes* 1, 38). It was regarded as a characteristic doctrine of the Pythagoreans (cf. Horace, *Odes* 1, 28, 10; Empedocles, 375; Pindar, *Ol.* 2, 56 ff.). It was also Orphic (Pindar, Fragment 127). It found classical expression in Plato and thence to Vergil, *Aeneid* 6, 713 ff. Little trace is found in Italy, though there is evidence of it among the druids (Caesar, *Bellum Gallicum* 6, 4, 5; Lucan, 1, 454 ff.). Evidence of belief in direct translation to the heavenly abode is even more rare. Various stories tell of Ganymedes being carried off to become the cup-bearer of Zeus (*OCD*, 457). Other figures credited with it include Menelaus, Apollonius of Tyana in Greece, Utanapishtim in the Babylonian flood epic who was granted immortality by the god Ea, and Seḥetepibrē, the king of Upper and Lower Egypt, though in this case the reference is to a god being united

with his father rather than a mortal called to dwell with the gods (R. Martin-Achard, *From Death to Life: A Study of the Doctrine of the Resurrection in the Old Testament*, 1960, 68 f.; on the fate of the dead generally see S. G. F. Brandon, *Man and his Destiny in the Great Religions*, 1962 and *The Judgment of the Dead: An Historical and Comparative Study of the Idea of a Post-Mortem Judgment in the Major Religions*, 1967; and L. R. Farnell, *Greek Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality*, 1921).

In his *Phaedo* Plato defended the idea of the immortality of the soul in the course of a dialogue between Socrates and his friends prior to the former's execution at his own hand by drinking poison. Socrates does not fear death because of the immortality of the soul which he defends on various grounds related to the Platonic doctrine of forms, the eternal realities behind our transient physical world (cf. *Phd.* 75, 102; *Rep.* 6, 508–11; 7, 514 ff.). The soul possesses a certain likeness to the forms, so that when the body dies the soul goes on. Certain forms are incompatible, like heat and cold, life and death. It is an essential feature of the soul that it should partake in life. Therefore at death the soul retires elsewhere. Plato also sees a certain cyclical pattern in nature: cold becomes hot, and hot becomes cold; day follows night, and night follows day. By analogy, the dead awake in a new life after death. Otherwise, life would vanish. Plato also made use of the doctrine of recollection (*anamnēsis*), according to which the soul is able to recall things known in a previous existence. Similarly, in the *Meno* 82b–85b a slave boy is able to solve geometrical problems on the basis of such recollection. Knowledge of the forms can only have been acquired in this way (*Phd.* 72e ff.).

Plato set out his doctrine of the transmigration of souls in the myth of Er at the end of his *Republic* (Book 10). Er is a soldier killed in battle. But after several days there are no signs of decay in his body, and he returns to life on the funeral pyre to tell of what he has seen in the beyond. At death the soul goes to a spot where it is judged. The just souls are seen ascending to a thousand years of happiness; the unjust tell of their thousand years of travail on the earth, where they have been sent as punishment, each soul receiving tenfold retribution for the evil it has done (*Rep.* 615). The very wicked are cast for ever into Tartarus, the traditional place of punishment in Hades surrounded by a brazen wall and encircled by impenetrable darkness. Here, they receive terrible torture (*Rep.* 626). After spending seven days by a meadow the soul journeys to a place where it must choose the next form of its life. It is brought to a place where the mechanism of the earth is visible, where the Fates can be seen and heard (*Rep.* 616 f.). The symbolism suggests the elements of necessity and choice. Thus Lachesis, the daughter of Necessity declares: "Your destiny shall not be allotted to you, but you shall choose it for yourselves. Let him who draws the first lot be the first to choose a life, which shall be his irrevocably. Virtue owns no master: he who honours her shall have more of her, and he who slights her, less. The responsibility lies with the chooser. Heaven is guiltless" (*Rep.* 617). Lots are cast to decide the order of choice. The forms of life are predetermined, but each man's will is his destiny. Some souls mistakenly choose power for themselves. Some even choose to become animals or birds because of their bitter experience of humans on earth (*Rep.* 620). Souls are generally wiser for their experiences in previous existences. *The Republic* ends with the exhortation: "Indeed, if we follow my advice, believing the soul to be immortal, and to possess the power of entertaining all evil, as well as all

good, we shall ever hold fast the upward road, and devotedly cultivate justice combined with wisdom; in order that we may be loved by one another and by the gods, not only during our stay on earth, but also when, like conquerors in the games collecting the presents of their admirers, we receive the prizes of virtue; and, in order that both in this life and during the journey of a thousand years which we have described, we may never cease to prosper" (*Rep.* 621). In the *Phaedrus* 249 ff. Plato not only links the ideas of transmigration, the forms and recollection, but also implies that the truly enlightened soul which loves the forms will one day transcend the circle of earthly existence and return to the pure state from whence it came.

There was a strong tradition in Gk. thought which denied the possibility of resurrection, referring either to the noun *anastasis* or the vb. *anhistēmi* (Homer, *Il.* 21, 56; 24, 551 and 756; Hdt. 3, 62; Aesch., *Ag.* 1360 f.; *Eum.* 648; Soph., *El.* 137 ff.; and probably Eur., *Hercules Furens* 719). On the other hand, certain passages entertain the idea of resurrection as an isolated miracle (Plato, *Symp.* 179c; Lucianus, *De Saltatione* 45). Evidently the physician Aesculapius enjoyed the reputation of being able to raise the dead (Pseudo-Xenophon, *Cynegeticus* 1, 6; Pausanias, *Periegeta* 2, 26, 5; cf. 2, 27, 4). Apollonius of Tyana raised in Rome an apparently dead girl (Philostratus, *Vita Apollonii* 4, 45). A. Oepke sees the raisings reported in the *Acts of Peter of Vercelli* 25–28 as essentially Hellenistic (*TDNT* I 369). Oepke concludes that "the idea of a general resurrection at the end of the age is alien to the Greeks", and thinks that it is attacked in the Phrygian inscription noted by Ramsay (ibid.; cf. W. M. Ramsay, *The Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, 1895–97, No. 323). Acts 17:31 f. records how Paul's preaching of the resurrection at Athens met with sceptical amusement. Acts 17:18 reports that: "Some also of the Epicurean and Stoic philosophers met him. And some said, 'What would this babbler say?' Others said, 'He seems to be a preacher of foreign divinities, – because he preached Jesus and the resurrection." F. F. Bruce notes various possible interpretations of *anastasis* here (*The Acts of the Apostles*, 1951, 333). If *Iēsous* was connected with *iasis* (healing) or *Iēsō* (Healer), *anastasis* might remind them of *anastatēria*, a word quoted by Hesychius as meaning sacrifices offered on recovery from sickness (cf. F. H. Chase, *The Credibility of the Acts of the Apostles*, 1902, 205 f.). Anastasis may, however, have been thought of as a goddess (cf. Chrysostom, *Hom. in Act.* 38, 1; Oepke, ibid.; E. Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 1971, 518).

OT 1. The pre-exilic portions of the OT are widely considered to contain no statements which enable us to recognize a hope of resurrection from the dead. Death is the definite end, the destruction of human existence (cf. Gen. 3:19; Job 30:23). This concept is not invalidated by the accounts of isolated individuals returning to life, viz. the widow's son in Zarephath (1 Ki. 17:17–22), the Shunammite's son (2 Ki. 4:18–37), and the man thrown hurriedly into Elisha's grave (2 Ki. 13:20 f.). If Enoch (Gen. 5:24) and → Elijah (2 Ki. 2:11) did not die, but were snatched away from earth before their death, it was a proclamation of the power of death to destroy life and the general lack of hope beyond it. This may be seen most clearly in Job's words to his friends (Job 7:7–10; 20:20 ff.; 14:14; on Job 19:25 f. → Redemption, art. *lyō* OT).

2. It is further confirmed by those statements in the Psalms in which prayer is made for salvation and preservation from the domain of death which destroys life,

but not from a death which has already been experienced. Thus the author of Ps. 88 prays to be delivered from Sheol (Heb. *šᵉ'ôl*; Gk. *hadēs*) and the Pit or destruction (Heb. *šaḥaṯ*; Gk. *diaphthora*) (→ Hell, art. *hadēs*), where the dead are evidently cut off from Yahweh: he is "like one forsaken among the dead, like the slain that lie in the grave, like those whom thou dost remember no more, for they are cut off from thy hand.... Dost thou work wonders for the dead? Do the shades rise up to praise thee? *Selah.* Is thy steadfast love declared in the grave, or thy faithfulness in Abaddon? Are thy wonders known in the darkness, or thy saving help in the land of forgetfulness?" (Ps. 88[87]:5, 10 f. [6, 11 f.]). Conversely, the faithful who are saved by Yahweh sing of salvation in the same terms (Pss. 30[29]:2 f., 11; 86[85]:12 f.; 103[102]:1, 3 ff.; 116[115]:8; 118[117]:7; Isa. 38:17.)

The salvation of which the psalmist sings in Ps. 16(15):10 appears to be this-worldly, though it also points beyond the grave: "For thou dost not give me up to Sheol, or let thy godly one see the Pit" (cf. Acts 2:25–28, 31). Some scholars see no mention of a life after death in Ps. 16 (e.g. A. F. Kirkpatrick, H. Gunkel, C. Barth, H.-J. Kraus, S. Mowinckel), whereas others do (S. R. Driver, A. Weiser, M. Dahood, H. H. Rowley) (cf. H. H. Rowley, *The Faith of Israel*, 1956, 175; A. A. Anderson, *The Book of Psalms, New Century Bible*, I, 1972, 145). R. Martin-Achard points out that "The real question in Ps. XVI is that of communion with the Living God; the writer foresees no end to this; he does not understand how its persistence will be possible, but that does not trouble his mind, because it depends on God" (*From Death to Life: A Study of the Development of the Doctrine of the Resurrection in the Old Testament*, 1960, 152 f.). The point is borne out by the final verse of the Psalm: "Thou dost show me the path of life; in thy presence there is fullness of joy, in thy right hand are pleasures for evermore" (Ps. 16[15]:11).

Another passage is Ps. 49(48):15: "But God will ransom my soul from the power of Sheol, for he will receive me [MT *yiqqāḥēnî*; LXX *lambanē me*]." M. Dahood suggests that the psalmist expected to be assumed in a way similar to Enoch or Elijah (*Psalms, Anchor Bible*, I, 1966, 301; cf. R. Martin-Achard, op. cit., 157 f.). He does so on the grounds that the Heb. vb. *lāqaḥ* is precisely that used in Gen. 5:24; 2 Ki. 2:3, 5, 9; cf. Sir. 42:15; 48:9; Ps. 73(72):24. However, it must be pointed out that both the Heb. and Gk. vbs. are the regular vbs. meaning to take, and it is probably best to exercise the same caution indicated by the interpretation of Ps. 16. Ps. 49 clearly does not teach a positive doctrine of resurrection. On the other hand, it envisages an ongoing life with Yahweh in which the believing Israelite is saved from the ongoing power of Sheol.

A similar thought is probably expressed in Ps. 73(72):24: "Thou dost guide me with thy counsel, and afterward thou wilt receive me to glory [MT *wᵉ'aḥar kāḇôḏ tiqqāḥēnî*: LXX *kai meta doxēs proselabou me*]." Again the Heb. vb. is *lāqaḥ*, and glory could mean honour and prosperity in this life. However, H. H. Rowley thinks that the psalmist's way of speaking is odd, if he is referring to this life only. "He speaks of God receiving him, rather than of his bestowing some material boon upon him. He first declares that he enjoys God's fellowship here and now, and if God is to receive him, it must be to future fellowship. If that is still in this life, nothing is added to the thought; but if it is beyond the grave then the words contribute something to the thought. It seems to me likely that the meaning is that both before death and after death he has a secure treasure in the fellowship of God. The God who delights to

enrich him with the experience of himself now will grant him fuller fellowship hereafter" (op. cit., 173).

Summing up the testimony of the psalmists, G. E. Ladd observes that "Such passages give us only glimpses of a hope of a blessed existence after death. It is important to note that the hope is based on confidence in God's power over death, not on a view of something immortal in man. The Psalmists do not reflect on what *part* of man survives death – his soul or spirit; nor is there any reflection on the nature of the after life. There is merely the confidence that even death cannot destroy the reality of fellowship with the living God. This is very different from the Greek view of immortality. 'The psalmists . . . cannot conceive that this communion with God can ever be broken even by death' " (*I Believe in the Resurrection of Jesus*, 1975, 47; the last sentence is a quotation from R. Martin-Achard, op. cit., 180).

3. Outside the Book of Psalms, the Song of Moses (Deut. 32) and that of Hannah (1 Sam. 2) proclaim that Yahweh kills and makes alive. The Song of → Moses has been described as a sort of compendium of prophetic theology, bringing to mind the historical evocations of Hos. 2, Jer. 2 and Ezek. 16, 23, and the historical theology associated with the Deuteronomistic outlook (cf. R. Martin-Achard, op. cit., 53). It celebrates the power of the living God, culminating in the assertion: "See now that I, even I, am he, and there is no god beside me; I kill and I make alive, I wound and I heal; and there is none that can deliver out of my hand" (Deut. 32:39). Whereas the Song of Moses reflects on Yahweh's dealings with the nation, the Song of Hannah which comes after the birth of Samuel celebrates Yahweh's power to those in need, including the barren (2 Sam. 2:5). In the mid-point of the song there is the reflection: "The LORD kills and brings to life; he brings down to Sheol and raises up" (1 Sam. 2:6). For interpretations of the song see R. Martin-Achard, op. cit., 56 f., who concludes that both songs stress the extraordinary power of the God of Israel. "Yahweh freely disposes of life, He bestows it, withdraws it, and gives it again. The history of the Chosen People and the existence of the Israelite alike abundantly testify to this sovereign power that Yahweh exercises at the expense of His enemies and for the sake of His own. The writers of these hymns do not envisage the resurrection of the dead, they are simply asserting that the Living God is able to intervene, effectively, everywhere, and at all times, even in the darkest hour; His liberating interventions are particular evidence of His tremendous power" (op. cit., 57).

4. The continuity of the living God and the ongoing life of those who belong to him is the premise of Jesus' interpretation of Exod. 3:6 in his debate with the → Sadducees over the resurrection and the problem case of levirate marriage (Matt. 22:23–33; Mk. 12:18–27; Lk. 20:27–40; → Marriage, art. *gameō* OT 5). "And as for the dead being raised, have you not read in the book of Moses, in the passage about the bush, how God said to him, 'I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob'? He is not God of the dead, but of the living; you are quite wrong" (Mk. 12:26 f., cf. par. Matt. 22:31 f., Lk. 20:37 f.). The idea of Yahweh as the protector of the patriarchs and of his covenant people recurs in Exod. 3:15 f.; 4:5 and also later writings (cf. Man. 5:1; Ass. Mos. 3:9; Jub. 45:3; Test. Reub. 4:10; Test. Sim. 2:8; Test. Jos. 2:2; 6:7; Test. Gad 2:5; 3 Macc. 7:16; Wis. 9:1; Jud. 9:11; 1QM 10:8). "The concept 'God of the dead' implies a blatant contradiction, especially in the context of the Sadducean understanding of death as extinction, without the hope of resurrection. If God has assumed the task of protecting the

patriarchs from misfortune during the course of their life, but fails to deliver them from that supreme misfortune which marks the definitive and absolute check upon their hopes, his protection is of little value. . . . In citing Ex. 3:6 Jesus showed how resurrection faith is attached in a profound way to the central concept of biblical revelation, the covenant, and how the salvation promised by God to the patriarchs and their descendants in virtue of the covenant contains implicitly the assurance of the resurrection. It was the failure to appreciate the essential link between God's covenant faithfulness and the resurrection which had led the Sadducees into their grievous error" (W. L. Lane, *The Gospel according to Mark, NLC*, 1974, 430; cf. F. Dreyfus, "L'Argument Scripturaire de Jésus en Faveur de la Résurrection des Morts (Marc, XII, 26, 27)", *RB* 66, 1959, 213–24; C. F. D. Moule, *The Birth of the New Testament*, 1966, 65). R. N. Longenecker sees Jesus as confounding the Sadducees for whom every word of the Torah possessed validity, by employing their own methods of exegesis against them (*Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*, 1975, 68 f.).

5. The two passages dealing with translation require further comment.

(a) The translation of Enoch is mentioned in a list of the antediluvian patriarchs, given in Gen. 5 which is widely attributed to P. The list extends from → Adam to → Noah. Ten names are mentioned and the great longevity of each is stated. Apart from the first, the last and the case of Enoch, there is a general pattern of description which R. Martin-Achard expresses as follows: "When *A* had lived *x* years, he became the father of *B*. *A* lived after the birth of *B y* years, and had other sons and daughters. Thus all the days of *A* were (*x* + *y*) years; *and he died*" (op. cit., 65). Generally speaking, as the generations proceed, the life-span of the patriarchs diminishes, as though in growing older man is increasingly alienated from the creator. But in the case of Enoch the process is momentarily interrupted, and he differs from the rest in that he did not die. "When Enoch had lived sixty-five years, he became the father of Methuselah. Enoch walked with God after the birth of Methuselah three hundred years, and had other sons and daughters. Thus all the days of Enoch were three hundred and sixty-five years. Enoch walked with God; and he was not, for God took him [MT *wayyiṯhallēḵ ḥ^anôḵ ʾeṯ-hāʾ^ĕlōhîm wᵉʾênennû kî-lāqaḥ ʾōṯô ʾᵉlōhîm*; LXX *kai euērestēsen Enōch tō theō kai ouch hēurisketo hoti metethēken auton ho theos*]" (Gen. 5:21–24). On the LXX translation → Please, art. *areskō*, NT 3; the intention was evidently to make it sound less anthropomorphic. In the LXX Enoch is one hundred and sixty-five years old at Methuselah's birth, and the rest of his life is correspondingly diminished to two hundred years.

In Heb. 11:5 Enoch is seen as an example of the → faith that is pleasing to God which was the cause of his translation. Martin-Achard suggests, however, that Enoch was originally an astral divinity, a sun-god (op. cit., 67). This is partly connected with the number 365 which is both his life-span and the number of days in the solar year. He also sees a connexion between the fact that Enoch was the seventh in line and that the Mesopotamian Enmeduranna was the seventh antediluvian king and was also lord of the oracles, custodian of the divine secrets, a renowned prophet and astrologer and King of Sippar, city of the sun (cf. the Sumerian king list in *ANET*, 265). Martin-Achard may well be right when he observes with W. Zimmerli that "the number 365 stands for a whole and so indicates that the Patriarch accomplished a complete cycle, his life being fulfilled when God takes him; the divine decision is not

a sign of reprobation but, on the contrary, sanctifies a life lived with God" (op. cit., 67 f.). On the other hand, E. A. Speiser thinks that the slight similarity of names is apparently coincidental, and that the initial *ḥ* in the Heb. form of Enoch's name appears to preclude any etymological relationship with the Sumerian Enmeduranna (*Genesis, Anchor Bible*, 1964, 41, 43).

The crucial vb. *lāqaḥ* means to take. Martin-Achard thinks that it is used here "as a technical expression to denote the assumption of a human being to God" (op. cit., 69; cf. 2 Ki. 2:2, 5, 9 f.; Pss. 49[48]:15; 83[82]:24; Sir. 44:16; 48:9; 49:14 f.; and liqû in the Gilgamesh epic, Tablet X, line 205 [for text of the tablet see *ANET*, 89–93]). But nothing is said about the mode of the taking. The LXX uses the vb. *metatithēmi*, change the position of, convey to another place, and in this it is followed by the author of Heb. (Heb. 11:5a and b; cf. Sir. 44:16; Wis. 4:10; 1 Clem. 9:3; the noun *metathesis*, removal, is used in Heb. 11:5c and 12:27). Josephus used the expression "withdrew to the divine [*anechōrēse pros to theion*]" (*Ant.* 1, 85); a phrase he also used to describe the passing of Moses (*Ant.* 4, 326; cf. 3, 96).

Subsequently a considerable Jewish literature grew up which supplied elaborate details of Enoch's translation. The so-called First Book of Enoch exists in its entirety only in Ethiopic, hence the title Ethiopic Enoch. About a third of it exists in Gk. and fragments in the original Aramaic and Heb. (representing the remains of more than ten separate manuscripts found at Qumran). Among these are all the sections of Eth. Enoch except chs. 37–71, the "Similitudes of Enoch". There is also a single Lat. fragment. R. H. Charles divided the work into five sections composed at different dates (Charles, II, 163–281): (i) chs. 1–36 incorporate portions of the Book of Noah and was written before 170 B.C..; (ii) chs. 37–71 contain the "Parables" or "Similitudes of Enoch" with the Son of Man passages which have NT affinities (*c.* 105–64 B.C., though some of it may belong to the Christian era); (iii) chs. 72–82 "The Book of the Heavenly Luminaries" (before 110 B.C..); (iv) chs. 83–90 "The Dream Visions" (*c.* 165–161 B.C.); (v) chs. 91–104 contain an "Apocalypse of Weeks" with material of various dates. The whole work is one of the most important Jewish pseudepigrapha, embodying revelations to Enoch on such topics as the origins of → evil, the → angels and their destinies, Gehenna (→ Hell) and → paradise. For critical edition of the text see M. A. Knibb and E. Ullendorff, eds., *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments*, I–II, 1977.

Slavonic Enoch or 2 Enoch bears the title "The Book of the Secrets of Enoch" in some manuscripts. It survives in Slavonic only in two recensions, and has numerous points of contact with Eth. Enoch. It has been variously seen as the work of an Alexandrian Jew at the beginning of the Christian era (Charles, II, 429), and as a Christian reply to Eth. Enoch dated in the 2nd or early 3rd cents. (A. Vaillant; cf. *ODCC*, 460). Hebrew Enoch or 3 Enoch is a Jewish, perhaps anti-Christian, work dating from the Christian era.

Eth. Enoch 1:9 is quoted by Jude 14 f.: "It was of these also that Enoch in the seventh generation from Adam prophesied, saying, 'Behold, the Lord came with his holy myriads, to execute judgment on all, and to convict all the ungodly of all their deeds of ungodliness which they have committed in such an ungodly way, and of all the harsh things which ungodly sinners have spoken against him." He is mentioned in Jub. 4:17 as "the first among men that are born on earth who learned writing and knowledge and wisdom." Elsewhere he is seen as the type of the righteous man:

"Enoch was found perfect, and he walked with Yahweh, and was taken; a sign of knowledge to every generation" (Sir. 44:16). The thought is amplified in Wis. 4:10 ff., stressing his innocence in the midst of wickedness and pointing out that "while living among sinners he was translated". Philo explained the translation as follows: "Concerning him it is said that 'Enoch was well-pleasing to God and was not found, for God translated [*metētheken*] him'; for 'translation' [*metathesis*] denotes turning and changing, and that a changing for the better" (*Abr.* 17 f.); "By 'translation' is clearly signified the new home [granted to him 'who escaped the insurrections of the body and deserted to the side of the soul'], and by 'not found' the solitary life" (*Praem.* 17; cf. F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, *NLC*, 1964, 188). In short, what in Gen. 5:21–24 began as a cursory statement about the life of Enoch, culminating in the statement, "Enoch walked with God, and he was not, for God took him", was articulated in later Judaism into a view of Enoch as a model of wisdom and righteousness, culminating in elaborate theories of translation.

(b) The translation of → Elijah is described in 2 Ki. 2:1–15. It belongs to the Elisha cycle, telling how the latter asked and received a double share of Elijah's spirit (the double portion being the right of the first-born, Deut. 21:17). Elijah is taken up to heaven by a whirlwind. "And as they still went on and talked, behold, a chariot of fire and horses of fire separated the two of them. And Elijah went up by a whirlwind into heaven" (v. 11; cf. Job 38:1). Martin-Achard suggests that the scene recalls the earliest theophanies of the God of Israel, as he first appeared to the tribes as the Lord of war and storm (op. cit., 70; cf. H. Fredriksson, *Jahve als Krieger*, 1945, 47 ff.). The text itself hardly supports Martin-Achard's suggestion of overtones of the sun myth in the light of the horses dedicated to the luminary at the entrance to the temple (2 Ki. 23:11). His other suggestion is more likely, that Yahweh is thought of in terms of chariots and horsemen, i.e. symbols of power in the realm where Israel was extremely needy. This latter point is underlined by the fact that the king of Syria allowed Israel to maintain a defensive force of only fifty horsemen, ten chariots and a thousand infantry (2 Ki. 13:7; cf. also Ps. 20:7). The people of God lack physical force, but Yahweh has it in abundance. Subsequent search fails to find the body of Elijah (2 Ki. 2:16 ff.), and Elisha succeeds him. For the sons of the prophets recognize that "The spirit of Elijah rests on Elisha" (v. 15).

The end of no other OT prophet is described in these terms. Again the vb. *lāqaḥ* is used for the taking of Elijah. It is questionable whether the carrying of Elijah by the Spirit of God (1 Ki. 18:12 ff., where the vb. is *nāśā'*) implies some form of supernatural transport, or whether *lāqaḥ* implies a more permanent and in fact a horizontal action as against *nāśā'* which has been thought to imply a vertical action (so L. Bronner. *The Stories of Elijah and Elisha as Polemics against Baal Worship, Pretoria Oriental Series* 6, 1968, 126 f.). Indeed, the only safe conclusion that can be drawn from the brief descriptions of the end of both Elijah and Enoch is the positive one that they both imply the positive points that (i) they entered the presence of Yahweh at the end of their earthly lives, and (ii) that Yahweh himself took the initiative. Negatively it may be said that in neither case is death mentioned, but then that the writers of the two accounts clearly wished to focus attention on the positive aspect. In the case of Elijah a whirlwind or tempest (Heb. *sᵉʿārâh*; LXX *sysseismos*) is mentioned. This may be compared with the manifestations of Yahweh's power in the elements in 1 Ki. 18:38, 45; 19:11–14 and the motif of Baal as the rider of the

clouds (cf. Bronner, op. cit., 122 ff.). Yahweh's power is manifested through the elements. In the case of the end of Elijah and the bestowal of his spirit on Elisha it was manifested through the whirlwind or tempest. (For the considerable rabbinic speculation on Elijah after his translation from this world see SB IV, 2, 764–98.)

6. A number of passages in the prophets are relevant to the discussion.

(a) Hos. 6:1–3 states: "Come, let us return to the LORD; for he has torn, that he may heal us; he has stricken, and he will bind us up. After two days he will revive us [MT *yᵉḥayyēnû*; LXX *hygiasei hēmas*, he will heal us]; on the third day he will raise us up [MT *yᵉqimēnû*; LXX *anastēsometha*], that we may live before him [MT *wᵉniḥyeh lᵉpānāyw*; LXX *kai zēsometha enōpion autou*]. Let us know, and let us press on to know the LORD; his going forth is sure as the dawn; he will come to us as the showers, as the spring rains that water the earth." For a review of critical opinion see R. Martin-Achard, op. cit., 74–86. The historical background is that of the Syro-Ephraimitish War (735–734 B.C.) and its aftermath (cf. 2 Ki. 15 and 18; Isa. 7 and 8), and the passage constitutes a call to repentance and faith in Yahweh for restoration. Martin-Achard sees in the terms "in two days", "on the third day", "dawn" and "dew" allusions to the Baal cult in the Ras Shamra texts, in which Baal descends into the nether world with his retinue, clouds, winds, rains, his servants and daughters, and restores life (op. cit., 84 f.). He concludes that resurrection is therefore envisaged, though on the basis of the agricultural cults. But the argument is slender. The context does not imply cultic renewal, and indeed repudiates it (Hos. 6:6). Moreover, Baal-worship is condemned as harlotry (v. 10; cf. vv. 4 and 7; and 2:13; 9:2). Rather, the passage implies national renewal on the basis of returning to Yahweh, using the language of healing after being stricken for apostasy. There is a case for saying that Hosea consciously takes over the language and idioms of Baal-worship and uses them polemically against the Baals (cf. H. W. Wolff, *Hosea, Hermeneia*, 1974, xxvi ff.). Hosea's point is that it is not the Baals that do these things through the cults but Yahweh; and it is Yahweh in Hos. 6:1–3 who will restore Israel to health and vitality, just as the spring rains renew the parched, dead earth.

Hos. 13:14 asks: "Shall I ransom them from the power of Sheol? Shall I redeem them from Death? O Death, where are your plagues? O Sheol, where is your destruction? [LXX *pou hē dikē sou* (your judgment), *thanate; pou to kentron sou* (your sting), *hade*; the MT has a positive statement instead of questions, *ʾᵉhî dᵉḇāreyḵā māweṯ ʾᵉhî qāṭāḇḵā šᵉʾôl*, i.e. I will be . . .]. Compassion is hid from my eyes." On the various questions raised by the language here see R. Martin-Achard, op. cit., 88. The LXX, like the Syriac, reads *ʾayyēh* ("where") for *ʾᵉhî* ("I will be"). It should be remembered that the Heb. text would be unpointed, i.e. written with the consonants only. The phraseology of Hos. 13:14b appears to be taken up by Paul in 1 Cor. 15:55 in celebrating the resurrection of the dead: "When the perishable puts on the imperishable, and the mortal puts on immortality, then shall come to pass the saying that is written: 'Death is swallowed up in victory.' 'O death, where is thy victory? O death, where is thy sting [*pou sou, thanate, to nikos; pou sou, thanate, to kentron*]?' " (1 Cor. 15:54 f.; v. 54 quotes Isa. 25:8).

Luther and others have seen the passage as a predictive prophecy of the downfall of death before the risen Christ (for a review of interpretations see R. Martin-Achard, op. cit., 90 ff.). However, to see the passage as a prediction in this sense is to violate the original intention of the words which in context refer to the coming judgment on

the nation. Nevertheless, the passage testifies to "the extraordinary power of the God of Israel; Yahweh treats Death as a lord treats one of his subjects; He commands it as a vassal, and, in spite of all, Sheol is at His disposal. In face of the Living God, even the dominion of death has to yield" (R. Martin-Achard, op. cit., 92). But in any case, the reference appears to be to the historical situation of Israel, threatened with destruction by the foreign nations. "These nations stand under the commanding authority of Israel's God (cf. 10:10). If those hostile nations punish Israel with the 'thorns' and 'stings' of the drover or foreman, then the imagery of tormenting and distressing death is clear (cf. Josh. 23:13; Nu. 33:55; Ju. 8:7). To be sure, only in Ps. 91:6 are 'thorn' (*dbr*) and 'sting' (*qṭb*) mentioned in connection with a humanly wielded weapon ('arrow' in v. 5). In most cases these words denote pestilence, which would naturally fit here as the instrument of death and Sheol as well. In each case Yahweh refuses to be compassionate" (H. W. Wolff, op. cit., 228).

In context, therefore, Hosea's words do not refer to the resurrection hope of the individual but to Yahweh's power over the death and destruction of the nation in history. However, as C. K. Barrett points out, Paul is not here "grounding an argument on Scripture, but writing freely, in scriptural language, of the ultimate victory over death" (*The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, *BNTC*, 1968, 283). To be more precise, Paul appears to be making use of OT testimonia, following a pesher style of exegesis which interprets the meaning of the original text in the light of the point the expositor is making (cf. E. E. Ellis, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament*, 1957, 96 ff., 144 ff.). The original meaning of Hosea's words finds its ultimate fulfilment in the resurrection, where men are ransomed from Sheol and redeemed from death, and where thus Sheol and death are mocked.

(b) On the other hand, Isa. 26:19 expresses fleetingly a confidence in the resurrection of Israel: "Thy dead shall live, my bodies shall rise. O dwellers in the dust, awake and sing for joy! For thy dew is a dew of light, and on the land of the shades thou wilt let it fall" (RSV mg.). The attempt to work out who is speaking presents a puzzle. "If the profession of trust in Yahweh is uttered by the praying community ... or an individual leading the prayer, then the dead are departed Israelites who are particularly close to him, or perhaps even the righteous.... On the other hand if Yahweh is the speaker, as most modern commentators accept, what we have is a promise in reply to the praying community, and all the subsequent relationships are simply reversed" (O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 13–19*, 1974, 215 f.). There are certain discrepancies of reading represented by the MT and the Vulgate on the one side and the LXX, the Qumran Isaiah Scroll and the Syriac and Aramaic traditions on the other. This has led to the conjecture of emendation concerning the clause in the MT *yiḥyû mēṯeḳā nᵉḇēlāṯî yᵉqûmûn* ("your dead shall live, my bodies shall rise" MT), as contrasted with the LXX *anastēsontai hoi nekroi kai egerthēsontai hoi en tois mnēmeiois* ("the dead shall rise and those in the tombs shall be raised" LXX). However, the passage clearly teaches a belief in the resurrection. This has led some commentators like Kaiser to regard it as an interpolation, on the grounds that such an expression of belief is too rare in Isaiah's day and appears only on the very limits of the OT (op. cit., 218). For the same reason he regards Isa. 25:8 also as an interpolation: "He will swallow up death for ever, and the Lord God will wipe away tears from all faces, and the reproach of his people he will take away from all the earth, for the LORD has spoken." Similarly, R. Martin-Achard dates the passage in the 4th

cent. B.C. at the time of the upheavals attending the conquests of Alexander the Great (op. cit., 131; but cf. E. J. Young, *The Book of Isaiah, The New International Commentary on the Old Testament*, II, 1969, 225–29, 253–61). There is no need with Martin-Achard to see in the allusion to dew the Mother Earth theme, reflecting ideas found at Ras Shamra (op. cit., 132; cf. Hos. 6:4; 14:5; Mic. 5:6; Ps. 110:3; Isa. 66:14). The dew in Palestine replaced the rain in summer and increased in quantity in the autumn (cf. Kaiser, op. cit., 217).

For discussion of the Servant Songs of Isa. (especially Isa. 53:10 ff. in 52:13–53:12) see R. Martin-Achard (op. cit., 103–23; → also Serve). As Martin-Achard points out, "The prophet here seems to be informing us of the destiny of an individual and not about the lot of a group; thus the exaltation of the Servant implies more than the restoration of Israel and the prospective greatness of the People of God. The destiny of the humiliated and glorified Servant presupposes his resurrection; yet Deutero-Isaiah makes no specific reference to this " (op. cit., 122).

(c) Ezekiel's vision of the valley of dry bones (Ezek. 37) has frequently been taken as a prediction of the resurrection (cf. Justin, *Apol. II*, 87; Irenaeus, *Haer.* 5, 1; Tertullian, *De resurrectione carnis* 30). In the vision the prophet is asked by Yahweh whether these bones can live (v. 3). The prophet replies that Yahweh alone knows. "Again he said to me, 'Prophesy to these bones, and say to them, O dry bones, hear the word of the LORD. Thus says the Lord God to these bones: Behold, I will cause breath to enter you, and you shall live. And I will lay sinews upon you, and will cause flesh to come upon you, and cover you with skin, and put breath in you, and you shall live; and you shall know that I am the LORD" (Ezek. 37:4 ff.). In the vision the prophet does so, and what is promised comes about (vv. 7–11). He is then given the interpretation: "Then he said to me, 'Son of man, these bones are the whole house of Israel. Behold, they say, "Our bones are dried up, and our hope is lost; we are clean cut off." Therefore prophesy, and say to them, Thus says the Lord God: Behold, I will open your graves, and raise you from your graves, O my people; and I will bring you home into the land of Israel. And you shall know that I am the LORD, when I open your graves, and raise you from your graves, O my people. And I will put my Spirit within you, and you shall live, and I will place you in your own land; then you shall know that I, the LORD, have spoken, and I have done it, says the LORD' " (vv. 11–14).

The background is the fall of → Jerusalem, the capture of the → temple and the exile which left the Israelites saying: "Our transgressions and our sins are upon us, and we waste away because of them; how then can we live?" (Ezek. 33:10). In the context of the times, therefore, the vision is one of national restoration. H. Riesenfeld has seen in it traces of sacral ceremonies, including the drama of the New Year festival in which the king was supposed to engage in combat with his enemies, representing the conflict of creative powers with chaos (*The Resurrection in Ezekiel xxxvii and in the Dura-Europos Paintings*, 1948). However, the evidence for this festival is tenuous, and any link with Ezek. 37 is uncertain. It is more likely that Ezekiel based his view of the creative power of Yahweh on the theology that is found in Gen. 2:7, and that the picture derives from the countless corpses scattered on the battlefield in the wake of Nebuchadnezzar's armies. "The prophet is not concerned with the resurrection of the dead as such, but there is no doubt that the symbolism that he employs raised among the Jews the question of renewal of life for the depar-

ted, and it is in this sense that both Jewish and Christian tradition re-read this chapter. Ezekiel's confidence is founded on the sovereign power of the God of Israel, a power that was made especially manifest when He created man" (R. Martin-Achard, op. cit., 102; cf. W. Eichrodt, *Ezekiel,* 1970, 505–15; J. W. Wevers, *Ezekiel, New Century Bible*, 1969, 276–80).

(d) Dan. 12:2 is "the only passage in the Old Testament where we have a clear and undisputed reference to the resurrection of the dead" (H. H. Rowley, op. cit., 167). The context speaks of a great tribulation such as there has never been, with Michael (→ Angel) arising in charge of the people and a book containing the names of the people who shall be delivered (v. 1). "And many of those who sleep in the dust shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt" (Dan. 12:2). V. 3 goes on to say: "And those who are wise shall shine like the brightness of the firmament; and those who turn many to righteousness, like the stars for ever and ever." Some writers trace this to the influence of Persian thought (e.g. H. Birkeland, "The Belief in the Resurrection of the Dead in the Old Testament", *StTh* 3/1, 1950, 75 f.). But Rowley thinks that "the author was driven by the dynamic of his own faith to this as the corollary of that faith" (ibid.). In common with many scholars Rowley locates Dan. in the Maccabean period, which in turn gave rise to the → Pharisaic belief in the resurrection. Thus, R. Martin-Achard sees in the passage an allusion to the victims of Antiochus Epiphanes (op. cit., 145; cf. 2 Macc. 7:11). (For an exposition of Dan. setting it in the time of the exile in terms of the events that it describes see E. J. Young, *The Prophecy of Daniel,* 1949.) Dan. 12 is apparently concerned only with a resurrection within Israel: some to salvation and others to condemnation. "The mass of the people does not appear to be interested in an event which will enable the *Ḥasidim* to be rewarded and the impious punished; the indifferent will thus remain in the dust. Justice requires the resurrection, for only the resurrection provides the one answer to the problem raised by the death of the most faithful servants of the Living God" (R. Martin-Achard, op. cit., 144; cf. 2 Macc. 7:9, 11 f., 13 f., 23, 29, 36 f.; 12:43 f.; 14:46). On the possible influence of Persian thought on Dan. see below, 9.

7. Before leaving the canonical writings of the OT, mention may be made of the episode in 1 Sam. 28 in which the medium at Endor conjured up the spirit of Samuel at the behest of Saul. The woman said to Saul: "I see a god coming up out of the earth" (1 Sam. 28:13). Commenting on Samuel's words, "Why have you disturbed me by bringing me up?" (v. 15), J. Mauchline writes: "The meaning of the statement by Samuel that he has been disturbed probably does not refer to an emotional disturbance at meeting Saul again but at having to leave Sheol to be involved in earthly affairs again (cf. Job 3.12–19)" (*1 and 2 Samuel, New Century Bible*, 1971, 182). The reference to a "god" means a "godlike being", and is probably best rendered by "spirit" (H. W. Hertzberg, *I & II Samuel*, 1964, 219). (On mediums in Israelite religion → Magic, art. *mageia* OT 4.)

8. The literature of the intertestamental period exhibits a variety of beliefs about the after-life and resurrection.

(a) Jesus ben Sirach, writing about 180 B.C., had no conception of resurrection or life after death, and thus held a position comparable with that of the → Sadducees in the time of Christ. Sheol is the ultimate abode of the dead. It is devoid of pleasure (Sir. 14:16). It is a place of darkness (22:11), endless sleep (46:19), silence (17:27 f.)

and corruption (10:11). Men cannot praise God there (18:28). There is no return from death (38:21) which is a state of eternal rest (30:17). The only immortality known to Sirach is a good name (39:9; 41:11 ff.; 44:8) or the perpetuation of one's name in one's children (11:28; 46:12).

(b) However, 2 Macc. describes the hope of the martyrs of Israel in the struggle against Antiochus Epiphanes (see especially 2 Macc. 7:9, 11, 14, 22 f., 29; 12:43; and cf. above 6(d) on the Book of Daniel). Thus the elder, Razis, disembowelled himself rather than fall into the hands of the Greeks. He flung his bowels at the crowds, "calling on Him who is lord of life and spirit to restore them to him again" (2 Macc. 14:46).

(c) The Apocalypse of Baruch was written late in the 1st cent. A.D., reflecting on the tragedy of the destruction of Jerusalem. The only hope lies in the world to come. For the author the dead will be raised in exactly the same form: "For the earth shall then assuredly restore the dead [which it now receives in order to preserve them]. It shall make no change in their form, But as it has received them, so shall it restore them, And as I delivered them unto it, so also shall it raise them" (Syr. Bar. 50:2). They will thus be recognizable (vv. 3 f.). But then they will be changed, just as the wicked will be tormented: "Also (as for) the glory of those who have now been justified in My law, who have had understanding in their life, and who have planted in their heart the root of wisdom, then their splendour shall be glorified in changes, and the form of their face shall be turned into the light of their beauty, that they may be able to acquire and receive the world which does not die, which is then promised to them" (Syr. Bar. 51:3). This hope seems to combine transformation "into the splendour of angels" (v. 5) with a Gk. idea of the eternal world. At the same time it makes resurrection dependent on adherence to the practice of the law.

(d) Another apocalyptic and pseudepigraphical writing is 2 Esdras which was similarly written about A.D. 100 and which describes the coming of the messiah. After an interim kingdom of four hundred years "the earth shall restore those that sleep in her, and the dust those that are at rest therein [and the chambers shall restore those that were committed unto them]. And the Most High shall be revealed upon the throne of judgment: (and then cometh the End) and compassion shall pass away (and pity be far off). . . . And then shall the pit of torment appear, and over against it the place of refreshment; The furnace of Gehenna shall be made manifest, and over against it the Paradise of delight" (2 Esd. 7:32–6). The nations shall also be raised for judgment (vv. 37 ff.). The saved are those who observed "the Law of the lawgiver perfectly" (v. 89). The face of the righteous in the resurrection shall shine like the sun (v. 97).

2 Esd. 7 is "the one passage in Jewish intertestamental literature which speaks of a dying Messiah" (G. E. Ladd, op. cit., 69). At the end of this evil age God will intervene to punish the wicked and reward the righteous in the age to come. "For my Son the Messiah shall be revealed, together with those who are with him, and shall rejoice the survivors four hundred years. And it shall be, after these years, that my Son the Messiah shall die, and all in whom there is human breath. Then shall the world be turned into the primeval silence seven days, like as at the first beginnings; so that no man is left. And it shall be after seven days that the Age which is not yet awake shall be roused, and that which is corruptible shall perish" (2 Esd. 7:28–31). (For further discussion of the messiah and the resurrection see G. E. Ladd, op. cit., 60–73.)

(e) The date and structure of Ethiopic Enoch have already been noted above in 5(a). The five sections express a variety of eschatological expectations. Chs. 1–36 do not speak explicitly of a resurrection, but one is implied. Enoch visits Sheol, the intermediate state of the dead. The statement that some of the spirits of the wicked shall be slain on the day of judgment (Eth. Enoch 22:13) suggests that others will be raised. The resurrection of the righteous Israelites (though not of others) is implied in Eth. Enoch 90:33. The same is true of the Similitudes of Enoch. The wicked "shall have no hope of rising from their beds, Because they do not extol the name of the Lord of Spirits" (46:6). But the righteous shall be raised as the chosen of the Elect One, the heavenly Son of man: "And in those days shall the earth also give back that which has been entrusted to it, And Sheol also shall give back that which it has received, And hell shall give back that which it owes. For in those days the Elect One shall arise, And he shall choose the righteous and holy from among them: For the day has drawn nigh that they should be saved" (Eth. Enoch 51:1 f.). The nature of the resurrection is described in Eth. Enoch 62:13–16: "And the righteous and the elect shall be saved on that day, And they shall never thenceforward see the face of the sinners and unrighteous. And the Lord of Spirits will abide over them, And with that Son of Man shall they eat, And lie down and rise up for ever and ever. And the righteous and elect shall have risen from the earth, And ceased to be of downcast countenance. And these shall be the garments of life from the Lord of Spirits: And your garments shall not grow old, Nor your glory pass away before the Lord of Spirits."

This latter passage seems to envisage the resurrection of a transfigured body. G. E. Ladd points out that the concept of resurrection in the final section of Eth. Enoch seems to be a resurrection of the spirit, although this is quite uncommon in Judaism (*I Believe in the Resurrection of Jesus*, 1975, 75): "And the spirits of you who have died in righteousness shall live and rejoice, And their spirits shall not perish, nor their memorial from before the face of the Great One unto all the generations of the world: wherefore no longer fear their contumely" (Eth. Enoch 103:4; cf. 95: 33 ff.; 104:2–6).

(f) The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs were probably compiled in the first two centuries B.C. Again the resurrection of righteous Israelites is affirmed (Test. Jud. 25:1–4; Test. Ben. 10:6–9; Test. Zeb. 10:4).

(g) Although the Qumran community expected a grand final conflict between the sons of light and the sons of darkness (cf. 1QM generally; 1QH 3:34 ff.; CD 20:14 f.), they do not seem to have been much concerned about the fate of the dead (G. E. Ladd, op. cit., 57 f.; cf. H. Ringgren, *The Faith of Qumran*, 1963, 148 ff.). J. Pryke attributes to them a view of the immortality of the soul rather than the resurrection of the body in any Christian or late Jewish sense ("Eschatology in the Dead Sea Scrolls", in M. Black, ed., *The Scrolls and Christianity, SPCK Theological Collections* 11, 1969, 56). The sect clearly shared a belief in some form of future life. Perhaps the nearest statement of belief in a resurrection comes in the following Hymns, but even here it may be poetic metaphor: "And then at the time of Judgement the Sword of God shall hasten, and all the sons of His truth shall awake to [overthrow] wickedness; all the sons of iniquity shall be no more" (1QH 6:29 f.); "Hoist a banner, O you who lie in the dust! O bodies gnawed by worms, raise up an ensign for [the destruction of wickedness]! [The sinful shall] be destroyed in the bat-

tles against the ungodly" (1QH 6:34); "that bodies gnawed by worms may be raised from the dust to the counsel [of Thy truth], and that the perverse spirit (may be lifted) to the understanding [which comes from Thee]; that he may stand before Thee with the everlasting host and with [Thy] spirits [of holiness], to be renewed with all the living and to rejoice together with them that know" (1QM 11:12 ff.). The Manual of Discipline speaks of "the Renewal", of God choosing them "for an everlasting Covenant and all the glory of Adam shall be theirs" (1QS 4). "And as for the visitation of all who walk in this spirit, it shall be healing, great peace in a long life, and fruitfulness, together with every everlasting blessing and eternal joy in life without end, a crown of glory and a garment of majesty in unending light" (1QS 4:7 f.).

It is passages such as these which lead Pryke to conclude that the main thrust of Qumran belief was that "the ultimate destiny of those raised from the dead is to join the angelic company of spirits and to be transmuted from the matter into spirit, from man into angelic being" (op. cit., 56). This variety of emphases found in the Qumran texts lends substance to the accounts of Josephus, who held that the Essenes believed in both the resurrection of the body and the immortality of the soul: "Now the following opinion is firmly held among them . . . that while bodies are corruptible and their material substance has no permanency, souls are immortal and continue for ever; and that, emanating from the finest atmosphere, they are bound up in their bodies as in prisons, into which they are drawn by a certain natural attraction: but when they are released from the bonds of the flesh, they rejoice and are borne upwards, freed from a long slavery" (Josephus, *War* 8, 11). "Now the dogma (word) of the resurrection also is firmly held among them. . . . For they confess that the flesh also will rise and be immortal as the soul is already immortal, which they now say, when separated from the body, enters a place of fragrant air and light, to rest until the judgment . . . for they say that there will be a judgment and a conflagration of everything, and that the wicked will be eternally punished" (Hippolytus, *Haer.* 27; both quotations taken from M. Black, "The Account of the Essenes in Hippolytus and Josephus", in W. D. Davies and D. Daube, *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology. In Honour of Charles Harold Dodd*, 1954, 175). Perhaps these summaries are weighted by a background Greek understanding of the immortality of the soul. But there is a passage in the Angelic Liturgy which together with the Horoscopes of Qumran comes near to gnosticism: "The sixth among the chief Princes will bless [. . .] all the perfect in righteous acts with seven words of wonder, so that they should be for ever with those who live for ever [. . .] The seventh of the sovereign Princes shall bless [. . .] who [for ever] praise his glorious kingdom with seven wondrous words which will be to them for eternal peace" (4QS1 1:24 ff.; cf. J. Pryke, ibid.; M. Delcor, "Recherches sur un Horoscope en Langue Hébraique provenant de Qumrân", *Revue de Qumrân* 20, 1966, 521–42; J. Carmignac, "Les Horoscopes de Qumrân", *Revue de Qumrân* 18, 1965, 199–217).

(h) In the later Talmudic literature "the primary doctrine of Judaism is the resurrection, the revivification of the dead" (G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, II, 379). The two terms are here synonymous. For complete demonstration, proof was sought from the three main divisions of scripture as in the discussion between Rabban Gamaliel II and the Sadducees. The latter asked Gamaliel where in scripture was the evidence that the Holy One brings the dead to life. Gamaliel replied by citing from the law Deut. 31:16, from the prophets Isa. 26:19, and from the hagiographa Cant. 7:10.

But the Sadducees were not satisfied, and Gamaliel finally quoted Deut. 11:9, claiming that the promise of the land "to them" implied resurrection of the dead (cf. Sanhedrin 90b; Moore, *Judaism*, II, 382, and for further data 377–95; SB IV, 2, 1166–98 on the question of a general or partial resurrection of the dead in Judaism; SB IV, 2, 1213–1323 on ideas of judgment in Judaism). However, recent investigation has also shown widespread belief in Judaism between c. 200 B.C. and A.D. 100 of immortality of the soul alongside resurrection (cf. H. C. C. Cavallin, *Life After Death. Paul's Argument for the Resurrection of the Dead in 1 Corinthians 15. Part I: An Enquiry into the Jewish Background*, 1974, 200).

9. Neither the OT nor later intertestamental literature contains a uniform eschatological expectation. In large tracts of the NT, expectation is concentrated on this life and on what Yahweh is doing in history. But in various places there is the growing belief that, because Yahweh lives, his faithful people will also live. The nature of such an existence is rarely defined, though there is an implied continuity of identity. While Sheol is often depicted as the ultimate end of man, there is "the beginnings of the thought of a richer and more worth-while survival in another world, and the growth of a belief in a resurrection to life on earth" (H.H. Rowley, op. cit., 160 f.).

Such beliefs are sometimes traced to foreign influence. One such suggestion is that the Israelites got the idea of resurrection from the Egyptian cult of Osiris (H. Gressmann, *Tod und Auferstehung des Osiris, Der Alte Orient* 13, 1923; R. Martin-Achard, op. cit., 195–205; but cf. F. Nötscher, *Altorientalischer und alttestamentlicher Auferstehungsglauben*, 1926, 177 ff., 185, and H. H. Rowley, op. cit., 161 ff.). This was related to the Babylonian Tammuz cult and to the Canaanite fertility cult (cf. the account of the "Descent of Ishtar to the Nether World", *ANET*, 196–9; H. Frankfort, *Kingship and the Gods*, 1945, 286 ff.). Osiris may well be connected with Adonis, the Syrian counterpart of Tammuz (Lucian, *De Dea Syra* 7; cf. W. W. von Baudissin, *Adonis und Esmun*, 1911, 94 ff.). The Osiris cult was originally a rite in which pharaoh was identified with Osiris, thus assuring him of immortality. It has been suggested that such rites were incorporated into Israelite religion in the form of a new year festival in which the king ritually died and rose again. In this he represented God, and the ceremonies were designed to encourage fertility and the renewal of nature. The idea of sacred marriage belonged to these rites, and this was reflected in the religious prostitution denounced by the prophets.

Although it is clear from the denunciations of the prophets that Canaanite religion encroached upon that of the Israelites, the subject of the new year festival as such is not directly mentioned by the OT writers. It is rather inferred from constructions placed on certain passages, and many scholars now doubt whether there ever was such a festival (cf. D. J. A. Clines, "The Evidence for an Autumnal New Year in Pre-Exilic Israel and Judah Reconsidered", *JBL* 93, 1974, 22–40; and "The Psalms and the King", *Theological Students' Fellowship Bulletin* 71, 1975, 1–6; → also Might, art. *thronos* OT 4; → Myth, art. *mythos* OT). Even if there was a new year festival, Rowley doubts whether the Israelites could have gained their notions of an after-life from Canaanite or Egyptian religion via this rite. If they had, one would have expected faith in resurrection to have appeared in pre-exilic times. But in any case, such Israelite belief in resurrection as there was had an essentially different character. "In the rites the central thing was not to set before men the idea of human resurrection,

but to maintain fertility in family, field and flock throughout the community" (Rowley, op. cit., 163). It is possible that some of the ideas of the Pss. (see above, 1) reflect the language of the rites. There are references to Adonis gardens in Isa. 17:10, weeping for Tammuz in Ezek. 8:13 f., and mourning for Hadad-rimmon in Zech. 12:11. But none of these passages warrants the conclusion that Israelite belief in an after-life or resurrection was actually derived from the non-Israelite sources so far discussed.

Another, but later, suggested source is Persian Zoroastrianism (cf. J. D. C. Pavry, *The Zoroastrian Doctrine of a Future Life*, 1929; J. H. Moulton, *Early Zoroastrianism*, 1913, 154 ff.; H. S. Nyberg, *Die Religionen des alten Iran*, 1938, 308 ff.; A. T. Nikolainen, *Die Auferstehungsglauben in der Bibel und ihrer Umwelt*, I, 1944, 22 ff.; R. Martin-Achard, op. cit., 186–95). But, although Rowley shares the widespread view that Jewish thought bears the influence of Persian ideas, particularly in the Book of Daniel and especially in connexion with its angelology, he rejects the suggestion that Iranian thought was the source of Daniel's doctrine of resurrection (op. cit., 161; cf. H. H. Rowley, *The Relevance of Apocalyptic*, 1947², 40; F. Nötscher, *Altorientalischer und alttestamentlicher Auferstehungsglauben*, 1926, 185–96; A. Bertholet, "The pre-Christian Belief in the Resurrection of the Body", *American Journal of Theology* 20, 1916, 25 ff.; and "Zur Frage des Verhältnisses vom persischen und jüdischen Auferstehungsglauben", in *Festschrift F. C. Andreas*, 1916, 51–62). In Daniel there is no thought of a universal resurrection of the kind found in Zoroastrianism. It may be that the "many" of Dan. 12:2 may have an inclusive sense, i.e. "all" (→ All, art. *polloi*) and this would fit the context. But this still leaves considerable differences between Heb. and Persian thought. W. W. von Baudissin has pointed out that the terminology employed by the Jews in discussing the resurrection is typically Semitic and does not recall Iranian expressions (*Adonis und Esmun*, 1911, 418 ff.). Whereas the biblical passages speak of awakening from death, as from sleep, the Persians thought of it as a reconstitution of the body through the reunion of its elements. In conclusion it may be said that the Jews had a conception of resurrection before they came into contact with the Persian Empire. The thought of an after-life has its deepest root in the awareness of the living God himself; because Yahweh lives and is the covenant God of Israel, his people, there is an on-going relationship and life. This awareness developed in the course of history in Israel's many vicissitudes and partly also in contrast with surrounding religious beliefs. *C. Brown*

NT Both the vb. and the noun are found in the NT in general senses not connected with resurrection. *anhistēmi* is used of raising up children for a deceased brother in a levirate marriage (Matt. 22:24; cf. Gen. 38:8), of rising to speak (Matt. 26:62; cf. Mk. 14:57, 60), to read scripture (Lk. 4:16), or from prayer (Lk. 22:45) etc. It can be used in the sense of to appear or come, of a king (Acts 7:18; cf. Exod. 1:8), a priest (Heb. 7:11, 15), accusers (Matt. 12:41; Lk. 11:32; Mk. 14:57), a questioner (Lk. 10:25; cf. Acts 6:9), and an enemy rising up or rebelling against someone (Mk. 3:26; Acts 5:36). There is also the weakened meaning indicating the beginning of an action expressed by another vb., i.e. rise, set out, get ready (Matt. 9:9; Mk. 2:14; 7:24; 10:1; and perhaps 1:35; Lk. 1:39; 4:29, 39; 5:28; 6:8; Acts 8:26; 9:6, 11, 34). In Mk. 13:2 *v.l.* it means to rise. (For further discussion and usage outside the NT in

these senses see Arndt, 69.) *anastasis* is used in the expression "Behold, this child is set for the fall and rising of many in Israel" (Lk. 2:34), i.e. because of him many will fall and others will rise in Israel. These words of Simeon draw attention almost at the outset of Lk. to the rôle of Jesus in God's purposes and to his divisive effect within Israel, a fact borne out by the succeeding narrative. Altogether the vb. occurs 107 times in the NT, including 71 instances in the Lucan writings alone (4 times in Matt.; 17 in Mk.; 26 in Lk.; 8 in Jn.; 45 in Acts; once each in Rom., 1 Cor. and Eph.; and twice each in 2 Thess. and Heb.). The noun is found 42 times, again predominantly in the Lucan writings (4 times in Matt.; 2 in Mk.; 6 in Lk.; 4 in Jn.; 11 in Acts; 2 in Rom.; 4 in 2 Cor.; once each in Phil. and 2 Tim.; 3 in Heb.; twice each in 2 Pet. and Rev.). Although the vb. is much more common, most instances of it do not refer to the resurrection; it is the reverse in the case of the noun. In the case of → *egeirō* it is the vb. which is more commonly used in connexion with resurrection.

1. In secular Gk. we find these words are hardly ever used to express resurrection of the dead to life, but this is their theologically richest meaning in the NT. When this happens, the root has become virtually synonymous with → *egeirō*. At first sight, as is the case in the LXX, it seems that there is hardly any difference between them. Closer study shows that *egeirō*, especially in the pass., is used predominantly for what happened at Easter, i.e. the wakening of the Crucified to life, while *anhistēmi* and *anastasis* refer more especially to the recall to life of people during the earthly ministry of Jesus and to the eschatological and universal resurrection. 1 Cor. 15:25 f. makes the difference between the two concepts clear (although the Eng. does not always make it sufficiently clear that two different roots are being used). They soon became interchangeable, however, as is shown by *tēn dynamin tēs anasteōs autou* ("the power of his resurrection") in Phil. 3:10, and especially by *anastasis Iēsou Christou* ("resurrection of Jesus Christ") in 1 Pet. 1:3 and 3:21. M. E. Dahl has shown in table-form that with both verbal stems the intrans. meaning predominates (*The Resurrection of the Body: A Study of I Corinthians 15, SBT* 36, 1962, 98 ff.); with both, except in 1 Cor. 15, the subject is almost always Christ. When they are used trans., God is predominantly the subject and Christ the object. Although we cannot apply it universally, we may say that the general rule in the NT is that, in contrast to the LXX, the action of God on and through Christ is expressed by *egeirō*, while *anhistēmi* expresses, as it were, that which happens in the realm of human experience.

2. Central for the NT are the statements about Jesus' resurrection, including the predictions Mk. 8:31 par. Matt. 16:21; Lk. 9:22; Mk. 9:9 par. Matt. 17:9; Mk. 9:31 par. Matt. 17:23; Mk. 10:34 par. Matt. 20:19, Lk. 18:33, and the testimony by Mary Magdalene (Matt. 28:8, 10) and the disciples (Acts 1:22; 2:31; 4:33 etc.). Through an act of God, the dead and buried Lord had been awakened to → life again (cf. Acts 2:31, 34; Eph. 5:14) with a body, which was new, material, not identical with the old, but not merely visionary (cf. Jn. 20; 21). He appeared to his disciples in a form that could be seen and felt (Jn. 20:27; Lk. 24:16, 31, 39; Acts 1:2, 9; cf. 1 Jn. 1:1 ff.), though he might not always permit the latter (Jn. 20:17), because from then on they should know him only as the Exalted One, i.e. independently from his form in the flesh (cf. 2 Cor. 5:16). Though Jesus already possessed the → light and → spirit → body of the new age (→ Time, art. *aiōn*), he maintained normal human fellowship with his disciples by eating and drinking with them (Lk. 24:29 f.; Jn. 21:12 f.). The

testimony of the disciples was not based on the event of Jesus being raised which no one had seen – according to Matt. 28:4 the guards fainted – but on their meetings with the Risen One (Acts 1:22). The fact that Jesus did not remain among the dead, but was alive (Lk. 24:5) gave the disciples, who until then had vacillated, the certainty that they had to do with the Lord, the Son (Rom. 1:4). The resurrection of Jesus thus became the sign of God's triumph over the power of → sin and → death. In other words, it had cancelled the fall of → Adam and all human slavery that had resulted from it, for the Crucified had entered the glory → of God as the first among many (→ Sacrifice, art. *aparchē*). This message is the foundation of all Christian hope and preaching (1 Pet. 1:3; 1 Cor. 15; → Proclamation); it also explains why → baptism is the sign of salvation (1 Pet. 3:21; Rom. 6:5).

In the mystery of his person Jesus incorporates "the resurrection and the life" (Jn. 11:25). In other words, the resurrection, which the Jews had conceived only eschatologically, begins at the point where he appears and sets his Spirit to work. Anyone who is linked to him by → faith, and has been possessed by his power, experiences the beginning of the transition from this transient age to the new one, to the liberation from sin and death (Phil. 3:10; → Redemption). This is testified to in the → Lord's Supper (Jn. 6:54). Hence, faith may be interpreted as a dying and rising again with Jesus (Rom. 6:11; Jn. 5:24).

4. Even if John gives us a concept of resurrection as something apparently contemporaneously realized, that is only a beginning. (On Jn.'s eschatology → Present, art. *The Parousia and Eschatology in the NT* 2 (d) .) 2 Tim. 2:18 expressly rejects the idea that the general resurrection of the dead took place in that of Jesus; the context of Col. 2:13 and Eph. 2:6 does not suggest it either. The general resurrection, which is inferred from that of Jesus, is held fast. In Jn. 6:39 f., 54 it is recorded as taught by Jesus himself. It is always in the sense of the resurrection of the → body; it is never a mere continuation of being, or a reawakening of the soul. As such, it was the real point of opposition to the proclamation of the gospel. It was rejected by the Sadducees (Matt. 22:23), who held that only the Torah, the OT law, was authoritative, and they claimed that the resurrection was not taught there (cf. Matt. 22:31 f.) It was equally rejected by the Greeks, because the teaching was too materialistic for their spiritualized thinking (Acts 17:18, 32; 1 Cor. 15:12). Faith in a resurrection linked with → judgment (cf. Heb. 6:2) belongs to the fundamental elements of faith (cf. 2 Cor. 5:10; Lk. 14:14; Heb. 11:35).

5.(a) Although the word resurrection is clearly used of a definite event in the future (Jn. 11:24; Matt. 22:28), the term does not necessarily imply it. There are here, as in Jewish apocalyptic, two lines of thought discernible concerning the scope of its effects. Besides the general resurrection as it is depicted in Rev. 20:11–15, Matt. 25:31–46, which is linked with the return of Christ and the separation (→ Judgment) of the good and bad, the NT also speaks of a preceding "first" resurrection of the righteous (Lk. 14:14), of the dead in Christ (1 Thess. 4:16; probably also in 1 Cor. 15:23 f., where *to telos* may mean the rest [cf. Arndt, 819]). In Rev. 20:4 ff. the dead in Christ are said to reign for a thousand years, whereas the remainder of the dead appear before the throne of God first on the day of final judgment (Rev. 20:11 ff.). (For interpretations of the millennium → Number, art. *chilias* NT 4.) While it is also true of the general resurrection that individual identity persists in spite of death, so that men will stand before God in their complete being, a fuller language is used for

believers. They will be "equal to angels [*isangeloi*]" (Lk. 20:36), free of all impulses of the *psychē*, including sexual ones (Matt. 22:30; 24:38); they will be like Jesus, for they will "see him as he is" (1 Jn. 3:2). In this connexion Paul once uses the expression *exanastasis* (Phil. 3:11): "that if possible I may attain the resurrection from the dead." It is debated whether the compound word simply means *anastasis*, as is normally the case, or whether Paul is alluding to the earlier transformation and the church's being lifted up to be with Christ (1 Thess. 4:17; Rev. 20:4). In any case, we must remember that the analogy of → seed and harvest has only a superficial resemblance to the process of resurrection. God gives a body as he wills (1 Cor. 15:38), and so he alone guarantees the identity of the person.

6. The vb. *anazaō*, come to life again, is rare in secular Gk. It is found in the NT in the following senses. In Rev. 20:5 f. TR it is used of the dead coming to life. In Rom. 7:9 it describes the action of the commandment in provoking and condemning sin: "I was once alive apart from the law, but when the commandment came, sin revived and I died." The argument is that it is the law which identifies sin for what it is (Rom. 7:7). But sin uses the commandment to attempt to justify itself by assuming that man can actually fulfil the law (vv. 8 ff.). This is a deception, and results in killing the person concerned (v. 11), because failure to keep the law brings condemnation. Finally, the vb. is used of the prodigal son after his return: "for this my son was dead, and is alive again [*anezēsen*]; he was lost, and is found" (Lk. 15:24).

L. Coenen

In Phil. 3 Paul describes how he counts as "loss" all the things which he previously gloried in as a Jew in order to gain Christ (Phil. 3:8; → Dirt, art. *skybalon*). His desire now is to have a → righteousness not of his own, but "that which is through faith in Christ" (v. 9), "that I may know him and the power of his resurrection [*tēn dynamin tēs anastaseōs autou*], and may share in his sufferings, becoming like him in his death, that if possible I may attain the resurrection from the dead [*ei pōs katantēsō eis tēn exanastasin tēn ek nekrōn*]" (vv. 10 f.). R. P. Martin suggests that the background here is a polemical confrontation with those perfectionists who were arguing that knowledge of the heavenly Lord was all-important and that believers were already raised with Christ to new life (*Philippians, New Century Bible*, 1976, 134; cf. Phil. 3:12–16; 2 Tim. 2:18; 1 Cor. 15:12; W. Schmithals, *Gnosticism in Corinth*, 1971, 155 ff., 259 ff.; P. Siber, *Mit Christus Leben. Eine Studie zur paulinischen Auferstehungshoffnung*, 1971, 116–22). "He does so with a forceful statement that the only way to enter into the *power of his resurrection* is by a willingness to *share his sufferings*, and so become *like him in his death.* The last phrase is clearly baptismal (cf. Rom. 6:1–11; 2 C. 4:7–15; Col. 2:12, 20; 3:1; 2 Tim. 2:11), referring to the representative death of Jesus on the cross in which believers participate as they too die to their old life and are raised to new existence" (ibid.; cf. J. Jervell, *Imago Dei*, 1960, 206 ff., 261, 273 ff.; M. B. Ahern, "The Fellowship of his Sufferings (Phil. 3,10)", *CBQ* 22, 1960, 1–32; H. Seesemann, *Der Begriff KOINONIA im Neuen Testament*, 1933, 83 f.). The reference to "his resurrection" (v. 10) suggests a present experience. In v. 11 "Paul expresses the hope that complete conforming to his Lord (3:21) will come at *the resurrection from among the dead* (the unparalleled expression – 'intended clearly to express the realism of the resurrection from the physically dead' [Gnilka] – is probably to be accounted for by Paul's

emphasis on the necessity for a future resurrection to complete God's saving plan for his people)" (R. P. Martin, op. cit., 135; cf. J. Gnilka, *Der Philipperbrief, Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*, 1968, ad loc.). Polycarp observed that false prophets said that "there is neither resurrection nor judgment" (*To the Philippians* 7). The phrase *ei pōs* ("if possible") is seen by Martin not as an expression of doubt about the reality of Paul's resurrection but about the way in which it will be his, i.e. whether by martyrdom in the near future or by some other means at a more distant time (op. cit., 136; cf. Phil. 1:20–26; on the Gk. see Funk § 375).

(b) That which happens between earthly death and eschatological resurrection is, from the standpoint of time, unimportant, for with death man is no longer within → time. Discussion about the intermediate state of the soul can only be speculative. The decisive point is that after death all men will stand before Christ, either as judge or saviour, "who will change our lowly body to be like his glorious body, by the power which enables him even to subject all things to himself" (Phil. 3:21, cf. v. 20; 1:10, 21; 2:10 f.; → Present, art. *The Parousia and Eschatology in the NT* 2 (c) for Paul's eschatological teaching, and the note below on *The Resurrection in Contemporary Theology* 2 for interpretations of the NT teaching on the resurrection of believers).

C. Brown

ἐγείρω

ἐγείρω (*egeirō*), wake, rouse, raise up; ἔγερσις (*egersis*), awakening, i.e. resurrection.

CL This word-group is often found in Gk. literature, the vb. from Homer onwards, the noun from Empedocles and Hippocrates, and is absolutely synonymous with *anhistēmi*. Accordingly the meaning of the vb. when trans. is to waken, lift up, erect, stimulate, stir up; when intrans. awake, get up, stand up. When used of persons, it is used for those who are awakened from sleep, unconsciousness, or lethargy, who are stimulated to action or revolt, or for those who do such actions. The noun means (trans.) a waking up, an establishing, (intrans.) a waking, standing up, a recovery (from illness). The meaning resurrection (from death) in our understanding of the term can hardly be found, either in a verbal or substantival sense. One of the few possible exceptions is Menander of Ephesus quoted in Josephus *Ant.* 8, 5, 3 (146), *Ap.* 1, 119, though this interpretation of *egersis* is not given in the standard translations of Whiston and Thackeray. From this we can infer, as was already pointed out under → *anastasis*, CL, that the concept was not native to Gk. thought, and occurs only symbolically or cultically for the waking up of sleeping gods. Fuller details in *TDNT* II 333.

OT The OT use of the word-group normally corresponds to Gk. idiom. In the LXX, which uses it as virtually synonymous with the *anhistēmi* group, it represents the Heb. *qûm* (rise), *'ûr* (arouse) and *'āmaḏ* (stand): Pharaoh awoke (Gen. 41:4, 7); the Lord raised up judges (Jdg. 2:16, 18); Gabriel set Daniel, who had fallen unconscious, on his feet (Dan. 8:18); King Ahasuerus rose from table (Est. 7:7); God is solemnly called on to arise and scatter his enemies (Num. 10:35). That it is synonymous with *anhistēmi* may be seen from Gen. 38:8 and 2 Sam. 7:12 where *anhistēmi* is used both for man and God, while in Isa. 45:13a *egeirō* is used (→

anastasis OT). At the same time already in LXX there is a marked modification of the verbal connotation through its use for the raising of the dead (→ *anastasis* OT) and the work of God's Spirit in man.

NT 1. Generally speaking the word-group has the same meaning in the NT as in CL and OT. *egersis* is found only once, viz. Matt. 27:53 in connexion with the resurrection of Jesus; elsewhere *anastasis* or its verbal forms is used. However, *egeirō* occurs 143 times (36 in Matt.; 19 in Mk.; 18 in Lk.; 13 in Jn.; 12 in Acts; 10 in Rom.; 20 in 1 Cor.; 4 in 2 Cor.; 2 in Eph.; once each in Gal., Phil., Col., 1 Thess., 2 Tim., Heb., Jas., 1 Pet. and Rev.). *egeirō* is particularly used by Matt. as an introduction to action (e.g. 1:24; 2:14; 8:26; 25:7), and for the appearance of characters on the stage of history (e.g. 24:7, 11, 24). This usage is common also in Lk. (e.g. 13:25). Mk. prefers the imperative (but cf. Lk. 5:23 f.; Jn. 14:31).

2. A survey of the cases in which the word-group is used for awaking to life creates at first the impression that the line of development already seen in the OT and Jewish apocalyptic has been merely further developed. There are occasional cases where those regarded by the doctors as dead are reported as brought back to life by Jesus. He took the hand of Jairus' daughter and caused her to get up and walk (Mk. 5:41). According to the Synoptics (Matt. 9:25; Mk. 5:41; Lk. 8:54 f.), it was his touch and kingly command that gave the child back her life. The command was expressed by the imperative *egeire*. The same is true of the widow's son outside the gate of Nain (Lk. 7:14; the command *egerthēti* is used). Lazarus was raised from the dead after a previous prayer of thanks merely by the command *deuro exō*, "Come out" (Jn. 11:43). In the case of "the officer in the royal service" (NEB) it was sufficient for Jesus to say, "Your son is alive" (Jn. 4:50). In the two latter cases the relation to the → faith of those concerned and of the spectators is underlined and it is stressed that Jesus had full authority to bring the dead to life (Jn. 4:50; 11:25, 40). The young man at Nain was called back to life merely out of pity for the mother (Lk. 7:13). It is probably also characteristic that both before the raising of Jairus' daughter (Mk. 5:39) and of Lazarus (Jn. 11:11) Jesus stated that (for him) the dead persons were not dead, but asleep. Both the Synoptics and John indicate that death can set no bounds to Jesus' activity, but that the → life which proceeded from him stripped death of its power, i.e. that the otherwise immutable frontier of → death and → time had been broken through or leaped over. The spectators' laughter at such a statement (Mk. 5:40) serves best to stress the extraordinary and incomprehensible nature of this life-giving → power. What the Jews at best considered possible, and to be expected, apart from their belief in eschatological resurrection (Jn. 11:24; Martha), was that someone should be preserved from death, even as in the OT: "Could not he ... have kept this man from dying?" (Jn. 11:37). But now God, the Lord over life and death, stood in person before them.

3. This has brought us to the heart of the concept which has to do with the raising of Jesus. The epistles of the NT never use *egeirō*, except in Phil. 1:17, in any sense but that of resurrection from the dead. It is so frequently used in Rom., 1 and 2 Cor., that we recognize that it must have been a dominant element in Paul's preaching. In fact, in 1 Cor. 15 he explains that God's breaking into history in the resurrection of Jesus is the decisive factor in the → gospel, the means by which we are saved, without which all faith would be vain. Witnesses are adduced for the truth of the happening;

they were those to whom Jesus had "appeared" (*ōphthē* is used four times in vv. 5–8). For the preacher of the gospel it had become the touchstone of its truth. The one who disputed or denied the resurrection made God a liar and their → faith a hollow mask (vv. 14–17: *kenos* and *mataios;* → Empty). After all, it is faith "in him who raised from the dead Jesus our Lord" (Rom. 4:24), and his spirit lives in those who believe "to give life" to their mortal bodies (Rom. 8:11; cf. 2 Cor. 4:14). It is the fact of Jesus' resurrection that has removed our sins (1 Cor. 15:17) and has broken the power of death (Rom. 6:4, 9, in connexion with → baptism).

The resurrection of Jesus is not described only with God as subject and Jesus as object; the vb. may be taken intrans. in the middle voice with Jesus as subject, i.e. "he arose from the dead" (e.g. Rom. 6:4, 9; 8:34, and especially in the Synoptics, Mk. 14:28; 16:6; Matt. 27:63). This change in usage shows that while the resurrecting power always issued from God, it belongs to the Son also, who is of one being with the Father.

4. This is seen most clearly in the case of the eschatological resurrection, when it is normally left open who raises the dead, Christ or God himself. "The dead will be raised", i.e. will rise (1 Cor. 15:52; Matt. 11:5). It is, however, clear that the resurrection of the dead is inseparably linked with the resurrection of Christ; it is based on it and follows on it (1 Cor. 15:13–17). Except in 1 Cor. 15 the *anhistēmi* group is normally used for it. In 1 Cor. 15:42–44 Paul contrasts the difference between now and then by the contrasts *phthora*, corruption – *aphtharsia*, incorruptibility; *atimia*, dishonour – *doxa*, glory; *astheneia*, weakness – *dynamis*, power; *psychikon*, natural, of the *psychē* – *pneumatikon*, spiritual. The power to raise the dead is transferred from God to Jesus, and by him is promised to his disciples (Matt. 10:8). Perhaps its most exalted expression is found in Matt. 3:9: "God is able from these stones to raise up children to Abraham." *L. Coenen*

The Resurrection in Contemporary Theology

The purpose of this note is to make a survey of some of the more recent influential studies of the NT teaching on resurrection looking at: 1. The Resurrection of Jesus, and 2. the Resurrection of Men in General.

1. *The Resurrection of Jesus.* (a) Rudolf Bultmann, who for more than a quarter of a century has dominated German NT interpretation, put forward the paradoxical position maintaining "the incredibility of a mythical event like the resuscitation of a corpse – for that is what the resurrection means" and the fact that "the resurrection is itself an article of faith" (cited from "New Testament and Mythology" (1941) in H. W. Bartsch, ed., *Kerygma and Myth*, I, 1953, 39 f.; → Myth). For Bultmann the cross and the resurrection constitute the heart of the NT kerygma. Although they are presented in the context of obsolete, mythological world-views, they cannot be set aside. Nor can they be verified by historical scholarship. For the cross and resurrection confront us with the eschatological which transcends all historical and objective investigation. "In accepting the word of preaching as the word of God and the death and resurrection of Christ as the eschatological event, we are given an opportunity of understanding ourselves. Faith and unbelief are never blind, arbitrary decisions. They offer us the alternative between accepting or rejecting that which alone can illuminate our understanding of ourselves. The real Easter faith is faith in the word of

preaching which brings illumination. If the event of Easter Day is in any sense an historical event additional to the event of the cross, it is nothing else than the rise of faith in the risen Lord, since it was this faith which led to the apostolic preaching. The resurrection itself is not an event of past history. All that historical criticism can establish is the fact that the first disciples came to believe in the resurrection" (op. cit., 41 f.).

In reply to criticisms Bultmann could even say: "It has often been said, most of the time in criticism, that according to my interpretation of the kerygma Jesus has risen in the kerygma. I accept this proposition. It is entirely correct, assuming that it is properly understood. It presupposes that the kerygma itself is an eschatological event, and that it expresses the fact that Jesus is really present in the kerygma, that it is *his* word which involves the hearer in the kerygma. If that is the case, then all speculation concerning the modes of being of the risen Jesus, all the narratives of the empty tomb and all the Easter legends, whatever elements of historical fact thy may contain, and as true as they may be in their symbolic form, are of no consequence. To believe in the Christ present in the kerygma is the meaning of the Easter faith" ("The Primitive Christian Kerygma and the Historical Jesus", in C. E. Braaten and R. A. Harrisville, eds., *The Historical Jesus and the Kerygmatic Christ: Essays on the New Quest of the Historical Jesus*, 1964, 42). (On Bultmann's position → Present, art. *The Parousia and Eschatology in the NT* 1 (d); → Myth; cf. also R. Bultmann, *Jesus Christ and Mythology*, 1951; the various essays in *Kerygma and Myth*, combined volume, 1972; L. Malevez, *The Christian Message and Myth: The Theology of Rudolf Bultmann*, 1958; C. W. Kegley, ed., *The Theology of Rudolf Bultmann*, 1966; W. Schmithals, *An Introduction to the Theology of Rudolf Bultmann*, 1968, 126–46; and C. Brown, "Bultmann Revisited", *The Churchman* 88, 1974, 167–87).

(b) Probably the most substantial study of the resurrection event by a German scholar in recent years is that of Hans Grass, *Ostergeschehen und Osterberichte*, (1956), 1964[3]. Grass begins with an examination of the gospel narratives. He considers much to be legendary and dominated by ulterior motives. "What remains now as the historical kernel of the legendary Easter stories of the gospels which were shaped by various motives? The conjecture that the first appearances occurred in Galilee (by the lake?) at a point in time removed from Easter, that the circle of disciples participated in the appearances and that Peter was dominant in it, or rather saw the Lord before the other disciples. Out of the appearances arose the Easter faith: the Lord is risen indeed. The encounter with the Lord was understood as a commission to continue his work. Nothing more certain can be derived from the reports about the mode and manner of the appearances. It also remains uncertain whether any dependable information about the empty tomb still stands behind the grave stories. The legendary character of all the gospel Easter reports would itself make these data appear questionable, if we did not have the resurrection testimony of Paul and could not derive from him a series of more certain data" (op. cit., 93). Nevertheless, the appearances were not a piece of self-deception for such self-deception could not have survived the rigours of the opposition encountered by the early church and the awareness of the presence of the risen Christ was intrinsic to the early church's message and sacraments (op. cit., 263 ff.; cf. 14, 29–32, 127).

Grass believes that the original ending of Mk. was erased by a community which may have felt a tension between the (later) tradition of a third-day appearance in

Jerusalem and an earlier Galilean appearance (op. cit., 18 f.). The original may be represented in Jn. 21 which contains a Galilean tradition which is older than the theologically slanted one of Jn. 20 (op. cit., 74–85; cf. 51–73). Grass regards many of the details given in Matt. as legendary and late, e.g., the story of the guard (Matt. 27:62–66; 28:4, 11–15) which is also found in Gos. Pet. He sees a tension here in that the appearance is to non-believers, whereas the earlier tradition (which survived in Acts 10:41) maintained that Jesus appeared only to believers (op. cit., 25). However, the parousia-like scene of the commissioning of the disciples preserves the historical element of locating it in Galilee (op. cit., 28 ff.). Luke's account of the Emmaus road encounter is also legendary and apologetic in intention (op. cit., 35 ff.). The story of the forty days and the ascension represent the answer of a post-Pauline theology to the question why the appearances had ceased (op. cit., 48 ff.), and they represent events in a much more naturalistic and verifiable way than they actually were.

Grass rejects all attempts at harmonization of the gospel accounts. "The gospel narratives are . . . strongly legendary and give no true picture of the events. Paul, as the more original account, must retain precedence over the gospel accounts" (op. cit., 107; cf. 1 Cor. 15:3–10). The kerygma which Paul took over contained only the first two appearances, those to Peter and the Twelve. The appearances to Peter and the twelve took place in Galilee, whereas those to James and "all the apostles" occurred in Jerusalem. The one to the five hundred brethren took place before that to James (op. cit., 101).

Grass is sceptical about "the third day" and the empty tomb. The place of the former in early tradition may be due to the discovery of the empty tomb on that day. But the idea may be due to a Christian adaptation of current Jewish interpretation of Hos. 6:2 in connexion with the general resurrection (op. cit., 134). The story of the empty tomb is a late development which came about through the need to regard the body of Jesus as freed from corruption and as having ascended into heaven (op. cit., 145 f.). In Paul's view the tomb does not need to be empty (op. cit., 146–73). The function of 1 Cor. 15:4 is to stress Jesus' death. Grass understands 2 Cor. 5:1–10 as teaching that those who rise from the dead do not need their old bodies (cf. 1 Cor. 15:49, 53). Resurrection does not necessitate the transformation of the physical body but its replacement by a glorious body.

Although ecstatic experiences were not uncommon in the early church, the resurrection appearances were not the subjective product of ecstasy. Despite the Lucan attempts to argue for the resurrection of Jesus' earthly body, Christ always appeared with a *sōma doxēs* (body of glory) or *sōma pneumatikon* (spiritual body) (op. cit., 232). "That a psychic disposition among certain disciples conditioned the visionary contemplation of the exalted Lord is no more probable than the reverse assumption that enthusiastic phenomena were a consequence of encounter with the Risen One" (op. cit., 238). The appearances were essentially visionary, though the visions have a divine authority. "The Easter event is reduced for critical, historical study to a series of Christ-visions, by which the scattered and shattered disciples were empowered to a death-defying proclamation of Christ, to the founding of the church and to mission. With them begins the history of Christianity. Theological reflection has no cause to dispute the visionary character of the Christ-encounters. It believes, however, that this was not a case of self-deception on the part of the disci-

ples to be explained by imminent factors, but rather that God has acted here. He has not left Christ in death, but raised and exalted him, revealing the Living and Exalted One not to all the people but to a circle of chosen witnesses, who in visionary contemplation were allowed to see him in his *doxa* and were certain of his *kyriotēs* which commissioned them anew" (op. cit., 249). The commissioning element is very old and original, though not necessarily authentic, in the sense that it is useless to ask which sayings are authentic (op. cit., 252 f.).

(b) In 1964 Willi Marxsen published a discussion paper intended for theologians which was subsequently translated into English under the title "The Resurrection of Jesus as a Historical and Theological Problem" (in C. F. D. Moule, ed., *The Significance of the Message of the Resurrection for Faith in Jesus Christ, SBT* Second Series 8, 1968, 15–50). The paper led to calls for Marxsen's removal from the examining commission of the Evangelical Church of Westphalia on the grounds of heresy. Marxsen himself followed it up with a more popular presentation, *The Resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth* (1968; E. T. 1970, cited below as *The Resurrection*). Commenting on 1 Cor. 15:14 ("If Christ has not been raised, then our preaching is in vain and your faith is in vain"), Marxsen says: "This means surely that apart from the resurrection of Jesus there would be no Church" (Moule, ed., op. cit., 15; cf. *The Resurrection*, 12). But for us the question is now on a different plane from what it was in NT times in view of our post-Enlightenment critical attitude to history. We cannot answer the question of historicity simply by appealing to the texts, any more than we can answer the question about how the world came into being by appealing to the Book of Genesis without taking into consideration the conclusions of natural science (Moule, ed., op. cit., 16). Although there is a close relationship between the theological interpretation of the biblical writers and their historical beliefs, the former is not altogether invalidated if the latter can no longer be accepted at face value (Moule, ed., op. cit., 17; cf. *The Resurrection*, 15). Whereas Bultmann appears to be uninterested in the connexion between theology and history, Marxsen thinks that it is at least worth investigating (Moule, ed., op. cit., 18 f.).

"Now it is of course obvious that I have *no* direct access to any event in the past" (Moule, ed., op. cit., 20). We have to work through the witness of intermediaries and build up a picture of what happened on the basis of our critical evaluation of their sources. One cannot short-circuit this process by appealing to spiritual insight. "But by means of spiritual perception no *event* is grasped, no historical fact, but merely the significance of a phenomenon open to others as well. Of this significance reality is a necessary characteristic. But this reality is recognized not *in addition to*, but precisely *in* the event" (Moule, op. cit., 21). Now, Paul's experience of Jesus on the Damascus road was not like, say, his encounter with Peter at Antioch. He did not claim to have seen the *Risen One*, but speaks of Jesus as God's *Son* (Gal. 1:15) and asks "Have I not seen *Jesus* our Lord?" (1 Cor. 9:1). Only in 1 Cor. 15:8 is there a somewhat different emphasis: "Last of all, as to one untimely born, he appeared also to me [*ōphthē kamoi*]" (on this verse → Birth, art. *ektrōma*). Conversely, when Paul spoke of the raising of Jesus he never did so in terms of something that had happened to him (Moule, ed., op. cit., 23). On this basis, Marxsen infers that "The belief that Jesus' resurrection had actually taken place is therefore founded for Paul *not* upon a happening of something which he considers to have taken place; on the contrary, it is a process of deduction. We are therefore on no account allowed to appeal to Paul if

we want to describe Jesus' resurrection (directly) as an event which has happened, but we must begin by asking if this process of deduction is reliable" (Moule, ed., op. cit., 24).

Marxsen's logic at this point is curious. For while granting what he says about Paul's language, neither the formal premises of Paul's position nor his actual statements warrant the inference that for him belief in the resurrection of Christ was a deduction as contrasted with "something which he considers to have taken place" (cf. 1 Cor. 15:4–7). While it is true to say that no one in the NT ever claimed to have seen the event of the resurrection (this is first found in the Gospel of Peter), the *kērygma* does presuppose that the resurrection was a historical event (→ Proclamation, art. *kēryssō*). In the meantime, Marxsen himself claims that belief in the resurrection came into being on the basis of two data. On the one hand, there was the empty tomb which in any case he believes to be ambiguous. For whilst it could be empty because Jesus was risen (Mk. 16:6 par.), it could be claimed that the disciples stole the body (Matt. 27:64; 28:13; cf. Jn. 20:13). On the other hand, there are the appearances which can be divided into two groups. In the first group only the *fact* of the appearances is mentioned (cf. 1 Cor. 15:5–7). In the second group there are more elaborate descriptions, and these Marxsen takes to be later embellishments (Moule, op. cit., 26 f.; cf. *The Resurrection*, 25–78 with 79–113).

Marxsen lays particular stress on the precise terminology used. The word *ōphthē* is pre-Pauline and is found in formalized traditional material (1 Cor. 15:5, 6, 7, 8; Lk. 24:34; cf. Acts 9:17; 13:31; 26:16). It can be taken as the aorist passive of *horan*, to see, i.e. he was seen (the person in each case being in the dat.). But a deponent meaning is also possible (cf. Funk *§§* 191 (1), 313), i.e. he appeared, or let himself be seen, or showed himself. A third possibility is to understand the passive as a form (common in Judaism) used as a paraphrase for the name of God, i.e. "God ... let himself be seen" (Moule, ed., op. cit., 27; cf. K. H. Rengstorf, *Die Auferstehung Jesu. Form, Art und Sinn der urchristlichen Osterbotschaft*, 1960[4], 57). The use of this kind of language suggests that what we have in the resurrection was some kind of vision. And in the last analysis Marxsen thinks that there is no fundamental distinction between a subjective vision and an objective one. For with due respect to Hans Grass, "the so-called objective-vision theory when examined closely is a subjective one *too*, i.e. it is derived from our own faith" (Moule, ed., op. cit., 30). Again in passing we may note a certain flaw in Marxsen's logic. For whilst the articulation of such a theory may be an articulation of one's faith, it is a question for critical investigation and not dogmatic assertion whether such a vision was the cause or the product of faith.

In the meantime, Marxsen asks whether to call the resurrection a vision is "indeed the whole truth of what really happened?" (Moule, ed., op. cit., 31). He follows Ulrich Wilckens in saying that "the witnesses who had the experience of this happening were obliged to make it known 'with the resources of the tradition' " (op. cit., 32; cf. U. Wilckens, "Der Ursprung der Überlieferung der Erscheinungen des Auferstandenen", in W. Joest and W. Pannenberg, eds., *Dogma und Denkstrukturen*, 1963, 56 ff.). From this he concludes that "The formulae show that both the setting up of the community as well as the reasons given for functioning within it were traced back to a vision of Jesus after his crucifixion. Now this means that what supplies the real basis of the community and the function within it is *the fact*, not of the resurrection

itself, but of Jesus' *appearances*; this fact alone is brought into prominence" (op. cit., 34). But again in passing we may note a curious leap of logic. For the community did not have ready-made resources of this particular tradition to hand; these resources were shaped by the community as it went along. Admittedly Matt. 28:16 ff.; Jn. 20:19–23 and Acts 10:44 ff. are capable of being interpreted in terms of visual experiences shared by those who had faith, but they are also capable of being understood as encounters with an objective, personal presence.

In terms of content the resurrection appearances do not provide the witnesses "with a *fresh* content to preach, or *fresh* revelations which need to be handed on and which now made this vision and what was connected with it to be the central content of the preaching. The content is rather, as Jesus is reported to have said later in the Gospel of John: 'As the Father has sent *me*, even so I send *you*' (20:21)" (Moule, ed., op. cit., 37). Here again this is not strictly true; it is only half the truth. For whilst the witnesses were sent, and whilst they were aware of the continuity of the identity of the one who sent them, there was in fact a new content, viz. that the one who sent them was risen from the dead.

For Marxsen, to speak of the resurrection of Jesus is "an outcome of reflection" (Moule, ed. op. cit., 41). And it is reflection which gives rise to the further hope of a general resurrection of mankind. It is connected with the outlook of Jewish anthropology which (unlike Greek-Hellenistic anthropology) happened to be monistic, understanding man as a unity. But already in 1 Cor. 15:35 ff. this is blended with Greek-Hellenistic ideas in which the resurrection body is seen as belonging to a quite different order from the earthly, physical body. But for Marxsen, the essential point is that "Jesus was experienced *in his earthly ministry* as an anticipation of the *eschaton*, as a divine event" (Moule, ed., op. cit., 47). After his death he continued to be experienced in this way. The language of resurrection is an objectifying interpretation of this event. "We must therefore hold firmly to the fact that the raising of Jesus is not the fundamental *datum* of Christianity" (ibid.). The language of raising expresses the reality of our encounter with the *eschaton* in the *kērygma*, and this is the real basis of the church and Christian faith and hope (cf. *The Resurrection*, 174–88).

(d) In addition to the paper referred to by Marxsen, Ulrich Wilckens has written on "The Tradition-History of the Resurrection of Jesus" (C. F. D. Moule, ed., op. cit., 51–76) and *Auferstehung* (1970). Wilckens is concerned about the *Sitz im Leben* of the NT testimony to the resurrection. 1 Cor. 15:3–5 "contains material from a kerygmatic and catechetical tradition which had a fixed form before Paul made use of it" (Moule, ed., op. cit., 57). But the other appearances to unspecified and collective groups (vv. 6 f.) are additions to the original list (op. cit., 59 ff.; cf. *Auferstehung*, 28 ff.). Equally ancient is the pre-Marcan Easter story (Mk. 16:1–8a; cf. Moule, ed., op. cit., 71). This influenced Paul as well as Mk. Paul's mention of the burial serves not only to emphasize Jesus' death. It is probably connected with the empty tomb tradition of the evangelists.

Wilckens distinguishes three main phases in the emergence of belief in the resurrection. (1) "It was the appearances of the risen Jesus in Galilee which inspired belief in the resurrection and led to the founding of the primitive community. On this basis, the resurrection of Jesus came to be a fundamental assumption in everything the community thought and did. Moving to Jerusalem, the community found in ex-

istence the women's story of the discovery of the empty tomb" (Moule, ed., op. cit., 73 f.). This story was treated as confirmation of the resurrection belief and came to occupy an important place in the passion narrative. (2) "At an early period diaspora Jews who were in Jerusalem came to believe in Jesus through contact with the primitive community" (ibid., 74). They had never known the earthly Jesus. "What they knew was the story of the passion and resurrection, and the nucleus of their preaching was a brief summary of this: Jesus died and was raised by God; now he is with God in heaven and is the principal mediator of salvation in the final phase of time which is to come" (ibid.). When they were driven out of Jerusalem they preached this message with extraordinary vigour and made it "the central article of Christian belief" (ibid.). Under the influence of the Jewish Diaspora and Hellenism there arose a cosmic christology with the central themes of the death and resurrection of Jesus. (3) In the meantime through the influence of Hellenization in Palestine certain stories developed like that of the Emmaus road (excluding the doctrinal discussion, Lk. 24) and the appearance to Mary Magdalene (Jn. 20:14 ff.). But there were also counter-influences which stressed the physical aspect of the risen Christ in opposition to incipient gnosticism. "This reaction played an important part in ensuring that the risen Christ remained identified with Jesus of Nazareth in common Christian tradition" (Moule, ed., op. cit., 75).

In *Auferstehung* Wilckens stresses the oneness of the Christian traditions with pre-Christian literature. He sees a connexion between Mk. 15:24 and Ps. 22:19 and between Mk. 15:29 and Ps. 22:8 f. Furthermore, the Lord is seen as a heavenly being who is admitted to the secrets of heaven (cf. Rev. 1:9 ff.; Acts 7:55 f.; Rom. 8:34; Eph. 1:19 ff.; Col. 1:18 ff.; Heb. 1:3; 13:20; ff.; op. cit., 91 ff.). There is thus an apocalyptic stamp about certain descriptions of the risen and ascended Christ, and this raises the question of how valid such descriptions can be for us today.

(e) In *The Formation of the Resurrection Narratives* (1971) R. H. Fuller aims "to start with the earliest record of the Easter traditions, in 1 Corinthians 15, and then to apply the tools of tradition and redaction criticism to the Easter narratives of the four Gospels. In so doing our purpose will be to reconstruct the history of the tradition from its earliest recoverable form in allegedly factual reports (beyond this the historian cannot go) through its successive developments in the preliterary and literary stages" (op. cit., 7). When this is done, "resurrection faith . . . becomes not a matter of believing in the historical accuracy of these narratives but of believing the proclamation which these narratives, for all their differences, enshrine" (op. cit., 8). For Fuller the resurrection is not a historical event but has a "meta-historical character" (op. cit., 23). It remains somewhat obscure whether this latter point represents any positive advance upon the more traditional views. It seems designed to claim that any judgment about historicity lies beyond the competence of the historian, which is a view which we shall see questioned below. On the other hand, traditionalists have always implied that the resurrection transcended the limitations of time and space.

Fuller holds "that 'on the third day' is not a chronological datum, but a dogmatic assertion: Christ's resurrection marked the dawn of the end-time, the beginning of the cosmic eschatological process of resurrection" (op. cit., 27). In making this point he is following M. Goguel in his claim that this is akin to Hos. 6:2 and those Talmudic texts which state that the general resurrection will occur three days after the end of the world (*La Foi à la Résurrection de Jésus dans le Christianisme*

Primitif, 1933, 169 ff.; cf. SB I 747). The list of appearances in 1 Cor. 15:3–8 is a catena of Jerusalem traditions which Paul acquired from Peter and James (Gal. 1:18 f.), combined with his own Damascus road experience. Previously they had been unconnected examples of kerygmatic assertion, but Paul used these as evidence for the resurrection and to prove his apostleship (1Cor. 15:9 ff.; cf. K. Barth, *The Resurrection of the Dead,* 1933). Fuller agrees with Bultmann in seeing this as the beginnings of an attempt to "prove" the resurrection (op. cit., 29; cf. *Kerygma and Myth,* I, 39).

The language of the NT here is "analogical". It was made "for the description of events in this age; the New Testament has the problem of conveying events which belong to the eschatological age, but which are disclosed through this-worldly, historical events. The farthest we can get perhaps is to say that the *events through which* the Easter revelations were conveyed were visionary, but to describe them as visions, even as 'objective visions', is not entirely felicitous. The word vision, at best, denotes the this-worldly event through which the eschatological event is mediated. " 'Objective' points to the divine act of disclosure mediated by the vision, but does not indicate that what was disclosed was eschatological" (op. cit., 33; cf. E. G. Selwyn, "The Resurrection", in E. G. Selwyn, ed., *Essays Catholic and Critical,* 1926, 281–319, especially 296–99). Perhaps the "this-worldly" aspect of the visions is open to public verification, but it would seem that the eschatological dimension lies outside the techniques of the historian. The appearances to Peter and the Twelve have a special function: "In these appearances the Risen One initiates the foundation of the eschatological community: they are 'church-founding appearances'. As such they must be distinguished from the later appearances, whose function is the call and sending of apostles to fulfil a mission" (op. cit., 35). But as A. R. C. Leaney comments, "The difficulty of maintaining this distinction is great and it is hard to believe that the apostles could have made it" ("Recent Studies on the Resurrection of Jesus", in R. H. Preston, ed., *Theology and Change: Essays in Memory of Alan Richardson,* 1975, 65).

Fuller holds that the two primary appearances in Galilee are Marcan rather than primary and authentic (op. cit., 57 f.), and that the finding of the empty tomb by Mary or the other women is Palestinian and apocalyptic tradition (rather than Hellenistic materialism). "The disciples received Mary's report not as the origin and cause of their Easter faith, but as a vehicle for the proclamation of the Easter faith which they already held as a result of the appearances" (op. cit., 70).

Turning to Matt., Fuller suggests that the angelophany in Mk. became a Christophany in Galilee in Matt., both being to women. "The earlier tradition of primary Christophanies in Galilee is beginning to react upon the originally quite separate story of the empty tomb with which only the women were originally associated (Mark 16:1 f.)" (op. cit., 78). The significance is twofold. "It is the first symptom of a tendency which culminates in the relocation of the primary appearances to the disciples in Jerusalem in Luke 24 and John 20:2. The Christophany of Matthew 28:11–17 is the first instance we have of a materialization of the appearances" (op. cit., 79). "The final scene in Matthew's Gospel adds only one fresh point to our knowledge of the resurrection appearances as they actually occurred, viz., that some of the disciples doubted. He has taken from the earliest tradition (via Mark) the second appearance to the Twelve in Galilee, and by drawing out the im-

plications of Mark 16:7 . . . has re-interpreted this appearance, not as the founding of the eschatological community, but as the inauguration of the mission" (op. cit., 91).

Although Luke is concerned with salvation history, Fuller thinks that his picture of a diffusion from Jerusalem is nearer to actual history. On the other hand, Leaney thinks that there could have been a "spontaneous combustion" of Christianity in various places where the earthly Jesus had ministered in Galilee, Decapolis and Syria as a result of the resurrection restoring faith among believers there (op. cit., 66; cf. Fuller, op. cit., 212). Leaney thinks that the appearance to more than five hundred need not have been in Jerusalem.

The thrust of the Johannine accounts is to emphasize that the faith engendered by the appearances is not primarily factual (that he did rise) but christological (since he is alive, he is to be confessed with Thomas as my Lord and my God) (op. cit., 142 ff.; cf. especially Jn. 20:24–29).

For Fuller, the resurrection has profound significance for the Christian community. "The resurrection does not mean that the earthly Jesus is relegated to past history but has as its consequence the extension of the word and work of the earthly Jesus into the present life of the community" (op. cit., 173). "Faith seeks the earthly Jesus not as a dead teacher, but as the living Lord, whose word and work were not merely accomplished once upon a time, but are now made ever present in the community" (op. cit., 74).

(f) It is virtually an axiom among the scholars following in the wake of Bultmann that the historian can only deal with the faith of the disciples in the resurrection but not the resurrection itself. Thus G. Bornkamm insists that "the last historical fact" available to scholars is "the Easter faith of the disciples" (*Jesus of Nazareth*, 1960, 180). The underlying premise is that the historian can deal with questions on a purely human level, but that he has to suspend judgment on questions which involve the metaphysical and supernatural. It is precisely this point which Alan Richardson questions in the name of critical history. According to Richardson, "such an attitude involves the abandoning of historical method altogether, for the historian cannot admit that there are any 'last facts' in history, for they would be causeless events" (*History – Sacred and Profane, Bampton Lectures for 1962*, 1964, 196). This is not to say that the historian has direct access to the resurrection or any other event. At best the historian's work is a piece of reconstruction, the creation of a picture or model of how he conceives the original event on the basis of the historical data available to him (for further discussion see C. Brown, "History and the Believer", in C. Brown, ed., *History, Criticism and Faith; Four Exploratory Studies*, 1976, 147–224). On the other hand, the historian cannot stop short at the data. "History is a causal nexus in which there can be no breaks, no events which are in principle inexplicable. The historian, if he is to be true to his calling, is bound to go on to consider the various possible explanations of the alleged happening or, if he can, to find a new and better one" (A. Richardson, op. cit., 196 f.).

In view of this, Richardson insists that we are bound to ask what caused the resurrection faith of the disciples, and that this is a proper question for the historian to ask. "Either Christ's resurrection called the Church's faith into being or we must give some more rationally coherent account of how that faith with all its tremendous consequences arose" (op. cit., 209; cf. "The Resurrection of Jesus Christ", *Theology* 74, 1971, 146–54, especially the conclusion on 153 f.). Hence, Richardson in com-

mon with traditional apologetics sees three possible explanations of the church's Easter faith. The first is that the resurrection was in some sense a historical fact. We may not be able to say how it happened, any more than we can say how Hannibal crossed the Alps. The historian is rarely an eye-witness, and "historical facts" are always inferences from pieces of testimony and other evidence which the historian has good reason to accept. The second possibility is that the claim that Jesus was raised was fraudulent. But Richardson rejects this on the grounds that "it is incredible that a faith which brought reconciliation with the all-holy God and peace and charity amongst men could have originated in a fraudulent conspiracy" (op. cit., 206). The third suggestion is that the disciples could have been mistaken. Such a view entails dismissing the claims found in the NT to have encountered the risen Christ and that the tomb was empty. It also means finding an explanation of how such a mistake could have arisen.

In making these points, Richardson has performed a valuable service in setting the debate about the resurrection of Jesus in the wider context of historical method. But several questions arise which these particular considerations do not solve. The argument leaves open the question of what the early church did see in the resurrection appearances and what kind of a resurrection body Jesus had (cf. op. cit., 212). It leaves to one side the detailed examination of the testimony to particular appearances and the empty tomb. Furthermore, Richardson appears to diminish its force by conceding that in the end the historical judgment that Jesus was raised from the dead cannot be made without an element of faith (ibid.). But it may be asked whether such a predisposing faith is a necessary condition and whether Richardson's approach actually demands it. The question can be pressed even further and put in the form of whether the first disciples had such a predisposing faith. The answer would seem to be in the negative. For it was encounter with the risen Christ which awakened faith, and not an existing faith that Jesus would rise that created resurrection belief.

(g) A German church historian who thinks that insufficient weight has been given to the actual historical evidence is Hans von Campenhausen in "The Events of Easter and the Empty Tomb" (*Tradition and Life in the Church: Essays and Lectures in Church History*, 1968, 42–90). Campenhausen does not wish to return to naive apologetics and sacrifice critical history. On the other hand, the evidence of the empty tomb should be taken more seriously than German scholars are wont to take it. "Thus, two essential and reliable pieces of data emerge from the confused mass of material handed down to us: a series of indubitable appearances of Christ, which must be placed in Galilee, and the discovery of the empty tomb in Jerusalem. At a very early date attempts were made to align the two accounts as closely as possible, that is to say, to make the first appearances begin at the empty tomb, and then, finally, to shift them all to Jerusalem. . . . Admittedly Mark's witness is not on a par with that of Paul; but, even so, it is old, in no way contradicts Paul, and cannot simply be ignored. Both pieces of data, therefore, the Galilean appearances and the empty tomb, must be upheld. They form the fixed points of departure, and point the line to be followed, for a consistent account of the events of Easter to be reconstructed" (op. cit., 77).

Campenhausen does not wish to stress external proof at the expense of faith. Rather, due weight must be given to both. "The credibility of the message rests not on bare historical proofs, but, on the one hand, on its existential ratification in the

spirit and through 'signs that follow', and, on the other, on the character of the events as fulfilments in salvation-history, or, dogmatically speaking, on the 'proof from scripture'. This, however, does not mean that the history can be treated as unimportant. It belongs, in fact, of necessity to the witness, which, apart from it, would lose its meaning" (op. cit., 87).

The question of the empty tomb has featured prominently in the debates on the resurrection since the eighteenth century. In the last of his *Discourses on the Miracles of our Saviour* (1729) Thomas Woolston maintained that the disciples had stolen the body of Jesus, the Roman soldiers being bribed and drunk. Jesus appeared only to his disciples who themselves eventually came to believe their own lies. Woolston was fined and imprisoned for blasphemy, but a less savage reply came from Thomas Sherlock whose *Tryal of the Witnesses of the Resurrection* (1729) took up the theme of the court case, putting the witnesses in the dock. Sherlock found it impossible to think that the disciples would have faced the persecution that befell them for the sake of a lie, while at the same time preaching a faith which demanded the utmost integrity. (For a latterday attempt at the same kind of thing see S. Greenleaf, *The Testimony of the Evangelists Examined by the Rules of Evidence Administered in the Courts of Justice*, [1874] 1965.) Admittedly, resurrection is contrary to the known laws of nature. But to someone living in a tropical climate in the eighteenth century the concept of ice is inconceivable. However, to others who have a wider experience the idea of water solidifying is comprehensible. The illustration figured in various apologetic works of the time. It has its limitations in that the phenomenon of ice is subject to repeated public verification, whereas the resurrection of Jesus is an unrepeatable event in the past. On the other hand, the Christian may assert that there will be an eschatological verification in the general resurrection. To say this, however, is to admit that resurrection claims are not on a par with other factual empirical assertions.

Other writers to pursue the theme were Peter Annet in a series of pamphlets, Gilbert West in his *Observations on the History and Evidences of the Resurrection* (1747), and H. S. Reimarus in the pamphlets published anonymously by G. E. Lessing known as the *Wolfenbüttel Fragments* (cf. *Fragments*, ed., C. H. Talbert, 1971; *The Goal of Jesus and his Disciples*, ed., G. W. Buchanan, 1970; H. Chadwick, ed., *Lessing's Theological Writings*, 1956). Reimarus, who is commonly though wrongly credited with having initiated the quest of the historical Jesus, took over many of the arguments of the English deists, claiming that the ideas of the resurrection and the second coming of Jesus were invented by the disciples at a time when Jesus' body could no longer be discovered, in order to perpetuate their comfortable way of life (→ Present, art. *The Parousia and Eschatology in the NT* 1 (a)). Reimarus's work was subjected to minute critique by numerous contemporaries but above all by J. S. Semler in his *Beantwortung der Fragmente eines Ungenannten insbesondere vom Zweck Jesu und seiner Jünger* (1779). (On this whole question see further C. Brown, *Jesus in European Protestant Theology, 1778–1860: A Study of Trends in Theological Method*, I–II, Dissertation, Bristol, 1969.)

The idea that the disciples stole the body goes back to NT times, and according to Matt. 28:13, it was even put forward by the Jewish elders in their attempt to bribe the Roman soldiers. It figured in Origen's debate with Celsus, in which Origen argued that men do not suffer persecution and risk martyrdom for a lie (*Contra Celsum* 2,

56; cf. Acts 7:60; 12:2). The rationalist H. E. G. Paulus put forward the "swoon theory" in *Das Leben Jesu als Grundlage einer reiner Geschichte des Christentums*, I, 2, 303 ff. Jesus was taken down from the cross still alive, and lingered on for another forty days before finally taking his leave in the mist (op. cit., 331). Shortly afterwards two disciples returned with the news that Jesus was now in a state of eternal bliss. It was the cool of the tomb and the aromatic spices which revived Jesus who stripped off his shroud and put on the gardener's clothes, hence the mistake of Mary Magdalene (Jn. 20:15). Jesus managed to emerge from the tomb because the earthquake had shifted the stone. In more recent times a similar view has been set out by H. Schonfield in *The Passover Plot* (1965). Other explanations of the empty tomb are those of K. Lake in *The Resurrection of Jesus*, 1912, 78 ff., and J. Klausner in *Jesus of Nazareth*, 1925, 357, who both suggest that Joseph of Arimathea buried the body. Lake conjectured that there were several tombs and that the women misunderstood the young man who said that Jesus was not there. The man had intended to redirect them to the right place, but they read into it something more.

Whilst all such theories fasten upon one or other detail of the Gospel narratives, they all place upon these details a construction other than the natural one in the context of the narrative. But even more significantly they do not explain the resurrection faith of the disciples. As G. E. Ladd points out, "Faith did not create the appearances; the appearances created faith" (*I Believe in the Resurrection of Jesus*, 1975, 138). The disciples themselves regarded the empty tomb as ambiguous, according to the Gospel accounts. It was the appearances of Jesus which convinced them; the empty tomb was the corroborative corollary. In reply to the suggestion that these appearances might have been some kind of subjective vision, Ladd follows W. Milligan in replying that the vision theory is inconsistent with the mental states of the disciples, that such visions could not have been witnessed by more than five hundred persons at once, and that they would not be likely to extend over a period of forty days and then cease (ibid.; cf. W. Milligan, *The Resurrection of Our Lord*, 1894⁴, 81–114; and W. Pannenberg, *Jesus – God and Man*, 1968, 85 ff.).

G. W. H. Lampe has argued that the empty tomb should not be taken literally (in G. W. H. Lampe and D. M. MacKinnon, *The Resurrection: A Dialogue Arising from Broadcasts*, 1966, 58 ff.). As a historian, he thinks that it rests on inferior evidence, and, as a theologian, he feels that Christ's resurrection should be of the same kind as that of other believers, whose bodies die and are decayed. Over against this view may be set that of N. Clark that, "the Empty Tomb stands as the massive sign that the eschatological deed of God is not outside this world of time and space or in despair of it, but has laid hold on it, penetrated deep into it, shattered it, and begun its transformation" (*Interpreting the Resurrection*, 1967, 98; cf. W. Künneth, *The Theology of the Resurrection*, 1965, 97). Moreover, the tradition of the empty tomb is not a late accretion designed to combat docetism. A number of scholars hold that Paul's mention that "he was buried [*etaphē*]" (1 Cor. 15:4) implies Paul's knowledge of the empty tomb (K. Bornhäuser, *Die Gebeine der Toten*, 1921, 9–37; W. Künneth, op. cit., 94; C. F. D. Moule, *The Significance of the Message of the Resurrection for Faith in Jesus Christ*, 7 f.; cf. also J. A. T. Robinson, *IDB* III 45 f.; and *The Human Face of God*, 1973, 127–41). In reply to the suggestion that a Jew of those times would in any case have thought of a continuity of identity between the earthly body and the risen one and thus would have assumed the emptiness of the

tomb, C. F. D. Moule points out that "the story in its essentials is very far indeed from conforming to the presuppositions of Jewish apocalyptic. Jewish apocalyptic did not believe in a *permanent* raising from death until the End, which was still in the future" (op. cit., 8). Before that, all that the Pharisaic Jew could believe in was temporary restoration to this life (as in the raisings by Elijah and Elisha and of Lazarus and Jairus's daughter) or to immaterial forms (as in 1 Sam. 28:12 ff.; Job 4:16; Mk. 6:49). In addition, Moule thinks that the failure to produce the body of Jesus should not be too readily dismissed and that the fact that women were the principal witnesses argues in favour of credibility, as women were notoriously invalid witnesses according to Jewish principles of evidence (op. cit., 9).

To Moule, belief in the empty tomb does not imply that the body of Jesus was exactly the same in its risen state. Rather, he suggests that the evidence implies transformation in a way comparable with the resurrection of believers. Admittedly their bodies die and decompose. "But is it conceivable that the total matter of this time-space existence is destined by the Creator not to be 'scrapped' but to be used up into some other existence? This, it might be said, would imply a doctrine of creation, not *ex nihilo in nihil* (out of nothing into nothing), but *ex nihilo in aliquid novi* (out of nothing into something new); and the latter is certainly congruous with the idea of a God who never creates without a purpose. If so, is it inconceivable that in just the area of the body of Jesus, which alone had been surrendered to death in total absolute obedience to the will of God, this transformation and using up was anticipated; while with the rest of mankind their 'material' returns to the collective reservoir of the totality of matter one way or another, by decomposition slow or sudden, until this new totality of things is ultimately used as the material of a new existence, in which they, by the grace of God, will share?" (op. cit., 10). For further elaboration of Moule's position see "St Paul and Dualism: The Pauline Conception of Resurrection", *NTS* 12, 1965–66, 106–23; and Moule and D. Cupitt, "The Resurrection: A Disagreement", *Theology* 75, 1972, 507–19. Moule's view may also be compared with that of G. E. Ladd discussed below under (h).

(h) A conservative NT scholar who has examined the historicity of the data is G. E. Ladd in *I Believe in the Resurrection of Jesus*, 1975. His investigation is carried out against the background of a study of resurrection belief in the OT and in Judaism. Ladd draws attention to the curious fact that the NT writers never appealed to Isa. 53:10 f. ("He shall see his offspring, he shall prolong his days; the will of the LORD shall prosper in his hand; he shall see the fruit of the travail of his soul and be satisfied") to support the resurrection of Jesus (op. cit., 67). Indeed, the disciples were not prepared for either the death or the resurrection of Jesus. "When Jesus began to teach that as the Son of Man his mission was to suffer and die (Mt. 8:31), the disciples were sure something was wrong. The Son of Man by definition was a heavenly super-human being who would come to earth with power and glory to transform the present order and reign in God's glorious Kingdom. But a suffering and dying Son of Man – such a thing was unheard of. It was in fact a contradiction in terms. The Son of Man was to conquer and reign, not to die" (op. cit., 71). The only dying messiah in Jewish literature is in 2 Esd. 7, and there his death has no saving power. Hence, the disciples were slow to realize how Jesus was fulfilling the rôle of messiah, because their expectations and those of contemporary Judaism were different.

Turning to the evidence of the Gospels, Ladd is willing to say that they were first

written some thirty to forty years after the events that they describe, and that each evangelist selected and to some degree shaped his material to suit his theological and ecclesiastical interests (op. cit., 74). He regards Mk. as the earliest Gospel written c. A.D. 65 in Rome by Mark the attendant of Peter (op. cit., 75; cf. Papias in Eusebius, *HE* 3, 39, 15). Ladd rightly rejects the longer ending of Mk. (16:9–19) as not original (op. cit., 83; cf. on this subject W. R. Farmer, *The Last Twelve Verses of Mark, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series* 25, 1974).

Ladd himself thinks that the ending of Mk. has been lost. Nevertheless, it would not be true to say that there is no evidence for the resurrection of Jesus in Mk. Jesus foretold his resurrection after Peter's confession of him as messiah at Caesarea Philippi (Mk. 8:31 par. Matt. 16:21; Lk. 9:22), at his transfiguration (Mk. 9:9 par. Matt. 17:9), and at his second prediction of his passion (Mk. 9:31 par. Matt. 17:23). On Easter morning Mk. relates that when the women came to the tomb, a young man announced to them, " 'Do not be amazed; you seek Jesus of Nazareth, who was crucified. He has risen, he is not here; see the place where they laid him. But go, tell his disciples and Peter that he is going before you to Galilee; there you will see him, as he told you.' And they went out and fled from the tomb; for trembling and astonishment had come upon them; and they said nothing to any one, for they were afraid" (Mk. 16:6 ff.).

Ladd points out that, whilst (in his view) Matt. and Lk. both made use of Mk. they largely go their separate ways in their resurrection narratives. "All this means that *at the points in which the gospels agree, that agreement is all the more striking*" (op. cit., 84). The following table is based on that given by Ladd (op. cit., 80 ff.). Agreements are shown in ordinary print; points of difference are in italics.

	Matt. 28:1–20	Mk. 16:1–8	Lk. 26:1–53	Jn. 20:1–21:25
1.	toward the dawn of first day	when Sabbath was past	on the first day of the week	on the first day of the week
2.	women	women	women	women
3.	Mary Magdalene, *the other Mary*	Mary Magdalene *Mary, mother of Salome*	Mary Magdalene Mary, mother of James; Joanna	Mary Magdalene (alone)
4.	*to see the tomb*	*to anoint Jesus' body*	*taking spices*	*no reason given (Nicodemus anoints the body, 19:39)*
5.	*an earthquake* an angel rolled the stone	they found the stone rolled away	they found the stone rolled back	found the stone taken away
6.	*an angel*	*a young man*	*two men*	*two angels* (20:12)
7.	*the guards fall like dead men*			
8.		the women enter the empty tomb	they did not find the body	

9.	"He has risen, as he said"	"He has risen, he is not here"	"Why do you seek the living among the dead?"	
10.	"Go, tell his disciples"	"Go, tell his disciples *and Peter*"		
11.	"He is going before you to Galilee; there you will see him."	"He is going before you to Galilee; there you will see him."		
12.	They departed quickly *with fear and joy*	They fled trembling *and astonished*	They returned from the tomb	*Mary runs to tell Peter and the other disciple*
13.	*They ran to tell his disciples*	*They said nothing to anyone; they afraid*	*They told all this to the eleven and all the rest. They do not believe*	
14.	*Jesus meets the two women*			
15.				*Peter and John enter the empty tomb; Peter believes* (21:3–10)
16.				*Jesus appears to Mary* (21:11–17)
17.				*Mary tells the disciples*
18.			*appearance to two disciples near Emmaus*	
19.			*an appearance to the eleven in Jerusalem* (24:36–49)	*an appearance to the disciples* (20:19–23)
20.				*a second appearance to the eleven, including Thomas* (20:21–29)
21.				*an appearance in Tiberias* (21:1–23)
22.	*the great commission in Galilee*			
23.			*the ascension from Bethany*	

In many instances the disagreements are negligible, and are capable of being resolved without any great stretch of the imagination, bearing in mind the various

standpoints of the writers and their sources of information. Thus the action of the women in coming to the sealed tomb two nights and a day after the death of Jesus may be less improbable than it appears, if we remember with C. E. B. Cranfield that "love often prompts people to do what from a practical view is useless" (*The Gospel according to Saint Mark*, 1959, 464). According to Jn. 19:40, the body was wrapped in strips of linen (*othonia*); according to the Synoptics it was wrapped in a linen shroud (*sindōn*) (Mk. 15:46 ff. par.). Possibly the body was wrapped in the shroud and then the strips were wound around it (op. cit., 85). Whereas the Synoptics mention several women, Jn. mentions only Mary Magdalene. Nevertheless, she used the plur. when she said, "They have taken the Lord out of the tomb, and we do not know where they have laid him" (Jn. 20:2). Whereas Mk. and Matt. focus attention on Galilee as the scene of the appearances, Lk. relates them only in or near Jerusalem. But Lk.'s interest may be explained in the light of his overall purpose of showing how the church has spread to the very heart of the Roman empire, being rejected by Israel both in Jerusalem and Rome, but finding response among the Gentiles. Thus Acts closes with an account of Paul's effective ministry in Rome. "Luke is not interested in writing a complete history nor does he have any particular interest in Galilee. He is interested in the movement from Jerusalem to Rome, and in connection with this interest, he relates only appearances in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem. Undoubtedly the command to the disciples not to leave Jerusalem (Acts 1:4) was given after the disciples had returned from Galilee to Jerusalem" (op. cit., 87 f.).

In contrast with Campenhausen who, on the basis of Lk., holds that "Peter seems to have understood the empty tomb as a pledge that the resurrection had occurred and to have influenced the others accordingly" (op. cit., 85), Ladd insists that "The empty tomb did not and does not arouse faith in the resurrection of Jesus" (op. cit., 89; cf. Mk. 16:8; Lk. 24:11, 21). The fact that the women were primary witnesses bears, moreover, the mark of verisimilitude especially in view of the attitude to women in Judaism. "If the faith of the community had entered significantly into the substance of the resurrection stories, *we should have expected the primary witnesses to have been apostles* instead of women" (op. cit., 90). Ladd, in common with C. H. Dodd and C. F. D. Moule, insists that we do not have to choose between Galilee and Jerusalem as the locale of the appearances, but that there are solid grounds for accepting both (ibid.; cf. C. H. Dodd, *The Founder of Christianity*, 1970, 163–72; C. F. D. Moule, "The Ascension – Acts i. 9", *ExpT* 68, 1956–57, 207).

Ladd concludes: "The Gospels agree in certain important points which we may take as being historically credible. 1. Jesus was dead and buried. 2. The disciples were not prepared for his death; they were overcome with confusion. 3. The tomb was found on Easter morning to be empty. 4. The empty tomb was not itself a proof of the resurrection. Mary thought the body had been stolen. 5. The disciples encountered certain experiences which they took to be appearances of Jesus risen from the dead. In the last analysis, it does not really matter where or to whom these appearances occurred. 6. We must include another important historical fact. Contemporary Judaism had no concept of a dying and rising Messiah. 7. Another historical fact: the disciples proclaimed the resurrection of Jesus in Jerusalem, near where he had been buried" (op. cit., 93; cf. 91 ff. for an outline harmonization of the Gospel accounts).

So far nothing has been said about the nature of the resurrection body of Jesus.

But the Gospels contain certain indications that the authors did not think of it merely as the resuscitation of a corpse. The description of the position of the grave clothes in Jn. 20:7 f. leads Ladd to say with S. H. Hooke that, "It seems to be the evangelist's intention to suggest that Peter saw the grave clothes lying like a chrysalis out of which the risen body of the Lord had emerged" (op. cit., 94; cf. S. H. Hooke, *The Resurrection of Christ*, 1967, 79). The account in Lk. 24 of the encounter on the Emmaus road and the breaking of bread afterwards "says two things: the person of Jesus was capable of being recognised by those who had known him in his earthly ministry; and yet he was capable of sudden, inexplicable disappearance" (op. cit., 97). The subsequent appearances in Lk. 24:34–40 suggest a "material" body, but one which had properties different from that of the body of Jesus in his earthly ministry. This may be compared with Jn. 20:19, 26. "He possessed a real body, but also powers never before heard of – of being able to appear and disappear at will to the human physical senses" (op. cit., 99). All this is far removed from the extravagances of the description of the actual resurrection in the Gospel of Peter, but it is compatible with Paul's concept of a "spiritual body" (1 Cor. 15:44). To Ladd the resurrection "was an event that was observed by no one, an event caused by God – indeed, an event in which the world of God intersected the world of time and space ... All that the historian as such can say is that something marvellous has happened here. *Only those who have reason to believe in the God to whom the Bible witnesses can accept the witness of the gospels, viz., that God raised Jesus from the dead"* (op. cit., 101 f.).

Turning to Paul, Ladd maintains that the account in 1 Cor. 15:3–8 embodies traditions independent of the Gospels (op. cit., 105). The appearance to Cephas, whose person was highly esteemed at Corinth (1 Cor. 1:12), is mentioned in the Synoptics only at Lk. 24:34. The appearance to the "twelve" could be that to the eleven in Lk. 24:36–49 or an appearance in Jn. 20. That to the five hundred is not mentioned in the Gospels, but could have occurred in Galilee. Nothing is known of the appearance to James. The scriptures which Paul had in mind may have been passages like Ps. 16 (cf. Acts 2:26 f.) and Ps. 110, Hos. 6:2, Jon. 2 interpreted christologically, finding a transcended fulfilment in the resurrection of Jesus. Ladd thinks that the appearance to Paul himself was not simply a vision (cf. 1 Cor. 12:4; 2 Cor. 12:1) but a face-to-face encounter with the risen, exalted Christ. Commenting on 1 Cor. 15:23 ("But each in his own order; Christ the first fruits, then at his coming those who belong to Christ"), he writes: "*the resurrection body of Jesus was of the same order as the resurrection bodies of the saints at the end of the age*" (op. cit., 123; cf. Phil. 3:21). As against Pannenberg, Ladd does not think that Paul derived his concept of a spiritual body from Syr. Bar. 50–51, for the differences are too great to establish dependence (op. cit., 124; cf. W. Pannenberg, "The Revelation of God in Jesus" in J. M. Robinson and J. B. Cobb, eds., *Theology as History*, 1967, 115). Rather, "it was Paul's familiarity with the theology of glory, and his experience of meeting Jesus in his glorified state, that led Paul to his theology of glorified bodies in the eschatological resurrection" (op. cit., 125).

There is a sense in which "*the resurrection of Jesus was his exaltation.* At his resurrection he entered the invisible world of God. His appearances to his disciples did not mean the passing of one body through other solid substances; it means that Jesus, who was with them but invisible, made himself visible to their physical senses"

(op. cit., 127). Support for this view of the exaltation of Jesus is found in Acts 2:32 f.; 5:30 f.; Col. 3:1; Phil. 2:8 f.; Heb. 1:3 (cf. 1:13; 8:1; 10:12; 12:2 which all refer to the exaltation, whereas only Heb. 13:20 refers to the resurrection as such). Only Luke-Acts emphasizes the ascension as an event separate from the resurrection. Ladd sees Lk.'s account as signalling the end of the resurrection appearances (op. cit., 128).

(i) G. E. Ladd's reflections on the resurrection body of Jesus bring us to the point where we may consider the views of a number of theologians on the theological significance of the resurrection of Jesus. And in so doing this final section on the resurrection of Jesus forms a bridge to the second part of this survey which will deal with the resurrection of men in general.

For the Barth of the early part of the *Church Dogmatics* the resurrection meant the breaking in of "fulfilled time", the time of "the pure presence of God" (*CD* I, 2, 115). For in the period of the forty days between the resurrection and the ascension God encountered the church in Christ in a direct and unique way. Eternity broke into time in this event of revelation in a way which transcended the successive momentariness of our time which is either "not yet" in the case of the future or "no longer" in the case of the past. "But the Easter story (with, if you like, the story of the transfiguration and the story of the conversion of Saul as prologue and epilogue respectively) actually speaks of a present without any future, of an eternal presence of God in time. So it does not speak eschatologically. The Easter story, Christ truly, corporeally risen, and as such appearing to His disciples, talking with them, acting in their midst – this is, of course, the recollection upon which all the New Testament recollections hang, to which they are all related, for the sake of which there is a New Testament recollection at all" (*CD* I, 2, 114). For Barth the resurrection of Jesus cannot be proved. It can be recollected, proclaimed and received in faith. This is because it belongs to the transcendent dimension of God and can be known only in revelation. Nevertheless, it took place in history.

In the theology of the later volumes of the *Church Dogmatics* the resurrection of Jesus not only has a revelatory significance. It belongs to the basis of the universal covenant with all mankind by which, according to Barth, God has united man to himself in virtue of the union of the divine and human natures in Jesus Christ. Thus no man can ever be considered as an independent subject. "In virtue of the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ – whether he knows it and believes it or not – it is simply not true that he belongs to himself and is left to himself, that he is thrown back on himself. He belongs to the Head, Jesus Christ, of whose body he is or is to become a member, the Lord of the Church who is also the Lord of the cosmos, and therefore the Lord of those who so far do not believe in him, or do so no longer. He exists because Jesus Christ exists. He exists as a predicate of this Subject, i.e. that which has been decided and is real for man in this Subject is true for him" (*CD* II, 2, 539; for critical discussion of Barth's position see C. Brown, *Karl Barth and the Christian Message*, 1967, 64 ff., 129 ff.).

In *The Easter Jesus* (1973) G. O'Collins seeks to understand the resurrection in the light of history, belief and theology. The theological value of the resurrection is the way in which it transforms our concrete and material existence, revealing Christ's continued and effective presence in the church. In Lk. and Jn. it is combined with a realism which insists on the physical reality of what is revealed, the other-worldly

and transformed identity of the risen Christ with the earthly Jesus. While the resurrection transcends history it is not supra-historical. It anticipates the end and purpose of history, but also leaves evidential traces within history. Thus, although O'Collins regards the empty tomb as "an ambiguous episode" (op. cit., 44), he lays great store by the probability of the narratives. The appearances were objective in the sense that "The encounters produced the disciples' faith and not vice versa" (op. cit., 34). But for us today the evangelists provide "an amalgam of believing witness and historical reminiscence with the aim of eliciting and developing the faith of their readers" (op. cit., 77).

In *Resurrection and the New Testament*, *SBT* Second Series 12, 1970, C. F. Evans studies the idea of resurrection and the several NT traditions. His form-critical analysis leads him to see a great fragmentation within the NT. Hence, what matters is not to believe in the historical accuracy of the stories but the central proclamation that they enshrine. The resurrection signifies that God has made Jesus Lord and messiah of Israel (Rom. 1:4; Acts 2:36; 3:13 ff.). "If, then, resurrection is the principal source of faith in the lordship and messiahship of Jesus, it follows that resurrection is also the source of the existence of the church, and its knowledge of itself as the community of the risen Lord and Messiah, the community of the last days" (op. cit., 149). However, for Evans the cause of the resurrection faith of the early church remains obscure: "Whatever the Easter event was, it must be supposed to be of such a kind as to be responsible for the production of these traditions as its deposit at whatever remove" (op. cit., 130). In its rudimentary form "Resurrection is the divine reversal of the Cross as life is opposite to death" (op. cit., 132; cf. Acts 2:23 f.). But in another sense Jesus' messianic lordship is established by God in the church which is the continuing sphere of Christ's presence. "From this point of view the resurrection body of Jesus is simply the church" (op. cit., 150). There is also for Paul the present resurrection life of the Spirit. "While the expectation of the parousia remained with Paul all his life, and so determined his thought on resurrection, the realization of what was involved in being here and now 'in Christ' or 'with Christ' served to unhook some of the links which tied resurrection to apocalyptic expectation, and to allow it to play a more creative role of its own" (op. cit., 163). For further discussion of Paul's eschatological teaching → Present, art. *The Parousia and Eschatology in the NT* 2 (c).

According to Rom. 1:3 f., Jesus is "God's Son, who was descended from David according to the flesh and designated Son of God in power according to the Spirit of holiness by his resurrection from the dead, Jesus Christ our Lord [*tou horisthentos hyiou theou en dynamei kata pneuma hagiosynes ex anastaseos nekron lesou Christou tou kyriou hēmōn*]." On the interpretation of these verses see M. E. Boismard, "Constitué Fils de Dieu", *RB* 60, 1953, 51–7; E. Schweizer, "Röm. 1, 3 f. und der Gegensatz von Fleisch und Geist vor und bei Paulus", *EvTh* 15, 1955, 563–71; A. J. B. Higgins, "The Old Testament and Some Aspects of New Testament Christology", *Canadian Journal of Theology* 6, 1960, 200–10; L. C. Allen, "The Old Testament Background of *(pro)horizein* in the New Testament", *NTS* 17, 1970–71, 104–8; E Linnemann, "Tradition und Interpretation in Röm. 1, 3 f.", *EvTh* 31, 1971, 164–71; and C. E. B. Cranfield, *The Epistle to the Romans*, I, 1975, *ICC*, 57–65. Paul is probably making use of existing confessional formulae. There is no other reference to Christ's Davidic descent in Pauline literature apart from 2 Tim. 2:8.

However, the reference to Jesus' Jewish origin in terms of → David fits the theme of Romans which is to expound the nature and identity of the people of God in the light of Christ and the new situation this has created for Jew and Gentile. Cranfield thinks that *horizō* here means to appoint, constitute or install. No clear example of the meaning "declare" or "show to be" has been found contemporary with the NT. The patristic interpretation along the latter lines (e.g. Chrysostom 397) may be due to doctrinal considerations. The passage does not teach a form of adoptionism. Cranfield sees the meaning of the opening words of v. 4 as " 'who was appointed Son-of-God-in-power' (that is, in contrast with His being Son of God in apparent weakness and poverty in the period of His earthly existence)" (op. cit., 62). The resurrection which is here attributed to the → Spirit thus inaugurates a new era in which Christ is exalted (cf. G. E. Ladd's view under (h) above; → Lord; → Son).

G. Kegel's *Auferstehung Jesu – Auferstehung der Toten. Eine traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum Neuen Testament* (1970) sees the resurrection faith initially articulated in terms of Jewish apocalyptic in Lk.-Acts but issuing in a specifically Christian world-view of the general resurrection and future hope. He asks, however, what happens when the apocalyptic thought world is questioned (op. cit., 121). Like Marxsen, to whom he is much indebted, the appearances are the primary data recoverable by historical research. The "resurrection of Jesus" represents a conclusion from these appearances cast in apocalyptic terms. It was motivated by apologetic concerns which in the last analysis represent a confession of God (op. cit., 12–25). Kegel's work thus raises the question of hermeneutics.

In similar vein X. Léon-Dufour is also concerned with interpretation in *Resurrection and the Message of Easter* (1974). The work examines (1) the conceptual categories which underlie the earliest expressions of Easter faith (resurrection, exaltation, appearance); (2) the literary genre of the stories of encounter with the risen Jesus; (3) the various theological and christological perspectives in the narratives; and (4) the focal point of interpretation and pastoral communication. The task for today is not to attempt to bring faith and science into line but to mediate and translate different language systems. God's action occurs in the "silence of God" and is accessible only in its consequences.

In *Dieu l'a Ressuscité Exégèse et Théologie Biblique* (1973) B. Rigaux examines the ideational background of resurrection faith, i.e. not only the conceptual categories in which it is expressed but the psychological content of the various images. This he finds not only in pre-Christian Judaism but in the preaching of Jesus himself. Jesus believed in a resurrection involving a transformation of life rather than its mere restoration. The resurrection brought about a new perspective in which the revelation of God as the God of Israel is transformed: "The act of God in the resurrection of Jesus comprises an essential and unique characteristic conferring on it an unprecedented and definitive function in God's relationship with humanity. First of all, it places Jesus at the term of the interventions of the mystery of revelation; secondly, it constitutes a living relation between God and the Church instituted by the risen Messiah" (op. cit., 321).

The views of R. E. Brown in *The Virginal Conception & Bodily Resurrection of Jesus* (1973) are of interest in that they represent the thought of a leading contemporary American Roman Catholic scholar who is thoroughly versed in historical and literary criticism. After a review of the biblical data in the light of contemporary

scholarship Brown concludes that "The resurrection of Jesus, along with his exaltation and his giving of the Spirit, constituted an eschatological event – the beginning of the end-time" (op. cit., 125). Our everyday language of "seeing" and "speaking" is that of analogy. No one knows when the resurrection took place, and no one can describe it. But it is wrong to think of it as not being historical, "for, while the risen Jesus stood outside the bounds of space and time, by his appearances he touched the lives of men who were in space and time, men who were in history. The interaction of the eschatological and the historical should not be lost sight of" (op. cit., 126). If there had been a body of Jesus in the tomb, it would be "difficult, if not impossible, to understand how the disciples could have preached that God raised Jesus from the dead, since there would have been irrefutable evidence that He had not done so" (ibid.). The tradition of the empty tomb is old, but it does not provide the basis of faith, for "Christians believe in Jesus, not in a tomb" (op. cit., 127). But in turn this affected the formation of the narratives. There was a real continuity between the earthly Jesus and the risen Christ. Whilst it is right to speak of the bodily resurrection of Jesus, we must think of that body in terms of a resurrection body. "Jesus' risen body was no longer a body as we know bodies, bound by the dimensions of space and time. It is best to follow Paul's description of risen bodies as spiritual, not natural or physical (*psychikos* . . .); he can even imply that these bodies are no longer flesh and blood" (op. cit., 128; cf. 1 Cor. 15:50). The fact that Jesus' body was not corrupted has important theological implications: "It was the sovereign action of God glorifying Jesus of Nazareth. Only because God has done this for His Son are new possibilities opened for His many children who have come to believe in what He has done" (op. cit., 128). "If Jesus' body corrupted in the tomb so that his victory over death did not involve bodily resurrection, then the model of destruction and new creation is indicated. If Jesus rose bodily from the dead, then the Christian model should be one of transformation" (op. cit., 129).

Finally we may note the significance of the resurrection in the theology of Wolfhart Pannenberg (cf. *Jesus – God and Man*, 1968; *Basic Questions in Theology*, I–III, 1973; *Theology and the Philosophy of Science*, 1976; "Did Jesus Really Rise from the Dead?", *Dialog* 4, 1965, 128–35; W. Pannenberg, ed., *Revelation as History*, 1969; J. M. Robinson and J. B. Cobb, eds., *Theology as History, New Frontiers in Theology* III, 1967; A. D. Galloway, *Wolfhart Pannenberg*, 1973; E. F. Tupper, *The Theology of Wolfhart Pannenberg*, 1974; and D. Fuller, *Easter Faith and History*, 1968, 177–87; → Present, art. *The Parousia and Eschatology in the NT* 1 (f)). As against the theologies of revelation through the Word, Pannenberg stresses revelation in history. It is only at the end of history that God will be fully revealed. Nevertheless, the resurrection of Jesus anticipates this final revelation. "The resurrection of Jesus supports our attempt at a new interpretation of the concept of revelation. It depends on the one hand on the fact that the raising up of Jesus implies a confirmation by God himself of his pre-Easter appearance and that the pre-Easter Jesus remained dependent on this confirmation, so that no position in regard to the pre-Easter Jesus and his message can be justified without regard to the cross and resurrection. On the other hand, the proper meaning of the resurrection depends from the beginning on its connection with the apocalyptic expectation: for only in relation to this connection is the resurrection already the inauguration of the expected end, which for the remainder of mankind is still to come. And this eschatological

character of the resurrection of Jesus as anticipation in Jesus of the end-event, for our outline, is the foundation of its original meaning as revelation of God, since – and here again we can argue only in terms of the history of the transmission – in the apocalyptic understanding of history the revelation of God's glory (and therefore of God himself) was expected in connection with the end-event of the raising of the dead and the judgment" (*Revelation as History*, 193). The "fate of Jesus" is "the anticipation of the end of all history" (op. cit., 134; cf. *Basic Questions in Theology*, I, 24).

This view of Jesus posits treating the resurrection of Jesus as an event in history, and Pannnberg does just this (cf. *Jesus – God and Man*, 53–114). But apart from the particular historical arguments in favour of the resurrection, Pannenberg has also defended the methodology of treating the resurrection as a historical event. In contrast with Ernst Troeltsch's view of analogy, which insists that we cannot accept anything in the past as historical unless it bears analogies with the events that we know in the present, Pannenberg insists that analogy must not be used to pre-empt the question of historicity. The positivistic historian would reject accounts of the resurrection on the grounds that he has no experiences of resurrection in the modern world. But Pannenberg insists that analogy can only enable us to discern events of a similar kind. It cannot prejudge the historicity of events that are dissimilar. In the case of the resurrection it is the raising of Jesus which provides the decisive context for understanding and interpreting all subsequent history and not vice versa (*Basic Questions in Theology*, I, 44 ff.; cf. C. Brown "History and the Believer", in C. Brown, ed., *History, Criticism and Faith,* 1976, 171 ff.).

2. *The Resurrection of Men in General.* The following survey is particularly indebted to the article by M. J. Harris, "Resurrection and Immortality: Eight Theses", *Themelios* 1, 1976, 50–55. It takes up the eight theses put forward by Harris and draws on the literature noted by him.

(a) The NT speaks of immortality, but this concept clearly does not mean endless, personal survival through the avoidance of physical death. Rather, it involves participation in the eternal life of God and therefore immunity from eternal death. Admittedly, the terms which are rendered "immortality" suggest by their etymology immunity from death (*athanasia*; 1 Cor. 15:53 f.; 1 Tim. 6:16) and decay (*aphtharsia*; Rom. 2:7; 1 Cor. 15:42, 50, 53 f.; Eph. 6:24; 2 Tim. 1:10). But in the context of the NT, Harris urges that they should be defined qualitatively as well as quantitatively. The concept of immortality involves sharing in the nature of God (2 Pet. 1:4) and enjoying fellowship with Christ (Lk. 23:43; 2 Cor. 5:8; Phil. 1:23). Comparison of 2 Cor. 5:4 with 1 Cor. 15:53 f. indicates that "life" and "eternal life" are equivalents for "immortality" (op. cit., 50; cf. R. W. Thomas, "The Meaning of the Terms 'Life' and 'Death' in the Fourth Gospel and in Paul", *SJT* 21, 1968, 199–212, especially 204). The terms are juxtaposed in Rom. 2:7 ("to those who by patience in well-doing seek for glory and honour and immortality, he [God] will give eternal life") and 2 Tim. 1:10 ("Christ Jesus, who abolished death and brought life and immortality to light through the gospel"). Harris concludes: "The Christian is destined to gain an immunity to that principle of decay and deterioration which characterizes humanity in Adam, through sharing the endless life of God" (op. cit., 50 f.).

(b) "In the distinctive New Testament usage, resurrection signifies not the reanimation of corpses but the transformation of the whole person into the image of Christ by the power of the indwelling Spirit, in spite of the intervention of death" (op.

cit., 51). The Gk. pagan of the 1st cent. would probably have understood *hē anastasis tōn nekrōn* as "the standing up of corpses" (Acts 17:23a), whereas others in the tradition of Judaism may have had some idea of the new body as a permanent home of the soul which had been preserved intact in the heavenly treasuries since the time of death (cf. P. Volz, *Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde*, 1934, 117–21, 249–55). The NT contains examples of restoration to life in the raising of Lazarus (Jn. 11:1–44) and the widow of Nain's son (Lk. 7:11–17), but these were only temporary. They were quite different from the resurrection of Christ who was never to die again (Acts 13:34; Rom. 6:9) and is always exalted at the right hand of God (Rom. 8:34).

The NT does not actually refer to "the resurrection of the body" or "the resurrection of the flesh" but only to "the resurrection of the dead" or "resurrection from the dead". "The subjects of resurrection are whole persons, who are transformed outwardly and inwardly in what may be called an acceleration of the process of Christification (see Rom. 8:29; 1 Cor. 15:49; 2 Cor. 3:18; Col. 3:10)" (op. cit., 51; on the credal formularies cf. W. Bieder, "Auferstehung des Fleisches oder des Leibes? Eine biblisch-theologische und dogmengeschichtliche Studie" *ThZ* 1, 1945, 105–20; J. A. Schep, *The Nature of the Resurrection Body*, 1964, 220–27; J. G. Davies, "Factors leading to the Emergence of Belief in the Resurrection of the Flesh", *JTS* New Series 23, 1972, 448–55; R. M. Grant, "The Resurrection of the Body", *JR* 28, 1948, 120–30, 188–208; J. Gnilka, "Contemporary Understanding of 'the Resurrection of the Body' ", in P. Benoit and R. Murphy, eds., *Immortality and Resurrection*, 1970, 129–41). Even the phrase "resurrection in the body" is not without difficulty (C. R. Bowen, *The Resurrection in the New Testament*, 1911, 76). In view of the NT understanding of → body, Harris suggests that the phrase "resurrection of the person" is least open to objection (ibid.; cf. P. H. Menoud, *Le Sort des Trépassés*, 1966², 60 f.).

A number of passages retain the primitive language of "coming to life again" (cf. Jn. 5:21a) or emergence from the tomb (cf. Jn. 5:28 f.). There is a resurrection which leads to → judgment and not life (Jn. 5:29; Acts 24:15; cf. Matt. 25:46; Lk. 11:32; Dan. 12:2; 2 Esd. 7:32–8), a reanimation of "the rest of the dead" that leads to "the second death" (Rev. 20:4 ff., 11–15).

Harris believes that in the Pauline epistles resurrection is a privilege reserved for the new humanity in Christ (op. cit., 52; cf. J. Héring, "Saint Paul a-t-il enseigné deux résurrections?", *RHPR* 12, 1932, 308 f.; and J. Jeremias, " 'Flesh and Blood cannot Inherit the Kingdom of God' (1 Cor. xv. 50)", *NTS* 2, 1955–56, 155, who holds that Paul distinguishes between *hoi nekroi*, deceased Christians, and the anarthrous *nekroi*, the dead in general; but against this J. B. Lightfoot, *Saint Paul's Epistle to the Philippians*, 1894⁴, 151). In any case, whatever the state of the wicked dead, they do not possess spiritual bodies, since the *sōma pneumatikon* (1 Cor. 15:44, 46) is imperishable (1 Cor. 15:42, 50).

The resurrection of Christ or the resurrected Christ forms the prototype and pattern for the resurrection of believers. Aquinas believed that his resurrection caused that of believers (*Summa Theologiae* 3, Q. 56; cf. M. E. Dahl, *The Resurrection of the Body, SBT* 36, 1962, 49 f.). But this goes beyond the explicit teaching of the NT which speaks of Christ as the firstfruits (*aparchē*) of those who have fallen asleep (1 Cor. 15:20, 23; Col. 1:18; Rev. 1:5; → Sacrifice). The term suggests both priority

in time (cf. Acts 26:23) and superiority in status, in that his resurrection forms the first and most significant part of the series. Moreover, this concept implies a pledge that Christians will have a share in the full ingathering of the harvest (2 Cor. 1:22; 3:18; 5:4 f.; → Seed, Harvest).

(c) "Only with the death and resurrection of Christ did the ideas of resurrection and immortality emerge from the Old Testament shadows into the full light of the New Testament day (cf. 2 Tim. 1:10)" (op. cit., 52). OT teaching has been reviewed above under *anastasis*. But there are grounds for maintaining a Jewish doctrine of immortality distinct from the idea of resurrection and the Gk. idea of the soul which was widespread in the period 200 B.C. to A.D. 100 (cf. H. C. C. Cavallin, *Life After Death. Paul's Argument for the Resurrection of the Dead in 1 Corinthians 15. Part I: An Enquiry into the Jewish Background*, 1974, 200). However, it was the resurrection of Jesus which first gave any tangible grounds for the hope of an after-life.

(d) Immortality is not a present possession of all men but a future acquisition of Christians. According to 1 Cor. 15:42, 52 ff., it is only after the resurrection transformation that believers "put on" the garment of immortality (op. cit., 53; cf. M. J. Harris, "Paul's View of Death in 2 Corinthians 5:1–10", in R. N. Longenecker and M. C. Tenney, eds., *New Dimensions in New Testament Study*, 317–28). In Paul's thought it is not immortality but death that is inherited from → Adam (Rom. 5:12; 1 Cor. 15:22; cf. C. K. Barrett, "Immortality and Resurrection", *London Quarterly and Holborn Review* 190, 1965, 97, 101). "Man is not immortal because he possesses or is a soul. He becomes immortal because God transforms him by raising him from the dead" (Harris, op. cit., 53). Sharing the divine nature is a future experience reserved for those who belong to Christ (1 Cor. 15:23, 54 f.; 2 Pet. 1:4).

Man may be said to possess a → "soul" already but this is not necessarily immortal in the Gk. sense. Matt. 10:28 teaches not the potential immortality of the soul but the irreversibility of divine judgment on the unrepentant. Similarly Rev. 20:6, 14 and 21:8 counter the idea of immunity from death with that of the "second death". The NT sees man essentially as a unity and promises the transformation of the whole person, and not just the survival of a part.

But to speak of immortality as a future acquisition and the resurrection as a future event is not to deny that man may proleptically enjoy eternal life now (cf. Rom. 8:2, 11). The transformation is something which begins now, because of the Spirit of life which dwells within the believer.

In the last analysis only God has immortality (1 Tim. 6:15 f.; cf. Jn. 5:26; Rom. 1:23; 1 Thess. 1:9). Whatever man has, he must receive as a gift from God alone. He has nothing intrinsic to himself as of right.

(e) "Just as resurrection is an act of God, so immortality is a gift of God" (op. cit., 54). The agent of resurrection is generally said to be the Father (Jn. 5:21; Acts 26:8; Rom. 4:17; 8:11; 1 Cor. 6:14; 2 Cor. 1:9; 4:14b; Heb. 11:19) but on occasion the Son (Jn. 6:39, 40, 44, 54). In raising Jesus, God was active by the Spirit of holiness (Rom. 1:4).

Denial of the resurrection stems not from ignorance of man's constitution but from ignorance of God, his word and his power (Mk. 12:24; 1 Cor. 15:12, 34).

(f) In Pauline thought, resurrection and immortality are inseparable and complementary ideas (op. cit., 54). In 1 Cor. 15 the two ideas are clearly juxtaposed. In the light of vv. 42, 50–54 it is clear that there can be no immortality without prior

resurrection. Those at Corinth who denied the resurrection (v. 12) may have been enlightened rationalists who advocated the immortality of the soul, claiming that the resurrection of the body was inconceivable and unnecessary. But Harris prefers to think of them as "over-realized eschatologists" who asserted that the only resurrection – the spiritual one – lay in the past having been accomplished at baptism (ibid., cf. 1 Cor. 4:8; 2 Tim. 2:17 f.). Against this view Paul insists on the futurity of the resurrection and the reality of the resurrection body. Resurrection and immortality are in fact complementary notions; neither can be had without the other. Those who were raised by Christ in his earthly ministry had to die, as these raisings did not confer immortality. But once raised, believers will bear permanently the image of the man from heaven (Rom. 8:29; 1 Cor. 15:49; 1 Jn. 3:2).

(g) All believers will be transformed, but not all will be resurrected (ibid.). This is due to the fact that some will still be alive at the parousia. But they too, like the dead, will be transformed (1 Thess. 4:15; 1 Cor. 15:51). The dead in Christ will be both raised and transformed (1 Cor. 15:42, 52).

(h) "The identity between 'the physical body' and the 'spiritual body' is not substantial but personal" (op. cit., 55). According to 1 Cor. 15:53, "this corruptible body must put on incorruption". "It is sown a physical body, it is raised a spiritual body" (1 Cor. 15:44). No mortal can inherit immortality (1 Cor. 15:50, 53). "Substantial or numerical identity between the successive forms of the Christian's embodiment seems excluded by the dual concept of a 'spiritual body' not yet possessed (2 Cor. 5:1) and the indispensability of change before such possession (1 Cor. 15:50)" (ibid.). Nevertheless, there is a continuity of personal identity (cf. 1 Cor. 15:49). There are two dwellings but one occupant. Although Matt. 22:29 implies that the resurrection body has no procreative powers, it does not mean that the distinction between the sexes will be obliterated.

The above discussion has focused on the concept of the resurrection body. For other eschatological concepts → Heaven, → Hell, → Judgment, → Punishment, → Number, art. *chilias* (for the millennium), → Present (for views of the parousia and eschatology). *C. Brown*

(a). J. T. Addison, *Life Beyond Death in the Beliefs of Mankind*, 1933; J. Alsup, *The Post-Resurrection Appearance Stories of the Gospel Tradition*, 1976; J. Baillie, *And the Life Everlasting*, 1934; K. Barth, *The Resurrection of the Dead*, 1933; *CD* (see indexes); M. Barth and V. H. Fletcher, *Acquittal by Resurrection*, 1964; H. W. Bartsch, ed., *Kerygma and Myth*, I–II combined volume, 1972; G. R. Beasley-Murray, *Christ is Alive*, 1947; F. W. Beare, "Sayings of the Risen Jesus in the Gospel Tradition: An Inquiry into their Origin and Significance", in W. R. Farmer, C. F. D. Moule and R. R. Niebuhr, eds., *Christian History and Interpretation: Studies Presented to John Knox*, 1967, 161–82; F. S. M. Bennet, *The Resurrection of the Dead*, 1929; P. Benoit, *The Passion and Resurrection of Jesus Christ*, 1969; P. Benoit and R. Murphy, eds., *Immortality and Resurrection*, 1970; A. Bertholet, "The pre-Christian Belief in the Resurrection of the Body", *American Journal of Theology* 20, 1916, 1 ff.; H. Birkeland, "The Belief in the Resurrection of the Dead in the Old Testament", *Studia Theologia* 3, 1950, 60–78; E. L. Bode, *The Gospel Account of the Women's Visit to the Tomb of Jesus*, 1969; G. Bornkamm, "The Risen Lord and the Earthly Jesus: Matthew 28. 16–20", in J. M. Robinson, ed., *The Future of our Religious Past; Essays in Honour of Rudolf Bultmann*, 1971, 203–29; C. R. Bowen, *The Resurrection in the New Testament*, 1911; S. G. F. Brandon, *Man and his Destiny in the Great Religions*, 1962; and *The Judgment of the Dead: A Comparative Study of the Idea of a Post-Mortem Judgment in the Major Religions*, 1962; C. Brown, *Karl Barth and the Christian Message*, 1967; *Jesus in European Protestant Theology, 1778–1860: A Study of Trends in Theological Method*, I–II, (Dissertation, Bristol) 1969; and C. Brown, ed., *History, Criticism and Faith: Four Exploratory Studies*, 1976; R. E. Brown, *The Virginal Conception & Bodily Resurrection of Jesus*, 1973; R. Bultmann, "New

Testament and Mythology", in H. W. Bartsch, ed., op. cit., 1–44; and *Jesus Christ and Mythology*, 1960; J. Burnet, "The Socratic Doctrine of the Soul", *Proceedings of the British Academy* 7, 1915, 235–60; C. F. Burney, *Israel's Hope of Immortality*, 1909; H. von Campenhausen, "The Events of Easter and the Empty Tomb", in *Tradition and Life in the Early Church: Essays and Lectures in Church History*, 1968, 42–89; H. C. C. Cavallin, *Life After Death. Paul's Argument for the Resurrection of the Dead in 1 Corinthians 15. Part I: An Enquiry into the Jewish Background*, 1974; R. H. Charles, *A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life in Israel, in Judaism and in Christianity*, 1913²; N. Clark, *Interpreting the Resurrection*, 1967; J. Comblin, *The Resurrection in the Plan of Salvation*, 1966; *Concilium* 10, 6, 1970, the whole issue is devoted to *Immortality and Resurrection*; H. Conzelmann, "On the Analysis of the Confessional Formula in I Cor. 15.3–5", *Interpretation* 20, 1966, 15–25; C. E. B. Cranfield, *The Epistle to the Romans*, I, 1975, *ICC*; O. Cullmann, *Immortality of the Soul or Resurrection of the Dead? The Witness of the New Testament*, 1958; D. H. van Daalen, *The Real Resurrection*, 1972; M. E. Dahl, *The Resurrection of the Body: A Study of I Corinthians 15*, *SBT* 36, 1962; J. G. Davies, "Factors Leading to the Emergence of Belief in the Resurrection of the Flesh", *JTS* New Series 23, 1972, 448–55; J. D. Davis, "The Future Life During the Pre-Persian Period", *Protestant Theological Review* 6, 1908, 246–68; G. Delling, "The Significance of the Resurrection for Faith in Jesus Christ", in C. F. D. Moule, ed., op. cit., 77–104; C. H. Dodd, "The Appearances of the Risen Christ: An Essay in Form-Criticism in the Gospels", in D. E. Nineham, ed., *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot*, 1957, 9–35; J. W. Drane, "Some Ideas of Resurrection in the New Testament Period", *TB* 24, 1973, 99–110; F. X. Durwell, *The Resurrection: A Biblical Study*, 1960; C. M. Edsman, "The Body and Eternal Life", *Mélanges J. Pedersen* I, 1946, 33 ff.; C. F. Evans, *Resurrection and the New Testament, SBT* Second Series 12, 1970; L. R. Farnell, *Greek Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality*, 1921; F. Foulkes, "Some Aspects of St. Paul's Treatment of the Resurrection of Christ in I Corinthians XV", *Australasian Biblical Review* 16, 1968, 15–30; J. G. Frazer, *The Fear of the Dead in Primitive Religion*, 1933; D. P. Fuller, *Easter Faith and History*, 1968; R. H. Fuller, *The Formation of the Resurrection Narratives*, 1972; M. Gaster, *Samaritan Eschatology*, 1932; T. H. Gaster, "Resurrection. The Raising of the Dead", *IDB* IV 39–43; H. -G. Geyer, "The Resurrection of Jesus Christ: A Survey of the Debate in Present Day Theology", in C. F. D. Moule, ed., op. cit., 105–36; J. Gnilka, "Resurrection of the Body", in P. Benoit and R. Murphy, eds., op. cit., 129–41; R. M. Grant, "The Resurrection of the Body", *JR* 28, 1948, 120–30; 188–208; D. W. A. Gregg, *A Comparison of the New Testament Teaching about Post-Mortem Existence, Concerning particularly the Fate of the "Wicked Dead", with the Jewish Beliefs*, (Dissertation, Bristol) 1968; E. M. B. Green, *Man Alive*!, 1967; S. Greenleaf, *The Testimony of the Evangelists Examined by the Rules of Evidence Administered in the Courts of Justice*, (1874) 1965; R. H. Gundry, *SOMA in Biblical Theology with Emphasis on Pauline Anthropology, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series* 29, 1976, 159–83; M. J. Harris, "Paul's View of Death in 2 Corinthians 5:1–10", in R. N. Longenecker and M. C. Tenney, eds., *New Dimensions in New Testament Study*, 1974, 317–28; and "Resurrection and Immortality: Eight Theses", *Themelios* 1, 1976, 50–55; G. Hebert, "The Resurrection-Narrative in St Mark's Gospel", *SJT* 15, 1962, 66–73 (reprinted with alterations from *The Australasian Biblical Review* 8, 1959); J. Hick, *Death and Eternal Life*, 1976; S. H. Hooke, *The Resurrection of Christ as Experience and History*, 1967; W. Jaeger, "The Greek Ideas of Immortality", in K. Stendahl, ed., *Immortality and Resurrection*, 1965, 97–114; J. Jeremias, " 'Flesh and Blood Cannot Inherit the Kingdom of God' (I Cor. xv. 50)", *NTS* 2, 1955–56, 151–59; A. R. Johnson, *The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel*, 1949; E. Jüngel, *Death: The Riddle and Mystery*, 1975; J. Kennedy, *The Resurrection of Jesus Christ*, 1882; J. Knox, *The Death of Jesus*, 1958, 175–82; W. Künneth, *The Theology of the Resurrection*, 1965; M. Kwiran, *The Resurrection of the Dead: Exegesis of 1 Cor. 15 in German Protestant Thought from F. C. Baur to W. Künneth, Theologische Dissertationen* 8, 1972; G. E. Ladd, *I Believe in the Resurrection of Jesus*, 1975; S. Laeuchli, "Monism and Dualism in the Pauline Anthropology", *Biblical Research* 3, 1958, 15–27; K. Lake, *The Historical Evidence for the Resurrection of Jesus Christ*, 1907; G. W. H. Lampe and D. M. MacKinnon, *The Resurrection: A Dialogue Arising from Broadcasts*, 1966; H. Latham, *The Risen Master*, 1901; R. B. Laurin, "The Question of Immortality in the Qumran 'Hodayot' ", *JSS* 3, 1958, 344–55; A. R. C. Leaney, "Recent Studies on the Resurrection of Jesus", in R. H. Preston, ed., *Theology and Change: Essays in Memory of Alan Richardson*, 1975, 5–67; X. Léon-Dufour, *Resurrection and the Message of Easter*, 1974; J. Mánek, "The Apostle Paul and the Empty Tomb", *NovT* 2, 1957, 276–80; I. H. Marshall, "The Resurrection of Jesus in Luke", *TB* 24, 1973, 55–98; J. P. Martin, "History and Eschatology in the Lazarus Narrative, John 11.1–44", *SJT* 17, 1964, 332–43; R.

Martin-Achard, *From Death to Life: A Study of the Development of the Doctrine of the Resurrection in the Old Testament*, 1960; W. Marxsen, "The Resurrection of Jesus as a Historical and Theological Problem", in C. F. D. Moule, ed., op. cit., 15–50; and *The Resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth*, 1970; J. Moltmann, "God and Resurrection: Resurrection Faith in the Forum of the Question of Theodicy", in *Hope and Planning*, 1971, 31–55; and *The Crucified God*, 1974; F. Morrison, *Who Moved the Stone?* 1930; C. F. D. Moule, "The Post-Resurrection Appearances in the Light of Festival Pilgrimages", *NTS* 4, 1957–58, 58–61; "St Paul and Dualism: The Pauline Conception of Resurrection", *NTS* 12, 1965–66, 106–23; C. F. D. Moule, ed., *The Significance of the Message of the Resurrection for Faith in Jesus Christ, SBT* Second Series 8, 1968; C. F. D. Moule and D. Cupitt, "The Resurrection: A Disagreement", *Theology* 75, 1972, 507–19; H. C. G. Moule, *Jesus and the Resurrection: Expository Studies on St John XX, XXI*, 1905[4]; G. W. E. Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism*, 1972; R. R. Niebuhr, *Resurrection and Historical Reason: A Study of Theological Method*, 1957; M. P. Nilsson, "The Immortality of the Soul in Greek Religion", *Eranos* 39, 1941, 1–16; and *A History of Greek Religion*, 1925; G. O'Collins, "Aquinas and Christ's Resurrection", *Theological Studies* 31, 1970, 512–22; review of Marxsen, op. cit., *Heythrop Journal* 12, 1971, 207–11; "Karl Barth on Christ's Resurrection", *SJT* 26, 1973, 85–99; and *The Easter Jesus*, 1973; A. Oepke, *an-, exanhistēmi* etc., *TDNT* I 368–72; and *egeirō* etc., *TDNT* II 333–39; J. Orr, *The Resurrection of Jesus*, 1908; E. H. Pagels, " 'The Mystery of the Resurrection': A Gnostic Reading of 1 Corinthians 15", *JBL* 93, 1974, 276–88; D. W. Palmer, "The Resurrection of Jesus and the Mission of the Church", in R. Banks, ed., *Reconciliation and Hope: New Testament Essays on Atonement and Eschatology Presented to L. L. Morris*, 1974, 205–23; and " 'To Die is Gain' (Philippians 1:21)", *NovT* 17, 1975, 203–18; W. Pannenberg, *Jesus – God and Man*, 1968; *Basic Questions in Theology*, I–III, 1973; "Did Jesus Really Rise from the Dead?", *Dialog* 4, 1965, 128–35; W. Pannenberg, ed., *Revelation as History*, 1969; L. B. Paton, *Spiritism and the Cult of the Dead in Antiquity*, 1921; J. D. C. Pavry, *The Zoroastrian Doctrine of a Future Life*, 1929; J. Pedersen, *Israel: Its Life and Culture*, I–II, 1926, III–IV, 1940; and "Wisdom and Immortality", *VT Supplements* 3, 1955, 238–46; M. L. Peel, *The Epistle to Rheginos: A Valentinian Letter on the Resurrection*, 1969, revised Ger. edition, 1974; and "Resurrection, The Treatise on", *IDB Supplementary Volume* 741 f.; N. Perrin, *The Resurrection Narratives: A New Approach*, 1977; A. M. Perry, *The Resurrection of Man*, 1976; C. V. Pilcher, *The Hereafter in Jewish and Christian Thought*, 1940; K. Rahner, "The Resurrection of the Body", in *Theological Interpretation*, II, 1963; 203–16; K. Rahner, W. Bulst, J. Schmid, J. Schmitt, and J. Ratzinger, "Resurrection", *Sacramentum Mundi* V 323–42; A. M. Ramsey, *The Resurrection of Christ*, 1945; and "What Was the Ascension?", in M. C. Perry, ed., *Historicity and Chronology in the New Testament, SPCK Theological Collections* 6, 1965; 135–44; I. Reist, "The Old Testament Basis for the Resurrection", *EQ* 43, 1971, 6–24; A. Richardson, *History – Sacred and Profane, Bampton Lectures for 1962*, 1964; and "The Resurrection of Jesus Christ", *Theology* 74, 1971, 146–54; H. Riesenfeld, "Paul's 'Grain of Wheat' Analogy and the Argument of 1 Corinthians 15", in *The Gospel Tradition*, 1970, 171–86; H. H. Rix, "Immortality of the Soul or Resurrection of the Body, or What?" *Reformed Theological Review* 17, 1958, 73–82; J. A. T. Robinson, "Resurrection in the NT", *IDB* IV 43–53; and *The Human Face of God*, 1973, 127–41; E. Rohde, *Psyche: The Cult of Souls and Belief in Immortality among the Greeks*, I–II, 1966; H. H. Rowley, "Death and Beyond", in *The Faith of Israel: Aspects of Old Testament Thought*, 1956, 150–76; D. T. Rowlingson, "The Moral Context of the Resurrection Faith", in B. Lindars and S. S. Smalley, eds., *Christ and Spirit in the New Testament. In Honour of Charles Francis Digby Moule*, 1973, 415–25; E. W. Saunders, "Resurrection in the NT", *IDB Supplementary Volume* 739 ff.; J. A. Schep, *The Nature of the Resurrection Body*, 1964; O. Schilling, "Resurrection", *EBT* II 754–64; J. N. Schofield, *Archaeology and the Afterlife*, 1951; J. M. Shaw, "Resurrection of Christ", *DAC* II, 329–67; R. J. Sider, "The Pauline Conception of the Resurrection Body in I Corinthians xv. 35–54", *NTS* 21, 1974–75, 428–39; W. J. Sparrow Simpson, *Our Lord's Resurrection*, 1905; and *The Resurrection and Modern Thought*, 1911; E. Smick, "The Bearing of New Philological Data on the Subjects of Resurrection and Immortality in the Old Testament", *WTJ* 31, 1968–69, 12–21; P. Gardner Smith, *The Narratives of the Resurrection: A Critical Study*, 1926; N. Snaith, "Justice and Immortality", *SJT* 17, 1964, 309–24; W. D. Stacey, "St Paul and the 'Soul' ", *ExpT* 66, 1954–55, 274–77; G. Stählin, "On the Third Day", *Interpretation* 10, 1956, 282–99; D. M. Stanley, *Christ's Resurrection in Pauline Soteriology, Analecta Biblica* 13, 1961; K. Stendahl, ed., *Immortality and Resurrection*, 1965; E. L. Sukenik, "Arrangements for the Cult of the Dead in Ugarit and Samaria", *Mémorial Lagrange*, 1940, 59 ff.; E. F. Sutcliffe, *The Old Testament and the Future Life*, 1946; L. Swain, "The Resurrection in the Old Testament. Eternal Life in the Old Testament",

Clergy Review 51, 1966, 949–54; ibid. 52, 1967, 104–9; H. B. Swete, *The Appearances of Our Lord after the Passion: A Study of the Earliest Christian Tradition*, 1907; R. C. Tannehill, *Dying and Rising with Christ. A Study in Pauline Theology*, *BZNW* 34, 1967; R. W. Thomas, "The Meaning of the Terms 'Life' and 'Death' in the Fourth Gospel and in Paul", *SJT* 21, 1968, 199–212; R. C. Ware, "The Resurrection of Jesus, I: Theological Orientations", *The Heythrop Journal* 16, 1975, 22–35; "The Resurrection of Jesus, II: Historical-Critical Studies", ibid., 174–94; T. F. Torrance, *Space, Time and Resurrection*, 1977; D. Wenham, "The Resurrection Narratives in Matthew's Gospel", *TB* 24, 1973, 21–54; B. F. Westcott, *The Gospel of the Resurrection: Thoughts on its Relation to Reason and History*, 1898[8]; U. Wilckens, "The Tradition-history of the Resurrection of Jesus", in C. F. D. Moule, ed., op. cit., 51–76; H. A. Williams, *Jesus and the Resurrection*, 1951; and *True Resurrection*, 1972; H. W. Wolff, *Anthropology of the Old Testament*, 1974; R. C. Zaehner, *The Teaching of the Magi: A Compendium of Zoroastrian Beliefs*, (1956) 1975, 139–50.

(b). S. K. Aboa, *Die Entstehung der Auferstehungshoffnung im Alten Testament*, (Dissertation, Hamburg) 1967; A. Albrecht, *Tod und Unsterblichkeit in der evangelischen Theologie der Gegenwart*, 1946; A. Albert, *Die israelitisch-jüdische Auferstehungshoffnung in ihren Beziehungen zum Parsismus*, 1910; B. J. Alfrink, "L'Idée de Résurrection d'après Daniel 12, 1–2", *RB* 40, 1959, 355–71; P. Althaus, *Die Wahrheit des christlichen Osterglaubens*, 1940; and *Die letzten Dinge*, 1949 [5]; L. Aubert, *La Vie après la Mort chez les Israélites*, 1902; W. W. von Baudissin, *"Adonis und Esmun". Eine Untersuchung zur Geschichte des Glaubens an Auferstehungsgötter und Heilgötter*, 1911; and "Alttestamentliches *hajjim* in der Bedeutung . von Glück", *Festschrift E. Sachau*, 1915, 143–61; W. Baumgartner, "Der Auferstehungsglaube im Alten Orient", *Zeitschrift für Missionskunde und Religionswissenschaft* 48, 1933, 193–214; P. Benoit, "Marie-Madeleine et les Disciples au Tombeau selon Jean 20, 1–18", in W. Eltester, ed., *Judentum, Urchristentum und Kirche, Festschrift J. Jeremias*, 1960, 141–52; W. Bieder, "Auferstehung des Fleisches oder des Leibes? Eine biblisch-theologische und dogmengeschichtliche Studie", *ThZ* 1, 1945, 105–20; A. Bertholet, *Die israelitischen Vorstellungen vom Zustand nach dem Tode*, 1914[2]; and "Zur Frage des Verhältnisses vom persischen und jüdischen Auferstehungsglauben", in *Festschrift F. C. Andreas*, 1916, 51–62; E. Böklen, *Die Verwandschaft der jüdisch-christlichen mit der parsischen Eschatologie*, 1902; M. E. Boismard, "Constitué Fils de Dieu", *RB* 60, 1953, 51–7; K. Bornhäuser, *Die Gebeine der Toten*, 1921; E. Brandenburger, "Die Auferstehung der Glaubenden als historisches und theologisches Problem", *WuD* 9, 1967, 16–33; H. Bückers, *Die Unsterblichkeitslehre des Weisheitsbuches*, 1938; J. Carmignac, "Les Apparitions de Jésus et le Calendrier biblico-qumranien", *Revue de Qumrân* 7:4 (28), 1971, 483–504; A. Causse, *Der Ursprung von der jüdischen Lehre von der Auferstehung*, 1908; H. Clavier, "Brèves Remarques sur la Notion de *sōma pneumatikon*", in W. D. Davies and D. Daube, eds., *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology. In Honour of Charles Harold Dodd*, 1956, 342–62; Y. Congar, "Le Purgatoire", in *Le Mystère de la Mort et sa Célébration*, 1951, 279 ff.; F. Delekat, "Tod, Auferstehung, ewiges Leben", *EvTh* 21, 1961, 1 ff.; A. Descamps, "La Structure des Récits Evangéliques de la Résurrection", *Biblica* 40, 1959, 726–41; E. P. Dhorme, "Séjour des Morts chez les Babyloniens et chez les Hébreux", *RB* 4, 1908, 59–78; "L'Idée de l'au-delà dans la Religion Hébraïque", *RHR* 123, 1941, 113–42; E. Ebeling, *Leben und Tod nach den Vorstellungen der Babylonier*, 1931; H. M. Féret, "La Mort dans la Tradition Biblique", in *Le Mystére de la Mort et sa Célébration*, 1951, 15 ff.; J.-B. Frey, *Tod, Seelenglaube und Seelenkult im alten Israel*, 1898; and "La Vie de l'au-delà dans les Conceptions Juives au Temps de Jésus-Christ", *Biblica* 13, 1932, 129–68; G. Friedrich, "Auferstehung Christi", *EKL* I 240 ff.; A. Geense, *Auferstehung und Offenbarung. Über den Ort der Frage nach der Auferstehung Jesu Christi in der heutigen deutschen evangelischen Theologie, Forschungen zur systematischen und ökumenischen Theologie* 27, 1971; M. Goguel, *La Foi à la Résurrection de Jésus dans le Christianisme Primitif*, 1933; H. Gollwitzer, *Jesu Tod und Auferstehung nach dem Bericht des Lukas*, 1951; H. Grass, *Ostergeschehen und Osterberichte*, 1964[3]; P. Grelot, "L'Historien devant la Résurrection du Christ", *Revue d'Histoire de la Spiritualité* 48, 1972, 221–50; G. Greschake, *Auferstehung der Toten. Ein Beitrag zur gegenwärtigen Diskussion über die Zukunft der Geschichte*, 1969; H. Gressmann, *Tod und Auferstehung des Osiris*, *Der alte Orient* 23, 3, 1923; J. Guillet, "Les Sources Scripturaires de la Foi en la Résurrection de la Chair", *Bible et Vie Chrétienne*, 1953, 40–56; J. Halévy, *La Croyance à l'Immortalité de l'Ame, Mélanges de Critique et d'Histoire*, 1883; J. Héring, "Saint Paul a-t-il enseigné deux Résurrections?", *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses* 12, 1932, 300–20; A. Jeremias, *Die babylonisch-assyrischen Vorstellungen vom Leben nach dem Tode*, *Der alte Orient*, 1887; and *Hölle und Paradies bei den Babyloniern*, *Der alte Orient*, 1903[2]; H. Kees, *Totenglaube und Jenseitsvorstellungen der alten Aegypter*, 1926; G. Kegel, *Auferstehung Jesu – Auferstehung der Toten.*

Eine traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum Neuen Testament, 1970; F. König, *Zarathustras Jenseitsvorstellung und das Alte Testament*, 1964; B. Klappert, *Die Auferweckung des Gekreuzigten. Der Ansatz der Christologie Karl Barths im Zusammenhang der Christologie der Gegenwart*, 1971; and B. Klappert, ed., *Diskussion um Kreuz und Auferstehung. Zur gegenwärtigen Auseinandersetzung in Theologie und Gemeinde*, 1968[3]; J. Kremer, *Das älteste Zeugnis von der Auferstehung Christi, Stuttgarter Bibelstudien* 17, 1966; and "Die Überlieferung vom leeren Grab", ... *Denn Sie Werden Leben*, 1972, 72 ff.; P. L. Landsberg, *Essai sur l'Expérience de la Mort*, 1951; G. Larcher, "La Doctrine de la Résurrection dans l'Ancien Testament", *Lumen Vitae* 3, 1952, 11–34; G. van der Leeuw, *Unsterblichkeit oder Auferstehung?*, *ThEH* Neue Folge 52, 1956; K. Lehmann, *Auferweckt am dritten Tag nach der Schrift*, 1968; J. Lippert, *Der Seelenkult in seinen Beziehungen zur althebräischen Religion*, 1881; A. Lods, *La Croyance à la Vie future et le Culte des Morts dans l'Antiquité Israélite*, 1906; *Le Culte des Ancêtres dans l'Antiquité Hébraïque et ses Rapports avec l'Organisation familiale et sociale des anciens Sémites*, 1906; "De quelques Récits de Voyages au Pays des Morts", *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, 1940, 434–52; and "Notes sur deux Croyances Hébraïques relatives à la Mort et à ce qui la suit: le Sort des Incirconcis dans l'au-delà et la Victoire sur le Léviathan", *ibid.*, 1943, 271–97; E. Lohmeyer, "Die Idee des Martyriums im Judentum und Urchristentum", *ZSTh* 5, 1927, 232 ff.; E. Lohse, *Die Auferstehung Jesu Christi im Zeugnis des Lukasevangeliums*, 1961; R. Mehl, *Notre Vie et notre Mort*, 1953; P. Menoud, *Le Sort des Trépassés, Cahiers Théologiques* 9, 1945; W. Michaelis, *Die Erscheinungen des Auferstandenen*, 1944; J. Monnier, *La Descente aux Enfers*, 1905; E. Morin, *L'Homme et la Mort dans l'Histoire*, 1951; F. Mussner, *ZOE. Die Anschauung vom Leben im Vierten Evangelium*, 1956; and *Die Auferstehung Jesu, Biblische Handbibliothek* 7, 1969; W. Nauck, "Die Bedeutung des leeren Grabes für den Glauben an den Auferstandenen", *ZNW* 47, 1956, 243 ff.; A. T. Nikolainen, *Der Auferstehungsglaube in der Bibel und ihrer Umwelt*, I–II, 1944–46; F. Nötscher, *"Das Angesicht Gottes schauen" nach biblischer und babylonischer Auffassung*, 1924; and *Altorientalischer und alttestamentlicher Auferstehungsglauben*, 1926; A. Oepke, "Wie entsteht nach den Schriften des Neuen Testaments der Glaube an die Auferstehung Jesu?", *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Karl Marx-Universität Leipzig, Gesellschafts- und sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe* 3, 1953–54, 109 ff.; A. Parrot, *Le "Refrigerium" dans l'au-delà*, 1938; and *Malédictions et Violations des Tombes*, 1939; J. van der Ploeg, "L'Immortalité de l'Homme d'après les Textes de la Mer Morte", *VT* 2, 1952, 171–75; G. Quell, *Die Auffassung des Todes in Israel*, 1925; K. H. Rengstorf, *Die Auferstehung Jesu*, 1960[4]; B. Rigaux, *Dieu l'a Ressuscité. Exégèse et Théologie Biblique*, 1973; L. Rost, "Alttestamentliche Wurzeln der ersten Auferstehung", *In Memoriam E. Lohmeyer*, 1951, 67 ff.; J. Scheftelowitz, "Der Seelen- und Unsterblichkeitsglaube im Alten Testament", *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, 1916, 210 ff.; and *Die altpersische Religion und das Judentum*, 1920; L. Schenke, *Auferstehungsverkündigung und leeres Grab, Stuttgarter Bibelstudien* 33, 1968; O. Schilling, *Der Jenseitsgedanke im Alten Testament*, 1951; J. Schmidt, *Der Ewigkeitsbegriff im Alten Testament, Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen*, 1940; F. Schwally, *Das Leben nach dem Tode nach den Vorstellungen des alten Israel und des Judentums einschliesslich des Volksglaubens im Zeitalter Christi*, 1892; H. Schwantes, *Schöpfung und Endzeit. Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis der Auferweckung bei Paulus*, 1963; E. Sellin, "Die alttestamentliche Hoffnung auf Auferstehung und ewiges Leben", *Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift* 30, 1919, 232 ff.; P. Siber, *Mit Christus Leben. Eine Studie zur paulinischen Auferstehungshoffnung*, 1971; N. Söderblom, *La Vie Future d'après le Mazdéisme. Etude d'Eschatologie Comparée*, 1901; G. Stemberger, *Der Leib der Auferstehung*, 1972; P. de Surgy, ed., *La Résurrection du Christ et l'Exégèse Moderne*, 1969; H. Thielicke, *Tod und Leben. Studien zur christlichen Anthropologie*, 1946; J. Touzard, "Le développement de la Doctrine de l'Immortalité dans l'Ancien Testament", *RB* 7, 1898, 207–41; P. Volz, *Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde*, 1934; G. Wied, *Der Auferstehungsglaube im späten Israel in seiner Bedeutung für das Verständnis von Apokalyptik und Weisheit*, (Dissertation, Bonn) 1965; U. Wilckens, *Auferstehung*, 1970.

Revelation

Revelation in Christian theology expresses the significant self-disclosure of God to man. The Gk. language possesses various terms and expressions relevant to this process. *apokalyptō*, a compound word formed from *kalyptō* (→ hide, conceal) and *apo* (from), carries with it the idea of unveiling something previously hidden. *dēloō*, derived from *dēlos*, clear, manifest, calls more attention to the goal, i.e. that as a

result something becomes known and manifest. *epiphaneia*, from the root *-phan-* (cf. *phainomai*, appear; *phaneroō*, let be seen; → Light art. *phainō*), suggests a visual appearance, a manifestation of deity. Other relevant concepts include *gnōrizō*, make known (→ knowledge, art. *ginōskō*); *horama*, an apparition (something seen) and *optasia*, a vision (→ See). Also → Hear, → Scripture, → Secret, → Teach, → Truth, → Word.

ἀποκαλύπτω

ἀποκαλύπτω (*apokalyptō*), uncover, disclose, reveal; ἀποκάλυψις (*apokalypsis*), disclosure, revelation.

CL 1. The vb. *apokalyptō*, unveil, formed from *kalyptō*, cover up, conceal, and *apo*, from, is attested in cl. Gk. from Hdt. onwards to denote the disclosure of previously hidden things; the noun *apokalypsis*, disclosure, revelation, is, however, only used from the 1st cent. B.C. onwards, and then predominantly in a religious sense.

2. The religious and theological use of both words is rare in the Greek-Hellenistic world. They occur sporadically in the *Corp. Herm.* (13, 1; in the 2nd or 3rd cent. A.D.), in the neo-Platonist Iamblichus (3rd cent. A.D.) and in later astrological and alchemical texts. Other words were preferred to designate divine revelations and manifestations. For the pronouncement of the Delphic oracle, for example, *sēmainō*, (indicate, explain, command: from *sēma*, a sign or mark) was used (cf. A. Oepke, *TDNT* III 566). In Hellenistic times the words → *epiphaneia*, an appearance, a becoming visible, and → *parousia*, presence (→ Present), signify that a hidden divinity has become visibly perceptible (cf. Arndt, 304, 635). It is instructive that the same expressions also play a rôle in the divine worship accorded to rulers. In the mystical Hermetic literature *gnōsis*, → knowledge, becomes the revelation (A. Oepke, *TDNT* III 569 f.). Clearly there is no question here of revelation in the NT sense of the word; the two concepts are quite distinct. God has indeed not left himself without a witness among the heathen (Acts 14:17); but even if they had the ability to recognize an invisible power and godhead from the works of God, they have perverted this knowledge through perverting faith in God into worship of idols (Rom. 1:18–23). If there is a reality behind heathen idol-worship, it is the reality of demonic powers (1 Cor. 10:20).

OT 1. Corresponding with its late appearance, the noun *apokalypsis* is found in the LXX only in 1 Sam. 20:30 for *'erwâh*, nakedness, and a further 3 times without Heb. equivalent in Sir. (11:27; 22:22; 42:1). The vb. *apokalyptō* (found *c.* 80 times) almost without exception represents forms of the Heb. vb. *gālâh*, in particular the niphal, to strip, and piel, expose, uncover. Thus it is used literally in Gen. 8:13 of removing the roof of the ark; in Num. 5:18 of the uncovering of the head, although this probably referred originally (as in the legal prescriptions of Lev. 18:6 ff. and 20:11 ff.) to the exposure of the otherwise covered sex-organs for the purpose of sexual union. The goal of the uncovering is thus not distant observation, but entrance to the most intense form of encounter which can involve the individual person. This picture was most notably taken up by Ezek. in order to characterize Israel's guilty and corrupt state (Ezek. 13:14; 16:36 f., 57: 21:29[24]; 22:10; 23:10, 18, 29).

In a figurative but still everyday use, *apokalyptō* means to reveal, to make known. It is used of human speech in Jos. 2:20; 1 Sam. 20:2, 13; 22:8, 17; and of human plans in 1 Macc. 7:31. The noun *apokalypsis* is used in Sir. 22:22 and 42:1 (?) in a secular sense for the revelation or publication of secrets. Perhaps there is theological significance in Sir. 11:27; at the end of a man's life stands "the revelation of his works". Here the thought could be of God's → judgment.

2. On the whole, *apokalyptō* is found relatively rarely in the LXX with a theological significance. The secular use is dominant. It occurs in the story of Balaam's prophetic experience in Num. 22:31 and 24:4, 16. God opened the prophet's inner eye and presented him with a true view of reality which, of course, did not accord with the wishes of Balak who wanted him to curse Israel. God gave him knowledge of the Most High, so that he could hear and speak his word. In a time when revelations were rare, God revealed himself to Samuel who previously did not know him (1 Sam. 3:1, 7); Samuel's prophetic authority is grounded in a series of further revelations (3:21). The account of Samuel's call (1 Sam. 3:1–4:1) has been seen to imply that not only were revelatory words from Yahweh rare, but that they were at that time received by men in visions (cf. Isa. 1:1; 2:1; Amos 1:1; Ezek. 1:1; Obad. 1). But in other instances of the writing prophets there are no explicit references to visions (cf. Jer. 1:1; Hos. 1:1; Zeph. 1:1; Zech. 1:1; Mal. 1:1). Samuel was evidently fully awake and not in an ecstatic state (1 Sam. 3:9 ff.; J. Mauchline, *1 and 2 Samuel, New Century Bible*, 1971, 56; → Prophet; → See; → Word). 1 Sam. 9:15 and 2 Sam. 7:27 refer to the opening of the ear. In this way Samuel and David are able to hear God's instructions and promises. "Open my eyes, that I may behold the wonders in your Law" prays the Psalmist (Ps. 119[118]:18). To the prophets, his servants, God reveals his divine *paideia*, his secret counsel (Heb. *sôḏ*) (Amos 3:7). In Theodotion's translation of Dan., the disclosure of the mysteries of God is rendered by *apokalyptō*, whereas the LXX uses *anakalyptō*, *ekphainō* and *dēloō* (Dan. 2:27–30, 47).

God's revelation mediates knowledge of God, his decrees and secrets, a knowledge which, in the last analysis, is inexhaustible: "The root of wisdom, to whom was it revealed?" (Sir. 1:6). Along with the mediation of knowledge goes the revelation of God's deeds. 1 Sam. 2:27 looks back to the revelation of God's deeds in → Egypt at the time of Israel's slavery. Isa. 52:10 and 53:1 speak of the revelation of the "arm" of God, i.e. of his power. In Isa. 56:1 God reveals his compassion and in Ps. 98(97):2 f. his → righteousness and his salvation, which the ends of the earth will see. The language of the LXX gives a clear picture of God's revealing activity under the old covenant.

3. For Judaism at the time of Jesus the content of divine revelation is drawn up and set down in the → Scripture (art. *graphē*). This is also called "the Law and the Prophets" (cf. Matt. 5:17, 12, etc.), by virtue of its contents of which the most important part is the → law of → Moses, the Torah. Prophecy, however, is extinct. "The prophets have gone to sleep" (Syr. Bar. 85:3; cf. e.g. 1 Macc. 4:46; 9:27; 14:41). Consequently the use of the word-group *apokalyptō* is rare in Judaism apart from the LXX (cf. *TDNT* III 578). There were the ideas that the messiah would give a new exposition of the law and that he would give a new Torah (SB III 577). The Dead Sea Scrolls, however, and in particular the Hymns Scroll, show that at the turn of the era there were Jewish circles with a continuing and living consciousness of prophetic

revelation and illumination (e.g. 1QH 1:21; 5:9; 6:4; cf. O. Betz, *Offenbarung und Schriftforschung in der Qumransekte*, 1960).

In this connexion, apocalyptic literature describes how God had entrusted holy men of antiquity with revelations of the last things, the coming of the messiah and his → kingdom, the → resurrection of the dead, the → judgment, and so on. Determinative for such apocalyptic thought is the contrast between the two worlds, the present age and the age to come (cf. e.g. Gal. 1:14; → Time, art. *aiōn*). Linked with assertions concerning the future are all manner of portrayals of the heavenly world, speculations about the constellations and the course of history. It is also a typical apocalyptic motif (→ art. *dēloō*, OT) for an angel to appear as a mediator of revelation. Apocalyptic also penetrated into early Christianity. As well as the Revelation to John there were other Christian-apocalyptic works which, however, were not accepted in the NT Canon. These include the Apocalypse of Peter and the Shepherd of Hermas. Jewish writings such as 3 Esd. were revised. It is also worth mentioning that the author of Rev. does not conceal his authorship behind the name of some man of antiquity but gives his own name.

NT 1. Numerically, the word-group is not very common in the NT (the vb. 26 times, and the noun 18 times). It is entirely lacking in a range of writings – Mk., Acts, Col., 1 Thess., the Pastoral Epistles, the Catholic Epistles (except 1 Pet.). In Jn.'s Gospel the vb. is found only in a quotation from Isa. 53:1 in Jn. 12:38, explaining unbelief of the Jews. Otherwise *phaneroō* is used for the act of revelation (Jn. 1:31; 2:11; 3:21; 7:4; 9:3; 17:6; 21:1, 14; cf. 1 Jn. 1:2; 2:19, 28; 3:2, 5, 8; 4:9). In Rev. the noun is found only in the title (1:1). Hence, we can assert at the start that the words are used predominantly by Paul (13 times each for verb and noun), 1 Pet. (perhaps dependent on Paul; the noun and vb. 3 times each), Matt. (4 times) and Lk. (6 times).

The noun always has theological significance; the vb. is found in Lk. 2:35 in an everyday sense, of thoughts being revealed. On the borderline of secular usage is the aphorism in Matt. 10:26 (par. Lk. 12:2): nothing is covered that will not be revealed (*ho ouk apokalyphthēsetai*; → Hide, art. *kryptō* NT 1). This dominical word is also transmitted in Mk. 4:22 (par. Lk. 8:17); but instead of *apokalyphthēsetai* there stands *hina phanerōthē/phaneron genēsetai*. If *apokalyptō* refers to the removal of a covering, then *phaneroō*, used in context with *phōs/phainō*, has the basic meaning of bringing into the → light, making visible. In the NT the meaning of both words is virtually interchangeable, so that, as with the synonymous *dēloō*, to make known, any attempt at precise conceptual distinction only leads to artificial demarcations (cf. Rom. 1:17; 3:21; 1 Sam. 3:21 LXX; 1 Pet. 1:12). By contrast with the LXX, the prevailing significance of the vb. in the NT is also the religious and theological one.

2. A theological understanding of the NT revelation is in the first instance orientated around the content, and only secondarily around the act and event of the revelation. Nevertheless, the latter must also be considered.

The OT statements (Num. 22:31, 1 Sam. 9:15 etc.; see above OT 2) make it plain that revelation is a divinely-effected opening of the eyes and ears. The NT is no different. Corresponding with the eyes there is a becoming visible, an appearance of God or Christ (2 Tim. 1:10; Tit. 2:11; 3:4). Corresponding with the opening of the ears there is a speaking by God (Heb. 1:1 f.). God's revelation must become percepti-

ble in the earthly world. In accordance with this, the apostles preach what they have heard and seen, and have even touched with their hands (Acts 4:20; 1 Jn. 1:1). The content of this seeing is Jesus Christ, the Word become flesh (*ho logos sarx egeneto*), the Word of Life (*tou logou tēs zōēs*) (Jn. 1:14; 1 Jn. 1:1). The disciples are called blessed, because they have been allowed to hear and see what was denied to many prophets and righteous men who longed for it, and what the angels themselves long to see (Matt. 13:16 par. Lk. 10:23 f.; 1 Pet. 1:12). To → hear and → see in this way, and in faith to perceive the glory of God (Jn. 11:40), is distinguished from the hearing and seeing of disbelief, which in truth is no hearing or seeing at all (Isa. 6:9 f. is cited 6 times in the NT: Matt. 13:13 ff., par. Mk. 4:12, Lk. 8:10; Jn. 12:39 ff.; Acts 28:26 f.; Rom. 11:8).

The knowledge of a new revelation of God surpassing the previous one is the characteristic of the attitude of faith of NT Christians. The earlier revelation given to the prophets is a pointer to Christ and the → gospel (Rom. 1:2; 1 Pet. 1:11 f.). Now, when unbelieving Jews read the OT, a veil lies over their → hearts which can only be removed when they are converted to Christ (2 Cor. 3:14 ff.; → Hide, art. *kalyptō* NT 3).

3. (a) In the Synoptic Gospels Jesus is the bearer of divine revelation. Simeon's words describe him as a *phōs eis apokalypsin ethnōn*, a light for revelation to the nations (Lk. 2:32; cf. Isa. 42:6). Jesus further confronts us as Revealer in the words of Matt. 11:25 ff. (par. Lk. 10:21 f.), where he praises the Father and Lord of the world for giving his revelation not to the wise and understanding, but to babes. It was not the → scribes or the → Pharisees, versed in the law, nor was it the High → Priests and spiritual leaders, but the → "poor in spirit", the fishermen from Galilee, who became his disciples. "All things have been delivered to me by my Father; and no one knows the Son except the Father, and no one knows the Father except the Son and any one to whom the Son chooses to reveal him" (Matt. 11:27; cf. par. Lk. 10:22). Knowledge of God through the old covenant has been surpassed; it can be regarded as only the first step towards the knowledge which the revelation of Jesus mediates. The authenticity of this logion has frequently been denied, but it fits into the picture which the Evangelists have painted of Jesus without any difficulty. Everywhere we meet the divine authority and consciousness of having been sent (Mk. 1:22, 27) which is expressed in Matt. 11:25 ff. On the authenticity of the saying see A. M. Hunter, "Crux Criticorum – Matt. xi. 25–30 – A Re-appraisal", *NTS* 8, 1961–62, 241–49; I. H. Marshall, "The Divine Sonship of Jesus (Did Jesus conceive himself as the Son of God?)", *Interpretation* 21, 1967, 87–103; J. Jeremias, *The Prayers of Jesus*, *SBT* Second Series 6, 1967, 48 ff.; and *New Testament Theology*, I, 1971, 56–61; D. Hill, *The Gospel of Matthew*, *New Century Bible*, 1972, 205 ff. The saying has been challenged because of its Johannine ring (cf. Jn. 3:35; 10:15). But it may be questioned if such a parallel must make a saying *ipso facto* inauthentic. Jeremias regards the Synoptic saying as a stage on the way to Johannine thought. Moreover, the saying is not only lacking in precise Hellenistic parallels, but it can be shown to be Semitic in language and style (cf. W. D. Davies, *Christian Origins and Judaism*, 1962, 144; Jeremias, *The Prayers of Jesus*, 46). Jeremias sees the picture drawn from everyday Jewish life: "Just as only a father really knows his son, so only a son really knows his father" (op. cit., 50; cf. Jn. 10:15). It is a key statement about Jesus' mission with parallels elsewhere in the Gospels (cf. Matt. 5:17, Jesus brings the final

revelation; Lk. 15:1–32, Jesus' action reflects God's attitude to sinners; Matt. 13:11 par. Mk. 4:11, Lk. 8:10, Jesus passes on the mystery of the kingdom of God). For further discussion of Jesus' sonship → Son.

(b) Although in Jn.'s Gospel the noun is lacking and the vb. occurs only in 12:38 (the quotation from Isa. 53:1), the theme that Jesus is the mediator of the divine revelation is expounded even more powerfully than in the Synoptic Gospels. He is the only Son who has made the Father known (Jn. 1:18; → One, art. *monos*). He speaks in the world what he has heard from his Father (Jn. 3:32; 8:26; 15:15). The word "to reveal", however, is not rendered in the Johannine literature by *apokalyptō* but by *phaneroō* (Jn. 1:31; 2:11; 3:21; 7:4; 9:3; 17:6; 21:1; 14; 1 Jn. 1:2; 2:19, 28; 3:2, 5,8; 4:9) and *emphanizō* (Jn. 14:21 f.). The description of Jesus as the → light of the world (Jn. 1:4 f.; 8:12 etc.) corresponds with this, as does the emphasis which is laid not only on hearing (→ hear) the voice of Jesus (Jn. 10:3, 2 f.), but also on seeing (→ see) the → glory of Jesus or God (Jn. 1:4; 11:40; 14:7, 9).

(c) The central content of the revelation is Christ himself. The Father in heaven revealed to Peter who Jesus is: "flesh and blood" could not mediate this knowledge to him (Matt. 16:17). The disciples are to declare openly in their → proclamation what has been revealed to them and what Jesus has said to them (Matt. 10:26 f.). Thus in the preaching of the disciples the event of revelation is continued: he who hears the disciples hears Jesus himself (Lk. 10:16; cf. Matt. 10:40; Jn. 12:44; 13:20). In Jn's Gospel Jesus promises his disciples the → Spirit of → truth who will bear witness to him. He will teach them everything and lead them into the full truth (Jn. 14:26; 15:26; 16:13). The event of revelation is not terminated in the earthly existence of Jesus.

4. (a) This is important for understanding the apostle Paul. He, too, is aware of himself as a bearer of divine revelation; the word *apokalypsis* consequently has fundamental significance. He lays great stress on the fact that Christ works and speaks through him (Rom. 15:18; 2 Cor. 13:3). From him he received his apostolic commission (Rom. 1:5), which is grounded in the fact that he has seen the resurrected Lord (1 Cor. 9:1; 15:8; → Birth, art. *ektrōma*; → Resurrection). Thereby he belongs to the circle of Easter witnesses and apostles (1 Cor. 15:11). This "seeing" is understood by him to be an event of revelation; it pleased God to reveal his Son to him (cf. Jn. 21:1, 14: the Easter appearances as self-revelation of the Risen One).

The authority with which Paul attacks the heresy threatening the Galatians is founded on the revelation of the Resurrected One. With a solemn *gnōrizō* (make known; cf. 1 Cor. 15:1) he insists that he has not received his gospel from men but by the revelation of Christ. *gnōrizō* is used both in LXX and NT language of immediate proclamations of the divine will (2 Sam. 7:21; Ps. 16:11; Col. 1:27; cf. Lk. 2:15, 17; Jn. 15:15; 17:26; Acts 2:28 [= Ps. 16:11]; 7:13; Rom. 9:23 f.; 16:26; 1 Cor. 12:3; 15:1; 2 Cor. 8:1; Gal. 1:11; Eph. 1:9; 3:3, 5, 10; 6:19, 21; Phil. 1:22; 4:6; Col. 1:27; 4:7, 9; 2 Pet. 1:16). To the Thessalonians Paul stresses that the gospel they received from him is not the word of men but the → Word of God (1 Thess. 2:13). 1 Cor. 2:10 points in the same direction; the Holy Spirit appears as the author of the revelation given to the apostle. The statements in Rom. 16:25 and Eph. 3:5 also crystallize the revelatory character of the apostolic message, which is identical with the mystery of Christ (→ Secret, art. *mystērion*).

The view that only Jesus' proclamation is revelation, and that the preaching of the early church is but an approximation to it (so J. Jeremias, *The Problem of the Historical Jesus*, 1964), does not, in view of the above affirmations, do justice to the statements of the NT. The NT does not draw a distinction here: the apostolic message is called the "Word of God" just as much as the word of Jesus (cf. Lk. 5:1; 8:21; with 1 Cor. 14:26; Col. 1:25). The consequence of this understanding was that early Christianity accepted both the words of Jesus transmitted in the Gospels and the apostolic writings into the Canon, and gave them recognition as the authoritative records of the divine revelation.

(b) Equally the word *apokalypsis* is not confined in Paul to the foundation message of Christ. In Gal. 2:2 he reports that he travelled to Jerusalem to the Apostolic Council on the basis of a revelation, i.e. he undertook the journey on the basis of divine direction, although we are not given any more exact details of the way he received it. 2 Cor. 12:1 ff. (cf. also 1 Cor. 14:6) refers to "visions and revelations" which Paul experienced, and which may have been ecstatic experiences (→ Ecstasy, art. *ekstasis*; → Paradise, art. *paradeisos* NT 1 (b)). In this connexion Paul also mentions the word that the exalted Lord spoke to him: "My grace is sufficient for you, for my power is made perfect in weakness" (v. 9).

But however important these revelations were for the personal faith and life of the apostle, we must distinguish them from the basic initial revelation of Christ. Such a revelation can be shared by other Spirit-filled Christians (1 Cor. 14:26, 30; Phil. 3:15). This is the explanation of Paul's prayer that God might give the Ephesians "the Spirit of wisdom and revelation" (Eph. 1:17). For the Spirit who guides the disciples into all truth opens up the understanding of revelation which is given them in the word of Jesus and of the apostles (cf. Eph. 2:18; Jn. 16:13; → Advocate).

(c) Alongside the revelation through the word stands the revelation in the acts of God. Paul is thinking of this when he speaks, from the standpoint of a man imprisoned under the law, of the message of → faith (*pistis*) which is to be revealed. The thought there is not only of the message itself but also of its content, the salvation event in Christ (Gal. 3:23). In the gospel is disclosed God's great gift enclosing salvation – the → "righteousness of God", through which sinful man is justified (Rom. 1:17; cf. 3:21).

This revelation of course contrasts with another: the revelation of the wrath of God, which falls on sinful humanity and allows it to sink even deeper into sin (Rom. 1:18 ff.; → *Revelation in Contemporary Theology* 2 (a)); on "the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God [*en hēmera orgēs kai apokalypseōs dikaiokrisias tou theou*]" (Rom. 2:5 AV) it will strike the impenitent in all its full severity. This revelation is anticipated by the gospel and the cross of Christ which show God's love and enmity to sin. 1 Cor. 3:13 also speaks of "fire" which will be revealed on the day of the Lord. Paul seems here to be thinking not only of the fire of → judgment, but also of a purifying fire. Preceding the day of Christ (2 Thess. 2:2), however, will be the revelation of the anti-Christian power which seizes control of the Sanctuary of God; the Lord will destroy it through the appearance of his advent (2 Thess. 2:3, 6, 8; → Present, arts. *hēmera*, *parousia*, and *The Parousia and Eschatology in the NT* 2 (c)).

This advent is the day of the revelation of Christ when he appears in the fullness of his power (1 Cor. 1:7; 2 Thess. 1:7). With it is linked the "revelation of the sons of

God" and of their heavenly → glory (*doxa*) which the sufferings of the time cause them to forget (Rom. 8:18 f.). Whenever 1 Pet. uses the word (apart from 1:12) it has the end revelation in view. The revelation of Christ is the revelation of his glory, in which Christians who are now led through suffering and manifold temptations will also have a share. They should therefore set all their hope on this salvation and grace (1 Pet. 1:5 ff., 13; 4:13; 5:1).

Such an *apokalypsis* is also the great theme of Rev. (1:1), which ends its vision of the future with the prayer "Amen. Come, Lord Jesus" (22:20; → Present, art. *maranatha* 2 (b)). The hope of this eternal future is a part of the Christian belief in revelation that cannot be surrendered. *W. Mundle*

δηλόω

δηλόω (*dēloō*), reveal, make clear, explain, give information, notify; δῆλος (*dēlos*), clear, plain, evident.

CL *dēloō*, from *dēlos*, visible, clear, manifest, is attested from the 5th cent. B.C. (Aesch., Hdt.), and means to announce, make manifest, explain, set forth. The word has a secular sense, first of all, and is so used in the LXX (Jos. 4:7; Tob. 10:8). In Stoic philosophy it takes on the meaning of to interpret, clarify (Cornutus, *Theologia Graeca* 6, p. 6, 13 f.; 33, p. 71, 4). Hellenistic writers of the 2nd cent. A.D. such as Pausanias (4, 33, 5; 9, 25, 6) and Aelius Aristides (47, 51 and 55, 49, 48) use the vb. for the publication of divine secrets. The post-Christian use of the word in Hermas, *Mandata* (4, 3, 3; 4, 1; 8, 8 etc.) and the Leiden magical papyrus, the Eighth Book of Moses, corresponds with this (cf. K. Preisendanz, *Papyri Graecae Magicae*, XIII, 614). An angel declares the divine revelation. It is not possible to differentiate precisely between *dēloō* and other synonymous words such as → *apokalyptō*, *emphanizō* (→ light) and *phaneroō* → *epiphaneia* (→ Truth, art. *alētheia* NT 2 (c)).

OT In the LXX *dēloō* is principally a designation for the divine revelation. The underlying Heb. root equivalent is generally *yāḏa'* (hiph), to declare, let know. Thus revelation includes the imparting of → knowledge (art. *ginōskō*). God reveals his → name (Exod. 6:3; → God, art. *theos* OT 2), his purposes (Exod. 33:12), his ways (1 Ki. 8:36; 2 Chr. 5:27), his mysteries (Ps. 50[51]:8; Dan. 2:28, 29, 30; → Secret), his → covenant (Ps. 25[24]:8). *dēloō* can also denote the revelation of God's power (Jer. 16:21) and → glory (2 Macc. 2:8). The word is found very frequently in Dan. 2 (14 times out of 38 passages in the LXX), occasionally in the sense of expounding, interpreting (Dan. 2:5 ff.; 7:16); but there is no thought here of allegorical textual interpretations such as in the Stoa, but of the interpretation of → dreams (→ Explain). In Dan. 2 the Aram. vb. is *ḥwh*, show, make known.

NT In the NT the rare use of *dēloō* is confined to two passages each in 1 Cor. and Heb., and one passage each in Col. and 1 and 2 Pet., where the adj. is also found three times. The vb. bears the everyday sense of making known in 1 Cor. 1:11 and Col. 1:8. Similarly in Matt. 26:73, *hē lalia sou dēlon se poiei* means "your speech makes you known" (cf. RSV "your accents betrays you"). Also non-theological is the regular expression *dēlon hoti*, "it is clear that . . ." in 1 Cor. 15:27, Gal. 3:11; 1

Tim. 6:7 *v.l.* 1 Pet. 1:11 leads into the sphere of faith. Here it is stated that the prophets inquired concerning the → time indicated by the Spirit at work in them, when bearing witness to the sufferings of Christ and the subsequent glory. According to 2 Pet. 1:14, the Lord revealed to Peter the nearness of his end. In Heb. *dēloō* is used of the spiritual interpretation of the OT. According to Heb. 9:8, the Holy Spirit reveals that the way into the sanctuary did not yet become visible as long as the first → tent (the Jewish tabernacle) was still standing, and that only with Christ, the High Priest of the good things to come (v. 11), did the fulfilment appear. Heb. 12:27 offers a spiritual interpretation of Hag. 2:6. The convulsion spoken of here which is to follow is again an allusion to the everlasting → Kingdom, which is not subject to the transitoriness of created things (→ Shake). 1 Cor. 3:13 deals with the final revelation of the day of judgment, which will reveal the true character and value of human works "by fire". This use of *dēloō* expresses not imparting of knowledge, but God's final active revelation. *W. Mundle*

ἐπιφάνεια

ἐπιφάνεια (*epiphaneia*), appearance, revelation; *ἐπιφαίνω* (*epiphainō*), show, appear; *ἐπιφανής* (*epiphanēs*), powerful, splendid, terrible; *φανερός* (*phaneros*), visible, clear, open, evident; *φανερῶς* (*phanerōs*), openly; *φανερόω* (*phaneroō*), reveal, make known, show, manifest; *φανέρωσις* (*phanerōsis*), revelation, manifestation, disclosure; *φαντάζω* (*phantazō*), make visible; *φάντασμα* (*phantasma*), apparition.

CL 1. *epiphaneia*, derived from *phainō*, to appear (cf. *phōs* → Light), and attested since the 4th cent. B.C. (in the Pre-Socratics only in later reports), denotes originally: (a) purely outward appearance or mode of appearance; thus "the three visible sides of a town" (Polyb., 4, 70, 9; cf. also Acts 27:20). Analogous to the meaning "glorious" for the related word *epiphanēs*, attested since Pindar, there developed simultaneously the figurative meaning (b) glorious appearance, i.e. esteem, distinction, majesty (Pseudo-Plato, *Alcibiades* 1, 124c). Since already in *c.* 350 B.C. Isaeus of Chalcis could use *epiphaneia* to express (c) the sensation which a person or thing causes, it is not surprising that, at the time of Jesus, the word had almost become a technical term for (d) the succouring appearance of an otherwise hidden deity (cf. M. Dibelius and H. Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles*, *Hermeneia*, 1972, 104).

2. (a) Since the appearances of a divinity occur principally in the temple, the whole narrative section of the temple chronicle of Lindos (beginning of 1st cent. B.C.) is entitled *epiphaneiai*. The epiphany of a god is celebrated in the cult as the feast of his birth, of his accession, of a single miracle worked by him (cf. with this the relationship of the Christian feast of Epiphany to Lk. 2 and Matt. 2, to → baptism, and to the miracle at Cana), or of his return from a foreign land (cf. E. Pfister, Pauly-Wissowa, Supplement 4, 277–323). It is experienced not only in the personal appearance of the divinity, but also in extraordinary happenings which reveal the power and providence of the divinity (Diod. Sic., Plut. and others; cf. R. Bultmann and D. Lührmann, *TDNT* IX 8 f.). *epiphaneia* thus denotes the appearance of the divinity less in myth than in historical events.

(b) Since *epiphaneia* is used to describe the powerful intervention of the gods, rulers who were regarded as divine kings applied the adj. *epiphanēs* to themselves. Thus Antiochus Epiphanes in 1 Macc. 1:10 and after; cf. also Caesar's title, *ton apo Areōs kai Aphrodeitēs theon epiphanē kai ... sōtēra*, "the mighty god and ... saviour descended from Ares and Aphrodite" (W. Dittenberger, *SIG* II, 760, 6 f.).

OT 1. In the LXX *epiphainō* is the chief rendering of Heb. *'ôr* (hiph.), to cause to shine. It occurs in the Aaronic blessing (Num. 6:25) and associated passages (Pss. 31[30]:16; 67[66]:1; 80[79]:3, 7, 19; 118[117]:27; 119[118]:135; Dan. 9:17 Theodotion). In addition *gālâh* (niph.), to show oneself (Gen. 35:7; Ezek. 39:28), *zāraḥ*, to shine forth (Deut. 33:2) and *māṣâ'* (niph.) to (let oneself) be found (Jer. 29[36]:14) are all rendered by *epiphainō*. But always it is Yahweh's marvellous rescuing and redemptive vindication of his people in the sense of the OT theophany that is meant.

2. *epiphanēs* is the LXX rendering of Heb. *nôrā'* (niph. part. of *yārē'*, to fear) terrible (Jdg. 13:6; Joel 2:11, 31[3:4]; Hab. 1:7; Mal. 1:14; 3:23[4:5]). The pl. *nôrā'ôṯ* is (only in 2 Sam. 7:23) translated by *epiphaneiai*, the terrifying deeds of God. The LXX has obviously confused derivates of *yare'* with derivatives of *rā'âh*, to see (or even *'ôr*, to illuminate) and so introduced the element of the terrible into the ancient epiphany concept. This becomes clear in the translation of the expected "great" and "terrible" day of the LORD (Joel 2:11, 31[3:4]; Mal. 3:23[4:23]) by *megalē* and *epiphanēs* (→ Present, art. *hēmera* OT). Acts 2:20 picks up Joel 2:11. Some texts render *epiphanēs* here by "glorious": the coming day of judgment is terrible for those who are to be punished, but glorious for those who are to be saved. Correspondingly the LXX also translates *nôrā'ôt* by *ta endoxa* (Deut. 10:21; Isa. 64:2), the marvellous deeds, or – more correctly – by *ta phobera*, (e.g. Pss. 106[105]:22; 145[144]:6), the terrible deeds.

Through the introduction by the LXX of the elements of the terrible into the epiphany concept, the expectation of the appearance of God as an eschatological event means that words from this group can be used to designate the double outcome of salvation history (see below, NT 1).

3. The word-group is found especially in 2 Macc. *epiphainō* serves here to denote the rescuing intervention of God (2 Macc. 2:24; 14:15; and especially 15:27) in the sense of an OT theophany. 3 Macc. 2:19 and 6:4, 9 go back to the OT linguistic usage corresponding with Num. 6:25. On the other hand, *epiphainō* is used in the sense of 1 (a) to refer to Judas Maccabaeus' troops. The adj. *epiphanēs* can both describe the "Lord" (2 Macc. 15:34; 3 Macc. 5:35), the God of Israel, and also the sanctuary of Dionysus (2 Macc. 14:33). In Josephus *epiphaneia* is found in the above-mentioned sense of CL 2 (b) (*Ant.* 1, 255; 2, 339; 3, 310; 9, 60; 12, 136, quoting Polyb.; 18, 286). But this sense does not occur in Philo (*TDNT* IX 9).

NT If, as Wrede, Knopf, Jülicher, Bultmann, Bornkamm and others hold, 2 Thess. and the Pastoral Epistles are sub-apostolic writings, then the word *epiphaneia* emerges only late in the NT. On the other hand, other scholars regard them as Pauline, though the Pastoral Epistles belong to Paul's latest writings (for discussion see D. Guthrie, *New Testament Introduction*, II, 1961, 198–236; W. G. Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament*, 1975², 370–87). The word is used with a twofold meaning for the visible appearance of Jesus Christ on earth.

1. *epiphaneia* occurs with reference to the appearance of the Lord on earth at the end of history. According to 2 Thess. 2:1–12, written in the language of Jewish apocalyptic, the advent of the "man of lawlessness" (→ Antichrist) precedes the visible appearance of the Kyrios (→ Present, art. *The Parousia and Eschatology in the NT* 2 (c)). In fact he is already at work (2:7), but his *parousia* (2:9) is at the moment impeded by some not further defined power (2:6 f.). The Lord Jesus will destroy him *tē epiphaneia tēs parousias*, at the appearance of his coming (2:8). *epiphaneia* and *parousia* are to be understood here as a hendiadys, *epiphaneia* stressing the powerful and effective action of the returning Christ, and *parousia* accentuating more strongly the fact of his re-appearance. The decisive factor at the return of the Lord is what he will do. His appearance, the judgment and the eschatological establishment of his → kingdom belong inextricably together. The awaited judgment day of the Lord will be both terrible and glorious. The NEB translates *epiphanēs* in Joel 2:31 by "terrible" and the quotation of this verse in Acts 2:20 by "resplendent" (AV "notable"; RSV "manifest"). Because there are two possible outcomes in salvation history, the need to stand one's ground in the fight of faith has to be stressed as the confirmation of this (note how the thought of 1 Tim. 6:12 precedes that of 6:14). Anyone who stands the test belongs to those "who have come to have a love for" the Lord's both powerful and illuminating intervention and so for "his appearance" (2 Tim. 4:8). The stress that is laid on Christ's powerful action in the designation of his return as *epiphaneia* derives ultimately from the fact that the Kyrios can be called God (Tit. 2:13) in connexion with his expected *epiphaneia*, even though the NT is still very restrained in its application of this title to Jesus Christ (→ God, art. *theos* NT 6; → Lord, art. *kyrios* NT 3).

2. From the use of the word in CL 2 (b) it is not surprising that Christians applied *epiphaneia* also to the visible earthly appearance of their Saviour (2 Tim. 1:10; and later Justin, *Apol. I* 14, 3 and 40, 1).

epiphainō (apart from Acts 27:20) is used in the NT solely of Jesus' earthly appearance, whether with a forward (Lk. 1:79) or a backward look (Tit. 2:11; 3:4). To see God's powerful revelation shining in Jesus' servant-form is not a judgment of the reason, but one exclusively of faith, for outside faith the revelation of God is not visible (cf. R. Bultmann, "The Concept of Revelation in the New Testament", in *Existence and Faith*, [1961] 1964, 67–106).

3. The no longer and not yet visible Lord, who is nevertheless believed in as present and active, can be requested in the prayer of the early church to reveal himself (1 Clem. 59:4 and 60:3; cf. Num. 6:25; and further 1 Cor. 16:22; Rev. 22:20). The thought is not that of seeing him, but of his succouring intervention and of a growing certainty which strengthens their faith (cf. CL 1 (d)).

4. In pregnant usage the word-group is found in the Bible only in the context of the revelation of Yahweh in the OT and of Jesus Christ in the NT. To speak of revelation in the fullest biblical sense is to speak of Jesus Christ. The words are never employed in connexion with the creation! The accent of the revelation-event rendered by *epiphaneia* lies on the soteriological character of God's revelation. The words accordingly do not belong to a theory of knowledge which is independent of history but to NT soteriology. In view of God's revelation in Jesus Christ the extension of knowledge is a trifling matter *vis-à-vis* salvation from blindness, lack of orientation and lostness. The mighty saving intervention of God has already occurred, but its

fulfilment will take place only at the appearance of Jesus Christ. Thus believers live in the eschatological tension of being already reconciled but not yet redeemed (Rom. 8:23; → Reconciliation; → Redemption). In other words, they live in → hope.

B. Gärtner

5. The NT has a number of related words. For *phainō* and *emphanizō* → Light.

(a) The adj. *phaneros*, visible, clear, open, evident, is not a theological technical term, although it is used in some important theological contexts. It stresses what is visible to the sight. It is used in connexion with the messianic → secret (Mk. 3:12 par. Matt. 12:16): Jesus charged them not to make him known. Nevertheless, his name had become known (Mk. 6:14). It is used in Jesus' declaration that men do nothing in secret that shall not be made manifest (Mk. 4:22; Lk. 8:17). In Acts 4:16 the Jewish leaders are compelled to acknowledge that the apostles, Peter and John, had performed a notable deed in healing the lame man in the temple, and that this was manifest to all the inhabitants of Jerusalem. Similarly, the fact that Paul's imprisonment was for Christ had become known throughout the praetorian guard (Phil. 1:13). In all these instances there is the implication that God's truth will become visible and evident in God's good time, whether men try to hasten it or hinder it. The adj. has a non-technical sense in Stephen's speech which refers to Joseph making himself known to his brethren (Acts 7:13).

Rom. 1:19 declares that what may be known about God is made manifest to men in the natural order (see the discussion of revelation in nature below in *Revelation in Contemporary Theology*). In Rom. 2:28 the man who is a Jew outwardly (*en tō phanerō*), i.e. by possessing → circumcision and making a formal profession of the → law, is contrasted with the one who is a Jew inwardly (*en tō kryptō*) who has the real, spiritual circumcision of the heart (v. 29). Paul is arguing that true membership of the people of God does not consist of possessing the outward marks of → covenant membership; there must also be the inner spiritual reality. But where this is absent, as in the case of the unbelieving Jews, it does not nullify the faithfulness of God (Rom. 3:1–4, 31; cf. Ps. 51:4). God plans to use even the unbelief of the Jews to his glory, and wills their inclusion in the people of God by grafting them back through their turning to him on a massive scale (Rom. 9:1–11:36).

In the day of the Lord the works of all men – including believers – will come to light (1 Cor. 3:13; cf. 14:25; Mk. 4:22; Lk. 8:17; Judgment; → Present, art. *hēmera*). Indeed, the present dissensions within the church make it manifest who are genuine (1 Cor. 11:19). In Gal. 5:19 Paul draws attention to the self-evident character of the works of the flesh, as contrasted with the → fruit of the Spirit. Timothy is exhorted to practise the duties of his ministry so that his progress may be evident to all (1 Tim. 4:15). Similarly, the believer's attitude to sin makes it plain that he is a child of God (1 Jn. 3:10).

(b) The adv. *phanerōs* is used in the sense of "openly", "publicly", so that people can see (Mk. 1:45; Jn. 7:10). It is the opposite of *en kryptō*, "in secret". In Acts 10:3 it means "plainly".

(c) The vb. *phaneroō*, reveal, make known, show, manifest, is relatively frequent in the NT compared with the number of instances outside it (*TDNT* IX 4). Mk. 4:22 has the character of a proverbial saying (cf. above (a)). Elsewhere it occurs in the Synoptic Gospels only in the longer ending of Mk.: Mk. 16:12, 14 (on the longer

ending see W. R. Farmer, *The Last Twelve Verses of Mark, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series* 25, 1974).

It is, however, frequent in Jn. virtually as a synonym for → *apokalyptō* which is used only in the quotation from Isa. 53:1 in Jn. 12:38 (cf. its use in Matt. and Lk.). John the Baptist came baptizing with water that Jesus Christ might be revealed to Israel (Jn. 1:31). The sign at Cana "manifested his glory; and his disciples believed in him" (Jn. 1:11). Those who do evil hate the light and do not come to it. "But he who does what is true comes to the light, that it may be clearly seen that his deeds have been wrought in God" (Jn. 3:21). Jesus' brothers urged him to go to Jerusalem, "For no man works in secret if he seeks to be known openly. If you do these things, show yourself to the world" (Jn. 7:4). But the words betray a lack of belief (v. 5), and Jesus rejected their counsel as his time had not yet come. On the other hand, their time – and their attitude which conformed to the world – is always here (v. 6). Jesus explained the blindness of the man blind from birth on the grounds that, "It was not that this man sinned, or his parents, but that the works of God might be made manifest in him" (Jn. 9:3). In his high priestly prayer Jesus declares: "I have manifested thy name to the men whom thou gavest me out of the world; thine they were, and thou gavest them to me, and they have kept thy word" (Jn. 17:6). In Jn. 21:1 and 14 the vb. is used of Jesus' revelation of himself to his disciples.

The vb. also figures prominently in 1 Jn. In Jesus "the life was made manifest, and we saw it, and testify to it, and proclaim to you the eternal life which was with the Father and was made manifest to us" (1 Jn. 1:2). By contrast the action of unbelievers in quitting the community makes it manifest that they were not truly of the community (1 Jn. 2:19). In 1 Jn. 2:28 it is used of the coming of Christ. The epistle proceeds to develop the tension between the two manifestations of Christ and the implications that this has for the believer. "Beloved, we are God's children now; it does not yet appear what we shall be, but we know when he appears we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is" (1 Jn. 3:2). "You know that he appeared to take away sins, and in him there is no sin" (1 Jn. 3:5). "He who commits sin is of the devil; for the devil has sinned from the beginning. The reason the Son of God appeared was to destroy the works of the devil" (1 Jn. 3:8). "In this the love of God was made manifest among us, that God sent his only Son into the world, so that we might live through him" (1 Jn. 4:9; cf. Jn. 3:16).

In Rev. 3:18 the church at Laodicea is counselled to buy white garments from the risen Christ to keep the shame of its nakedness from being seen. The allusion is to the lukewarm attitude of that church in its self-contented prosperity which blinded it to its true state (→ Cold, Hot, Lukewarm NT (c)). In Rev. 15:4 the song of those who have conquered celebrates the God who alone is holy and the fact that "All nations shall come and worship thee, for thy judgments have been revealed."

Paul uses *phaneroō* and *apokalyptō* as synonyms (cf. Rom. 1:17 and 3:21 on the revelation of the → righteousness of God in Christ; Eph. 3:5 and Col. 1:26 on the revelation of the mystery hidden for ages). In Rom. 1:19 and 1 Cor. 4:5 *phaneroō* has the sense of "make visible". The former passage refers to the revelation of God's "eternal power and deity" in the creation (Rom. 1:20; see below on *Revelation in Contemporary Theology*). The latter refers to the coming → judgment when all the hidden things will be made manifest. For Paul this has the practical implication that he does not pronounce judgment before the time, being content to leave it to God,

and equally he does not wish to have premature commendation for the same reason.

Paul uses *phaneroō* no less than 9 times in 2 Cor. especially in polemical contexts. He uses it of the revelation that comes about through his preaching (2 Cor. 2:14; 11:6). His own apostolic way of life is itself a paradoxical revelation of Christ, in a way comparable to Christ's own way of life. For men – including his adversaries – naturally expect God to manifest himself in success. But in fact it is otherwise. Paul's apostolic way has been one of affliction and suffering, "always carrying about in the body the death of Jesus, so that the life of Jesus may also be manifested in our bodies. For while we live we are always being given up to death for Jesus' sake, so that the life of Jesus may be manifested in our mortal flesh. So death is at work in us, but life in you" (2 Cor. 4:10 ff.). On the other hand, the existence of believing men and women in the church shows them to be a letter from Christ, a manifest attestation vindicating Paul's apostleship in contrast with the letters of accreditation vaunted by his opponents. The vb. is used of the appearance of all before the judgment seat of Christ (2 Cor. 5:10 f.; → Judgment, art. *bēma*). The vb. is used 3 times. Not only shall we appear (v. 10), but what we are is made manifest to God (v. 11a). To this Paul adds the hope that it is also manifest to the consciences of his readers (v. 11b). In 2 Cor. 7:12 Paul declares that his intention in writing as he did was "in order that your zeal for us might be revealed to you in the sight of God." Despite his lack of eloquence Paul expresses the hope that his apostleship and devotion to Christ have been made plain (2 Cor. 11:6). For further discussion of the vb. and the cognate noun in 2 Cor. see below (d).

Revelation takes place in proclamation (Col. 1:25 f.; 4:4; Rom. 16:25 ff.). In Eph. 5:13 Christian conduct is seen in terms of light. The thought of revelation is further developed in terms of mystery hidden for ages but now revealed in Christ (Col. 1:26; 3:4; 4:4; cf. Eph. 3:5; 6:19).

On the question of whether there is a conflict between Paul's claims about revelation (cf. also 1 Cor. 11:23; Gal. 1:12) and his insistence on having received his kerygma from tradition (1 Cor. 15:3) see G. E. Ladd, "Revelation and Tradition in Paul", in W. W. Gasque and R. P. Martin, eds., *Apostolic History and the Gospel: Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F. F. Bruce*, 1970, 223–30. Ladd sees Paul in 1 Cor. thinking of particular aspects of his gospel: the Lord's Supper, the saving death, the resurrection and the appearances of Jesus. These include facts and interpretations which Paul received from earlier Christians (→ Proclamation). However, in Gal. Paul is dealing with his apostolic authority and conversion. "Paul was not converted by Christian preaching but by an immediate confrontation by the exalted Christ. Neither did he receive his apostolic office from men. Both – his gospel and his apostolic office – came directly from the Lord, unmediated by men" (op. cit., 230).

1 Tim. 3:16 takes up the theme of mystery in quoting a primitive Christian hymn: "Great indeed, we confess, is the mystery of our religion: He was manifested in the flesh [*hos ephanerōthē en sarki*], vindicated in the Spirit, seen by angels, preached among the nations, believed on in the world, taken up in glory." On this subject see R. H. Gundry, "The Form, Meaning and Background of the Hymn Quoted in 1 Timothy 3:16", in W. W. Gasque and R. P. Martin, eds., op. cit., 203–22; J. T. Sanders, *The New Testament Christological Hymns, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series* 15, 1971, 94 f.; M. Dibelius, *The Pastoral Epistles, Hermeneia*,

1972, 61 ff.; and A. T. Hanson, *Studies in the Pastoral Epistles*, 1968, 21–28 (on the introductory clause). *phaneroō* here refers to the incarnation (cf. Rom. 1:3 f. and the use of the vb. elsewhere for the incarnate ministry of Jesus in Jn. 1:31; Heb. 9:26; 1 Pet. 1:20; 1 Jn. 1:2; 3:5, 8; and the use of *sarx* for the humanity of Jesus in Jn. 1:14; 6:51 ff.; Rom. 8:3; 10:5; Eph. 2:14; Col. 1:22; Heb. 5:7; 1 Pet. 3:18; 4:1; 1 Jn. 4:2; 2 Jn. 7; cf. Lk. 24:39). Gundry thinks that the clause refers to the entire earthly ministry right up to the ascension in view of (1) the use of *sarx* for human lifetime (Gal. 2:20; Phil. 1:22, 24; Heb. 5:7), (2) the generality of "manifested" instead of a more specific vb. like "born", and (3) the synthetic relation to "taken up in glory" (op. cit., 209). *ephanerōthē* thus becomes a constative aorist indicating that the action is conceived of as a whole. The same vb. is also used of the significance of the incarnation in 2 Tim. 1:10 in concluding its definition of the → gospel in the power of God: "and now has manifested through the appearing of our Saviour Christ Jesus, who abolished death and brought life and immortality to light through the gospel." The incarnation is also in mind in the other reference to the vb. in the Pastoral Epistles, but it is now mediated by proclamation: "and at the proper time manifested in his word through the preaching with which I have been entrusted by command of God our Saviour" (Tit. 1:3).

The vb. occurs twice in Heb. 9 but with somewhat different meanings. In Heb. 9:26 the reference is to the incarnation, the purpose of which was to offer a sacrifice for sins which supersedes the OT → sacrifices and day of atonement ritual. The manifestation of Christ is unique and unrepeatable: "Nor was it to offer himself repeatedly, as the high priest enters the Holy Place yearly with blood not his own; for then he would have had to suffer repeatedly since the foundation of the world. But as it is, he has appeared once for all at the end of the age to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself" (Heb. 9:15 f.). Conversely, the author has earlier argued that the structure of the tabernacle (and by implication the → temple) and the prohibition of all but the high priest from entering the inner sanctuary is proof of the incompleteness of the religion and rites of the old covenant: "By this the Holy Spirit indicates [*dēlountos*] that the way into the sanctuary is not yet opened [*pephanerōsthai*] as long as the outer tent is still standing" (Heb. 9:8; → Tent). Whereas the RSV translates the vb. by "opened", it would be consistent with the regular meaning of the vb. to translate it as "manifested", "revealed" or "made known" (cf. NEB "remains unrevealed").

The vb. also occurs twice in 1 Pet. again of Christ referring to his two manifestations in his historical life and at his second coming. "He was destined from the foundation of the world but was made manifest at the end of the times for your sake" (1 Pet. 1:20). "And when the chief Shepherd is manifested you will obtain the unfading crown of glory" (1 Pet. 5:4).

(d) Compared with the relative frequency of the vb. (49 times), the noun *phanerōsis*, revelation, manifestation, disclosure, occurs only twice. In 1 Cor. 12:7 it describes the → gifts of the → Spirit: "To each is given the manifestation of the Spirit for the common good." In 2 Cor. 4:2 it is used in connexion with Paul's preaching in a polemical passage replying to accusations: "We have renounced disgraceful, underhanded ways; we refuse to practise cunning or to tamper with God's word, but by the open statement of the truth [*tē phanerōsei tēs alētheias*] we would commend ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God. And even if our gospel is veiled [*kekalymmenon*], it is veiled [*kekalymmenon*] to them that are perishing" (2 Cor. 4:2

f.; → Hide, art. *kalyptō* NT 3). C. K. Barrett takes the phrase to mean "by showing forth the truth, that is the Gospel, or word of God" (*The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, *BNTC*, 1973, 129; cf. R. Bultmann, *Exegetica*, ed. E. Dinkler, 1967, 143). The passage may be compared with 2 Cor. 5:10 f. and the use of the vb. in 2 Cor. noted above (c). W. Schmithals sees Paul defending his rational, non-ecstatic method of proclaiming Christian truth as against gnostic criticism (*Gnosticism in Corinth*, 1971). But Barrett prefers to see Paul's use of the vb. against the background of the law court, where it was used of appearances in court (2 Cor. 5:10; op. cit., 160, 164; cf. C. F. D. Moule, *The Phenomenon of the New Testament*, *SBT* Second Series 1, 1967, 92).

(e) The vb. *phantazō*, make visible, usually in the pass. to become visible, especially of extraordinary phenomena, is rare in secular Gk. and occurs only in Heb. 12:21 of → Moses on Sinai: "Indeed so terrible was the sight [*to phantazomenon*] that Moses said, 'I tremble with fear' " (cf. Deut. 9:19). *phantasma* means an apparition or ghost (secular Gk. from Aesch. and Plato; cf. Job 20:8 *v.l.*; Wis. 17:14; Josephus, *Ant.* 1, 331 and 333; Matt. 14:26 par. Mk. 6:49, Lk. 24:37D, of the disciples' mistaken impression of Jesus walking on the water). *C. Brown*

χρηματίζω

χρηματίζω (*chrēmatizō*), impart a revelation, injunction or warning; bear a name, be called or named; *χρῆμα* (*chrēma*), property, wealth, means, money; *χρηματισμός* (*chrēmatismos*), a divine statement or answer.

CL & OT *chrēma* is related to *chrē*, necessity, it is inevitable, and means affair, money in secular Gk. (B. Reicke, *TDNT* IX 480). It has the meaning of money, riches in the LXX and is so used in the NT (→ Possessions, art. *chrēma*). From *chrēma* in the sense of affair, business, the vb. *chrēmatizō* means to handle a matter (e.g. Thuc., 1, 87, 5). In the language of government and business in the Hellenistic world it came to denote taking up a matter, dealing with something, giving an answer, especially from an official point of view (*TDNT* IX 481). It can have this sense in the case of a deity giving an answer (Diod. Sic. 15, 10, 2; Josephus, *Ant.* 3, 212). In Jer. LXX it corresponds to the Heb. *dibber*, speak (26[33]:2; 29[36]:23; 30[37]:2) and *šā'ag*, roar (25[32]:30).

NT 1. In the NT *chrēmatizō* has 2 distinct senses, though the second sense may be a quite different vb. The first sense may be connected with *chrēsmos*, oracle, and the second with *chrēmata*, business (Moulton, *Grammar*, II, 265).

(a) In the infancy stories, the story of Cornelius and Heb. the vb. is used of the instruction of people by revelations. It is usually in the pass., and the recipient is regarded as an instrument of God. Often the vb. is in the imperative. Thus the wise men were warned in a → dream not to return to Herod (Matt. 2:12; → Magic, art. *mageia* NT 2(b)). Joseph was likewise warned not to go to Judea where Archelaus ruled and so withdrew to Galilee (Matt. 2:22). It was "revealed" to Simeon "by the Holy Spirit that he should not see death before he had seen the Lord's Christ" (Lk. 1:26). In the account of the opening of the church to the Gentiles "Cornelius, a centurion, an upright and God-fearing man, who is well spoken of by the whole Jewish nation, was

directed to send for you [Peter] to come to his house, and to hear what you have to say" (Acts 10:22). Heb. 11:5 speaks of the response of → Noah's → faith to the warnings of God, and Heb. 12:25 exhorts professing Christians: "See that you do not refuse him who is speaking. For if they did not escape when they refused him [Moses] who warned them on earth, much less shall we escape if we reject him [Jesus] who warns from heaven" (cf. Heb. 3:12; Exod. 19:18; 20:19).

(b) In two instances *chrēmatizō* means to appear as something, bear a name, be called or named. Thus "in Antioch the disciples were for the first time called Christians" (Acts 11:26c; → Jesus Christ, art. *Christianos*). A woman "will be called an adulteress if she lives with another man while her husband is alive" (Rom. 7:3a; → Marriage, art. *moicheuō*).

2. *chrēmatismos* is found in secular Gk. from Plato onwards in the sense of money-making (e.g. *Rep.* 2, 357c). But it is also a term for an official answer, instruction or decree and also a divine answer in Hellenism (*TDNT* IX 482). In the LXX it means dispatch (2 Macc. 11:17), oracle (Prov. 31:1; Isa. 13:1), and divine direction (2 Macc. 2:4). In the NT it is found only at Rom. 11:4: "But what is God's reply [*chrēmatismos*] to him [→ Elijah]? 'I have kept for myself seven thousand men who have not bowed the knee to Baal' " (cf. 1 Ki. 19:18). The instance affords a precedent and example for Paul to argue "So too at the present time there is a remnant, chosen by grace" (v. 5). The argument is concerned to show that God has not rejected altogether his ancient people, and that God's way of working now is the same as it was in time past under the old covenant. "In spite of the linguistic link between *entynchanō* and *chrēmatismos* Elijah is thought of, not as an attorney submitting written petitions, not as a mantic practising incubation, but as a man of God receiving revelations" (B. Reicke, *TDNT* IX 482). *C. Brown*

Revelation in Contemporary Theology

The purpose of this note is to draw attention to some of the representative views of revelation of the past half-century. Two main streams have emerged: the one stresses revelation through the word, the other through history and events. They do so against a double background. On the one hand, the rise of critical historical scholarship has set a question mark against the possibility of treating the Bible without more ado as the written word of God. On the other hand, there is the question whether God does not reveal himself in nature and history, and within the Bible itself there are grounds for answering this in the affirmative.

1. *Revelation through the Word.* (a) In the 1920s and 1930s Karl Barth was a leading advocate of Dialectical Theology, and his commentary on *Romans* (1919) became a programmatic manifesto of this school of thought. Basic to it was the idea that God is *Wholly Other*. God exists on a different plane and in a different way from men. Consequently they can know him only as he reveals himself to them. But being *Wholly Other* there is a sense in which God remains hidden even in revelation. For when men saw Jesus with their eyes, they saw a man and not God. When they heard his words, they heard human words. The divine cannot be perceived directly; it can only be perceived indirectly. This view of God as *Wholly Other* had a double consequence for Barth's thinking. On the one hand, it meant that man's religion as a human quest for God was worthless and sinful. Indeed, in the light of God's revela-

tion of himself in Jesus Christ we can see how misguided it really is. On the other hand, for the Barth of Dialectical Theology the words of Scripture are not themselves revelation but a witness to revelation. They point in human terms to that which cannot be expressed by man at all.

In the 1930s. Barth moved away from the strict position of Dialectical Theology in favour of a view which saw an analogical correspondence between the truth of our words about God and the reality of God himself (cf. *CD* I, 1, 279, cf. 274 ff.; II, 1, 223–54). For strictly speaking, if God is *Wholly Other* nothing at all can be said about him. He would be so different from our ways of speaking and thinking that nothing appropriate could be said. But in the light of the revelation in Scripture, Barth came to see a correspondence between our concepts and the reality of God in himself. Thus, if we call God our "Father" we do not mean that he is our father in the same way as our human fathers, who can be seen, heard, touched, and who bring children into the world by physical procreation. God is not a father in the literal sense. But there is a correspondence in the way in which he is the source of our life and in the way he cares for and guides us as his children.

In the *Church Dogmatics* Barth developed the concept of the threefold form of the Word of God (*CD* I, 1, 98–140). In the strictest sense of the word Jesus Christ himself is the Word of God (cf. Jn. 1:1, 14; Rev. 19:13; Heb. 1:2). He is the one who reveals the Father (Matt. 11:27 ff.; Lk. 10:22; Jn. 14:6–10; 1 Cor. 1:30). But there is also a sense in which Scripture is also the → Word of God. It is the Word of God as God speaks to men through it. Thus Barth conceives of Scripture not as something separate from God but as the vehicle through which God speaks to men. But it is revelation in so far as it reveals Christ, or rather, as Christ reveals himself through it. Barth speaks of Scripture as "the witness of the prophets and apostles", i.e. as the witness of those who were specially commissioned by God to testify to him before and after the event of Christ. The former look forward to him, and the latter look back to him. The word "witness" has to be understood in the gospel sense of the term: "He who receives you receives me, and he who receives me receives him that sent me" (Matt. 10:40; cf. Lk. 10:16; Jn. 13:20). Just as those who received the disciples received Christ in and through them, so we today in receiving their written words also receive Christ, and with him also the Father. In addition to Christ and Scripture, Barth also thinks of proclamation as a form of the Word of God. The church's preaching today is the concrete means of God revealing himself and of men receiving the Word of God. In practice these three forms of the Word of God are inseparable. There is no revelation apart from Christ, but no knowledge of Christ apart from the Scriptures. In practice we know Christ and the Scriptures through the proclamation of the church, but we must test that proclamation by Scripture.

For Barth there can be no external proof of the truth of revelation. For it is impossible to stand outside our human condition and look at God as he is in himself and look at our theologies and see them in a completely detached manner. There is no vantage point from which we could do this. Barth admits that his argument is circular (*CD* I, 2, 535), but it is not a vicious circle. We may step into the circle of truth and see its truth from a position of obedient faith. The truth of God is self-attesting. Therefore an extraneous "objective" proof is as impossible as it is irrelevant. The truth of the Bible on historical matters is of course open to corroboration by

archaeology. But such corroboration would merely be on a human level. It would not tell us whether what the Bible says about God is true. This can only be known from within the self-attesting circle of revelation.

Two further observations may be made on Barth's position. On the one hand, it means that all knowledge of God is mediated in and through the person of Jesus Christ. On the other hand, this means that there is no true knowledge of God outside this revelation, which in turn means the rejection of religion as a subject of interest and value in its own right (whether in its Christian or non-Christian forms) and also of natural theology. Natural theology, as the attempt to discover certain truths about God by reflection on the natural world and certain human institutions like marriage and moral values, formed the subject of a debate between Barth and Emil Brunner in the 1930s (cf. their papers in *Natural Theology; Comprising 'Nature and Grace' by Professor Emil Brunner and the Reply 'No!' by Dr. Karl Barth*, 1946). Brunner argued that a knowledge of God from nature was a presupposition for the proclamation of the gospel and that it was the task of Protestant theology to construct a new natural theology. Barth ridiculed the proposition, but in so doing failed to give adequate weight to passages like Ps. 19:1 ff.; Acts 14 and 17; and Rom. 1:19 ff. Later on he recognized that the Bible speaks of a revelation in nature, but maintained that the natural man makes nothing of it (*CD* II, 1, 119 ff.), insisting that only the Spirit of God can reveal the deep things of God (1 Cor. 2:6–16). The knowledge of God by the Gentiles in Rom. 2:12–16 is not a general unaided response to natural revelation. Rather, it is the fulfilment of Jer. 31:31 ff. in the knowledge of God by the Gentiles under the new covenant. The Gentiles in question are Gentile believers (*CD* I, 2, 304; II, 242, 604; IV, 1, 33, 369, 395). For Brunner's view of revelation see *Revelation and Reason; The Christian Doctrine of Faith and Knowledge*, 1947; and *Truth as Encounter: A New Edition, Much Enlarged, of The Divine-Human Encounter*, 1964 (cf. also P. K. Jewett, *Emil Brunner's Concept of Revelation*, 1954).

For Barth the doctrine of the Trinity is grounded in revelation in so far as the Father reveals himself in the Son (who is the objective reality of revelation) through the power of the Holy Spirit (who is the subjective reality of revelation) (cf. Eph. 2:18; Matt. 28:19; 2 Cor. 13:14). Hence, *CD* I, 1 which deals with the doctrine of the Word of God as the prolegomena to church dogmatics is also a massive treatise on the doctrine of the Trinity. For it is none other than the triune God himself who is active in revelation, and as such is also the underlying principle of Christian theology.

Barth's concept of inspiration stretches the concept from the idea of God-breathed scriptures ("All Scripture is inspired by God [*pasa graphē theopneustos*] and profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, and for training in righteousness", 2 Tim. 3:16) to cover the whole process of illumination described in 1 Cor. 2:6–16 and 2 Cor. 3:4–18 (*CD* I, 2, 514 ff.). Within this general context Barth is willing to speak of the inspiration of scripture, and warns against saying anything different in the light of Matt. 5:17 f. At the same time, he insists that the Bible must not be detached from encounter with the living God. Otherwise, it becomes a "paper Pope". Barth's high view of Scripture does not preclude for him the possibility that the biblical writers were capable of error and that they spoke "the Word of God in their fallible and erring human word" (*CD* I, 2, 530; cf. 509, 528 ff.). The action of the Spirit does not suspend their human thought-processes. But he prefers to speak of a

"capacity for errors" rather than actual errors, warning us not to attempt to play off one writer against another.

(b) In the 1920s Rudolf Bultmann was also associated with Dialectical Theology. But in subsequent years the gap between Barth and Bultmann widened into a chasm. It would be wrong to think of Bultmann entirely as an existentialist theologian. The existentialist element in his teaching is but one aspect. At its foundation lies the thought of the otherness of God. This means that God cannot be objectified. At the same time Bultmann espoused a much more radical view of the Bible than Barth in such works as *The History of the Synoptic Tradition* (1921, ET 1963). Moreover, the thoughts of the biblical writers are couched in the language of obsolete mythical world views (→ Myth). Thus the message of the NT requires to be demythologized, not indeed to remove all offence, but to allow the real offence of the gospel to stand (cf. "New Testament and Mythology"; 1941, ET in *Kerygma and Myth*, ed. H. W. Bartsch, combined volume, 1972, 1–44; and *Jesus Christ and Mythology*, 1960). Christ is revealed in the *kērygma* of the cross and resurrection. "The word of preaching confronts us as the word of God. It is not for us to question its credentials. It is we who are questioned, we who are asked whether we will believe the word or reject it. But in answering this question, in accepting the word of preaching as the word of God and the death and resurrection of Christ as the eschatological event, we are given an opportunity of understanding ourselves. Faith and unbelief are never blind, arbitrary decisions. They offer us the alternative between accepting or rejecting that which alone can illuminate our understanding of ourselves" (*Kerygma and Myth*, 41 f.; → Resurrection, art. *The Resurrection in Contemporary Theology* 1 (a)).

There is both an eschatological and an existential note here which resounds throughout Bultmann's teaching. The eschatological is the element of the transcendent breaking into time through the medium of the *kērygma*; the existential is the element of self-understanding which occurs in our response to it (cf. *Theology of the New Testament*, I, 1952, 3; *The Gospel of John*, 1971, 159 f.).

In so far as revelation is transcendent and eschatological it cannot be communicated. It is rather occasioned by the Christian *kērygma* as it meets the response of faith. Thus, if we ask Bultmann what has been revealed according to the NT, his reply is "Nothing at all, so far as the question concerning revelation asks for doctrines – doctrines, say, that no man could have discovered for himself – or for mysteries that become known once and for all as soon as they are communicated. On the other hand, however, everything has been revealed, insofar as man's eyes are opened concerning his own existence and he is once again able to understand himself" (*Existence and Faith*, [1961] 1964, 100). "Revelation is an act of God, an *occurrence*, and not a communication of supernatural knowledge" (ibid., 102). Faith, for Bultmann, does not have an object. It "does not relate itself to historical or cosmic processes that could be established as free from doubt, but rather to the *preaching* behind which faith cannot go and which says to man that he must understand the cross as God's act of salvation and believe in the resurrection" (ibid., 163).

(c) A somewhat older view which was in no way bound up with Bultmann's demythologized existential *kērygma* was that of William Temple who rejected the idea of propositional revelation in words. "What is offered to man's apprehension in any specific Revelation is not truth concerning God but the living God Himself" (*Nature, Man and God*, Gifford Lectures, 1934, 322). However, Temple went further

than Bultmann in thinking that the truth of revelation could be formulated. "There are truths of revelation, that is to say, propositions which express the results of correct thinking concerning revelation; but they are not themselves directly revealed" (ibid., 317).

(d) A writer who rejects the idea of revelation altogether is F. G. Downing who claims that, "If God intended to 'reveal himself' in Christ, in the events of his life and death and resurrection and in his teaching, he failed. It seems more faithful to assume that this was not his intention. . . . A 'revelation' of what cannot now be seen is not a 'revelation'. We may believe, trust, that Christ has made 'the revealing of God' a possibility in some sort of future. It is surely nonsense, even pernicious nonsense, to pretend that it is a present fact" (*Has Christianity a Revelation?*, 1964, 238).

(e) By contrast with these positions stands the traditional orthodox and evangelical understanding of revelation, as represented by scholars like B. B. Warfield in the various articles collected in *The Inspiration and Authority of the Bible*, 1951, and J. W. Wenham in *Christ and the Bible*, 1972. This position is based on a detailed examination about what the Bible says about itself and especially Jesus' own attitude to → Scripture as the → Word of God. Thus Jesus came to endorse and fulfil the law and the prophets (Matt. 5:17 f.; → Fullness, art. *plēroō*; → Redemption, art. *lyō* NT 6 (a) and 6 (d) for Jn. 10:35 f.). His life was governed by the fulfilment of Scripture (Matt. 11:10 par. Lk. 7:27; Matt. 21:42 par. Mk. 12:10; Lk. 20:17, cf. Ps. 118:22; Matt. 26:24 par. Mk. 14:21; Matt. 26:31 par. Mk. 14:27; cf. Zech. 13:7; Matt. 26:53–56 par. Mk. 14:49; Mk. 9:12 f.; Lk. 4:21; 18:31 ff.; 21:22; 24:25 ff., 44–47; Jn. 5:39–47; 13:18; cf. Ps. 41:9; Jn. 15:25; cf. Ps. 35:19; Jn. 17:12). He lived not by bread alone but by every word that proceeds from the mouth of God (Matt. 4:4; cf. Deut. 8:3). The Scriptures are thus the expression of the will of God. The question "Have you not read. . .?" is virtually the equivalent of "Do you not know that God has said. . .?" (Matt. 12:3; 19:4; 21:16; 22:31; Mk. 2:25; 12:10, 26; Lk; 6:3). Similarly the word *gegraptai*, "It is written", carries with it the full weight of divine authority (Matt. 11:10; 21:13; 26:24, 31; Mk. 9:12 f.; 11:17; 14:21, 27; Lk. 7:27; 19:46). On occasion "Scripture" and "God" are even used interchangeably (Rom. 9:17, cf. Exod. 9:16; Gal. 3:8, cf. Gen. 12:3; 18:18; Matt. 19:4 f., cf. Gen. 2:24). This view involves the concept of the plenary inspiration of the Bible (cf. 2 Tim. 3:16; 1 Pet. 1:23 ff.; 2 Pet 1:20 f.; 1 Thess. 2:13), though not necessarily the corollary that the Holy Spirit dictated the words of scripture in a way which involves the suspension of the normal thought-processes of the writers. Advocates of this view leave open the question of how the Spirit guided the biblical writers, but they recognize that this view commits them to propositional revelation. Thus God reveals himself to us today through the medium of words.

(f) In marked contrast with this position is the view set out by John Macquarrie in *The Principles of Christian Theology*, 1966. Macquarrie sees revelation as "the primary source for theology" and "a basic category for theological thinking" (op. cit., 6, 76). But he utterly rejects the notion of propositional revelation and indeed of a theistic view of God. Revelation is not concerned with acquiring new items of knowledge but with seeing things in a different way (op. cit., 80). "Because of its gift-like character, revelation is of a different order from our ordinary matter-of-fact knowing of the world" (op. cit., 6). But a basic pattern runs through experiences of revelation in the different religions which Macquarrie analyses as follows: "a mood

of meditation or preoccupation; the sudden in-breaking of the holy presence, often symbolized in terms of the shining of a light; a mood of self-abasement (sometimes terror, sometimes consciousness of sin, sometimes even doubt of the reality of the experience) in face of the holy; a more definite disclosure of the holy, perhaps the disclosure of a name or of a purpose or a truth of some kind (this element may be called the 'content' of the revelation); the sense of being called or commissioned by the holy to a definite task or way of life" (op. cit., 6 f.). Macquarrie sees this pattern exemplified in the story of Moses and the burning bush (Exod. 3:1 ff.), the Gnostic writer who received the gospel of *Poimandres* (introduction), and Arjuna who received a theophany of the god Krishna (*Bhagavadgita* 11). If further distinctions are to be drawn, Macquarrie sees such revelations as "classic" or "primordial" which subsequently become paradigms or normative patterns for interpreting the later experience of the community (op. cit., 7). They are handed down by means of scriptures which are not themselves revelation but means (among others) of keeping the revelation alive (op. cit., 8).

In revelation one does not, according to Macquarrie, enter into an I-Thou encounter with a personal God (op. cit., 83 f.). For the idea of a personal God over against the universe is one to be rejected. Rather, one is grasped by being which pervades all beings, and is the condition of their being (op. cit., 94–110). "The expression which I prefer to use . . . to point to the characteristic of being as the condition that there may be any particular beings, is 'letting-be'. Being, strictly speaking, 'is' not; but 'lets be', and since letting-be is prior to particular instances of being, though other than these, we are justified in claiming that being is more beingful than any particular being that it lets be, and we have justification too for using, with proper care and qualification, the expression 'being is' " (op. cit., 103).

The significance of Macquarrie's approach here lies not so much in any intrinsic merits but in its interest as an example of a phenomenological approach to revelation which attempts to work out a philosophy of religion on the basis of an examination of religious phenomena in general. For one thing, "being" is hardly the "neutral" category that Macquarrie appears to imagine it to be (op. cit., 105). It is itself just as much an interpretation as the use of the words "holy" or "God"; and to understand, say, Exod. 3:1 ff. in terms of an experience of being is not an objective, detached, presuppositionless way of letting religious phenomena speak for themselves, but is itself an interpretation in terms of a framework of interpretation. Moreover, it is difficult to imagine how one can meaningfully speak of being as prior to beings from the logical, ontological or chronological standpoints. Similar difficulties attach to the concept of "being letting-be". But what is perhaps most striking from the standpoint of revelation is not how much Macquarrie's analysis of "primordial revelation" coincides with the Christian viewpoint but how little. Whilst there are parallels with certain events in the Bible, such as Isaiah in the temple (Isa. 6), Peter's confession of Christ (Matt. 16:17 par.), the transfiguration (Matt. 17:1–8 par.), Paul on the Damascus road (Acts 9:3–9; 22:6–11; 26:12–18), and perhaps the resurrection appearances, there is much more in the OT and the NT which is regarded as the meaningful self-disclosure of God. The proclamation of the prophets in terms of "Thus says the Lord. . ." and the dominical "But I say unto you. . .", the parabolic teaching of Jesus and the law and the proclamation of the gospel are all forms of disclosure. At the same time, the biblical writers are aware of a revelation in nature (cf.

Ps. 19:1 ff.; Rom. 1:19 ff.; Acts 14:17; see below 2 (a)) and in other religions and philosophies (Acts 17:26–29, quoting Epimenides and Aratus, *Phaenomena* 5; → God, art. *theos* NT 4 (b)).

2. *Revelation in Nature and History.* (a) We have already had occasion to note certain strands of biblical teaching which speak of a revelation in nature (see above 1 (a) and (f)). The passages in question maintain that man has an awareness of God apart from the special revelation given through Christ and Scripture, though this does not amount to a saving knowledge of God. Nor, despite Thomas Aquinas (*Summa Theologiae* 1 Q.2) do these passages entitle us to say that the existence of God can be proved *from* nature by such arguments as the cosmological and the teleological arguments which argue back from evidences of causation and purpose to a first cause or original designer. The Bible itself contains no such proofs. Rather the passages in question claim that reflection on nature indicates something of the kind of God that God is. Thus the heavens declare his glory (Ps. 19:1). On the other hand, the same Psalm proclaims that it is the law of God which revives the soul, and his testimony which makes the simple wise (v. 7). The thrust of Matt. 6:16 ff., 45; Acts 14:17; 17:26–29; Rom. 1:19 ff. is not to prove the existence of God but to point out lessons from the natural world that we can learn about God. Thus, God cares for the flowers and the birds; *a fortiori* he will care for his children. The fruits of the earth and the seasons testify to his providential concern. The pagan poets have an awareness that man's being is sustained by the invisible God; we ought not therefore to think of him in terms of idols, "a representation by the art and imagination of man" (Acts 17:29). Similarly, in Rom., God is not to be reduced to an image or idol (Rom. 1:23), for such things could not have wrought the created order that we live in. "For what can be known about God is plain to them, because God has shown it to them. Ever since the creation of the world his invisible nature, namely, his eternal power and deity, has been clearly perceived in the things that have been made. So they are without excuse; for although they knew God they did not honour him as God or give thanks to him, but they became futile in their thinking and their senseless minds were darkened. Claiming to be wise, they became fools, and exchanged the glory of the immortal God for images resembling mortal man or birds or animals or reptiles" (Rom. 1:19–23).

G. Bornkamm has drawn attention to the parallels with the Stoic terminology and apologetic trains of thought that are characteristic of Hellenistic Judaism, especially Wis. 12 f. and Philo (in "The Revelation of God's Wrath (Romans 1–3)", *Early Christian Experience*, 1969, 50 ff.; cf. G. Kuhlmann, *Theologia Naturalis bei Philon und bei Paulus*, *Neutestamentliche Forschungen* I, 7, 1930; J. N. Sevenster, *Paul and Seneca*, *Supplements to NovT* 4, 1961). Thus, Cleanthes' *Hymn to Zeus* begins: "Greetings, most glorious of the immortals, of many names, almighty Zeus, ruler of nature, you who govern the universe according to law." It goes on to say: "For we Thine offspring are, and all created things that live and move on earth receive from Thee the image of the One" (ibid., lines 4 f.). The hymn concludes: "Therefore all-giving Zeus, clouded in darkness, powerful as lightning, save men from their miserable foolishness; banish it, O Father, from their souls and let them acquire reason, with which you rule all in justice, that we, so honoured by you, return to you the honour, for there is nothing higher for mortals and for gods than, as is proper always, to praise the all-governing law." There is an affinity between the Stoic con-

cern for the law and Philo: "His exordium, as I have said, is one that excites our admiration in the highest degree. It consists of an account of the creation of the world, implying that the world is in harmony with the Law, and the Law with the world, and that the man who observed the Law is constituted thereby a loyal citizen of the world, regulating his doings by the purpose and will of Nature, in accordance with which the entire world itself is administered" (*Op. Mund.* 3; for further instances see Bornkamm, op. cit., 50–53).

But, as Bornkamm points out, there is a common feature of the Hellenistic doctrine of God which is lacking in Paul: in Paul one does not ascend from below to above (op. cit., 50). On the other hand, sin may distort this knowledge of God which comes from God through nature, but it does not completely destroy it (cf. Rom. 1:32). "If Paul speaks to man as he does in order that he may know about God's creative power, his law, the folly of idolatry, the sacrilege of a deification of the world, the error of the moral life and the legitimacy of the death sentence which comes as a consequence, he is saying that this knowledge does not represent a solution for him at all. Rather, it seals his lostness. Thus, the all-pervading intention of his statements and their difference from the parallel texts becomes fully clear. Therefore, Rom. 1:18 ff. is not an apologetic and pedagogical discussion, because *the intention of the Apostle is not to infer God's being from the world, but to uncover the being of the world from God's revelation; not to prove the revelation of God before the judgment of the world, but to unveil the judgment of God over the world revealed in the law*" (G. Bornkamm, op. cit., 58 f.).

(b) Alongside the theologies of the word developed by Barth, Bultmann and others in the mid-twentieth century a number of biblical scholars have elaborated theologies of revelation in history. G. Ernest Wright maintains that one of the distinctive features of the Bible is to see history and historical tradition "as the primary sphere in which God reveals himself" (*God Who Acts: Biblical Theology as Recital, SBT* 8, 1952, 55). He goes on to say, "To be sure, God also reveals himself and his will in various ways to the inner consciousness of man, as in other religions. Yet the nature and content of this inner revelation is determined by the outward, objective happenings of history in which individuals are called to participate. It is, therefore, the objectivity of God's historical acts which are the focus of attention, not the subjectivity of inner, emotional, diffuse and mystical experience" (ibid.). Central to this idea is the concept of God's "election of a special people through whom he would accomplish his purposes" (ibid.). This in turn provides the framework not only for the exodus and the giving of the law but for prophetic eschatology and apocalyptic. It also contrasts with much of the surrounding religion in which historical events play little or no part (cf. also *The Old Testament against its Environment, SBT* 2, 1950).

An objection which has been levelled against Wright is that the language of the "God who acts" has been taken over from the realism of the biblical narrative itself. Unless one is willing to maintain that the events took place much as they are described, one is open to the charge of equivocation (cf. L. Gilkey, "Cosmology, Ontology and the Travail of Biblical Language", *JR* 41, 1961, 194–205; and *Naming the Whirlwind*, 1969). In later works Wright has tended to stress Israelite mental patterns, such as the covenant, rather than the underlying history (cf. *The Old Testament and Theology*, 1969), and this has raised a question mark in the minds of some scholars as to how seriously the idea of the "God who acts" is to be taken.

The work of G. von Rad also lays great stress on salvation history (cf. *Old Testament Theology*, I–II, 1962–65; *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays*, 1966; *Genesis*, 1972 [2]; *Deuteronomy*, 1966; *Studies in Deuteronomy*, *SBT* 9 1953). But by contrast with Wright who was more concerned with archaeology than exegesis of the text, von Rad laid great stress on literary analysis, form-criticism and tradition history, and in particular the kerygma of the various strata within the texts. Thus the OT proclaimed the actions of Yahweh in history. On the other hand, von Rad drew a distinction between this confession of history and the actual history as it was, even though the confession is rooted in the latter. It is this gap between the two histories that makes it difficult to accept the proclamation of salvation history. Moreover, von Rad held that this view fitted the Deuteronomistic outlook, but not the whole of the OT. The story of David is not included. Neither is the late OT tradition because of changes in the view of history and the law.

According to B. Albrektson, *History and the Gods*, 1967, the differences between Israel and other religions in the Near East have been overstressed, and J. Barr argues that the differences between Greek thinking and Hebrew thinking are also less clear cut than have been imagined (cf. *Old and New in Interpretation: A Study of the Two Testaments*, 1966, 34–64 and 65–102). Clearly not all the OT is historical in its outlook; some of its thought forms have been influenced by Greek thought. Moreover, in Hellenistic times when Hebrew thought came into contact with the Greek world it did not only not lose its historical sense but became even more interested in history.

In the sphere of NT studies Oscar Cullmann has made a major contribution with his stress on salvation history (Ger. *Heilsgeschichte*; cf. *Christ and Time: The Primitive Christian Conception of Time and History*, 1951; *The Christology of the New Testament*, 1959; and *Salvation in History*, 1967; for further discussion of his view → Present, art. *The Parousia and Eschatology in the NT* 1 (e)). Cullmann saw the NT understanding of time as a line formed by the joining together of decisive moments, constituted by the decisive acts of God in time. For Cullmann the eschatological acts of God are not so transcendent as to be hidden from view. They become objective in history, and as such become the object of faith. "Faith means that in humility I turn away from myself and look only to the radiant light of an event in which I am totally uninvolved, so that I can only fall down and worship him who has brought about this event (Rom. 1:21)" (*Salvation in History*, 321).

In the realm of systematic theology Wolfhart Pannenberg has reacted against both the theologies of the word and the more restricted view of salvation history in favour of a universal view of history (cf. *Jesus – God and Man*, 1968; *Basic Questions in Theology*, I–III, 1970–73; W. Pannenberg, ed., *Revelation as History*, 1969; and J. M. Robinson and J. B. Cobb, eds., *Theology as History. New Frontiers in Theology* III, 1967). Within the Bible there is a broadening perspective of history. "It is not so much the course of history as it is the end of history that is at one with the essence of God. But insofar as the end presupposes the course of history, because it is the perfection of it, then also the course of history belongs in essence to the revelation of God, for history receives its unity from its goal" (*Revelation as History*, 133). But this does not mean that we are left completely in the dark about the meaning of history. "With the resurrection of Jesus the end of history has already occurred, although it does not strike us in this way. It is through the resurrection that the God of Israel has substantiated his deity in an ultimate way and is now manifest as the

God of all men. It is only the eschatological character of the Christ event that establishes that there will be no further self-manifestation of God beyond this event. Thus, the end of the world will be on a cosmic scale what has already happened in Christ" (op. cit., 142). Within this framework of universal history "The Word relates itself to revelation as foretelling, forthtelling and report" (op. cit., 152). The events themselves are revelatory and as such are "self-evident" (op. cit., 155). They are capable of being perceived by anyone without special revelation. The word of proclamation merely draws attention to the revelation in the event.

3. *Towards a Synthesis.* (a) The advocates of revelation in history have been accused of imprecision and ambiguity in their attitude to history. For many of them would be unwilling to regard as historical all the events in the Bible which are depicted as historical (cf. J. Barr, "Revelation in History", *IDB Supplementary Volume* 746 f.). Clearly, to regard an event as revelatory does not necessarily imply the suspension of all natural and historical causes. For God can work through them as well as apart from them. The revelation in such a case would consist in God's guidance of the event and in his making it clear by the nature of the event and its interpretation by the accompanying prophetic or apostolic word what its significance is. But it would be impossible to accept as revelation a story that was intended to refer to an event that had happened, if there is no historical basis for the event. This is not to say that the stylistic conventions of historical reporting at any given period are to be taken as a kind of photograph of the event taking place. Rather, the event has to be understood in terms of the form and style of the narrative in the light of the appropriate critical and hermeneutical procedures for understanding the text. But it is not the thought-patterns of ancient Israel which are the true foundation of a biblical theology but the revelation of God in and through them. A study of the thought-patterns alone might conceivably be a matter of antiquarian interest. The resultant theology would give an account of how the Israelites looked at life and history. But as such, it would not amount to revelation. Only if there is an apprehension of the living God in and through these thought-patterns can we speak of revelation. And if the ostensibly historical narratives have no historical basis, the concept of a revelation in history is a contradiction in terms. This is not to say that we must take a pessimistic view of the historicity of the OT and the NT. Rather, the reverse. But the advocates of the idea of biblical revelation must be prepared to defend the historicity of the events recorded in the Bible in the light of all the techniques of modern scholarship.

(b) Conservative scholars in the past have tended to base their case on the formal statements of Scripture itself about Scripture. We have noted already the charge of circularity in the argument and Barth's reply (see above 1 (a)). In the last analysis revelation must be self-authenticating. That is, there cannot be external proofs; it must carry with it its own validation by enabling the recipient of revelation to grasp the truth of the revelation and be grasped by it. On the other hand, the claim to revelation through the assertions of Scripture is, like the concept of historical revelation, open to falsification. If the truth claims of a purported revelation can be shown to be false on a factual level, we can hardly claim it to represent the truth about God and man on any other level.

(c) A view which is sometimes presented as an alternative to propositional revelation is the idea that revelation takes place through symbols and images. This has been argued by Austin Farrer (*The Glass of Vision*, 1948) and E. L. Mascall (*Words*

and Images, 1957; and *Theology and Images*, 1963) within the context of an Anglican theism, and by Paul Tillich (see especially "The Meaning and Justification of Religious Symbols" and "The Religious Symbol" in S. Hook, ed., *Religious Experience and Truth: A Symposium*, 1962, 3–11 and 301–21) in the context of Tillich's anti-theistic view of God as the ground of being or being itself. Basically the symbol has two aspects, the symbolic material, i.e. the ordinary meaning of the word, the empirical reality of the person or object, and that to which this points. Through symbols one is pointed to a reality beyond the immediate empirical and material context and dimensions of reality are opened up which would be otherwise hidden or obscured. Symbols have also an integrating and even a disintegrating power (as in the case of the swastika as a symbol of hate and racism). Examples of biblical symbolism are the lamb of God, light, living water, the shepherd, the king, and the vine. Instances could readily be multiplied. In the thought-world of the Bible we do not remain with these concepts on a literal and empirical level; but neither can we dispense with them. Rather, by apprehending them in the contexts in which they are given we are enabled to grasp something of the reality which they represent. But it would be a mistake to think that images and symbols are simply given apart from any context whatsoever. In fact, they come within the context of history and language, and therefore symbolism is not an alternative to revelation in history and revelation through words but an aspect of both. It is as such that any future doctrine of revelation must take them into account.

(d) In addition to symbolism any future doctrine of biblical revelation must take into account the question of hermeneutics and the function of language in its many forms. (On these subjects see the articles on Explain and Word and the literature referred to there.) In order to penetrate the meaning of an utterance one has to study not only its grammatical and syntactical form; one has also to penetrate the thought-world out of which it comes and relate the utterance and the thought-world to our present-day world. Moreover, it has to be recognized that terms change and develop in meaning within Scripture. It would be an anachronism, for example, to read into the LXX use of *ekklēsia* the later Pauline understanding of "church". On the other hand, our understanding is greatly enriched when we see organic connexions between the uses of words in their various contexts. It has also to be recognized that Scripture does not present us with a single, unified world-view which remains unchanged from Genesis to Revelation. Rather, we are given a series of inter-related world-views which are unified by their relationship to God himself who has spoken to men and dealt with them within concrete historical situations. The Christian view of revelation maintains that the God who spoke and acted then is the same God who speaks and acts now, and that the words, actions and symbolism of the past are media through which God speaks today in our contemporary situation. Without media of some form or other there is no revelation. In this life we do not perceive God directly but only indirectly (1 Cor. 13:12; cf. Matt. 5:8; Exod. 33:20 ff.). Thus there is a sense in which revelation involves a veiling of God in the media of revelation in all their concreteness and historicality in the selfsame act as the unveiling (cf. K. Barth, *CD* I, 1, 188). Our knowledge of God in his revelation of himself depends in part therefore on our understanding of the concrete media of revelation.

Revelation is frequently said to have an objective and a subjective side. The objective side consists of what is revealed: the media of revelation through which God

makes himself known. The subjective side is the activity of God himself in opening man's eyes to see. Paul insists that this is the work of the → Spirit, and without it man cannot come into a personal, saving relationship with God (1 Cor. 2:4–16; 2 Cor. 3:6–4:15; cf. also Eph. 2:18; Matt. 16:17). In these passages Paul makes it plain that without the Spirit one cannot have a true knowledge of either Scripture or Christ.

From the philosophical standpoint of analyzing what happens in the process of understanding, I. T. Ramsey has spoken of "disclosure situations" (cf. *Religious Language: An Empirical Placing of Theological Phrases*, 1957; *Christian Discourse: Some Logical Explorations*, 1965; *Models for Divine Activity* 1973; and *Christian Empiricism*, ed. J. H. Gill, 1974, 59–142). Religious language represents a kind of model which is not identical with God, because of course it operates on the human plane. A model is not the same as the thing which it represents. On the other hand, by understanding it the mind is enabled to grasp something of the reality which it represents. Thus, by grasping the words and images of the revelation one is able to perceive something of the reality of God himself. When this happens a disclosure takes place.

This process does not apply solely to words and symbols; it applies also to history. Strictly speaking, a historical account is not a reconstruction of the original event. For that would strictly involve trying to re-enact the event on the same scale. Rather, the work of the historian (whether it is a matter of primary reporting or critical research) is more akin to that of the model maker who constructs something which is not identical with the original but which enables one to grasp what the original is like. Thus, the biblical historians do not attempt to give every detail. Rather, they give an interpretative picture through which one may grasp the significant activity of God and man. The function of this activity is not simply to provide information, although it does this. It is through the information that the recipient encounters the divine reality in the original event and also interprets his own existence. For the original events and pronouncements serve as paradigms or models for understanding our own situation. Thus, the exodus and exile serve as patterns for understanding the Christian's pilgrim walk (1 Pet. 1:1; 2:11). The priesthood is a model for understanding Christ's priesthood, although he was never technically and formally a priest, and of the believer's access to God (Heb. 9:11 ff.; 1 Pet. 2:9). To make this point is not to say that revelation has ceased at some point in the past. Indeed, there is a sense in which revelation is an on-going process. For in so far as God continues to have dealings with men, this is in fact a revelation of himself. Rather, the revelations of the past serve as paradigms for our understanding of God's dealings with us in the present.

To demand that revelation should be understood in terms of such alternatives as propositional revelation or revelation in history, or a general revelation or revelation through symbols, is to present false antitheses. Since words are part and parcel of history, they cannot be precluded from the concept of revelation in history. Conversely, in so far as the prophetic, dominical and apostolic words give interpretations of God's actions in history, we cannot say that the revelation resides exclusively in propositions. Moreover, language is more than propositions, making factual statements. The → parables, for example, do not function as interesting stories. They are designed to provoke an element of response in which disclosure of truth, personal commitment and encounter with God take place. Similarly, the imperatives of Scrip-

ture invite a response which has both horizontal and vertical dimensions, in that our response to our fellow man also involves our relationship with God (cf. 1 Jn. 4:20). Revelation cannot therefore be reduced simply to the intellectual apprehension of and mental assent to a series of propositions. On the other hand, the assertive element in revelation cannot be ignored either.

The pre-Reformation church made the great mistake of propounding the doctrine of transubstantiation to explain the action of God in the Lord's Supper, claiming that at the moment of consecration the whole substance of the bread and the wine were changed into the whole substance of the body and blood of Christ, although the accidents (the outward appearances) remained. The debate about revelation has tended to make the tacit assumption that a similar change takes place in the media of revelation when God reveals himself either in history or through Scripture as his Word. But in God's actions in history and his dealings with us today there is not necessarily a suspension of natural causes but the working of God in and through them. Similarly, the words of Scripture do not lose their historicality and concreteness, neither do they cease to be human words. They retain their human-ness, and all the specific character of their origins in particular situations at particular points in time. They have to be grasped in the light of grammar, syntax and semantics, history and the conceptual world of their age. And yet at the same time they are the vehicle of God's self-disclosure. It is factors such as these that future doctrines of revelation must take into account. *C. Brown*

→ Explain, → Faith, → Reason, → Scripture, → Truth, → Word

(a). P. J. Achtemeier, *An Introduction to the New Hermeneutic*, 1969; K. Aland, *The Problem of the New Testament Canon*, 1962; B. Albrektson, *History and the Gods*, 1967; R. G. Alexander, "On the Language of the New Hermeneuticians", *Lutheran Quarterly* 20, 1968, 52–60; P. Althaus, *Fact and Faith in the Kerygma Today*, 1960; J. Baillie, *Our Knowledge of God*, 1939; and *The Idea of Revelation in Recent Thought*, 1956; J. Baillie and H. Martin, eds., *Revelation*, 1927; J. Barr, *The Semantics of Biblical Language*, 1961; *Old and New in Interpretation*, 1966; *The Bible in the Modern World*, 1973; "Revelation through History in the Old Testament and in Modern Theology", *Princeton Seminary Bulletin* 56, 1963, 4–14; "Jewish Apocalyptic in Recent Scholarly Study", *BJRL* 58, 1975, 9–35; "Revelation in History", *IDB Supplementary Volume*, 1976, 746–49; and *Fundamentalism*, 1977; K. Barth, *Church Dogmatics* I, *The Doctrine of the Word of God*, Part 1 1975 [2], Part 2 1956; H. W. Bartsch, ed., *Kerygma and Myth*, combined volume 1972; W. Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*, 1971; H. Bavinck, *The Philosophy of Revelation*, Stone Lectures 1908–9, 1953; G. R. Beasley-Murray, "New Testament Apocalyptic – A Christological Eschatology", *Review and Expositor* 72, 1975, 317–23; R. Bertalot, "Revelation and Manifestation", *SJT* 15, 1962, 44–49; D. M. Beegle, *The Inspiration of Scripture*, 1963; G. C. Berkouwer, *General Revelation*, 1955; and *Holy Scripture*, 1975; E. Bevan, *Symbolism and Belief*, 1938; J. G. Bishop, "Psychological Insights in St Paul's Mysticism", *Theology* 78, 1975, 318–24; R. A. Bohlmann, *Principles of Biblical Interpretation in the Lutheran Confessions*, 1968; T. Boman, *Hebrew Thought Compared with Greek*, 1960; C. E. Braaten, *History and Hermeneutics*, 1966; J. Bright, *The Authority of the Old Testament*, 1967; G. Bornkamm, "The Revelation of God's Wrath (Romans 1–3)", in *Early Christian Experience*, 1969, 47–70; C. E. Braaten, *History and Hermeneutics*, 1966; C. Brown, *Karl Barth and the Christian Message*, 1967; C. Brown, ed., *History, Criticism and Faith: Four Exploratory Studies*, 1976; *Philosophy and the Christian Faith*, 1974[2]; and "Bultmann Revisited", *The Churchman* 88, 1974, 167–87; N. Brox, "Revelation", *EBT* II 770–75; F. F. Bruce, *The New Testament Documents. Are they Reliable?* 1960[5]; *Tradition Old and New*, 1970; "A Reappraisal of Jewish Apocalyptic Literature", *Review and Expositor* 72, 1975, 305–15; and "Was Paul a Mystic?", *Reformed Theological Review* 34, 1975, 66–75; F. F. Bruce and E. G. Rupp, eds., *Holy Book and Holy Tradition*, 1968; E. Brunner, *The Word and the World*, 1931; *Revelation and Reason: The Christian Doctrine of Faith and Knowledge*, 1947; *Truth as Encounter: A New Edition, Much Enlarged, of The Divine-Human Encounter*, 1964;

and with K. Barth, *Natural Theology: Comprising 'Nature and Grace' by Professor Emil Brunner and the Reply 'No!' by Dr. Karl Barth*, 1946; R. Bryant, *The Bible's Authority Today*, 1968; R. Bultmann, *Jesus and the Word*, 1935; *Jesus Christ and Mythology*, 1960; *Theology of the New Testament*, I–II, 1952–55; *The Gospel of John*, 1971; *Existence and Faith*, (1961) 1964, see especially the essay on "The Concept of Revelation in the New Testament", (1920) 67–106; *Essays Philosophical and Theological*, 1955; *History and Eschatology*, 1962; and *Faith and Understanding: Collected Essays*, 1969; *dēloō*, *TDNT* II 61 f.; R. Bultmann and D. Lührmann, *phainō* etc., *TDNT* IX 1–10; J. Burnaby, *In What Sense is the Bible Inspired?*, 1960; J. T. Burtchaell, *Catholic Theories of Inspiration since 1810*, 1969; F. W. Camfield, *Revelation and the Holy Spirit: An Essay in Barthian Theology*, 1933; H. von Campenhausen, *The Formation of the Christian Bible*, 1972; B. S. Childs, *Biblical Theology in Crisis*, 1970; G. H. Clark, *Religion, Reason and Revelation*, 1961; G. Cope, *Symbolism in the Bible and in the Church*, 1959; O. Cullmann, *Christ and Time: The Primitive Christian Conception of Time and History*, (1951) 1964[3]; "The Tradition", in *The Early Church*, 1956, 59–105; *The Christology of the New Testament*, 1959; and *Salvation in History*, 1967; R. E. Davies, *The Problem of Authority in the Continental Reformers*, 1946; and *Religious Authority in an Age of Doubt*, 1968; W. D. Davies, *Christian Origins and Judaism*, 1962; M. Dibelius and H. Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles, Hermeneia*, 1972; H. Diem, *Dogmatics*, 1959; F. W. Dillistone, ed., *Myth and Symbol, SPCK Theological Collections* 7, 1966; C. H. Dodd, *The Authority of the Bible*, 1935; *According to the Scriptures*, 1952; and *The Bible and the Greeks*, 1954; F. G. Downing, "Revelation in the New Testament and among its Expounders", *StudEv* II (*TU* 87) 183 ff.; and *Has Christianity a Revelation?*, 1964; G. Ebeling, *The Nature of Faith*, 1961; *The Problem of Historicity*, 1967; *Theology and Proclamation*, 1966; and *Word and Faith*, 1963; E. E. Ellis, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament*, 1957; and "The Authority of the Bible: Critical Judgments in Biblical Perspective", *EQ* 39, 1967, 196–204; C. F. Evans, *Is 'Holy Scripture' Christian? and Other Questions*, 1971; D. D. Evans, *The Logic of Self-Involvement*, 1963; A. M. Fairweather, *The Word as Truth: A Critical Examination of the Christian Doctrine of Revelation in the Writings of Thomas Aquinas and Karl Barth*, 1944; H. H. Farmer, *Revelation and Religion: Studies in the Theological Interpretation of Religious Types*, 1954; A. Farrer, *A Rebirth of Images: The Making of St John's Apocalypse*, 1949; G. Florovsky, *Bible, Church, Tradition: An Eastern Orthodox View*, 1972; R. T. France, *Jesus and the Old Testament: His Application of Old Testament Passages to Himself and His Mission*, 1971; H. W. Frei, *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative*, 1974; and *The Identity of Jesus Christ*, 1975; C. J. Friedrich, Jr., ed., *Authority*, 1958; E. C. Fudge, "Language, Revelation and Illumination", *SJT* 26, 1973, 1–23; D. P. Fuller, *Easter Faith and History*, 1965; R. W. Funk, *Language, Hermeneutic and the Word of God*, 1966; L. Gaussen, *Theopneustia*, 1840; L. D. Gilkey, "Cosmology, Ontology and the Travail of Biblical Language", *JR* 41, 1961, 194–205; *Naming the Whirlwind: The Renewal of God-Language*, 1969; A. Galloway, *Wolfhart Pannenberg*, 1973; C. Gore, "The Holy Spirit and Inspiration", in C. Gore, ed., *Lux Mundi: A Series of Studies in the Religion of the Incarnation*, 1889, 313–62; and *The Doctrine of the Infallible Book*, 1924; P. D. Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic*, 1975; P. Helm, "Revealed Propositions and Timeless Truths", *Religious Studies* 8, 1972, 127–36; and *The Varieties of Belief*, 1973; C. F. H. Henry, *God, Revelation and Authority*, I–IV, 1976–; C. F. H. Henry, ed., *Revelation and the Bible*, 1958; L. Hodgson et al., *On the Authority of the Bible*, 1960; S. Hook, ed., *Religious Experience and Truth: A Symposium*, 1962; D. Jenkins, *Tradition and Spirit*, 1951; J. Jeremias, *The Problem of the Historical Jesus, Facet Books*, 1964; P. K. Jewett, *Emil Brunner's Concept of Revelation*, 1954; F. E. Johnson, *Religious Symbolism*, 1955; E. Käsemann, "The New Testament Canon and the Unity of the Church", in *Essays on New Testament Themes, SBT* 41, 1964, 95–107; C. W. Kegley, ed., *The Theology of Emil Brunner*, 1962; and *The Theology of Rudolf Bultmann*, 1966; C. W. Kegley and R. W. Bretall, eds., *The Theology of Paul Tillich*, 1966; D. H. Kelsey, *The Uses of Scripture in Recent Theology*, 1975; S. Kierkegaard, *On Authority and Revelation*, 1966; K. Koch, *The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic, SBT* Second Series 22, 1972; W. G. Kümmel, *The New Testament: The History of the Investigation of its Problems*, 1972; G. E. Ladd, *The New Testament and Criticism*, 1967; and "Revelation and Tradition in Paul", in W. W. Gasque and R. P. Martin, eds., *Apostolic History and the Gospel: Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F. F. Bruce*, 1970, 223–30; R. B. Laurin, ed., *Contemporary Old Testament Theologians*, 1970; A. L. Lilley, *Religion and Revelation*, 1932; H. Lindsell, *The Battle for the Bible*, 1976; R. N. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*, 1975; H. D. McDonald, *Ideas of Revelation: An Historical Study A.D. 1700 to A.D. 1860*, 1959; and *Theories of Revelation: An Historical Study 1860–1960*, 1963; J. G. Machen, *Christianity and Liberalism*, 1923; R. A. F. MacKenzie, *Faith and History in the Old Testament*, 1963; J. Macquarrie, *Principles of Christian*

Theology, 1966; I. H. Marshall, ed., *New Testament Interpretation*, 1977; E. L. Mascall, *Words and Images*, 1957; and *Theology and Images*, 1963; J. Moltmann, "Eschatology and Revelation", in *Theology of Hope: On the Ground and Implications of a Christian Eschatology*, 1967, 37–94; J. W. Montgomery, ed., *Crisis in Lutheran Theology*, I–II, 1967; and *God's Inerrant Word: An International Symposium on the Trustworthiness of Scripture*, 1974; G. Moran, *Theology of Revelation*, 1967; and *God Still Speaks: The Basis of Christian Education*, 1967; J. Moreau, *Language and Religious Language*, 1961; L. Morris, *I Believe in Revelation*, 1976; P. Munz, *Problems of Religious Knowledge*, 1959; S. Neill, *The Interpretation of the New Testament, 1861–1961*, 1964; H. R. Niebuhr, *The Meaning of Revelation*, 1960; A. Oepke, *apokalyptō, apokalypsis*, *TDNT* III 563–92; J. Orr, *Revelation and Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament*, 1946; H. W. Robinson, ed., *Record and Revelation, God and Man*, 1968; *Basic Questions in Theology*, I–III, 1970–73; *Theology and the Philosophy of Science*, 1976; W. Pannenberg, ed., *Revelation as History*, 1969; C. H. Pinnock, *Biblical Revelation – The Foundation of Christian Theology*, 1971; R. Preus, *The Inspiration of Scripture: A Study of the Theology of the Seventeenth Century Lutheran Dogmaticians*, 1957[2]; G. von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, I–II, 1962–65; K. Rahner, *Inspiration in the Bible*, 1964; K. Rahner and J. Ratzinger, *Revelation and Tradition*, 1966; B. Ramm, *Special Revelation and the Word of God*, 1961; J. K. S. Reid, *The Authority of Scripture: A Study of the Reformation and Post-Reformation Understanding of the Bible*, 1957; A. Richardson, *A Preface to Bible Study*, 1954; *The Bible in the Age of Science*, 1961; *History – Sacred and Profane*, 1964; A. Richardson and W. Schweitzer, eds., *Biblical Authority for Today*, 1951; H. W. Robinson, *Redemption and Revelation in the Actuality of History*, 1942; and *Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament*, 1946; H. W. Robinson, ed., *Record and Revelation*, 1938; J. M. Robinson and J. Cobb, eds., *The Later Heidegger and Theology. New Frontiers in Theology* I, 1963; and *Theology as History. New Frontiers in Theology* III, 1967; H. H. Rowley, *The Relevance of Apocalyptic: A Study of Jewish and Christian Apocalypses from Daniel to the Revelation*, 1944; and *The Unity of the Bible*, 1957; K. Runia, *Karl Barth's Doctrine of Holy Scripture*, 1962; E. F. Scott, *The New Testament Idea of Revelation*, 1935; W. Sanday, *The Oracles of God*, 1891; and *Inspiration*, 1896; J. Sanders, *Torah and Canon*, 1972; E. Schillebeeckx, *Revelation and Theology*, 1967; A. Schweitzer, *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*, 1931; W. Schmithals, *An Introduction to the Theology of Rudolf Bultmann*, 1968; J. Smart, *The Interpretation of Scripture*, 1961; H. P. Smith, *Inspiration and Inerrancy*, 1893; A. Snell, *Truth in Words*, 1965; D. G. Spriggs, *Two Old Testament Theologies: A Comparative Evaluation of the Contributions of Eichrodt and von Rad to our Understanding of the Nature of Old Testament Theology*, *SBT* 30, 1975; N. B. Stonehouse and P. Woolley, eds., *The Infallible Word*, 1946; A. Sundberg, *The Old Testament of the Early Church*, 1964; L. J. Swindler, ed., *Scripture and Ecumenism*, 1965; G. H. Tavard, *Holy Writ or Holy Church: The Crisis of the Protestant Reformation*, 1959; M. C. Tenney, ed., *The Bible – The Living Word of Revelation*, 1968; A. C. Thiselton, "The Parables as Language-Event. Some Comments on Fuchs's Hermeneutics in the Light of Linguistic Philosophy", SJT 23, 1970, 437–68; "The Use of Philosophical Categories in New Testament Hermeneutics", *The Churchman* 87, 1973, 87–100; "The Theology of Paul Tillich", *The Churchman* 88, 1974, 86–107; "Kierkegaard and the Nature of Truth", *The Churchman* 89, 1975, 85–107; "The New Hermeneutic", in I. H. Marshall, op. cit., 308–33; and *New Testament Hermeneutics and Philosophical Description: Issues in New Testament Hermeneutics with Special Reference to the Use of Philosophical Description in Heidegger, Bultmann, Gadamer and Wittgenstein* (Dissertation, Sheffield), 1976; L. S. Thornton, *Revelation and the Modern World, Being the First Part of a Treatise on the Form of a Servant*, 1950; P. Tillich, "The Meaning and Justification of Religious Symbols" and "The Religious Symbol", in S. Hook, ed., op. cit., 3–11 and 301–21; and *Systematic Theology*, I, 1953; J. G. S. S. Thomson, *The Old Testament View of Revelation*, 1960; E. F. Tupper, *The Theology of Wolfhart Pannenberg*, 1974; H. E. W. Turner, *The Pattern of Christian Truth*, 1954; J. H. Walgrave, *Unfolding Revelation: The Nature of Doctrinal Development*, 1972; H. Wansbrough, *Event and Interpretation*, 1973; J. F. Walvoord, ed., *Inspiration and Interpretation*, 1957; B. B. Warfield, *The Inspiration and Authority of the Bible*, 1948; J. W. Wenham, *Christ and the Bible*, 1972; G. E. Wright, *The Old Testament against its Environment*, *SBT* 2, 1950; *God Who Acts: Biblical Theology as Recital*, *SBT* 8, 1952; and *The Old Testament and Theology*, 1969; E. J. Young, *Thy Word is Truth*, 1950.

(b). M. Albertz, *Die Botschaft des Neuen Testaments*, I, 1947, 16 ff.; P. Althaus, "Offenbarung als Geschichte und Glaube", *TLZ* 87, 1962, 321 ff.; F. Baumgärtel, "Das Offenbarungszeugnis des Alten Testaments im Lichte der religionsgeschichtlich-vergleichenden Forschung", *ZTK* 64, 1967, 393 ff.; A. Bea, *De Inspiratione et Inerrantia Sacrae Scripturae*, 1954; H. Benkert, "Offenbarung", *EKL* II 1652

ff.; O. Betz, *Offenbarung und Schriftforschung in der Qumransekte*, 1960; H. Diem, *Das Problem des Schriftkanons*, 1952; and *Was heisst Schriftgemäss?*, 1958; U. Duchrow, "Die Klarheit der Schrift und die Vernunft", *KuD* 15, 1969, 1–17; C. M. Edsman, W. Eichrodt, E. L. Dietrich, L. Richter, G. Gloege, "Offenbarung", *RGG*^{3} IV 1597 ff.; H. Fries, "Offenbarung", *LTK* VIII 1106 ff.; G. Gloege, "Offenbarung und Überlieferung", *TLZ* 79, 1954, 213 ff., H. Gollwitzer, *Gottes Offenbarung und unsere Vorstellung von Gott*, 1965^3; M. Haag, " 'Offenbarung' in der hebräischen Bibel", *ThZ* 16, 1960, 251 ff.; H. H. Huber, *Der Begriff der Offenbarung im Johannesevangelium* 1934; Jörg Jeremias, *Theophanie. Die Geschichte einer alttestamentlichen Gattung*, 1965; H. Kahlefeld, *Die Epiphanie des Erlösers im Johannesevangelium*, 1954; D. Lührmann, *Das Offenbarungsverständnis bei Paulus und in paulinischen Gemeinden*, *WMANT* 16, 1965; W. Mundle, "Das Problem der Offenbarung bei Paulus", *Deutsches Pfarrerblatt*, 1938, 567 ff.; and "Jesus Christus, die Mitte des neutestamentlichen Zeugnisses von der Offenbarung", *Lutherischer Rundblick* 12, 1964, 114 ff.; R. Rendtorff, "Geschichte und Wort im Alten Testament", *EvTh* 22, 1962, 621 ff.; W. Schmauch, *Orte der Offenbarung und der Offenbarungsort im Neuen Testament*, 1956; R. Schnackenburg, "Zum Offenbarungsgedanken in der Bibel", *BZ* Neue Folge 7, 1963, 1 ff.; H. Schulte, *Der Begriff der Offenbarung im Neuen Testament*, *EvTh* Beihefte 13, 1949; W. Zimmerli, " 'Offenbarung' im Alten Testament", *EvTh* 22, 1962, 15 ff.

Revile, Blaspheme, Slander

The use of speech gives us a certain control over objects. Words produce concepts of the things to which they refer and are thus important, in affecting our relationship with things. For this reason the word came, in the thought of primitive peoples, to be invested with magical powers, since it could, as it were, conjure up or alter the object named. This fact enables us to understand the original meaning and function of abuse, slander and calumny (→ Curse). In the NT, a whole range of terms is found which seem in part to be synonymous, but which, on closer examination, reveal different emphases. The strongest form of calumny, which is very near to a curse, is expressed by the words of the *blasphēmeō* group. In the NT, this group of words almost always refers directly or indirectly to an attitude towards God. *katalaleō*, on the other hand, means to slander; it denotes a hostile attitude towards a fellow man. The words of the *loidoreō* group are not religious in origin, and mean rather to abuse (probably, at first, to make fun of). In some passages the meaning is close to that of *blasphēmeō*.

Certain other terms should be mentioned, which belong to this category, but are not treated in separate articles. *oneidizō* and *oneidismos* refer to a reproach thrown against someone (originally against the gods!). In the NT, for instance, Jesus reproached or upbraided the cities of Galilee (Matt. 27:44 par. Matt. 11:20); but the same word refers to the reviling of Jesus (Mk. 15:32) and his disciples (Matt. 5:11; Lk. 6:22; cf. 1 Pet. 4:14). In the longer ending of Mk. Jesus upbraided the unbelief of the eleven (Mk. 16:14). On Heb. 11:26 and Rom. 15:3 (cf. 1 Tim. 3:7) → Possessions, art. *thēsauros* NT 3. The vb. also occurs at Jas. 1:5 and the noun at 1 Tim. 3:7; Heb. 10:33; 13:13. *oneidos*, reproach, insult, disgrace occurs only at Lk. 1:25 (cf. Gen. 30:23; Isa. 4:1), of Elizabeth's joy at being pregnant, the Lord having taken away the disgrace of being childless. In Matt. 5:11 and Lk. 6:22 the meaning of *oneidizō* comes near to that of *empaizō*, which originally meant to behave childishly, to make fun of, and then to ridicule. *empaizō*, ridicule, make fun of, mock, occurs only in the Synoptic Gospels, and in 11 out of 13 instances refers to the mocking of Jesus during his passion (Matt. 20:19 par. Mk. 10:34, Lk. 18:32; Matt. 27:29, 31, 41

par. Mk. 15:20, 31; Lk. 22:63; 23:11, 36). In Lk. 14:29 it occurs in the parable of the tower of those who mock the man's inability to complete it. But in Matt. 2:16 it means to deceive or trick, of Herod by the magi. 2 Pet. 3:3 sees *empaigmonē*, mocking, i.e. mockers, or scoffing as a sign of the last days. Luke uses *ekmyktērizō*, ridicule, sneer, instead (Lk. 16:14; 23:35). Ridicule is here the rejection, in foolish arrogance, of the bearer of revelation. *myktērizō* (have a nose bleed) means to turn up the nose at, treat with contempt. It occurs at Lk. 23:35 D, and in the pass. of God who is not mocked (Gal. 6:7; cf. Jer. 20:7, of the prophet).

βλασφημέω

βλασφημέω (*blasphēmeō*), slander, defame, blaspheme; *βλασφημία* (*blasphēmia*), slander, defamation, blasphemy; *βλάσφημος* (*blasphēmos*), slanderous, blasphemous, a blasphemer.

CL *blasphēmeō* (Plato onwards) is simplified from *blaps(i)phēmeō*, speak harm, being derived from *blapsis* (cf. *blaptō*), harm, and *phēmi*, speak, and means generally to bring into ill repute, slander, blaspheme. *blasphēmia* (a noun of action) means profane language, slanderous speech, or slander, defamation, by which another person is damaged. *blasphēmos* expresses the quality of the action or the doer. Like *empaizō*, *loidoreō*, *myktērizō*, and *oneidizō*, *blasphēmeō* expresses the slandering of a person; it is the strongest expression of personal defamation.

In cl. Gk. false representations of the deity, for instance in anthropomorphic terms, can be described as blasphemy (e.g. in Plato, *Rep.* 2 381e; Vettius Valens 58:12; 67:20); so too can doubts about the authority of the deity (cf. H. W. Beyer, *TDNT* I 621).

OT These words appear relatively seldom in the LXX (22 times, predominantly in 2 Macc.), and, where there is a basis in the MT, without any consistent Heb. equivalent. *blasphēmeō*, *blasphēmia* and *blasphēmos* are always in the LXX either directly or indirectly against the majesty of God; and, with a few exceptions, (*blasphēmos* in Isa. 66:3 for *nā'aṣ*, contemn, spurn; Wis. 1:6; Sir. 3:16), they refer to the reviling of the people of Israel by heathen enemies. Thus in a comparison with the king of Assyria, Yahweh is written off as powerless, "reviled" (2 Ki. 19:4 [*yāḵaḥ*, rebuke], 6, 22 [*gādap̄*, revile, blaspheme]); when Israel is under attack, Yahweh is blasphemed against (2 Macc. 8:4; 9:28; 10:4, 34); the Edomites rejoice over the fall of Jerusalem and in so doing blaspheme against Yahweh (Ezek. 35:12 f. [LXX *blasphēmia*; MT *ne'āṣâh*, contempt]). In Isa. 52:5 (*nā'aṣ*) the lament of the rulers over the continual despising of God's name through the exile is the basis for Yahweh's saving intervention (cf. v. 6). The God of Israel is not as a rule a source of hope and help, or even of fear, for the heathen; and this fact alone is enough to earn them the title in general of blasphemers (*blasphēmia*, Dan. 3:29[96] Theodotion, Aram. *šālâh* or *šālû*). The LXX clearly reinterprets Lev. 24:16 in a Judaistic sense (cf. Sanhedrin 7:5): "He who blasphemes the name of the LORD [*onomazōn to onoma kyriou*; lit. "names the name of the LORD] shall be put to death" (Lev. 24:16). The MT has *nāqaḇ*, curse. Even to name the → name of Yahweh is blasphemy, since the Name of Yahweh may not be pronounced at all (→ God, art. *theos* OT 2). This does not apply to blasphemy by Israelites only (which is hedged about with the most

various stipulations), but also to blasphemy uttered by heathen, which may be requited by God with death (cf. 2 Ki. 19:6 *blasphēmeō*; 2 Macc. 9:28 *blasphēmos*). In Judaism the religious use of the words, as in the LXX, is in the main retained. Other instances are: *blasphēmeō* (Tob. 1:18 *v.l.*; Add. Dan. Bel Theodotion 9); *blasphēmia* (Tob. 1:18; 1 Macc. 2:6; 2 Macc. 10:35; 15:24); *blasphēmos* (2 Macc. 9:28; 10:4).

The concept is sometimes found in the OT even where the technical terms for blasphemy are lacking. It is blasphemy to make use of the name of God for evil ends such as magic and unlawful cursing: "You shall not take the name of the LORD your God in vain; for the LORD will not hold him guiltless that takes his name in vain" (Exod. 20:7; cf. Deut. 5:11). Similarly the king or priest was not to bring discredit upon his sacred office (1 Sam. 3:13; 2 Sam. 12:14), oppose God's chosen (Num. 16:30), break the covenant (Deut. 31:20; Isa. 1:4), or doubt Yahweh's power either in judgment or salvation (Num. 14:11, 23; 20:10 ff.; 2 Ki. 18:30–35; 19:4, 6, 22; 2 Chr. 32:13 ff.; Isa. 5:24; 10:8 ff.; 36:18 ff.; 37:10 ff.). Blasphemy is closely linked with cursing. Job's wife and Satan expected Job to curse God and thus blaspheme (Job 1:11; 2:5, 9). On the other hand, his friends regarded his protestations of innocence as blasphemy (Job 15:2–6; 34:35 ff.). To mock or oppose God's people is blasphemy (Isa. 52:5; Ezek. 35:12 f.; cf. 1 Macc. 2:6; 2 Macc. 8:4; 10:34; 12:14; 15:24).

These are numerous passages in which the innocent appear to reproach Yahweh, but this is not regarded as blasphemy. It is more like a confession of faith expressing utter dependence on him to act (Exod. 5:22; Num. 11:11 ff.; Jos. 7:7; Isa. 38:13; Jer. 12:1–5; 15:16–21; 20:7–10; Lam. 3:10 f.; Job 9:12–20; 19:6–21; 30:18–23; 38:2; 40:2, 8). On the other hand, genuine blasphemy is a transgression which merits death and is punished by human judges (Lev. 24:10–16; 1 Ki. 21:13) or by God himself (Exod. 20:7; Num. 16:30; Deut. 5:11; 1 Sam. 4:11; 2 Ki. 19:7; 2 Chr. 32:21; Isa. 37:36 ff.; 2 Macc. 9:4, 12, 38). The forms of the penalties suggest the extermination of the guilty party.

NT Words of the *blasphēmeō* group are found in the NT altogether 56 times (the vb. alone 34 times), without any special concentration in any of the NT books. As in the OT and in Rab. Judaism (cf. SB I 1009 f.), the terms are used in the NT in a religious sense, i.e. with direct or indirect reference to God (with the exception of Jude 9). Blasphemy against God amounts to words or conduct injurious to God's honour and holiness.

1. This sin against God's majesty can consist of blasphemy against God himself (Acts 6:11; Rev. 13:6; 16:11, 21 → Animal, art. *thērion*), against his → name (Rom. 2:24; 1 Tim. 6:1; Rev. 16:9, where the name is a circumlocution for God himself), against the → word of God (Tit. 2:5), or against God's → angels (2 Pet:10 ff.).

Since Jesus claims for his words and actions messianic authority, and at the same time assumes rights and powers (e.g. to forgive sins, Lk. 5:21), which in the view of the religious Jews and scribes belong to God alone, he is regarded in these circles as a blasphemer (Matt. 9:3 par. Mk. 2:7; Jn. 10:36). The sentence of death against him is therefore based, among other things, on a charge of blasphemy (Matt. 26:65 par Mk. 14:64). In 1st century Judaism, blasphemy was still an offence deserving death (cf. SB I 1009 ff. on Exod. 22:27 and Num. 15:30 f.). According to Sanhedrin 7:5, the blasphemer is not culpable unless he pronounces the divine name itself (cf. Lev.

24:10 ff.); the judges were to rend their garments on hearing the evidence. The *egō eimi* ("I am") of Jesus has been understood by some scholars to be a claim to the divine name, implying that Jesus was guilty in Jewish eyes of the crime in Sanhedrin 7:5 (for literature and discussion see D. R. Catchpole, *The Trial of Jesus: A Study in the Gospels and Jewish Historiography from A.D. 1770 to the Present Day*, 1971, 132 ff.; J. C. O'Neill, "The Charge of Blasphemy at Jesus' Trial before the Sanhedrin", in E. Bammel, ed., *The Trial of Jesus*, *SBT* Second Series 13, 1970, 72–77).

2. From the NT point of view, the real blasphemers are those who deny the messianic claims of Jesus, and therefore revile and mock at him like those by the cross who said, "You who would destroy the temple and build it in three days, save yourself! If you are the Son of God, come down from the cross" (Matt. 27:39 f. par. Mk. 15:29; Lk. 22:65; cf. Matt. 26:61; Mk. 13:2; 14:58; Jn. 2:19; Acts 6:14). He who impugns the dignity of the one sent commits an offence against God himself.

3. Since, however, the church of Christ and its members bear witness by their existence to Christ himself, they also undergo the abuse which is directed against their Lord (1 Pet. 4:4; Rev. 2:9). Thus Paul must suffer as Christ's disciple (Acts 13:45; 18:6) what he previously inflicted on the Christians as their persecutor (1 Tim. 1:13). To revile the church which bears Christ's name, can be to mock Christ and thus, indirectly, to blaspheme against God.

4. Christians for their part must take care that they do not, by their own conduct, give cause for blasphemy against God or against his word (1 Tim. 6:1; Tit. 2:5). Indeed, the behaviour of Christ's disciples (even towards each other) should contribute to the glory of the Father (Matt. 5:16). This is probably the sense in which we should interpret the lists of → sins, in which we repeatedly find prohibitions of blasphemy (cf. Eph. 4:31; Col. 3:8; 1 Tim. 6:4; 2 Tim. 3:2). The disciple is not "to deny ... the presence of the Spirit by his life" (H. Conzelmann, *NTD* 8, 82); therefore he is given in these lists of sins explicit instructions about his conduct. Blasphemy is mentioned in them, as being a characteristic of the heathen and of apostate Christians. By contrast Rom. 2:24 adapts Isa. 52:5 LXX (cf. 2 Pet. 2:2). The MT of Isa. 52:5 refers to the reviling of God's name by the oppressors of Israel. The LXX interpretation lays the cause for this with Israel himself.

5. Even the sin of blasphemy can be forgiven (Matt. 12:31 par. Mk. 3:28; Lk. 12:10), including (according to Matt. and Lk.) blasphemy against the Son of man. Only blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is unforgivable (Matt. 12:32 par Mk. 3:29, Lk. 12:10). This statement has been the subject of much questioning. Obviously the reference here is not to the naming of the Holy Spirit in a blasphemous utterance, for in Matt. 12:32 even blasphemy against the Son of man can be forgiven. Among the many attempts at exegesis, the most convincing is the suggestion that the man who blasphemes against the Holy Spirit is he who has recognized that God is working through the Holy Spirit in the actions of Jesus, and who quite consciously "misrepresent faith in God as faith in the devil. This saying is an extremely serious warning against the demonic and scarcely conceivable potential in man: To declare war on God. This is not done in weakness and doubt, but by one who has been overcome by the Holy Spirit and who knows very well on whom he is declaring war" (E. Schweizer, *The Good News according to Mark*, 1971, 87; cf. H. W. Beyer, *TDNT* I 624; O. E. Evans, "The Unforgivable Sin", *ExpT* 68, 1956–57, 240–44). This is the

blasphemer who does it deliberately, after encounter with the God of grace, as the context shows (→ Satan, art. *Beelzeboul*). For Jesus has just been accused of casting out demons by Beelzebul, the prince of demons. "Therefore he who blasphemes the Spirit is no longer speaking against a God who is distant, about whom he entertains mere foolish thoughts, but against the one who makes evident to him his gracious work, and confirms it with his manifest, divine seal. He is a man who ought to give thanks, not to blaspheme" (A. Schlatter, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus, Erläuterungen zum Neuen Testament* I, 1962, on Matt. 12:32).

W. L. Lane draws attention to Sifre on Deut. 32:38 (end): "The Holy One, blessed be he, pardons everything else, but on profanation of the Name [i.e. blasphemy] he takes vengeance immediately" (*The Gospel of Mark, NLC*, 1974, 145; cf. M. Smith, *Tannaitic Parallels to the Gospels*, 1951, 48 f.; E. Lövestam, *Spiritus Blasphemia. Eine Studie zu Mk 3, 28 f. par.*, 1968). Lane goes on to comment: "This is the danger to which the scribes exposed themselves when they attributed to the agency of Satan the redemption brought by Jesus. The expulsion of demons was a sign of the intrusion of the Kingdom of God. Yet the scribal accusations against Jesus amount to a denial of the power and greatness of the Spirit of God. By assigning the action of Jesus to a demonic origin the scribes betray a perversion of spirit which, in defiance of the truth, chooses to call light darkness. In this historical context, blasphemy against the Holy Spirit denotes the conscious and deliberate rejection of the saving power and grace of God released through Jesus' word and act" (ibid.). Thus blasphemy here is much more serious than the taking of the divine name in vain which a believer may have done before coming to repentance and faith. It may be said to those who have been tormented by fear that they have committed the unforgivable sin that their concern is itself a sign that they have not committed the sin envisaged in Jesus' teaching here. Lane's interpretation also helps to explain the distinction drawn between blasphemy against the Son of man and blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. The distinction suggests that "while an attack on Jesus' own person, as Son of Man and therefore 'hidden', is pardonable, any speaking against the *power* by which he works (i.e. the divine endowment for his messianic ministry) will not be pardoned" (D. Hill, *The Gospel of Matthew, New Century Bible*, 1972, 218). For such an action would be deliberately to attribute to Satan the action of God himself.

This interpretation fits the historical context of the Gospels themselves much better than to posit a situation which reflects the Spirit-filled community, in which to speak against the Spirit after → Pentecost is unpardonable whereas to speak against Jesus as the messiah before it was pardonable (cf. K. Stendahl, in *Peake's Commentary on the Bible*, ed. M. Black and H. H. Rowley, 1962, 785).

6. Another passage which is the subject of debate is Jude 9: "But when the archangel Michael, contending with the devil, disputed about the body of Moses, he did not presume to pronounce a reviling judgment on him [*ouk etolmēsen krisin epenenkein blasphēmias*], but said, 'The Lord rebuke you [*epitimēsai soi Kyrios*].' " The false teachers are compared with the men of Sodom and Gomorrah (v. 7), and are accused of defiling the flesh, rejecting authority (*kyriotēta*; cf. the use of *Kyrios* in v. 9) and reviling the glorious ones or glories (*doxas de blasphēmousin*) (v. 8). The latter are probably angels (cf. J. N. D. Kelly, *The Epistles of Peter and of Jude, BNTC*, 1969, 263 f., who notes that according to Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1, 25, 1 f., certain gnostics despised angels as the agents of the inferior creator-God who brought the

universe into being, though there are no grounds for seeing such views here). On the agency of → angels see Acts 7:53 and Gal. 3:19, and on Michael → Angel, art. *Michaēl*. The story alluded to here does not appear in the OT which merely records that "he [i.e. Yahweh] buried him [i.e. Moses] in the valley of the land of Moab opposite Beth-peor" (Deut. 34:6). Kelly notes that the LXX tried to eliminate the offensive anthropomorphism by changing the vb. to the plur. "they buried" (op. cit., 265). However, Philo records that "immortal angelic powers buried him" (*Vit. Mos.* 2, 291). Several early Christian writers attribute Jude's account to the Assumption of Moses, a Pharisaic work of the early 1st cent. which was soon translated into Gk. (Clement of Alexandria, *Adumb. in ep. Iud.*; Origen, *De prin.* 3, 2, 1; Didymus of Alexandria, *In ep. Iud. enarr.*; Gelasius of Cyzicus, *Hist. Eccl.* 2, 20, 7). But this story is missing from the Lat. fragment that has survived.

Kelly thinks that *krisin . . . blasphēmias* is best translated as "a reviling judgment" rather than "a judgment on his reviling", as this would fit the context better. The archangel was deputed to bury the body of → Moses, though Satan did his best to prevent him, claiming as lord of the material order that the body was his, and threatening to accuse Moses of murdering the Egyptian (cf. Exod. 2:12). The point of the observation is that even the archangel Michael did not respond with like reviling but committed the responsibility for rebuking Satan to God, using an imprecation found in Zech. 3:2. Perhaps we may see in the background the old conception that man should beware, as in making a → curse, so also in reviling, of challenging a power too great for him to cope with. The text goes on to say "But these men revile whatever they do not understand, and by those things that they know by instinct as irrational animals do, they are destroyed" (Jude 10; cf. 1 Cor. 2:7–16). There is in the passage the implication that the unspiritual not only fail to understand but even blaspheme God in the process. Thus the sense may be comparable with that in the Synoptic Gospels (see 5, above). On the other hand, there may also be the sense in which the believer should leave judgment to God (cf. Rom. 12:19; cf. Deut. 32:35).

7. *blasphēmos*, evil-speaking, slanderous, blasphemous, occurs at Acts 6:11; 2 Tim. 3:2; 2 Pet. 2:11; and as a noun, blasphemer, at 1 Tim. 1:13.

H. Währisch, C. Brown

καταλαλέω

καταλαλέω (*katalaleō*), speak evil of, rail at, slander; καταλαλιά (*katalalia*), evil speech, railing, slander; κατάλαλος (*katalalos*), slanderer, railer, defamer.

CL & OT *katalaleō*, to speak evil against, slander, is rare in cl. Gk., but occurs as early as Aristophanes (5th century B.C.). In the LXX it is found chiefly for forms of *dāḇar*, say, speak (Num. 12:8; 21:5, 7; Pss. 50[49]:20; 78[77]:19; 119[118]:23; Hos. 7:13; Mal. 3:13, 16), and also for *gāḏap̄*, revile, blaspheme (Ps. 44[43]:16), *kālam*, humiliate (Job 19:3), *lāšan*, slander (Ps. 101[100]:5), and at Prov. 20:13 and Mic. 3:7. The noun *katalalia*, slander, is found only in the Bible (in LXX, Wis. 1:11) or in texts depending on it. *katalalos*, slanderer, is found for the first time at Rom. 1:30, and then in Hermas (*Sim.* 6, 5, 5).

In the LXX *katalaleō* expresses hostility of speech, whether against God (Num. 21:5, 7; Ps. 78:19; Hos. 7:13 etc.), against his servant Moses (Num. 12:8; 21:7), or

against other men, e.g. when Job is reproached by his friends (Job 19:3), or in cases of slander against one's brother or one's neighbour (Pss. 50:20; 101:5). The words are also found several times in Test. XII, and often in the Apostolic Fathers (e.g. Test. Gad 3:5; 5:4; 1 Clem. 30:1, 3; Hermas, *Mand.* 2:2 f.; 8:3).

NT In the NT *katalaleō* is not used of blasphemy against God (→ *blasphēmeō*); but slanderers (*katalalous*) are among the sinners whom Paul mentions in Rom. 1:30 as typical examples of paganism. It is linked with *psithyristas*, whisperers, tale-bearers (v. 29). The cognate nouns *psithyrismos*, gossip, tale-bearing, and *katalalia* are again linked in 2 Cor. 12:20 and 1 Clem. 30:3; 35:5. Similarly *katalaliai*, slanders, are among the sins which Paul fears he will encounter in the rebellious church of Corinth (2 Cor. 12:20): the fellowship of the community is destroyed by this sin. But the Christian churches are themselves the victims of such evil speech: it is the result of the hostile attitude taken up towards them by the heathen world around. Christians ought, therefore, for their part to be so much the more concerned to show by their "good behaviour in Christ" that the slanders against them are groundless (1 Pet. 2:12; 3:16). As "newborn babes", i.e. those born again, who know the kindness of their Lord, Christians should put away malicious slander along with other sins (1 Pet. 2:1–3). The letter of James, too, with its particular censure of sins of the tongue (3:3 ff.; → Word, art. *glōssa*), emphatically forbids Christians to indulge in evil speaking. It is not only an expression of arrogance and disregard for one's brother, but also a slight to God's law and God himself as the *one* Lawgiver and Judge of all (Jas. 4:11 f.). Thus the apostolic injunctions show us what the outworking of Jesus' love-commandment should be in the life of the Christian churches.

W. Mundle

λοιδορέω

λοιδορέω (*loidoreō*), insult, abuse, revile; λοιδορία (*loidoria*), insult, abuse, railing; λοίδορος (*loidoros*), railing, abusive, a reviler; ἀντιλοιδορέω (*antiloidoreō*), abuse or revile in turn.

CL The group of words connected with *loidoreō* (probably related to Lat. *ludus*, game), is frequently found in cl. Gk. In general it is not used in a religious sense. It was rather in the political and social life of the Greeks that importance came to be attached to slander, insult and disparagement of an opponent, e.g. as a weapon of the orator in a political dispute, or of the Homeric heroes.

OT In the LXX the words are found comparatively seldom (altogether 21 times). The vb. normally renders the Heb. *rîḇ* (Exod. 17:7; 21:18; Num. 20:3, 13; Deut. 33:8), to quarrel, accuse, strive; but also for the Heb. *gā'ar*, to rebuke (Jer. 29[36]:27). It is without equivalent at Gen. 49:23; 2 Macc. 12:14. *loidoria* translates *dibbâh*, slander (Prov. 10:18), and formations from *rîḇ* (Exod. 17:7; Num. 20:4; Prov. 20:31), and in the Apocrypha is without Heb. equivalent (Sir. 22:24; 23:8; 27:21; 29:6). *loidoros* translates *māḏôn* or *miḏyān*, strife, contention (Prov. 25:24; 26:21; 27:15), and is without equivalent in Sir. 23:8. Apart from some slight shifts of emphasis due to the meaning of the Heb., the use of the words in the LXX follows that of cl. Gk.

NT In the NT the words occur altogether only 9 times, of which 1 Cor. and 1 Pet. have 3 instances each. They retain the meaning which they have in cl. Gk., although they are used chiefly in religious contexts. If for the Greek it was one of the arts of life to know how to insult others or bear insults against oneself, for the believer the suffering of slander and insults is evidence of the cross the Christian disciple is called to bear (1 Pet. 2:23; 1 Cor. 4:12; cf. Mk. 14:65; 15:16–19, 29–32 par. Matt. 27:39–44; Lk. 23:35–39; and also Isa. 53:7; → Cross; → Disciple). In the Christ-hymn cited at 1 Pet. 2:23, it is a matter of more than simply imitating Christ. The disciple, as one who has been freed in order to obey, is constantly encountering the unredeemed character of the world, and shares his Lord's suffering in it. There is more to this than the keeping of standards: rather it is a question of maintaining the faith in the form of love even towards one's enemies, as we see from the formal statements in 1 Pet. 3:9 and 1 Cor. 4:12. When reviling is answered with → blessing, we have to do not with an art of living that can be learned, but with the evidence of the power of Jesus Christ and of the gospel to overcome the world, which has to be worked out in faith.

We therefore find *loidoros* twice in lists of sins, indicating conduct not becoming to the Christian (1 Cor. 5:11; 6:10).

Neither must the Christian himself give any cause for evil gossip (1 Tim. 5:14): the reason for this is that his life should be a testimony to his Lord. He will, however, have to endure reviling for his Lord's sake (cf. Jn. 9:28).

The case is different in Acts 23:4 f. *loidoreō* is here used in the same way as → *blasphēmeō*. Paul utters a prophetic → curse, pronouncing God's judgment on the high priest, because he is misusing the authority given to him by God. Paul's statement that he did not know he was addressing the high priest should probably be understood as ironical: Ananias was not behaving like a high priest in the way he executed his office. If he had behaved in a proper manner, the curse would have been blasphemy. (On this passage → Black, White, Red, art. *leukos* NT; → Priest, art. *hiereus* NT 2 (a).) *H. Währisch*

→ Anger, → Blessing, → Curse, → Laugh, → Swear, → Virtue

(a). G. Bertram, *myktērizō* etc., *TDNT* IV 796 ff.; and *paizō* etc., *TDNT* V 625–36; H. W. Beyer, *blasphēmeō* etc., *TDNT* I 621–25; S. H. Blank, "Men against God", *JBL* 72, 1953, 1–13; and "The Curse, the Blasphemy, the Spell, and the Oath", *Hebrew Union College Annual* 23, 1950–51, 73–95; J. Blinzler, *The Trial of Jesus*, 1959 (fuller *Der Prozess Jesu*, 1969[4]); D. R. Catchpole, *The Trial of Jesus: A Study in the Gospels and Jewish Historiography from A.D. 1770 to the Present Day, Studia Post-Biblica* 18, 1971; O. E. Evans, "The Unforgivable Sin", *ExpT* 68, 1956–57, 240–44; H. Hanse, *loidoreō* etc., *TDNT* IV 293 f.; G. Kittel, *katalaleō* etc., *TDNT* IV 3 ff.; W. L. Lane, *The Gospel of Mark, NLC*, 1974; J. C. O'Neill, "The Charge of Blasphemy at Jesus' Trial before the Sanhedrin", in E. Bammel, ed., *The Trial of Jesus. Cambridge Studies in Honour of C. F. D. Moule, SBT* Second Series 13, 1970, 72–77; J. Scharbert, "Blasphemy", *EBT* I 67 ff.; J. Schneider, *oneidos* etc., *TDNT* V 238–42; E. Schweizer, *The Good News according to Mark: A Commentary on the Gospel*, 1971.
(b). H. Conzelmann, "Der Epheserbrief", in *Die kleineren Briefe des Apostels Paulus, NTD* 8, 1968[3], 81 f.; E. Lövestam, *Spiritus Blasphemia. Eine Studie zu Mk 3, 28 f. par.*, 1968; SB I 1006–20; J. Scharbert, " 'Fluchen' und 'Segnen' im Alten Testament", *Biblica* 39, 1958, 1–26.

Right, Worthy

The terms and groups of words dealt with in this article are used, each in its own way and with its own shade of meaning, to express appropriate, suitable behaviour or a

corresponding state (negative forms expressing the opposite, viz. unsuitable, incorrect, etc.). *axios* is a relative term, comparing two entities (persons or things) by measuring the lesser against the greater. If the lesser comes up to the standard of the greater, it is worthy; otherwise it is unworthy. *artios* and its derivatives contain the idea of straightening, equipping and preparing for a specific purpose, which requires corresponding appropriateness, suitability, usefulness or aptitude. *orthos* is the plainest and most unequivocal term: the root meaning is upright, straight; it connotes the virtue of right, i.e. honest and straightforward, behaviour.

ἄξιος

ἄξιος (*axios*), of like value, fit, worthy, worth; ἀξίως (*axiōs*), worthily, in a manner worthy of, suitably; ἀνάξιος (*anaxios*), unworthy; ἀξιόω (*axioō*), consider or think worthy, make worthy; καταξιόω (*kataxioō*), deem worthy, consider worthy.

CL *axios* (Homer onwards) meant originally tipping the scales, counter-balancing, of like value (*TDNT* I 379). The term compares two entities, either of the same or of different (*anaxios*) weight (e.g. Prov. 3:15 where the LXX has *axios*: "all the things thou canst desire are not to be compared" with wisdom). The meaning of *axios* is then extended to cover the relation between persons or things which correspond (or do not correspond) to one another: i.e. fit, appropriate (cf. Hdt. 4, 28). Since this relation of fitness implies corresponding worth, *axios* comes finally to mean worthy, worth. The adv. *axiōs* is especially used in this sense (e.g. worthy of the truth, Diod. Sic. 1, 51, 7). *anaxios* is the negative form of expression, not suitable, unworthy (Sophocles onwards; cf. Epictetus, 2, 8, 18). The vb. *axioō* (Hdt. onwards) means: (1) to think worthy, think suitable (Eur., *Medea* 962); (2) to request, ask (Xenophon, *Memorabilia* 3, 11, 12). *kataxioō* (Aesch. onwards) has the same meaning, intensified: to deem worthy; pass. to be held worthy (Polybius, 12, 10, 8; cf. Diod. Sic. 2, 60, 3).

OT In the LXX this group of words has no great significance. Instead the Heb. *zāḵâh*, to be morally pure (e.g. Job 15:14; LXX *amemptos*) is used in Judaism for the concept of merit (→ Reward). *axios* gains the meaning of deserving, e.g. "Here is a man who is worthy of the Holy Spirit" (SB I 129). In relation to God, *axios* lost its character in Judaism as a relative term showing correspondence to a standard; it became a quality, a merit belonging to the zealous keeper of the law, who uses it as the foundation of a claim on God (2 Macc. 7:20; 4 Macc. 17:18 ff.; SB II 254).

NT In the NT the majority of instances is found either in the Synoptic Gospels, or in the Pauline and a few other epistles.

1. In radical contrast to the Judaistic concept of merit, the parable of the prodigal son makes it clear that man can make no claim upon God: "I am not worthy to be called your son" (Lk. 15:19, 21; cf. also Jn. 1:27; Acts 13:25). The centurion from Capernaum, who in the Jewish view deserved Jesus' help, because he had built a synagogue, did not even consider himself worthy for Jesus to be troubled with him, "but say the word, and my servant will be healed" (Lk. 7:7). Instead, it is the grace of God

in the gospel that imparts worth, and makes men worthy of fellowship with God. In Lk. 20:35, Acts 5:41 and 2 Thess. 1:5 it is the undeserved gift of salvation which is expressed by *kataxioō*. The worth of a man before God is decided by whether he comes into contact with the message of Christ and is obedient to it: "He who does not take his cross and follow me is not worthy of me" (Matt. 10:38; cf. vv. 11, 13, 37; 22:8).

2. In the epistles *axios* frequently has the meaning of fitting, in accord with. This is especially evident in the use of the adv. *axiōs* in exhortations demanding the right manner of life to accord with the gospel of Christ (Phil. 1:27), the Lord (Col. 1:10; 1 Thess. 2:12), or our calling (Eph. 4:1). Similarly in 1 Cor. 11:27 Paul warns against celebrating the → Lord's Supper in an unworthy manner (*anaxiōs*). He is not requiring moral quality in the participants, but looking for a manner of life which accords with the gospel, i.e. mutual love (cf. the context, 1 Cor. 11:17–34).

axios also describes the value of human actions. A much-quoted proverb says, "The labourer is worthy of his hire" (1 Tim. 5:18; cf. Lk. 10:7; Matt. 10:10; cf. Did. 13:1; 1 Cor. 9:14). Sinners do things for which they deserve (*axioi*) to die (Rom. 1:32); Paul's enemies can find nothing in his behaviour deserving death, with which to accuse him (Acts 25:11, 26). Christians are worthy to be clothed in white in the age to come (Rev. 3:4; → Black, White, Red, art. *leukos*).

At Rom. 8:18 Paul uses *axios* in its original sense of a comparison between two entities. The → sufferings of this present time are not *axia*, i.e. do not stand comparison with, the future → glory.

At Rev. 4:11 *axios* is even used in reference to the exalted Lord. None is worthy of such glory and honour as → God and the → Lamb (because of creation [Rev. 4:11], or Christ's sacrificial death [Rev. 5:12]); and the Lamb alone is worthy to be entrusted by God with the execution of his plans of salvation and of kingship (5:2, 4, 9).

E. Tiedtke

ἄρτιος

ἄρτιος (*artios*), suitable, complete, capable, sound; καταρτίζω (*katartizō*), put in order, restore, make complete, prepare; καταρτισμός (*katartismos*), preparation, equipment; κατάρτισις (*katartisis*), being made complete, completion; προκαταρτίζω (*prokatartizō*), get ready, arrange in advance; ἐξαρτίζω (*exartizō*), finish, complete, equip, furnish.

CL *artios* and its derivatives come from the root *ar-* which indicates appropriateness, suitability, usefulness, aptitude (cf. *artyō*, to arrange, season; *artynō*, to put in order; Lat. *aptare*, *adaptare*, *congruere*). *artios* accordingly means suitable, appropriate, fitting a situation or requirements; hence also respectively, normal, perfect, sound in physical, intellectual, moral and religious respects. In mathematics it is used to describe what is straight and to denote even numbers (as against *perissos*, odd).

The oldest derivative in cl. Gk. (apart from the Homeric *artyō*) is the vb. *katartizō*, to put in order, restore, furnish, prepare, equip. These various meanings have a common origin in the basic meaning to make suitable, make fitting. *katartismos* and *katartisis* mean restoration.

OT The LXX uses *katartizō* 19 times, and it stands for no fewer than 9 different Heb.

words. On 7 occasions the vb. renders the Aram. *kᵉlal*, to complete. It is found in this sense only in Ezr. in connexion with the building of the wall and the temple by the post-exilic community (Ezr. 4:12 f., 16; 5:3, 9, 11; 6:14). The various meanings of the vb. range from to set up, establish, in a literal sense (Ps. 74[73]:16; Heb. *kûn*); and of the righteous man's steps to hold fast to Yahweh's paths, human "goings" (Ps. 17[16]:5; Heb. *tāmaḵ*); to sayings about God's activity, to equip (Ps. 40[39]:6 RSV), to restore (Ps. 68[67]:9; Heb. *kûn*). Frequently Yahweh is the subject of sentences which refer to his work of establishing and founding. Other instances are Exod. 15:17 (Heb. *pā'al*, make); Ps. 8:2 (Heb. *yāsaḏ*, found, establish); Ps. 11(10):4 (Heb. *šāṯ*, foundation); Ps. 18(17):33 (Heb. *šāwâh*, make like); Ps. 29(28):9 (Heb. *ḥûl*, whirl); Ps. 68(67):28 (Heb. *pā'al*); Ps. 80(79):15 (Heb. *kānan*, cf. *kûn*); Ps. 89(88):37 (Heb. *kûn*). *artiōs* is used in the LXX only as a temporal adv. meaning until now (2 Sam. 15:34).

NT Of this group of words only *katartizō* is used at all frequently in the NT (13 times), while *artios* (2 Tim. 3:17), *katartisis* (2 Cor. 13:9), and *katartismos* (Eph. 4:12) occur only once each.

1. At Matt. 4:21 and Mk. 1:19, *katartizō* is found in the secular sense of repairing fishing nets. In addition to this, the NT also uses *katartizō* in the same way as the LXX: the meaning here is to prepare (Heb. 10:5, a citation of Ps. 40:6; Matt. 21:16, citing Ps. 8:3 LXX; Rom. 9:22), to establish, to form (Heb. 11:3), to equip (Heb. 13:21; 1 Pet. 5:10). As in the OT, God is the subject of sentences which express his power to strengthen and establish.

2. Of particular importance are those passages in which *artios* and its derivatives are used in connexion with the preparation and equipment of the believer and the church, for the service of God and their fellow-men. The adj. *artios* occurs only at 2 Tim. 3:17, together with the perfect pass. participle *exērtismenos*. In the OT → scriptures the church of the New Testament has an indispensable, God-given guide to living, through which the man of God may achieve an appropriate state, viz. be equipped for every work of love: "so that the man who belongs to God may be efficient and equipped for good work of every kind" (NEB). *artios* here does not imply perfection, as was originally thought, doubtless because of the variant reading *teleios*, perfect, in Codex D. Rather it refers to the state of being equipped for a delegated task. So too, in Eph. 4:12 *katartismos* refers to the preparation of the church for becoming perfect, but not to this perfection itself, as can be seen from the use of *teleios* (complete, mature; → Goal), *hēlikia* (stature; → Age, Stature), and *plērōma* (→ fullness) in v. 13 (cf. also 1 Cor. 1:10). The terms *artios* and *katartismos* thus have not so much a qualitative meaning as a functional one. This standard, hortatory use of *artios* and its derivatives arises from the fact that all imperatives are founded on the one indicative, i.e. the firm promise of salvation. The life of the saints is to correspond to the grace given, and this itself is the standard to which they are to aspire. It is on this ground that in Gal. 6:1 and 2 Cor. 13:11 *katartizō* can mean to restore; in 1 Thess. 3:10 to make up, to put in a fit state, to perfect. *katartisis* in 2 Cor. 13:9 also comes into this category. Like the verbal form in v. 11, it should be translated with the NEB, "that all may be put right with you", as a reference to the restoration and perfection of the church.

3. At 2 Cor. 9:5 *prokatartizō* is used of arranging or gathering and making ready

the collection (→ Poor, art. *ptōchos* NT 4); and at Acts 21:5 we find *exartizō* in *egeneto hēmas exartisai tas hēmeras*, "our time was up" (Arndt, 273), or ended as prescribed (cf. G. Delling, *TDNT* I 476). *R. Schippers*

ὀρθός

ὀρθός (*orthos*), upright, straight, right; *ὀρθῶς* (*orthōs*), rightly, correctly; *διόρθωσις* (*diorthōsis*), improvement, reformation, new order; *ἐπανόρθωσις* (*epanorthōsis*), correcting, restoration, improvement; *ἐπανορθόω* (*epanorthoō*), set up again, correct; *ὀρθοτομέω* (*orthotomeō*), cut straight, lead in a straight way, rightly handle; *ὀρθοποδέω* (*orthopodeō*), walk uprightly, act rightly, be straightforward.

CL *orthos* means lit. standing upright, continuing in a straight direction; fig. right, true. In cl. Gk. *orthos* is used in a fig. sense of ethically correct behaviour (Pindar, *Pythian Odes* 10, 68, *nous orthos*, a right mind; Plato, *Phaedrus* 73a; Epictetus, *Dissertationes* 1, 11, 19). Both in the classical period and for the Stoics, the word refers to an objective quality or virtue. *diorthōsis* denotes the straightening of what has become disordered, correct ordering, right treatment (Plato, *Laws* 642a); then fig. correction of a mistake (Polybius, 3, 58, 4; not in the LXX). *epanorthōsis* (from *epanorthoō*, to set up again, correct) means lit. restoration (e.g. of what has been destroyed); fig. improvement (e.g. of the laws, Demosthenes, *Or.* 24, 22).

OT In the LXX *orthos* is also used in the sense of upright (Mic. 2:3, "with your head upright", i.e. haughtily), and in a straight direction (Jer. 38:9 LXX, on a straight path). *orthos* has, however, a special use in the Wisdom literature. Here it is used for Heb. *yāšār* and means right, correct, true (Prov. 8:6, 9, right words; 11:6, an honest man; 16:25, a right way; etc.). Occasionally *nāḇôn*, understanding (from *bîn*, to understand), is also translated by *orthos* (Prov. 15:14, an understanding heart). Thus in the Wisdom literature *orthos* is used to refer to the kind of right attitude, speech, and action, that accords with a proper relationship to Yahweh. It does not describe a virtue so much as a relationship. The adv. *orthōs* occurs at Gen. 4:7; 40:16; Exod. 18:17; Deut. 5:25[28]; 1 Sam. 16:17 (in connexion with *ṭôb*, good, well); and at Num. 27:7(6); Prov. 14:2; 16:5 etc.

NT 1. In the NT the group of words which goes with *orthos* has no particular part to play. In the epistles none of the words occurs more than once or twice; in the Gospels they are not found at all, with the exception of the adv. *orthōs*, which is used to confirm the correctness of a speech or answer (Lk. 10:28; 20:21). Only at Acts 14:10, where Paul heals a lame man by calling "stand upright on your feet", is *orthos* found in its lit. sense. Heb. 9:10 speaks of the time of a right and better order (*diorthōsis*), which has begun with the coming of Christ and is contrasted with the provisional nature of the OT covenant.

2. The other instances belong to the sphere of NT ethics and exhortation.

(a) Heb. 12:13 exhorts a church which has become weary not to lose sight of the risen Lord and the goal towards which it is moving. The "straight paths" (a citation of Prov. 4:26 LXX) refer to the direction set for the wandering people of God. Thus

orthos is here interpreted in the sense of an eschatological alignment for the Christian church.

(b) Gal. 2:14 deals with the delicate question of Peter's right behaviour (*orthopodeō*) towards the Gentile Christians of Antioch, when he came to them from → Jerusalem. By right behaviour, or walking uprightly, Paul means obedience towards the gospel of Christ in its freedom from the law.

(c) 2 Tim. 3:16 lists the uses of Holy Scripture in ethical and didactic categories. They serve progressively (1) to convert; (2) to restore and improve (*epanorthōsis*); and (3) to instruct in righteousness.

3. *orthotomeō* is found elsewhere only at Prov. 3:6 and 11:5, where it is used in connexion with cutting a path in a straight direction. It is connected with *temnō*, cut. The idea is that of cutting a path through a forest or difficult terrain so that the traveller may go directly to his destination (Arndt, 584). The vb. occurs only at 2 Tim. 2:15 where the RSV has: "Do your best to present yourself to God as one approved, a workman who has no need to be ashamed, rightly handling [*orthotomounta*] the word of truth." The phrase may be compared with Plato, *Laws* 7, 801E: "to proceed along the way of legislation which has been cleared [*tetmēmenēn hodon*] by our present discourse." Arndt suggests that the meaning in 2 Tim. is to guide the word of truth along a straight path, like a road that goes straight to its goal. Other interpretations are to teach the word aright, expound it soundly, shape rightly, and preach fearlessly (cf. Moulton-Milligan, 456 f.).

4. *orthopodeō* occurs only at Gal. 2:14: "But when I saw that they were not straightforward [*ouk orthopodousin*] about the truth of the gospel, I said to Cephas before them all, 'If you, though a Jew, live like a Gentile and not like a Jew, how can you compel the Gentiles to live like Jews?' " Here the question turns on → circumcision and the ambiguous stance adopted by Peter in the face of the circumcision party. Arndt give the meaning "be straightforward" (583), but notes other interpretations: progress or advance in the direction of the truth (C. H. Roberts, *JBL* 40, 1939, 55 f.); cf. also the phrase noted by J. G. Winter in a 3rd cent. papyrus *orthopodei to paidion*, the child is getting on or growing up (*HTR* 34, 1941, 161 f.); "They were not on the right road toward the truth of the gospel", G. D. Kilpatrick, in *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann*, 1954, 269–74). *R. Klöber*

→ God, → Ready, → Virtue

W. Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*, 1972; G. Delling, *artios* etc., *TDNT* I 475 f.; J. D. G. Dunn, *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament: An Inquiry into the Character of Earliest Christianity*, 1977; W. Foerster, *axios* etc., *TDNT* I 379 f.; H. Preisker, *orthos* etc., *TDNT* V 449 ff.

Righteousness, Justification

δικαιοσύνη

δικαιοσύνη (*dikaiosynē*), righteousness, uprightness; *δίκαιος* (*dikaios*), upright, just, righteous; *δικαιόω* (*dikaioō*), justify, vindicate, treat as just, acquit, pronounce or treat as righteous, make or set free from; *δικαίωμα* (*dikaiōma*), regulation, requirement, commandment, righteous deed; *δικαίως* (*dikaiōs*), justly, in a just manner, uprightly; *δικαίωσις* (*dikaiōsis*), justification, vindication, acquittal. For *ἀδικία* (*adikia*), unrighteousness, and cognates → Sin.

CL All the words in this group are derived from *dikē* (→ Punishment). According to H. Frisk, the original root-noun meant "instructress" or "instruction" (*Studien zur griechischen Wortstellung, Göteborgs Högskolas Årsskrift* 39, 1, 1933; but cf. the discussion by G. Schrenk in *TDNT* II 178 ff.). The sense of "instructress" is supported by Hesiod (*Works* 256 ff.): Dike is the daughter of Zeus who shares in his government of the world. The concept of "instruction" is also supported by Hesiod (ibid., 275 ff.): Zeus put a difference between beasts and men: to the former he gave a *nomos* (→ law, i.e. that they should devour one another), while to the latter, in order to make human life possible, he gave *dikē*, whose implacable enemy is *biē*, violence. In its basic religious sense, therefore, and in common with all things divine in Gk. religion, *dikē* is an elemental cosmic force which men feel to be superior to themselves. It is not a standard imposed upon the world by God, but something immanent, inherent in the very nature of being, and related to men's living together in society. In post-Homeric times it was also regarded as expiation or punishment, or as the goddess of punishment who pursued wrongdoers. In the arguments that preceded the creation of the *polis* (→ People, art. *polis*) *dikē* and its derivatives were first of all battle-cries, and then later became concepts basic to the whole ideas of the *polis*. Of overriding importance in this connexion was the thought that justice prevails when every man does that which is fitting for him (Plato: *ta heautou prattein*). For Plato *dikaiosynē* is basic to the structure of the state (*Rep.* 1–4) and the human soul (*Rep.* 4, 443c ff.), and for Aristotle (who devoted *Eth. Nic.* 5 to the subject) it is the chief of human virtues (5, 3, p. 1129b, 27). To Plato and those who followed him, it was right and proper to accept the existence of utterly diverse social ranks with their accompanying degrees of power, and to take upon oneself that which befitted one's own station. In other words, *dikē* acquired the status of the axiomatic, unshakable foundation of all human life.

1. Hence, the righteous man (*dikaios*) was originally one whose behaviour fitted into the framework of his society and who fulfilled his rightful obligations towards the gods and his fellow-men (Homer, *Od.* 13, 209), his observance of such obligations serving to differentiate him from the unrighteous (*dyssebēs*) (Aesch., *Sept* 598; → Godliness). Hybris and uncivilized behaviour were out of keeping with the character of a righteous man (*Od.* 9, 175), therefore the term *dikaia zoē* (righteous life) was applied to a civilized way of life, i.e. one which, unlike barbarism, adhered to the rules of an orderly society; while in *Od.* 14, 90 *dikaiōs mnasthai* refers to wooing one's bride "in a fitting manner". At a later period the meaning was extended to cover the idea of conforming to a given standard, so that *harma dikaion* was a smoothly running carriage; *dikaia basanos* an impartial examination; and *tō dikaiotatō tōn logōn* the most appropriate way of speaking. Undoubtedly, however, the legal and ethical aspect was of supreme importance, *dikaios* meaning righteous *vis-à-vis* the law, conforming to the existing, static, social order. It is particularly common as a neuter noun in the sense of "that which is [legally and ethically] right", e.g. *to dikaion to nomikon kai to ison* (Aristotle, *Eth. Nic.* 1129a, 34); *ouden tōn dikaiōn poiein tini*, to do nothing that is right and just to someone, i.e. treat someone unjustly; *ta dikaia lambanein*, to take what is one's due. Hence *to dikaion* comes to mean a legal claim, while *ta pros allēlous dikaia* means the contracts and obligations existing between men.

2. The noun *dikaiosynē* (*-synē* indicating an abstraction) is a later formation

(since Theognis 1, 47: *en de dikaiosynē syllēbdēn pasa aretē estin*). On the one hand, it denotes the quality of the righteous man (*dikaiosynē dikastikē* being righteousness according to the law), but, on the other hand, it is in itself the standard which a judge is required to uphold, and which it must be his aim constantly to restore. Thus it is impartial justice, described by Aristotle as *hōs ho nomos*, as the law (*Rhet.* 1, 9p, 1366b, 9 ff.). It is one of the four cardinal virtues, along with *phronēsis* (prudence), *sōphrosynē* (temperance) and *andreia* (fortitude).

From the time of Pindar and Aeschylus, the corresponding and derivative verb *dikaioō* is used, meaning: (a) to put right (e.g. the law on violence, *Fragment* 169, 3); (b) to demand as a right, regard as being right, pass sentence; (c) to give someone his due, either in the sense of to punish (Herodotus 1, 100) or, from the LXX onwards, to declare righteous, to justify.

3. Finally, two other nouns from the same stem express either the result of human action, or the application of justice to a given person:

dikaiōma (since Plato and Aristotle) which means: (a) right action; (b) judgment, either of condemnation or acquittal; (c) (from the LXX onwards) ordinance, decree; (d) legal documents, credentials.

dikaiōsis (since Thucydides), which means: (a) condemnation, punishment; (b) acquittal; (c) just claim; (d) discretion, judgment as to what is just or unjust.

OT The noun *dikaiōma* is frequently found in the LXX in the context of → law meaning ordinance or statute. It translates the Heb. *ḥōq* or *ḥuqqâh* some 70 times (e.g. Gen. 26:5; Exod. 15:25 f.; Lev. 25:18; Num. 27:11; 30:17; 31:21; 35:29; Deut. 4:1, 5 f., 8, 14, 40, 45; 5:1, 28[31]; 6:1 f., 17, 20, 24; 7:11; 8:11; 10:13; 11:1; 17:19; 26:16 f.; 27:10; 28:45; 30:10, 16; 2 Sam. 22:23; 2 Ki. 17:8, 13, 19, 34, 37; 23:3; 2 Chr. 19:10; 33:8; Pss. 18[17]:22; 50[49]:16; 89[88]:31; 105[104]:45; 119[118]:5, 8, 12, 16, 23, 26, 33, 48, 54, 56, 64, 68, 71, 80, 83, 112, 117 f., 124, 135, 145, 155, 171; 147:19[8]; Mic. 6:16; Ezek. 36:27). It translates the Heb. *mišpāṭ*, judgment, ordinance, some 40 times (e.g. Exod. 21:1, 9, 31; 24:3; Num. 15:16; 36:13; Deut. 7:12; 33:10; 1 Sam. 2:13; 8:3, 9, 11; 10:25; 27:11; 30:25; 1 Ki. 3:28; 8:45, 59; 2 Chr. 6:35; Ps. 119[118]:20; Prov. 2:8; 19:28; Mal. 3:22[4:4]; Ezek. 5:6 f.; 11:20; 18:9, 21; 20:11, 13, 16, 18, 19, 21, 24 f.). It is also found for sundry other words (2 Sam. 19:29[28]; 1 Ki. 2:3; Job 34:27; Pss. 19[18]:8; 119[118]:27, 56, 93 f., 141; Prov. 8:20; Ezek. 18:21; 43:11) and has no corresponding Heb. term at Deut. 6:3; Ruth 4:7; Ps. 119[118]:24; Sir. 4:17; Bar. 2:12, 17, 19; 4:13; Hos. 13:1; Ezek. 20:13; 44:24; 1 Macc. 1:13, 49; 2:21, 40; 4 Macc. 18:6.

Apart from this, the *dikaios* word-group translates words belonging to the Heb. *ṣdq* word group on 462 out of a possible 476 times. There is thus a considerable semantic overlap between the two groups. *diakaiosynē* normally renders the Heb. *sᵉḏāqâh* and less frequently *ṣeḏeq* (some 220 times; for instances see discussion below), although there are 11 other terms it is used to translate, and it also occurs occasionally for other formations from *ṣdq*. These include *ʾᵉmeṯ*, truth, faithfulness (Gen. 24:49; Jos. 24:14; Isa. 38:19; 39:8); *mišpāṭ*, judgment (Prov. 17:23; Mal. 2:17; Isa. 61:8; Ezek. 18:17, 19, 21); *ḥeseḏ*, loving kindness, grace, covenant fidelity (Gen. 19:19; 20:13; 21:23; 24:27; 32:11[10]; Exod. 15:13; 34:7; Prov. 20:28; Isa. 61:7).

The adj. *dikaios* occurs some 180 times for *ṣaddîq*, although it also translates 17

other terms and expressions, including *yāšār*, right, correct, straightforward, upright (e.g. Num. 23:10; Prov. 3:32; Job 1:1, 8) and *nāqî* and *nāqî'*, innocent (e.g. Job 9:23; 17:8; Prov. 6:17; Joel 4:19; Jon. 1:14). Its use to translate *yāšār* may suggest Hellenistic influence on the part of the translator, giving *dikaios* the sense of "virtuous" (cf. D. Hill, *Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings: Studies in the Semantics of Soteriological Terms, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series* 5, 1967, 105).

The vb. *dikaioō* is used 23 times to translate *ṣādaq* (Gen. 38:26; 44:16; Exod. 23:7; Deut. 25:1; 2 Sam. 15:4; 1 Ki. 8:32; 2 Chr. 6:23; Job 33:22; Pss. 19[18]:9; 51[50]:4; 82[81]:3; 143[142]:2; Isa. 5:23; 42:21; 43:9, 26; 45:25[26]; 50:8; 53:11; Jer. 3:11; Ezek. 16:51 f.). It also translates *bāḥan*, try (Ezek. 21:18[13]); *zāḵâh*, be clean (Ps. 73[72]:13; Mic. 6:11); *rîḇ*, contend, conduct a legal case (Mic. 7:9; Isa. 1:17); and *šāpaṭ*, judge (1 Sam. 12:7). It occurs without Heb. equivalent at Tob. 6:11 f. *v.l.*; 12:4; Sir. 1:21; 9:12; 10:29; 13:22; 18:2, 22; 23:11; 26:29; 31(34):5; Ezek. 44:24.

1. Righteousness in the OT is not a matter of actions conforming to a given set of absolute legal standards, but of behaviour which is in keeping with the two-way relationship between God and man. Thus the righteousness of God appears in his God-like dealings with his people, i.e. in redemption and salvation (Isa. 45:21; 51:5 f.; 56:1; 62:1). His righteous acts are extolled from the earliest times onward (Jdg. 5:11; 1 Sam. 12:7; Isa. 45:24; Mic. 6:5; Ps. 103[102]:6; Dan. 9:16). He who longs for → redemption calls upon God's righteousness, i.e. he pleads for God's intervention (Pss. 71[70]:2; 143[142]:11). Israel's enemies, by contrast, find God's righteousness to be the root of their downfall (Isa. 41:10 f.; 54:17; Ps. 129[128]:4 f.). For Israel's sake, even the very land itself may be restored through the gift of God's righteousness (Hos. 10:2; Joel 2:23; Isa. 32:15 ff.; 48:18 f.). Dwelling in the land as he does, Israel partakes of God's righteousness (Ps. 24[23]:5) and such righteousness may actually be referred to in spatial terms (Pss. 89[88]:16; 69[68]:28).

2. In the pre-exilic period, little is said about individual righteousness, the main concern being that men should remain within the national righteousness referred to above. Access to it is denied to anyone whose life falls short of God's standards (Pss. 15[14]; 24[23]:3 ff.), the righteousness of God being, in effect, salvation *per se*; hence the OT never identifies righteousness with condemnation. On a purely human level, therefore, judgment is pronounced not in terms of "the guilty man is justly punished", but rather "the just man is made just and the guilty man made guilty" (Deut. 25:1). In general before the exile, a man's righteousness is not so much in relation to God as in relation to his fellow-men, his behaviour being regulated on the one hand by human relationships (e.g. between members of the same family, Gen. 38:26; or between the king and one of his officers, 1 Sam. 24:15), and on the other by the law of God (Zeph. 2:3); Amos 5:7 and 6:12 each refers to both of these aspects. On the other hand, Amos 5:4, 6, 14 and the book of Hosea testify generally to a concern for righteousness before God, through inter-personal relationships.

The exile, however, marks a turning-point in the history of ideas, and thereafter the OT has no hesitation in speaking of the devout individual's righteousness before God. Before the exile the pledge of God's presence among the people was their free, independent possession of the land, with his righteousness covering both the people and the land they owned. Afterwards, however, God's pledge is his gift of the law,

which provides clear terms of reference for righteousness between man and man, and at the same time the framework within which a man may share, and go on sharing, in Yahweh's righteousness. Hence, when the Psalmists refer to themselves as "righteous" (Pss. 7:9; 17[16]:1–5; 18[17]:22–24; 26[25]:1–6), they are appealing to their membership of that nation which Yahweh has permitted to partake of his righteousness, for, as the religion of Israel had long since made clear, God alone can pronounce a man righteous. Such a claim on the part of the Psalmists is, therefore, an act of testimony. The fact that a man joins in public worship is evidence that he is not cut off from the righteousness of God. Furthermore, the law is considered easy to keep, therefore in claiming to be righteous, men are joyfully acknowledging the law to be the well-spring of their daily life (G. von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, I, 1962, 381 f.). Here and there, however, the note is already heard that in the eyes of God one's own righteousness counts for nothing (Ps. 143[142]:1; Job 4:17), and that men are dependent on his mercy alone (Dan. 9:18). Thus in the intertestamental period, "righteousness" takes on increasingly the character of "goodness" (→ grace), which counterbalances the strictly impartial judgment of God (cf. G. von Rad, op. cit., 370–83; F. Horst, *RGG*[3] II 1403 ff.). *H. Seebass*

3. D. Hill contends that the original significance of the root *ṣdq* appears to be irretrievably lost and that the study of parallels in other languages does not allow us to attribute with confidence any single primary meaning to it (*Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings: Studies in the Semantics of Soteriological Terms, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series* 5, 82 f.). Outside specifically theological contexts in the OT it is used in connexion with weights and measures, indicating conformity to the proper standards (Lev. 19:36; Deut. 25:15; Ezek. 45:10), and correct sacrifices which have been offered in accordance with the prescribed ritual (Deut. 33:19; Pss. 4:6; 51:21 MT). Hill sees Judah's remark about Tamar ("She is more righteous than I") as not making a moral judgment so much as making an observation about the strength of her case in terms of the levirate marriage law (op. cit., 84; → Marriage, art. *gameō* OT 5). Similarly a righteous person in the law is one who is "in the right" (cf. Exod. 23:7; with 1 Sam. 24:17; Ezek. 16:52).

The standard of righteousness is not provided simply by custom. Hill endorses W. Eichrodt's verdict that it is to be seen against the wider background of the → covenant relationship with Yahweh: "It may therefore be said that in the case of Yahweh his righteousness implies the same kind of right conduct which in Israel upholds the law by means of judicial procedure; the justice appropriate to Israel on her side is determined by her position as the covenant people, in virtue of which she can count on the intervention of the divine assistance in any danger which threatens that position" (*Theology of the Old Testament*, I, 1961, 241 f.; cf. Hill, op. cit., 86). Eichrodt points out that "In the early period of Israel's history God's righteousness seems only to have been spoken of in connection with his help against outside enemies. Yahweh watches over the 'justice' of his people in that he safeguards their existence by his victories over their foes, and Israel's triumphs in war are therefore proofs of the righteousness of God, *ṣidqōt yhwh*" (ibid.; cf. Jdg. 5:11; 11:27; Mic. 6:5; 1 Sam. 12:7; 2 Sam. 18:31; Deut. 33:21). Some scholars see a background of Canaanite influence, reflecting a deity or agent of God in Pss. 85, 89 and 97, where righteousness is thought to be hypostatized (cf. Hill, op. cit., 86), though the argu-

ment seems tenuous in the context of the Psalms (cf. A. A. Anderson, *The Book of Psalms, New Century Bible*, 1972, II, 613, 637 f., 687). Righteousness is there a divine attribute, occasionally personified. Thus, Anderson sees the expression, "He loves righteousness and justice" (Ps. 33[32]:5) as meaning that Yahweh "loves to perform righteous and just deeds (cf. 99:4; Jer. 9:24). This may also imply that God is concerned to do and to uphold righteousness and justice. 'Righteousness' (*ṣᵉḏāqâh*) is a term of relationships, denoting that kind of conduct which serves to maintain the established ties" (op. cit., I, 262). In certain contexts this amounts to "deliverance" (Pss. 22:31 [MT 32]; 40:9 [MT 19]; 51:14 [MT 16]; 65:5 [MT 6]), "salvation" (Ps. 69:27 [MT 28]), "victory" (Isa. 41:2). "vindication" (Ps. 103:6), "righteous help" (Ps. 71:24), "healing" Ps. 40:10 [MT 11]), and perhaps even "reward" (Ps. 106:31). Negatively, it means punishment of the wicked (Ps. 119:75). Anderson also sees a covenant background in the sense of "faithfulness to the obligations stipulated by the Covenant, but in general it may imply a behaviour which is right according to the standards accepted by the community" (ibid.).

Because the nation found its focus in the king, it depended on him for its right-ordering and well-being, and thus the king has a special place in maintaining righteousness in Israel (cf. Hill, op. cit., 87 ff.; 2 Sam. 15: 1–6; Ps. 72). "As judge, Yahweh supremely distinguishes between those who are 'in the right' and those 'who are in the wrong': he condemns the latter and 'puts in the right' (Hiph'il of *ṣdq* = declare to be in the right) the former [Gen. 18:25; Exod. 23:7; 1 Ki. 8:32; Hos. 14:8 f.; Ps. 7:7–11; Jer. 11:20; Zeph. 3:5; Ezra 9:15]. Just as the righteous judgment of the king took on a special character when it was directed towards the poor and needy, so in establishing *ṣᵉḏāqâh* in the land, Yahweh has a particular concern for the cause of the poor and outcast, the widow and orphan" (Hill, op. cit., 89 f.; cf. Amos 2:6 f.; 5:12–15; Mic. 3:2; Isa. 5:7). Within the righteousness of Yahweh there is a place for punishment and for deliverance. Thus, in the destruction of Jerusalem the city confesses: "The LORD is in the right [*ṣaddîq*]: I have rebelled against his word" (Lam. 1:18). On the other hand, Yahweh may still deliver Israel, giving sentence in his favour because of the character of Yahweh himself (Isa. 46:12 f.; cf. 51:5–8, 17).

Hill rejects the idea that the prophets gave an ethical content to a religion which was previously non-ethical, insisting that "we may regard the prophetic teaching as essentially a recalling of Israel to the covenant and to the standards and way of life which should characterise national and individual existence within the covenant" (op. cit., 94). On many occasions in the Psalms he sees the individual righteous as "those who, in humility and faithfulness, trust in Yahweh, despite persecution and oppression; those who seek to live uprightly and without pride of heart, depending on Yahweh for protection and vindication. 'Righteousness' here is not ethical perfection, but that obedience and uprightness of the faithful who plead with Yahweh for a favourable decision, not always in order to be 'justified' against an adversary, but often, in an absolute manner, to be accepted and saved" (Hill, op. cit., 94 f.; cf. Ps. 24:3 ff.). Isa. 56–59 form a section which begins with the call: "Keep justice, and do righteousness, for soon my salvation will come, and my deliverance be revealed" (Isa. 56:1). Righteousness is the key to national recovery (Isa. 58:8 ff.; cf. 60:17, 21) and will ultimately spread to the nations (Isa. 61:10). This righteousness depends on Yahweh's gift (Isa. 46:12 f.; 50:9; 52:13–53:12); but it calls for a corresponding

righteousness in the national and individual lives of the people (cf. Deut. 6:20 ff.; 24:13).

Commenting on the LXX usage of the *dikaios* word-group, D. Hill observes that it underwent a considerable change through being consistently used to render the Heb. group formed from *ṣdq*, especially as compared with cl. Gk. "(1) The words were employed to refer to God's character and actions [in the LXX]. In Classical Greek usage, *dikaios*, etc., were not terms used of the divine, except at a very early date. (2) In the Classical Greek usage of the terms the idea of conformity to a standard was present and the standard was primarily that of social obligation. In the Old Testament use of *ṣᵉḏāqâh* the standard implied possesses divine authority and often is the demands of the covenant law. Through being used consistently as the means of translating the Hebrew word, *dikaiosynē* gained this new dimension of reference (i.e. the divine requirement) in biblical Greek. (3) Through being drawn into the covenant terminology the word *dikaiosynē* was supplied, from time to time, with a content which is related to that of 'mercy' (when translating *ḥeseḏ*) and of 'loyalty' and 'trustworthiness' (when translating *ʾᵉmeṯ*). The verb *dikaioō* is not found with its secular Greek meanings in the LXX: it has to be interpreted in terms of the Hebrew root it renders. When it translates the root *ṣdq* (and even other roots as well), the forensic sense is almost always present. The only possible exceptions we have found are in Pss. 19(18):10 and 73(72):13" (op. cit., 108 f.).

4. In the apocryphal books *dikaios* is used as in the LXX except that there are no instances of it meaning "in the right" and "innocent" (D. Hill, op. cit., 109). Righteous is applied to God, man and actions (Tob. 3:2; 14:9; Wis. 2:10; 3:1; Sir. 10:23). The meaning "just" occurs at Wis. 12:15 and 2 Macc. 9:18; cf. 1 Macc. 7:12; 11:33; 2 Macc. 11:14; 13:22. In Pss. Sol. *dikaios* denotes the upright man who trusts in God and keeps the law, as distinct from sinners (2:34; 3:4–8; 15:6). When applied to God it describes his attitude in discriminating between the upright and the sinner (2:10, 18, 32, 34; 5:1; 8:8; 9:2; 10:5). It is also applied to the messiah in this sense (17:32).

In the apocryphal writings *dikaiosynē* is the righteousness or righteous conduct which makes a man acceptable to God (Tob. 12:9; 14:11; Wis. 1:15). It denotes God's righteousness in discerning good and evil, and saving the good and punishing the evil among men (Wis. 5:18; 12:16). In Wis. 15:3 knowledge of God constitutes righteousness. In Sir. 42:2 *dikaioō* means to do justice to, punish, and in Sir. 7:5; 10:29; 13:22 it means to recognize or declare to be right or righteous. Otherwise the vb. frequently occurs in the passive, meaning to be declared innocent or to acquit, and even accept (18:22). In Pss. Sol. it means to recognize as just or righteous (2:15; 3:3, 5; 4:9; 8:7, 23, 26; 9:2; cf. D. Hill, op. cit., 110). *C. Brown*

5. In rabbinic Judaism righteousness was completely identified with conformity to the → law. Many of the laws, particularly the ceremonial ones, were no longer relevant as they stood, but, according to the rabbis, were intended to train men in obedience and, in particular, to provide a way for men to acquire merit in the sight of God. The passion for obedience now became transformed into a striving for merit, to ensure one's part in the kingdom of God. Works of charity and works of mercy were considered especially meritorious, the former (*ṣᵉḏāqâh*) comprising everything that could be done by material expenditure, such as feeding the hungry, clothing the

naked, giving drink to the thirsty, etc., while works of mercy were those requiring a moral effort, such as mourning with mourners, comforting the broken-hearted and visiting those who were sick or in prison (cf. Matt. 25:35 f.). However, there are many examples to show the power of trust in God, quite apart from meritorious works; e.g. at the time of Israel's exodus from Egypt, Moses' faith alone sufficed for God to divide the sea. Very few qualified for the designation "a righteous man" (principally biblical figures, cf. R. Mach, *Der Zaddik in Talmud und Midrasch*, 1957, 242 ff.); it was believed that no one, not even the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, could achieve righteousness apart from God's grace, but that on the other hand "God helps those who help themselves". Eventually merits will be weighed against demerits in the day of judgment; if a man's merits preponderate, he will be deemed a righteous man; if the opposite is the case, he will be deemed an evil-doer. Should there be an even balance, then according to one view the persons concerned will go to hell, emerging therefrom later when their purification is complete, while others believed that God will make use of his own great riches and of the merits of the righteous, in order to render the mediocre righteous (cf. R. Mach, op. cit.; A. Marmorstein, *The Old Rabbinic Doctrine of God*, 1922). For further discussion and data D. Hill, op. cit., 115–20; J. A. Zeisler, *The Meaning of Righteousness in Paul: A Linguistic and Theological Enquiry, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series* 20, 1972, 112–27.

6. The Qumran community seems to have been deeply aware of its own guilt and of the transitoriness of life, hence their recurring appeals to justification by God: "As for me, my justification [*mišpāṭ*] is with God"; "he will wipe away my transgression through his righteousness"; "his righteousness is the source of my justification"; "if I stumble and fall because of the guilt of my flesh, my justification shall arise through the righteousness of God which endures for ever" (1QS 11:2, 3, 5, 12). "Righteousness, I know, is not of man, nor is a perfect walk of the son of man. To the most high God belong deeds of righteousness [= grace 11, 18; 16, 9]; but the way of man will not stand, save by the spirit which God created for him" (1QH 4, 30). But impressively like Paul as such statements are at first sight, it should be noted that righteousness is based not simply upon the law (as it is in Judaism generally), but in particular upon the radical doctrines of the Teacher of Righteousness. "This concerns all those who observe the Law in the House of Judah, whom God will deliver from the House of Judgment because of their suffering and because of their faith in the Teacher of Righteousness" (1QpHab 8: 1–3 on Hab. 2:4). The title Teacher of Righteousness occurs in CD 1:11; 20:32; 1QpHab 1:13; 2:2; 5:10; 7:4; 11:15; 1QpMic frag. 10. There are a number of other possible allusions (cf. J. A. Ziesler, op. cit., 91). For when the members of the community are called the "sons of righteousness" (1QS 9, 14) or the "elect of righteousness" (1QH 2, 13), this implies one thing only, namely, that they follow their Teacher's doctrine, and it would appear that the justifying grace of God is seen essentially in the fact that this doctrine of radical legal piety has been revealed (cf. G. Jeremias, *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit, StUNT* 2, 1963, 308 ff.; F. F. Bruce, *The Teacher of Righteousness in the Qumran Texts*, 1957). On Qumran teaching see further D. Hill, op. cit., 110–115; J. A. Ziesler, op. cit., 91–103; O. Betz, "Rechtfertigung in Qumran", in J. Friedrich, W. Pöhlmann and P. Stuhlmacher, eds., *Rechtfertigung. Festschrift für Ernst Käsemann*, 1976, 17–36.

NT The NT uses the words of this group in many different ways. The adj. *dikaios* occurs in almost all NT books, most often in Matt. and Paul (17 times each), while its related words are predominantly Pauline, occurring with particular frequency in Rom. It will make for greater clarity if the usage of each writer is examined, the more straightforward passages being left on one side.

1. *Matthew.* The adj. *dikaios* is applied to Christ (Matt. 27:19, 24 *v.l.*), to righteous men (Matt. 1:19; 5:45; 9:13; 10:41; 13:17, 43, 49; 23:28 f., 35; 25:37, 46), and to things (Matt. 20:4; 23:35; 27:4 *v.l.*). *dikaiosynē* occurs at Matt. 3:15; 5:6, 10, 20; 6:1, 33; 21:32; and *dikaioō* at Matt. 11:19; 12:37.

Matt.'s doctrine of righteousness is central to his message. Even the work of John the Baptist is described in these terms, for he came "in the way of righteousness" (Matt. 21:32), i.e. calling all → Israel to repentance and → baptism. In insisting that no one had any claim upon God (Matt. 3:9), John was acting, said Jesus, in the name of God, who was even then bringing in his → kingdom. So in order "to fulfil all righteousness" (Matt. 3:15), Jesus submitted to John's baptism. They are blessed, therefore, who hunger and thirst after righteousness (Matt. 5:6); for whether they live according to the law or not (Matt. 1:19), their one desire is that God may justify them.

In the light of such righteousness, Jesus was particularly concerned to address sinners rather than the righteous (Matt. 9:13; cf. Mk. 2:17) who imagined that they had no need of it. Admittedly, he did not dispute the righteousness of such men (in the sense that they formally fulfilled the → law), for, in the rabbinic tradition, he could speak of the righteous men who were exemplars to Israel (Matt. 10:41; 13:17; 23:15, 29; note that when these are mentioned, it is always in conjunction with the → prophets). The conflict with the → Pharisees and scribes who fancied that they were in the way of righteousness (Matt. 23:27 f.) arose only because they could not see their righteousness as the free gift of God, and so did not submit to John's baptism (Matt. 21:32). They murmured because God's calling of men was in the nature of a free gift and had nothing to do with just rewards (Matt. 20:13–15). They adopted towards other men a "holier than thou" attitude, but Jesus taught that separation between the wicked and the righteous was something reserved for the final → judgment of God (Matt. 13:49).

In teaching this, however, Jesus was not seeking to soften the demands of God's revealed will; on the contrary: "Unless your righteousness exceeds that of the scribes and Pharisees, you will never enter the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. 5:20). Jesus intensified the torah or repealed it (Matt. 5:21 ff.), depending on the character and work of God, who, as the baptism of John reveals, loves his enemies and therefore sends rain upon the just and the unjust (Matt. 5:44 f.; v. 45 is a typically rabbinic utterance).

Should the practice of such righteousness bring about a conflict with the letter of the law, then that man is blessed who, like Jesus himself, is persecuted for righteousness' sake (Matt. 5:10). "Seek first the kingdom of God and his [God's] righteousness", exhorts Jesus (Matt. 6:33). But this righteousness is not to be displayed before the eyes of men (Matt. 6:1); to do so is to seek a → reward from men and not from God, as do the Pharisees who, like whitewashed tombs, appear righteous in the eyes of men, but within (and so in God's sight) are full of unclean thoughts (Matt. 23:27 f.; → Black, White, Red, art. *leukos*).

2. *The Lucan Writings.* The adj. *dikaios* is applied to Christ (Lk. 23:47; Acts 3:14; 7:52; 22:14), to righteous men (Lk. 1:6, 17; 2:25; 14:14; 15:7; 18:9; 20:23; 23:50; Acts 10:22; 24:15), and to things (Lk. 12:57; Acts 4:19). The adv. *dikaiōs* occurs only in the Gospels at Lk. 23:41 in the remark of the penitent thief who observed that he and the other thief were suffering justly, but Jesus had done no wrong. The noun *dikaiōma* occurs in the Gospels only at Lk. 1:6 of Zechariah and Elizabeth who walked "in all the commandments and ordinances of the law blameless." The noun *dikaiosynē* occurs at Lk. 1:75; Acts 10:35; 13:10; 17:31; 24:25; and the vb. *dikaioō* at Lk. 7:29; 10:29; 16:15; 18:14; Acts 13:38 f.

In the Lucan writings the word-group is important as one of the means whereby Christianity is shown to be the legitimate development of Judaism, the latter being a religion tolerated by the Romans and having the status of a *religio licita.* Hence, special mention is made of devout observers of the Jewish law (*dikaioi*) who came into contact with Jesus: Zechariah and Elizabeth, Simeon, Joseph of Arimathea (Lk. 1:6; 2:25; 23:50), to whom is added the Roman centurion, Cornelius (*anēr dikaios*, Acts 10:22; cf. v. 35). The beginning of Lk.'s Gospel is marked by references to Jewish eschatological hopes regarding the return of → Elijah who will turn the disobedient to the wisdom of the just (Lk. 1:17) and to similar hopes of a life whose characteristics throughout will be righteousness and → holiness (Lk. 1:75). Lk. sees this returning Elijah in the person of John the Baptist; tax-gatherers and public sinners justified God (*edikaiōsan*, Lk. 7:29) by being baptized by John, while the → scribes and → Pharisees deceived themselves into thinking they could pass themselves off before men as righteous (Lk. 20:20), or indeed that they were already righteous (Lk. 16:15). This is vividly portrayed in the parable of the Pharisee and the publican (Lk. 18:9–14), in form a perfect rabbinic example of false self-confidence (cf. SB II 210 f.).

But in → heaven there is more joy over one sinner who repents than over ninety-nine righteous (Lk. 15:7). Lk. does not deny that there is joy in heaven over the righteous; but the greatest joy is over those who turn from sin (→ Conversion). For the wonderful thing about Jesus is that by his word he makes new life possible for men who are so depraved and sinful as to suffer social and religious ostracism (Lk. 5:32); and this applies not only to Jews but to Gentiles too (Acts 10:22, 35). Jesus himself is therefore the very exemplar of a righteous man (a fact mentioned only incidentally in Matt. 27:19). His righteousness is openly recognized by the Roman centurion at Jesus' death (Lk. 23:47), after which it becomes fundamental to Christian preaching (Acts 3:14; 7:52; 22:14). As the righteous one he has been raised by God from the dead, in advance of the general → resurrection of the righteous and unrighteous (Acts 24:15), and has been commissioned to judge the whole world in righteousness (Acts 17:31). This being the climax of Luke's message, he records the pointed way in which the question of righteousness was handled by the apostles when face to face with the Jewish authorities: "Whether it is right in the sight of God to listen to you rather than to God, you must judge" (Acts 4:19).

3. *Mark.* By contrast with the other Synoptic Gospels the only instance of the word-group in Mk. is the use of the adj. at Mk. 6:20 in describing Herod's reluctance to have John the Baptist executed on account of Herodias: "for Herod feared John, knowing that he was a righteous and holy man, and kept him safe. When he heard him, he was much perplexed; and yet he heard him gladly." The usage is in line with

Jewish concepts of righteousness; but the general absence of the word-group is indicative of Mk.'s tendency to avoid technical language.

4. *The Johannine Writings.* The adj. *dikaios* is applied to the Father by Jesus in his high priestly prayer (Jn. 17:25) and also in 1 Jn. 1:9 and Rev. 16:5; to Jesus (1 Jn. 2:1, 29; 3:7), though 1 Jn. 3:7, like Rev. 22:11, may apply to men. It applies to Jesus' just judgment (Jn. 5:30); and the Jews are likewise urged to "judge with right judgment" (Jn. 7:24). The adj. is also used impersonally in 1 Jn. 3:12; Rev. 15:3; 16:7; and 19:2. The noun *dikaiosynē* occurs only at Jn. 16:8; Rev. 19:11; 22:11 (where the only instance of *dikaioō* in the Johannine writings occurs as a *v.l.*); though *dikaiōma* also occurs at Rev. 15:4; 19:8.

(a) The sole instance of *dikaiosynē* in the Gospel of Jn. is used in a significant passage: the Paraclete (→ Advocate) will convince the world of sin and of righteousness and of judgment (Jn. 16:8). Jesus is seeking to show that righteousness will be manifested by his returning to the Father (Jn. 16:10), for it is not to be found in the world itself, not even in the world's best and most worthy representatives; the Father alone is its source and fountain-head. Jesus must therefore go away from his disciples, in order that their hopes might not be set upon him in any "this-worldly" fashion, but might be centred upon the Father with whom the Son is one.

(b) 2 and 3 Jn. do not use these words, but 1 Jn. sounds a note peculiar to itself. There are two mutually exclusive spheres: "Little children, let no one deceive you. He who does right is righteous, as he [Christ] is righteous. He who commits sin is of the devil; for the devil has sinned from the beginning" (1 Jn. 3:7 f.; cf. 3:10). In other words, a man can belong only to one of these two spheres, and bears the stamp of one or the other: "If you know that he [Christ] is righteous, you may be sure that every one who does right is born of him" (1 Jn. 2:29). Since there is only one person who is completely righteous, namely, Jesus (1 Jn. 2:1), and only one who has sinned from the beginning (1 Jn. 3:8), it is crucial whose side a man is on, i.e. whether he recognizes and confesses his sin (1 Jn. 1:9–2:2) or not. The sharpness of the distinction (cf. also 1 Jn. 3:12) is probably explained by the fact that many Christians had such a sense of communion with God as to imagine that they no longer belonged to this world but were already in heaven (1 Jn. 1:8), and were therefore beyond the reach of → sin.

(c) *dikaiosynē* is used of the rider on the white horse, Christ, who is called "Faithful and True, and in righteousness he judges and makes war" (Rev. 19:11; → Black, White, Red, art. *leukos*). In the concluding visions of Rev. there is a great separation between the righteous and the evil doers: "And he said to me, 'Do not seal up the words of the prophecy of this book, for the time is near. Let the evil doer still do evil, and the filthy still be filthy, and the righteous still do right, and the holy still be holy' " (Rev. 22:11). The thought is comparable with Dan. 12:9 f. *dikaiōma* means a judgment in Rev. 15:4 and a righteous deed in Rev. 19:8.

5. *Paul.* The adj. *dikaios* is applied by Paul to God (Rom. 3:26), Christ (2 Tim. 4:8), men (Rom. 1:17; cf. Gal. 3:11; Heb. 10:38; Rom. 2:13; 3:10; 5:7, 19; 1 Tim. 1:9; Tit. 1:8), and things (Rom. 7:12; Eph. 6:1; Phil. 1:7; 4:8; Col. 4:1; 2 Thess. 1:5 f.). The noun *dikaiosynē* occurs in Rom. 1:17; 3:5, 21 f., 25 f.; 10:3; cf. 2 Cor. 5:21; Phil. 3:9; Rom. 4:3, 5, 9, 22; cf. Gal. 3:6; Jas. 2:22; Gen. 15:6; Rom. 4:6, 11, 13; 5:17, 21; 6:13, 16, 18; 8:10; 9:30 f.; 10:4 ff., 10; 14:17; 1 Cor. 1:30; 2 Cor. 3:9; 5:21; 6:7, 14; 9:9 f.; 11:15; Gal. 2:21; 3:21; 5:5; Eph. 4:24; 5:9; 6:14; Phil. 1:11; cf.

Heb. 12:11; Jas. 3:18; Phil. 3:6, 9; 1 Tim. 6:11; 2 Tim. 2:22; 3:16; 4:8; Tit. 3:5. *dikaiōma* occurs in Rom. 1:32; 2:26; 5:16; 8:4; and the only instances of *dikaiōsis* in the NT are to be found in Rom. 4:25; 5:18. The adv. *dikaiōs* occurs in 1 Cor. 15:34; 1 Thess. 2:10; Tit. 2:12. The vb. *dikaioō* occurs in Rom. 2:13; 3:4, 20; cf. Gal. 2:16; Rom. 3:24, 26, 28, 30; 4:2, 5; 5:1, 9; 6:7; 8:30, 33; 1 Cor. 4:4; 6:11; Gal. 2:16 f.; 3:8, 11, 24; 5:4; 1 Tim. 3:16; Tit. 3:7.

Paul thus makes the most frequent use of this whole word-group, and gives it its widest range of meanings. Of all NT writers, he it is who establishes the closest connexion with the OT, when speaking of God's righteousness and God's justification of sinners. God's righteousness is essentially his covenant dealings with his people, who are thereby constituted a new humanity, a new → Israel comprising both Jews and Gentiles. This divine righteousness is revealed by the fact that God's purposes are not foiled by man's sin; rather he remains almighty both as Lord and Saviour in spite of man's rebellion. Since man's sin has been so radically dealt with, the demarcation between Israel and the Gentiles can be swept away so that the new people of God may come into being. The transgression and unbelief of the one man (→ Adam; Gen. 3) brought unbelief into the world, with the result that all men fell under God's condemnation. But now the righteous act (*dikaiōma*) of the one man (Christ), his absolute trust in him who justifies the ungodly, has defied the curse of → sin by bringing into the world the possibility of a similarly implicit trust in God. The result, at the appearing of Christ, will be the acquittal (*dikaiōsis*), the declaring righteous of all who are members of the new humanity (*dikaioi katastathēsontai hoi polloi*, "many will be made righteous"; Rom. 5:16–19). The following strands of teaching may be distinguished:

(a) By the works of the law, i.e. on the basis of perfect obedience, no man can be justified (Rom. 3:20, 28; Gal. 2:16; 3:11). Indeed, there would have been no need for Christ to die if *dikaiosynē* were by the law (Gal. 2:21; cf. 3:21). Henceforth, he who would be justified by the → works of the law shows that he has fallen from grace (Gal. 5:4). Thus men who pursue the righteousness of the law come to grief upon a stumbling stone (Rom. 9:32; → Offence, art. *proskomma*; → Rock, art. *lithos*). For through Christ this law has lost its absolute validity (Rom. 10:4; → Goal, art. *telos* NT 1 (a)), because by its own standards, he who knew no sin was made sin for us (2 Cor. 5:21; → Reconciliation, art. *katallassō* NT 4). Rom. 2:13 seems to contradict this: the doers of the law are justified, not the hearers (cf. 10:5). But it was precisely in the matter of *doing* the law that Israel had failed (Rom. 9:31), for a man can only do the will of God when he is grasped by the righteousness of God and completely taken up by it. Otherwise sin usurps the law (Rom. 7), and man is powerless against it because sin is not primarily evil deeds or evil inclinations, but man's striving for his own righteousness and justification (Rom. 10:3). Hence, only the man who has died to sin and so is justified (Rom. 6:7) can do God's will (Rom. 6:10).

(b) From this Paul concludes that man can be justified only by → faith in Christ (Rom. 3:26, 28; 5:1; Gal. 2:16), i.e. by trusting utterly and only in God's grace, which by definition must be a free gift (Rom. 3:24). Jews and Gentiles are justified in the same way: the circumcised (Israel) on the ground of their faith and the uncircumcised (the nations) because of their faith (Rom. 3:30; cf. Gal. 3:8). Here Paul appeals to the testimony of Scripture concerning → Abraham, who trusted in the God who justifies the ungodly (Rom. 4:5, 9, 11; Gal. 3:6; cf. E. Käsemann, "The Faith of

Abraham in Romans 4", in *Perspectives on Paul*, 1971, 79–101; A. T. Hanson, "Abraham the Justified Sinner", in *Studies in Paul's Technique and Theology*, 1974, 52–66; C. K. Barrett, "The Allegory of Abraham, Sarah, and Hagar in the Argument of Galatians", in J. Friedrich, W. Pöhlmann and P. Stuhlmacher, eds., *Rechtfertigung. Festschrift für Ernst Käsemann*, 1976, 1–16). Similarly, in the light of the transition between Rom. 3:20 and 3:21 ff., *dikaiosynē* in the latter passage must be taken as meaning the way in which God justifies. Rom. 3:20 says: "Therefore by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified in God's sight"; Rom. 3:21 f. continues: "But now the righteousness of God has been manifested. . ., the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ. . . ." The outcome of this righteousness of God is therefore being "justified freely by his grace" (v. 24). Vv. 25 f. take up the same idea and may be paraphrased as follows: "[Christ Jesus] has God put forward as an expiation [or propitiation] by his sacrificial death [→ blood], an expiation which becomes a reality through faith [→ Reconciliation, art. *hilaskomai* NT 4]. This took place to show his righteousness, because in the time of his forbearance he had passed over former sins [→ Patience, art. *anechomai* NT 2]; it was to prove at the present time that he himself is righteous, that he might be just and the justifier of him who lives by faith in Jesus Christ". Christ's atoning work is viewed from three different aspects. First, it is experienced as a reality only by → faith, since it was Christ's faith in him who justifies the ungodly (Phil. 2:8) which enabled him to be "made sin", i.e. treated as an ungodly man. To faith, therefore, Christ's atonement is something objectively real, for it is only through faith that we can die with Christ. Second, the sacrificial death of Christ atones for sin because it is proof of God's righteousness, i.e. it was not intended to atone for Christ's alleged offence of blasphemy (→ Revile, art. *blasphēmeō*), but to procure justification for all believers (cf. 1 Cor. 1:30). Third, this justification anticipates Christ's return in that it is already revealed; it enables God to be just, for he does not plunge men into sin so that they may experience his grace (see Rom. 3:5 ff.), but, in spite of the alienation between himself and men, he enables men even now to exercise believing trust and thereby, even before the manifestation of "the age to come", to enter into newness of life (Rom. 5:17). The manner in which God justifies the sinner is expressed by the following phrases: *dikaiosynē pisteōs* "righteousness of faith" (Rom. 4:11, 13); *dōreas tēs dikaiosynēs* "free gift of righteousness" (Rom. 5:17); *dikaiosynēn tēn ek pisteōs* "righteousness through faith" (Rom. 9:30; 10:6, 10; Phil. 3:9).

(c) Since the believer has died with Christ to → sin and is now justified (Rom. 6:7), he lives only for God (6:11). This can be expressed in the words of Rom. 6:18: "Thanks be to God that. . ., having been set free from sin, you have become slaves of righteousness" (cf. v. 19). Paul can therefore speak of being subject to the righteousness of God (Rom. 10:4 cf. E. Käsemann, " 'The Righteousness of God' in Paul", in *New Testament Questions of Today*, 1969, 168–82). All such phrases, however, are but variations on the theme of the Christian belonging exclusively to God; see Rom. 6:13, 22: "But now being made free from sin and having become slaves of God . . . do not yield your members to sin as instruments of wickedness, but yield yourselves to God as men who have been brought from death to life, and your members to God as instruments of righteousness." Similarly Paul can speak of the service of righteousness (2 Cor. 3:9; cf. 11:15) and of its → weapons (Eph. 6:10–17), since the righteousness of God is the way in which he reveals himself and the only

way in which he can be approached (Rom. 1:16 f.). On 1 Cor. 4:4 → Conscience, art. *syneidēsis* NT 4. On Rom. 1:17; 3:21; Gal. 3:11; Heb. 8:38; cf. Hab. 2:4 see below, 6 (b).

(d) As the → resurrection anticipates the universal manifestation of God's kingdom, in the same way righteousness at the present time (Rom. 3:26) anticipates the final revelation of God's righteousness at the parousia of Christ, for believers "through the Spirit, by faith, wait for the hope of righteousness" (Gal. 5:5; cf. 2:17; Rom. 5:19). Otherwise, however, Paul always speaks of believers having been justified (*dikaiousthai*), i.e. in the past tense. The connecting link between present and future righteousness is the fact that, while believers have already become a people for God's own possession, he is still at enmity with the world as a whole ("all men", Rom. 5:18).

Hence, the justification of the individual springs entirely from that of all men (Rom. 5:19), so that it is not we who possess righteousness but righteousness which possesses us; we are its servants (Rom. 6:18; 2 Cor. 3:9). Our justification both comes from and extends into the future.

(e) Paul's doctrine of God's righteousness was so alien to the early church that Col. makes no use whatsoever of these words; Eph. has them merely in certain echo-like phrases (4:24; 5:9; 6:14), while the Pastorals speak of them entirely in terms of Hellenistic virtues: 1 Tim. 6:11; 2 Tim. 2:22: "Aim at righteousness. . ."; Tit. 1:8 (listing the virtues of a → "bishop"); 2:12: God's saving grace trains us "to live sober, upright and godly lives in this world". Similarly Scripture is profitable "for training in righteousness" (2 Tim. 3:16), and the law is considered to be only for the lawless and profane, not for the righteous who by their virtues far surpass the law (1 Tim. 1:9). So the Lord, the righteous judge (cf. Rev. 19:12) will award the crown of righteousness to his apostle when the latter has finished his course (2 Tim. 4:7 f.). The preaching of virtue is made possible, however, by our being "justified by his [Christ's] grace" (Tit. 3:7), for God "saved us, not because of deeds done by us in righteousness, but in virtue of his own mercy" (3:5).

6. *The Epistle to the Hebrews.* The adj. *dikaios* occurs at Heb. 10:38 in the quotation from Hab. 2:4 "my righteous one shall live by faith". *dikaiosynē* occurs at Heb. 1:9 (quoting Pss. 45[44]:7); 5:13; 7:2; 11:7 (of → Noah); 11:23; 12:11 (cf. Jas. 3:18; Phil. 1:11), and *dikaiōma* at Heb. 9:1, 10. The vb. *dikaioō* is not found at all in Heb.

(a) Heb. shows scarcely any Pauline influence, righteousness being seen as the result of faith in the invisible God. This is the sense in which the epistle speaks of righteousness *kata pistin* "according to faith" (Heb. 11:7; cf. vv. 4, 33 f.; → Faith). God's discipline (*paideia*; cf. Heb. 12:5–11; Prov. 3:11 f.) leads to this righteousness, and for those made perfectly righteous he has prepared a place in heaven (Heb. 12:23). The Son, as the antitype of → Melchizedek (Heb. 7:2) is the King of Righteousness (cf. 1:8, 9). The ordinances of the old covenant are described in Heb. 9:1 by the word *dikaiōma*, and in Heb. 9:10 are further characterized as "ordinances of the flesh", i.e. those of a merely temporary nature – particularly, no doubt, those relating to the sacrificial system. *H. Seebass*

(b) Whilst Heb. does not use the vb. to justify, and relates faith in Heb. 11 directly to the invisible God, drawing its examples from the OT, there are certain parallels

with Pauline thought. For Paul likewise is concerned to show that his understanding of salvation is entirely in line with that in the OT. The burden of the argument of Rom. 4 is to show from the example of → Abraham and → David that justification under the old covenant was by faith (cf. Gal. 3:15–18, where Paul stresses that it is by → promise and not by works, with Heb. 6:13 ff.). Similarly, Paul's teaching on Jesus' propitiatory death is paralleled in Heb. by the argument that Jesus as our perfect high → priest has offered himself in → sacrifice, fulfilling the day of atonement ritual and thus inaugurating the new → covenant, thereby superseding the old covenant, its priesthood and sacrifices (Heb. 7–10). The new element is the way in which the thought of the day of atonement ritual is carried through, so that the believer has his sins dealt with and gains access to God through Jesus' priestly and sacrificial act on the cross and his exaltation: "Therefore, brethren, since we have confidence to enter the sanctuary by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way which he opened for us through the curtain, that is, through his flesh, and since we have a great high priest over the house of God, let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, with our hearts sprinkled clean from an evil conscience and our bodies washed with pure water" (Heb. 10:19–22; cf. Lev. 16; F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, *NLC*, 1964, 244–52). J. A. T. Robinson goes even further and sees the death of Jesus in Heb. 10:19 as "the new Encaenia or Dedication (*enekainisen*)" (*Twelve New Testament Studies*, *SBT* 34, 1962, 172). Robinson suggests that the author of Heb. is "conflating the two ideas that the Cross is the dedication (a) of the new covenant (cf. 9:18: 'Even the first covenant hath not been dedicated (*enkekainistai*) without blood') and (b) of the new temple (the Encaenia as a technical term [cf. John 10:22] goes back to the rededication of the Temple in I Macc. 4:54–9, and the whole argument of chapters 9 and 10 leads to the climax that Jesus has now 'opened' the new sanctuary in the temple of his body)" (ibid.).

The writer proceeds to apply this teaching to the need for patience, which he supports with a quotation from Hab. 2:3 f.: "For yet a little while, and the coming one shall come and shall not tarry; but my righteous one shall live by faith [*ho de dikaios mou ek pisteōs zēsetai*], and if he shrinks back my soul has no pleasure in him" (Heb. 10:37 f.). The prophet Habakkuk lived in the latter part of the 7th cent. B.C. at a time of oppression, crying out for vindication of divine righteousness. Yahweh replied by telling him to be patient, for the oppressor would reap his due judgment, and the righteous man would be preserved by his loyal trust in God: "For the vision awaits its time; it hastens to the end – it will not lie. If it seems slow, wait for it; it will surely come, it will not delay. Behold, he whose soul is not upright in him shall fail, but the righteous shall live by his faith [MT *wᵉṣaddîq beʾᵉmûnāṯô yiḥyeh*]" (Hab. 2:3 f.). In the LXX version the words are given a different emphasis with various changes of detail: "For the vision is for a time yet to come. But it will spring up at last and will not be in vain. Though he may tarry, wait for him; for he will assuredly come and will not fail. If any one draw back my soul hath no pleasure in him. But the just [or "righteous one"] shall live by faith in me [*ho de dikaios ek pisteōs mou zēsetai*]." This reading follows the B text of the LXX, but the A text and C group of MSS change the place of the possessive pronoun and thus give a significantly different sense: *ho de dikaios mou ek pisteōs zēsetai*, "but my righteous one will live by faith[fulness]" (cf. F. F. Bruce, op. cit., 273). Codex A has the *mou* ("my") in both positions, but this is evidently a secondary reading. Most editors prefer the B text,

and it has even been suggested that the A reading has been influenced by the text of Heb. (cf. B. Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic*, 1961, 231). But the A reading has been defended by T. W. Manson ("The Argument from Prophecy", *JTS* 46, 1945, 129 ff.) claiming that it makes better sense in the context of the argument. God's righteous one will live by faithfulness. By contrast the leader who plays the coward "*eo ipso* shows that he is not God's chosen. The genuine choice of God, God's righteous one, will be faithful to his God, his people, and his task, and so he will win life."

If this is correct, the LXX gives an interpretation which focuses on one individual, God's chosen one, and on the element of faithfulness. The author of Heb. further interprets this, applying it to the second coming of Christ. The introductory clause ("for yet a little while") is not taken from any attested text of Hab., but may derive from Isa. 26:20. Heb. places a definite article before the participle "coming", so as to give the messianic title "the coming one" (cf. Matt. 11:3 par. Lk. 7:19). But Heb. also inverts the two parts of the verse: "my righteous one" is applied to the believer who may be tempted to lose patience and doubt the second coming, and thus shrink back. "My righteous one" thus becomes the subject for both parts of the verse. At the same time, the author of Heb. may not, like various commentators, feel compelled to choose between the two alternative interpretations of *pistis*, i.e. as "faith" and "faithfulness". For in living by faith one becomes faithful in the sense of loyal to the promises of God, enduring temptation and hardship. And this is, in fact, the theme of ch. 11 with its many examples of faith which enabled the heroes of faith to endure (cf. also Heb. 12:1 f.).

The interpretation of Hab. 2:3 f. was discussed by the rabbis. Rabbi Simlai (c. A.D. 250) claimed that the 613 commandments received by Moses had been summed up by David in eleven commandments (Ps. 15), by Isaiah in six (Isa. 33:15 f.), by Micah in three (Mic. 6:8), by Isaiah again in two (Isa. 56:1), and finally by Amos in one (Amos 5:4), but Rabbi Nachman ben Isaac (c. A.D. 350) substituted Hab. 2:4b for Amos 5:4 as the summary in one commandment (Makkoth 23b; cf. C. E. B. Cranfield, *The Epistle to the Romans*, *ICC*, I, 1975, 101; SB III 542 ff.). The Qumran community applied the passage to those who were loyal to the Teacher of Righteousness: "Interpreted, this concerns all those who observe the Law in the House of Judah, whom God will deliver from the House of Judgement because of their suffering and because of their faith in the Teacher of Righteousness" (1 QpHab 8:1–3; for Qumran exegesis see R. N. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Age*, 1975, 40 ff.; J. A. Ziesler, op. cit., 103).

Hab. 2:4 is quoted and interpreted twice by Paul as a testimonium laying the foundation for his doctrine of justification by faith. In Rom. 1:16 Paul declares that he is "not ashamed of the gospel: it is the power of God for salvation to every one who has faith, to the Jew first and also to the Greek." He then adds: "For in it the righteousness of God is revealed through faith for faith; as it is written, 'He who through faith is righteous shall live' " (RSV; cf. RSV mg. "The righteous shall live by faith"; *ho de dikaios ek pisteōs zēsetai*). In Gal. 3:11 Paul argues: "Now it is evident that no man is justified before God by the law; for 'He who through faith is righteous shall live' " (RSV; cf. RSV mg. "the righteous shall live by faith"; *ho dikaios ek pisteōs zēsetai*). There is also an echo of the thought in Phil. 3:9, where Paul declares it his aim to be found in Christ "not having a righteousness of my own, based on law,

but that which is through faith in Christ, the righteousness from God that depends on faith."

C. H. Dodd suggests that the quotation was current as a testimonium to the coming of Christ in primitive Christian times, and that it was used independently by both Paul and the author of Heb. He thinks that Paul quoted it in Gal. as an *ad hominem* argument based on common acceptance of the testimonium by himself and his opponents (*According to the Scriptures*, 1952, 50 f.). F. F. Bruce sees no fundamental difference between Paul's use of the text and that of Heb. (op. cit., 274). A. Feuillet argues that Paul's meaning is not simply that "the just shall live by faith." Because Paul attaches *ek pisteōs* to *zēsetai*, dropping altogether the possessive pronoun (*mou*, "my", which occurs in the LXX and Heb.), Feuillet contends that Paul's thesis is "he who is just in virtue of faith will live" ("La Citation d'Habacuc II.4 et les Huit Premiers Chapîtres de l'Épître aux Romains", *NTS* 6, 1959–60, 52–80). He further argues that this is the thesis that Paul develops in Rom. 1–8. His argument is adopted by J. A. Ziesler who endorses the forensic and ethical meaning of *dikaios*: "the believer is really righteous because he is in Christ, though this righteousness is not and never becomes his own. This is the righteousness acceptable to God which enables the man of faith to live. This life is probably eschatological salvation, understood forensically and in terms of eternal life, cf. Rom. 5:17; Ezek. 18:27" (op. cit., 177). C. E. B. Cranfield relates *zēsetai* ("will live") to Rom. 2:7; 4:17; 5:17, 18, 21; 6:4, 10, 11, 13, 22, 23; 7:10; 8:2, 6, 10, 13; 10:5; 12:1 (op. cit., 101).

Paul is giving a selective interpretation of Hab. which asserts a fundamental identity between the righteous in Israel and the righteous in the Christian community (E. E. Ellis, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament*, 1957, 120). The Heb. *'ᵉmûnâh* means both faithfulness and faith (op. cit., 177), the former denoting the quality of character produced by faith. The hiphil form of the corresponding vb. *h'myn b* (cf. Num. 14:11), means both "to show steadfastness in" and "to believe in". As the argument of Rom. shows, the faith that Paul is contending for is never a bare faith which does not issue in a life of faithfulness (cf. Rom. 6:1 ff.). On the other hand, faithfulness springs from faith and not *vice versa*.

C. E. B. Cranfield argues against the numerous exegetes who link *ek pisteōs* ("by faith") with the vb. *zēsetai* ("will live") on the grounds that this reflects the MT and LXX (op. cit., 101 f.). Paul is giving an interpretation of Hab. But to argue that, if Paul had meant to link "by faith" with "the just", he would have written *ho de ek pisteōs dikaios zēsetai*, fails to appreciate that Paul is quoting and not formulating something independently. Moreover, to claim that *zēsetai* alone without the support of *ek pisteōs* is weak, is to fail to recognize the significance of the word-group associated with "live" in Rom. Cranfield advances three positive arguments for linking "the just" (*ho dikaios*) with "by faith" (*ek pisteōs*). (i) The context requires it, for Paul's thesis is not immediately concerned with living by faith but with righteousness by faith. (ii) The structure of the epistle requires it: Rom. 1:18–4:25 expounds the meaning of "the just by faith", while Rom. 5:1–8:39 expounds the meaning of the promise that the man who by faith is righteous "will live". (iii) The connexion between righteousness and faith is made explicit by Rom. 5:1 ("therefore being justified by faith") which summarizes the argument of the previous section, and also by 4:11 ("seal of righteousness by faith"), 4:13 ("the righteousness of faith"), 9:30 ("righteousness through faith"), and 10:6 ("the righteousness based on faith says").

7. *James.* The adj. *dikaios* occurs in Jas. 5:6 ("you have killed the righteous man") and Jas. 5:16 ("The prayer of a righteous man has great power in its effects"). The noun *dikaiosynē* is found at Jas. 1:20 ("for the anger of man does not work the righteousness of God"); 2:23 quoting Gen. 15:6 ("and the scripture was fulfilled which says, 'Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned to him as righteousness'; and he was called the friend of God"; cf. Rom. 4:3; Gal. 3:11; Isa. 41:8; 51:2; 2 Chr. 20:7; Dan. 3:35); and 3:18 ("And the harvest of righteousness is sown in peace by those who make peace"). The vb. *dikaioō* also occurs three times: "Was not Abraham our father justified by works, when he offered his son Isaac upon the altar?" (Jas. 2:21); "You see that a man is justified by works and not by faith alone" (Jas. 2:24; cf. v. 23 quoted above); "And in the same way was not also Rahab the harlot justified by works when she received the messengers and sent them out another way?" (Jas. 2:25; cf. Jos. 2:1–21).

There has been a considerable debate on whether James is actually contradicting Paul and in the past Jas. 2:14–26 has been a major battleground in the conflict between Protestant and Catholic apologists in the debate on justification by faith (for a brief survey and literature see M. Dibelius and H. Greeven, *James: A Commentary on the Epistle of James*, *Hermeneia*, 1976, 174–80; see also the bibliography below). Dibelius and Greeven see as the background a basically Jewish exposition of scripture (op. cit., 161–67), and point out that the example of Abraham must be seen in the light of the Jewish tradition about him (cf. Midrash Rabbah on Genesis; Sir. 44:19 ff.; 1 Macc. 2:52 ["Was not Abraham found faithful when tested, and it was reckoned to him as righteousness?"]; Philo, *Abr.* 167 on the offering of Isaac ["For I might almost say that all the other actions which won favour with God are surpassed by this"]; *Rer. Div. Her.* 94; *Leg. All.* 3, 228; Dibelius and Greeven, op. cit. 168–74; B. Beer, *Leben Abrahams nach Auffassung der jüdischen Sage*, 1859; P. Billerbeck, "Abrahams Leben und Bedeutung nach Auffassung der älteren Haggada", *Nathanael. Zeitschrift für die Arbeit der evangelischen Kirche an Israel* 15, 1899, 43 ff.; ibid. 16, 1900, 33 f.; O. Schmitz, "Abraham im Spätjudentum und im Urchristentum", *Aus Schrift und Geschichte*, Festschrift A. Schlatter, 1922, 99–123; S. Sandmel, *Philo's Place in Judaism: A Study of Conceptions of Abraham in Jewish Literature*, 1956).

James' position presupposes the radically non-Jewish separation of faith and works wrought by Paul. Dibelius and Greeven think that James was not attacking Paul as such, but it was Paul's fate to be misunderstood and James lacked the depths of spiritual experience which lay behind the Pauline slogan of "faith without works" (op. cit., 180 f.). But the context of James' remarks argues against this. The situation is one in which the rich could be indifferent to the starving and ill-clad, content with their own spirituality (Jas. 2:14–18; 3:13 ff.; cf. 5:1 ff.), and in which church members saw no inconsistency between their spirituality and gossip and slander (Jas. 3:1 ff., 11 ff.). It was a situation which was not without its parallels in the church at Corinth with its factions, moral laxity and complacent attitudes in the face of Paul's collection for the → poor. In such a situation Paul himself did not preach justification by faith but the need to do something.

James introduces the problem by asking: "What does it profit, my brethren, if a man says he has faith but has not works? Can his faith save him?" Faith here could mean either notional assent to a doctrine such as justification by faith, or preoccupa-

tion with or uncritical acceptance of an attitude without asking about its practical implications. It is not the wholehearted trust and self-commitment which Paul speaks of. Similarly, the works which justify a man are not the works envisaged by Paul. For Paul faith signifies implicit trust and works man's attempt to procure favour with God by his own merits. With James the contrast is between holding something to be true without acting upon it and acknowledging a truth which is worked out in daily life. James' use of "righteousness" (1:20; 3:18) and the "righteous" (3:5; 5:6, 16) shows that he is standing in the Jewish tradition (cf. also his address in 1:1). At the same time he is appealing within that tradition to a strand of interpretation which complements rather than contradicts Paul.

For in both Paul and James *dikaioō* means to pronounce righteous, though in the case of James it concerns evidence that can be seen by men whereas in Paul it is the eschatological verdict pronounced by God on the unrighteous. Paul bases his argument on Gen. 15:6, where Abraham believes the promises of God and is declared righteous. Although James quotes the same passage, he illustrates his point not from that passage but from the subsequent story of the offering of Isaac (Jas. 2:21; cf. Gen. 22:1–14). This enables him to draw the conclusion: "You see that faith was active along with his works, and faith was completed by works" (2:22); "For as the body apart from the spirit is dead, so faith apart from works is dead" (2:26). A bare lifeless faith is like a corpse; but the works which animate it are not the self-righteous acts which supposedly accrue merit with God, but the acting out of the word of God, as is illustrated by the way Abraham and Rahab acted out the word of God which came to them. Thus, Paul and James are fighting on different fronts. Paul is attacking self-righteous legalism, and James self-righteous indifference.

8. *1 and 2 Peter.* The adj. *dikaios* occurs in 1 Pet. 3:12 ("For the eyes of the Lord are upon the righteous", quoting Ps. 34:16); 3:18 ("For Christ also died once for all, the righteous for the unrighteous, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh but made alive in the spirit"); 4:18 ("And 'If the righteous man is scarcely saved, where will the impious and sinner appear?' " quoting Prov. 11:31 LXX); 2 Pet. 1:13 ("I think it right"); and 2:7 f. ("And if he rescued righteous Lot, greatly distressed by the licentiousness of the wicked [for by what that righteous man saw and heard as he lived among them, he was vexed in his righteous soul day after day with their lawless deeds], then the Lord knows how to rescue the godly from trial, and to keep the unrighteous under punishment until the day of judgment"; cf. Gen. 19:16, 29). The adv. *dikaiōs* occurs in 1 Pet. 2:23 ("When he was reviled, he did not revile in return; when he suffered he did not threaten; but he trusted to him who judges justly"). The vb. *dikaioō* does not occur at all. But the noun *dikaiosynē* is found twice in 1 Pet. and 4 times in 2 Pet.: "He himself bore our sins in his body on the tree, that we might die to sin and live to righteousness. By his wounds you have been healed" (1 Pet. 2:24); "But even if you do suffer for righteousness' sake, you will be blessed. Have no fear of them, nor be troubled" (1 Pet. 3:14). The concept figures in the opening address of 2 Pet.: "Simon Peter, a servant and apostle of Jesus Christ, to those who have obtained a faith of equal standing with ours in the righteousness of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ" (2 Pet. 1:1). 2 Pet. 2:5 speaks of → Noah as "a herald of righteousness", and 2 Pet. 2:21 describes the Christian faith and life as "the way of righteousness" in its dire warning against falling away: "For it would have been better for them never to have known the way of righteousness than after know-

ing it to turn back from the holy commandment delivered to them." Finally it occurs in 2 Pet. 3:13: "But according to his promise we wait for new heavens and a new earth in which righteousness dwells."

There is the sense in which a righteous person is a member of the righteous community, but in none of these passages is the notion a bare formality. Righteousness takes its character from God himself (1 Pet. 2:23; cf. Rev. 16:5), and salvation is grounded in righteousness (1 Pet. 3:18; cf. 2:24 ff.) which finds its expression in right behaviour (1 Pet. 2:24; cf. 3:12; 4:18). He who is called to suffer for righteousness' sake is blessed (1 Pet. 3:14), and in so doing lives out the righteousness of Christ. Thus the Christian faith and way of life can be called "the way of righteousness" (2 Pet. 2:11), and the goal of life can be described in terms of righteousness (2 Pet. 3:13).

9. *Contemporary Interpretations of Righteousness.* Traditionally the question of justification has been a divisive issue since the time of the Reformation. The Roman Catholic view set out at the Council of Trent regards justification as both an acquittal and a making righteous, and can even speak of an increase of justification (Session VI, Canon 24). On the Catholic side it is pointed out that Scripture never speaks of justification by faith *alone*, and support for the ethical interpretation is found both in the OT and in Jas. At the same time, it has been argued that the Council of Trent insists that works are entirely the fruit of grace, and Hans Küng has argued that there is a fundamental agreement between the Reformed and Catholic understanding of justification (*Justification: The Doctrine of Karl Barth and a Catholic Reflection*, 1964). Perhaps typical of the more traditional Catholic exegesis is the view of F. Amiot: "God considers just those whom he has rendered just, and implicitly declares them to be so. But he does not, strictly speaking, pronounce a judgment. The judgment is reserved for the day of the appearance before the judgment seat of Christ. . . . Then it is that God will finally declare just those who are just, having remained faithful to the end" (*The Key Concepts of St Paul*, 1962, 124). For K. Kertelge, justification is forensic but not merely so; it is a real rather than an imputed righteousness (*"Rechtfertigung" bei Paulus*, 1967, 115–20).

Against the Catholic position it has been pointed out that the distinction between "real" and "imputed" righteousness is a false antithesis. For the notion of imputation is no mere legal fiction. Because the believer is in Christ, he is really righteous, since he has the righteousness of Christ (cf. E. J. Goodspeed, "Some Greek Notes: III Justification", *JBL* 73, 1954, 86–91; cf. also G. W. Bromiley, "The Doctrine of Justification in Luther", *EQ* 24, 1952, 91–100; E. G. Rupp, *The Righteousness of God*, 1953, 177–83; and J. A. Ziesler, op. cit., 1–16 for a survey of interpretations).

Karl Barth defines the righteousness of God as that which is revealed by the gospel according to Rom. 1:16 f.: "There it is made clear that the gospel is the revelation of *dikaiosynē*, also called *dikaiōsis* (Rom. 4:25 and 5:18) and *dikaiōma* (Rom. 5:16) – i.e. the revelation of the final righteous decision of God, which, for everyone who acknowledges it in faith, is the power of God unto salvation – *dynamis Theou eis sōtērian*" (*Christ and Adam: Man and Humanity in Romans 5*, *SJT Occasional Papers* 5, 1956, 1; cf. "The Justification of Man", *§* 61, *CD* IV, 1, 514–642; and for a brief discussion C. Brown, *Karl Barth and the Christian Message*, 1967, 130–9). Accordingly, justification is construed as "conforming to the decision about

them that has already been made in Him" (*Christ and Adam*, 3). "In sovereign anticipation of our faith God has justified us through the sacrificial blood of Christ" (ibid., 2). Underlying Barth's approach is his view of the covenant which he understands as the partnership between God and man generally in view of the union of divine and human nature in Jesus Christ. There is a sense in which all God's dealings with man take place in him. He is the elect for all and the reprobate for all. On the cross he bore the wrath of God for all, so that the wrath of God is a thing of the past. The resurrection of Jesus is God's *verdict* on man in view of Christ's death in his place. Thus the justification of man takes place objectively in Christ, and is appropriated subjectively as men come to faith in him. The difference between believers and unbelievers lies in the fact that the former consciously enjoy their justification and live it out, whereas the latter do not. Barth's position has been criticized from various angles. On the one hand, it has been questioned on the grounds that his view of the covenant is a piece of speculation based on a biblical core of ideas. On the other hand, his exegesis of Rom. requires him to treat *dikaiosynē*, *dikaiōsis* and *dikaiōma* as synonyms which identify the justifying act of God with the righteousness of God, making it take place entirely outside man as God's verdict, whereas for Paul one cannot speak of justification apart from faith. In so doing Barth makes justification and atonement identical (→ Reconciliation; → Redemption).

R. Bultmann holds that *dikaioō* means to make righteous, because it normally renders the Heb. in the hiphil and thus must be causative. But the term righteous means "in a right relationship" and not "ethically upright". It is forensic and eschatological, in that righteousness is already imputed to man in the present on the presupposition that he has faith, but as such it is also eschatological in that the saving event has ended the old course of the world and has introduced the new aeon (cf. *Systematic Theology*, I, 1952, 270–78; "DIKAIOSYNĒ THEOU", *JBL*, 12–16). C. K. Barrett takes a similar view of *dikaioō* (*The Epistle to the Romans*, *BNTC*, 1957, 74 ff.). Alan Richardson argues that the righteous man actually is righteous but only eschatologically (*An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament*, 1958, 236 ff.).

Ernst Käsemann rejects the view that God's righteousness is a property of the divine nature, as deriving from the Greek speculative tradition and as being in conflict with the OT and Jewish tradition. For him it is both a power and a gift (" 'The Righteousness of God' in Paul", in *New Testament Questions of Today*, 1969, 168–82; cf. also "Justification and Salvation History in the Epistle to the Romans", in *Perspectives on Paul*, 1971, 60–78; and *An die Römer, HNT* 8a, 1973). It is "a power which brings salvation to pass" (*New Testament Questions of Today*, 181), "the rightful power with which God makes his cause to triumph in the world which has fallen away from him and which yet, as creation, is his inviolable possession" (ibid., 180). Käsemann sees the phrase *dikaiosynē theou* as a fixed term which existed independently of Paul (cf. Matt. 6:33; Jas. 1:20) which can be traced back to Deut. 33:21 ("The LORD executed righteousness [*dikaiosynēn kyrios epoiēsen*] and his judgment with Israel" LXX; cf. ibid., 172). It is found in Test. Dan 6:10 ("Depart therefore, from all unrighteousness, and cleave unto the righteousness of God") and 1QS 11:12 ("If I stumble by reason of the wickedness of my flesh, my justification lies in the righteousness of God").

Käsemann refrains from drawing an over-sharp distinction between the gift-like

character of righteousness, its juridical application and its character as power (ibid.). But C. Müller eliminates the forensic element and thinks of it as eschatologically making real God's rightful power in the world (*Gottes Gerechtigkeit und Gottes Volk. Eine Untersuchung zu Römer 9–11*, *FRLANT* 86, 1964). P. Stuhlmacher sees it as a technical term and a basic theme in apocalyptic, the demonstration of the creator's power that establishes justice (*Gottes Gerechtigkeit bei Paulus*, *FRLANT* 87, 1965).

Against Käsemann it has to be said that the grounds for asserting that "the righteousness of God" is a Jewish formula are not very substantial. Deut. 33:21 appears to be concerned with God as the punishing judge, though there may be grounds for seeing it as a technical term at Qumran (cf. 1QS 10:25; 11:12; 1QM 4:6). Within the teaching of Paul it appears as power (2 Cor. 3:9; Rom. 10:3; 6:13 ff.), a designation for Christ (1 Cor. 1:30), a possible synonym for God's glory (Rom. 3:21 ff.), and a possible description of God's covenant faithfulness (Rom. 3:5). Käsemann makes an important point when he warns against understanding God's righteousness in too narrowly an individualistic way. He has performed a service in drawing attention to the aspect of righteousness as the power of God, and in warning against seeing the term anachronistically and abstractly in terms of a speculative understanding of the divine attributes. On the other hand, it must be said that the righteousness of God is God acting righteously. As such, God is acting in power. As such, his action is a free gift. And in the light of the context of judgment, which Paul develops, e.g. in Rom. 1 and 2 and Gal. 3, God's righteousness has a forensic context.

J. A. Ziesler sees the vb. as essentially relational or forensic and the noun and adj. as describing behaviour within the relationship (op. cit., 212). But the distinction seems to oversimplify. Perhaps it is safer to say with him that the Pauline doctrine of justification by faith is relational or forensic: "God accepts us as we are, he acquits us despite our lack of deserving, he forgives us. It all rests entirely on his grace, our faith being not the ground but the means by which justification operates, though the expressions may vary, cf. *ek pisteōs* in Rom. 5:1 and *dia pisteōs* in Gal. 2:16. This entire dependence on grace is not only initially, at baptism or conversion, but remains. Even after a lifetime of Christian service, the believer has no works on which to rely. Justification is always by grace through faith, now, and before God's judgment throne, cf. Rom. 3:30; 5:1" (op. cit., 168). Moreover, there is a corporate and ethical aspect to it. "The believer enters not just a private relationship to Jesus, but a new humanity, in which he becomes a new kind of man. Thus there are not only social or corporate implications, but also ethical ones, for he now shares in the risen life of Christ, which means power, including ethical power" (op. cit., 168 f.). This righteousness is the righteousness of Christ which he participates in and receives as a gift. He never possesses it outright as his own, but only in Christ as Christ lives in him (cf. Gal. 2:20). This faith-righteousness means the end of law-righteousness, which in fact was never a real righteousness at all. "True righteousness does not consist in law-fulfilment, for the Christian has died to the Law both as the way to justification and as the way to righteousness. Yet if God looks on believers only as they are found in Christ, he may properly declare them righteous, for in him – and only in him – they are righteous, and therefore ought to be acquitted. There is nothing fictional here" (op. cit., 169). *C. Brown*

→ Cross, → Forgiveness, → Judgment, → Law, → Reconciliation, → Redemption, → Sin

(a). E. R. Achtemeier, "Righteousness in the OT", *IDB* IV 80–5; P. J. Achtemeier, "Righteousness in the NT", *IDB* IV 91–9; F. Amiot, *The Key Concepts of St. Paul*, 1962; J. A. Baird, *The Justice of God in the Teaching of Jesus*, 1963; C. K. Barrett, *The Epistle to the Romans*, *BNTC*, 1957; and *From First Adam to Last*, 1962; G. C. Berkouwer, *Faith and Justification*, 1954; K. Barth, "The Justification of Man", § 61, *CD* IV, 1, 514–642; and *Christ and Adam: Man and Humanity in Romans 5*, *SJT Occasional Papers* 5, 1956; M. Barth, *Justification: Pauline Texts Interpreted in the Light of the Old and New Testaments*, 1971; M. Black, *Romans*, *New Century Bible*, 1973; C. Blackman, "Romans 3 26b: A Question of Translation", *JBL* 87, 1968, 203 f.; G. Bornkamm, "The Revelation of Christ to Paul on the Damascus Road and Paul's Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation", in R. Banks, ed., *Reconciliation and Hope: New Testament Essays on Atonement and Eschatology Presented to L. L. Morris*, 1974, 90–103; and *Paul*, 1971, 109–239; J. A. Bollier, "The Righteousness of God", *Interpretation* 8, 1954, 404–13; G. Bornkamm, G. Barth and H. J. Held, *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew*, 1963; J. F. Bottorff, "The Relation of Justification and Ethics in the Pauline Epistles", *SJT* 26, 1973, 421–30; G. W. Bromiley, "The Doctrine of Justification in Luther", *EQ* 24, 1952, 91–110; F. F. Bruce, *The Teacher of Righteousness in the Qumran Texts*, 1957; *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, *NLC*, 1964; *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans*, *TC*, 1963; and "Justification by Faith in the Non-Pauline Writings of the New Testament", *EQ* 24, 1952, 66–77; and *Paul: Apostle of the Free Spirit*, 1977; J. Buchanan, *The Doctrine of Justification: An Outline of its History in The Church and of its Exposition from Scripture*, (1867) 1961; A. Büchler, *Studies in Sin and Atonement in the Rabbinic Literature of the First Century*, 1928; R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, I–II, 1952–55; "Adam and Christ according to Romans 5", in W. Klassen and C. F. Snyder, eds., *Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation*, 1962, 143–65; and "DIKAIOSYNE THEOU", *JBL* 83, 1964, 12–16; L. Cerfaux, *Christ in the Theology of St. Paul*, 1959^2; H. Conzelmann, "Paul's Doctrine of Justification: Theology or Anthropology?", in F. Herzog, ed., *Theology of the Liberating Word*, 1971, 108–23; C. E. B. Cranfield, "St. Paul and the Law", *SJT* 17, 1964, 43–68; and *The Epistle to the Romans*, *ICC*, I, 1975; A. Cronbach, "Righteousness in Jewish Literature, 200 BC–AD 100", *IDB* IV 85–91; W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*, 1955^2; M. Dibelius and H. Greeven, *James: A Commentary on the Epistle of James*, *Hermeneia*, 1976; K. P. Donfried, "Justification and Last Judgment in Paul", *Interpretation* 30, 1976, 140–52 (fuller form in *ZNW* 67, 90–110); J. W. Drane, *Paul – Libertine or Legalist? A Study in the Theology of the Major Pauline Epistles*, 1975; E. E. Ellis, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament*, 1957; and *Paul and his Recent Interpreters*, 1961; R. Y. K. Fung, *Righteousness and Faith in the Thought of Paul*, (Dissertation, Manchester), 1975; and "The Forensic Character of Justification", *Themelios* 3, 1977, 16–21; V. P. Furnish, *Theology and Ethics in Paul*, 1968, 135–61; T. F. Glasson, "Dying and Rising with Christ", *London and Holborn Quarterly Review*, 1961, 286–91; E. J. Goodspeed, "Some Greek Notes: III. Justification", *JBL* 73, 1954, 86–91; W. Grundmann, "The Teacher of Righteousness of Qumran and the Question of Justification by Faith in the Theology of the Apostle Paul", in J. Murphy-O'Connor, ed., *Paul and Qumran: Studies in New Testament Exegesis*, 1968, 85–114; A. T. Hanson, "Abraham the Justified Sinner", in *Studies in Paul's Technique and Theology*, 1974, 52–66; H. W. Heidland, *logizomai*, *TDNT* IV 284–92; R. T. Herford, *Christianity in Talmud and Midrash*, 1903; D. Hill, "DIKAIOI as a Quasi-Technical Term", *NTS* 11, 1964–65, 296–302; and *Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings: Studies in the Semantics of Soteriological Terms*, *Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series* 5, 1967, 82–162; E. G. Hirsch, "Right and Righteous", in I. Singer, ed., *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, X, 1905, 420–24; Z. C. Hodges, "Light on James Two from Textual Criticism", *Bibliotheca Sacra* 120, 1963, 341–50; A. M. Hunter, *Paul and his Predecessors*, 1961^2; J. Jeremias, "Paul and James", *ExpT* 66, 1954–55, 368–71; and *The Central Message of the New Testament*, 1965, 51–66; S. E. Johnson, "Paul and the Manual of Discipline", *HTR* 48, 1955, 157–65; C. Johnston, "The Controversy between St. Paul and St. James", *Constructive Quarterly* 3, 1915, 603–19; E. Käsemann, " 'The Righteousness of God' in Paul", in *New Testament Questions of Today*, 1969, 168–82; and "Justification and Salvation History in the Epistle to the Romans", in *Perspectives on Paul*, 1971, 60–78; G. Klein, "Righteousness in the NT", *IDB Supplementary Volume*, 1976, 750 ff.; W. L. Knox, "Abraham and the Quest for God", *HTR* 28, 1935, 55–60; H. Küng, *Justification: The Doctrine of Karl Barth and a Catholic Reflection*, 1964; A. R. C. Leaney, "The Righteous Community in St. Paul", *StudEv* II, *TU* 87, 441–46; W. F. Lofthouse, "The

Righteousness of Jahveh", *ExpT* 50, 1938–39, 341–5; and "The Righteousness of God", ibid., 441–5; R. N. Longenecker, *Paul, Apostle of Liberty*, 1964; and *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*, 1975; S. Lyonnet, "Pauline Soteriology", in A. Robert and A. Feuillet, eds., *Introduction to the New Testament*, 1965, 820–65; T. W. Manson, "The Argument from Prophecy", *JTS* 46, 1945, 129 ff.; A. Marmorstein, *The Doctrine of Merits in Old Rabbinic Literature*, 1920; and *The Old Rabbinic Doctrine of God*, I–II, 1927–37; L. Morris, *The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross*, 1960[2]; and *The Cross in the New Testament*, 1967; C. F. D. Moule, "Obligation in the Ethic of Paul", in W. R. Farmer, C. F. D. Moule and R. R. Niebuhr, eds., *Christian History and Interpretation: Studies Presented to John Knox*, 1967, 389–406; and "Fulfilment-words in the New Testament", *NTS* 14, 1968, 293–320; J. Murray, *The Epistle to the Romans*, I–II, *NLC*, 1960–65; F. Nötscher and P. Bläser, "Righteousness (justice)", *EBT* II 780–92; J. Pedersen, *Israel: Its Life and Culture*, I–IV (in 2 volumes), 1926–40; T. G. Pinches, E. J. Thomas, A. R. Gordon, W. C. Allen, J. Denney, A. F. Simpson, A. M. Blackman, P. Shorey, A. B. Keith, J. Abelson and B. C. de Vaux, "Righteousness", *ERE* X 777–811; G. Quell and G. Schrenk, *dikē, dikaios*, etc., *TDNT* II 174–225; G. von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, I–II, 1962–65; "Faith Reckoned as Righteousness", in *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays*, 1966, 125–30; and " 'Righteousness' and 'Life' in the Cultic Language of the Psalms", ibid., 243–66; B. Reicke, *The Epistles of James, Peter, and Jude*, 1964; J. Reumann and W. Lazareth, *Righteousness and Society, Ecumenical Dialog in a Revolutionary Age*, 1967; A. Ritschl, *A Critical History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation*, 1872; and *The Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation*, 1900; C. J. Roetzel, *Judgement in the Community: A Study of the Relationship between Eschatology and Ecclesiology in Paul*, 1972; J. H. Ropes, *The Epistle of St. James*, *ICC*, 1916; and " 'Righteousness' and 'The Righteousness of God' in the Old Testament and in St. Paul", *JBL* 22, 1903, 211–27; H. J. Schoeps, *Paul: The Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish Religious History*, 1961; W. Schmithals, *Paul and James*, *SBT* 46, 1965; H.-H. Schrey, H. H. Walz, and W. A. Whitehouse, *The Biblical Doctrine of Justice and Law*, 1955; A. Schweitzer, *Paul and his Interpreters*, 1912; and *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*, 1931; C. A. A. Scott, *Christianity according to St. Paul*, 1927; R. Scroggs, *The Last Adam: A Study in Pauline Anthropology*, 1966; and "Romans vi. 7 *ho gar apothanōn dedikaiōtai apo tēs hamartias*", *NTS* 10, 1963–64, 104–8; J. Skinner, "Righteousness in OT", *HDB* IV 272–81; N. H. Snaith, *The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament*, 1944; and "Justice and Immortality", *SJT* 17, 1964, 309–24; G. B. Stevens, "Righteousness in NT", *HDB* IV 281–4; and *The Christian Doctrine of Salvation*, 1905; W. A. Stevens, "The Forensic Meaning of *dikaiosynē*", *American Journal of Theology* 1, 1897, 443–50; R. C. Tannehill, *Dying and Rising with Christ*, *BZNW*, 32, 1967; V. Taylor, *Forgiveness and Reconciliation: A Study in New Testament Theology*, 1946[2]; R. B. Ward, "The Works of Abraham: James 2:14–26", *HTR* 61, 1968, 283–90; N. M. Watson, "Some Observations on the Use of DIKAIOO in the Septuagint", *JBL* 79, 1960, 255–66; D. E. H. Whiteley, *The Theology of St. Paul*, 1974[2]; J. A. Ziesler, *The Meaning of Righteousness in Paul: A Linguistic and Theological Enquiry*, *Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series* 20, 1972 (see also the review by N. M. Watson in *NTS* 20, 1973–74, 216–28).

(b). B. Bartmann, *St. Paulus und St. Jacobus über die Rechtfertigung*, 1897; E. Beaucamp, "La justice de Jahwé et l'Economie de l'Alliance", *Stud. Bibl. Francisc. Liber Annuus* 11, 1960–61, 1–55; J. Becker, *Das Heil Gottes. Heils- und Sündenbegriffe in den Qumrantexten und im Neuen Testament*, *StUNT* 3, 1964; K. Benz, "*Dikaiosynē* beim Apostel Paulus", *ThQ* 94, 1912, 590 ff.; J. Böhmer, "Der 'Glaube' im Jakobusbriefe", *Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift* 9, 1898, 241–6; G. Bornkamm, "Die Frage nach der Gerechtigkeit Gottes (Theodizee und Rechtfertigung)", in *Das Ende des Gesetzes*, 1958, 196 ff.; and "Theologie als Teufelskunst, Römer 3, 1–9", in *Geschichte und Glaube*, II, *BEvTh* 53, 1971, 140–8; H. Brunner, "Gerechtigkeit als Fundament des Thrones", *VT* 8, 1958, 426 ff.; J. Cambier, "Justice de Dieu, Salut de tous les Hommes et Foi", *RB* 71, 1964, 537–83; "Péchés des Hommes et Péché d'Adam en Rom. v. 12", *NTS* 11, 1964–65, 217–55; and "La Doctrine Paulinienne de la Justice de Dieu, Principe d'Unité dans l'Eglise et Source de Paix dans le Monde", in O. Böcher and K. Haacker, eds., *Verborum Veritas. Festschrift für Gustav Stählin*, 1970, 159–70; H. Cazelles, "A propos de quelques Textes difficiles relatifs à la Justice de Dieu dans l'Ancien Testament", RB 58, 1951, 169–88; K. Cramer, "Der Begriff der *ṣ*ᵉ*dāqâh* bei Tritojesaja und bei Amos", *ZAW* 27, 1907, 77 ff. and 146 ff.; H. Cremer, *Die Rechtfertigungslehre im Zusammenhange ihrer geschichtlichen Voraussetzungen*, 1899; G. Dalman, *Die richterliche Gerechtigkeit im Alten Testament*, 1897; A. Descamps, *Les Justes et la Justice dans les Evangiles et le Christianisme primitif hormis de la Doctrine proprement Paulinienne*, 1950; and "La Justice de Dieu dans la Bible Grecque", *Studia Hellenistica* 5, 1948, 69–82; E. von Dobschütz, "Die Rechtfertigung bei Paulus, eine Rechtfertigung des Paulus", *ThStKr* 85, 1912, 38–67;

A. Dünner, *Die Gerechtigkeit nach dem alttestamentlichen ṣeḏeq*, (Dissertation, Bonn) 1963; J. Dupont, *La Réconciliation dans la Théologie de Saint Paul*, 1953; G. Eichholz, *Jakobus und Paulus. Ein Beitrag zum Problem des Kanons*, *ThEH* Neue Folge 39, 1953; and *Glaube und Werke bei Paulus und Jakobus*, *ThEH* Neue Folge 88, 1961; K. H. Fahlgren, *ṣᵉḏāqâh, nahestehende und entgegengesetzte Begriffe im Alten Testament*, 1932; A. Feuillet, "La Citation d'Habacuc ii. 4 et les Huit Premiers Chapîtres de l'Épître aux Romains", *NTS* 6, 1959–60, 52–80; G. Fitzer, "Der Ort der Versöhnung nach Paulus", *ThZ* 22, 1966, 161–83; N. Gäumann, *Taufe und Ethik. Studien zu Römer 6*, *BEvTh* 47, 1967; E. Gerstenberger, *Wesen und Herkunft des "apodiktischen Rechts"*, *Wissenschaftliche Monographien* 20, 1965; W. Grundmann, "Gesetz, Rechtfertigung, und Mystik bei Paulus", *ZNW* 32, 1933, 52–65; T. Häring, DIKAIOSYNĒ THEOU *bei Paulus*, 1896; H. W. Heidland, *Die Anrechnung des Glaubens zur Gerechtigkeit*, 1936; N. J. Hein, F. Horst, E. Schweizer, "Gerechtigkeit Gottes", *RGG*[3] II 1402 ff.; F. Horst, *Gottes Recht. Gesammelte Studien zum Recht im Alten Testament*, 1961; A. Jepsen, "*ṣāḏaq* und *ṣᵉḏāqâh* im Alten Testament", in *Gottes Wort und Gottes Land*, Festschrift H. W. Hertzberg, 1965, 78 ff.; G. Jeremias, *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit*, *StUNT* 2, 1963; J. Jeremias, "Die Gedankenführung in Röm. 4. Zum paulinischen Glaubensverständnis", *Analecta Biblica* 42, 1970, 51–65; E. Jüngel, *Paulus und Jesus*, *Hermeneutische Untersuchungen zur Theologie* 2, 1962, 33–70; O. Kaiser, "*dikē* und *ṣᵉḏāqâh*. Zur Frage nach der sittlichen Weltordnung. Ein theologisches Präludium", *Neue Zeitschrift für systematische Theologie und Religionsphilosophie* 7, 1965, 251–73; E. Käsemann, *An die Römer*, *HNT* 8a, 1973; E. Kautsch, *Über die Derivate des Stammes ṣḏq im alttestamentlichen Sprachgebrauch*, 1881; K. Kertelge, *"Rechtfertigung" bei Paulus. Studien zur Struktur des paulinischen Rechtfertigungsbegriffs*, *NTAbh* Neue Folge 3, 1967; G. Klein, "Gottes Gerechtigkeit als Thema der neuesten Paulus-Forschung", *Rekonstruktion und Interpretation*, *BEvTh* 50, 1969, 225–36; K. Koch, *ṣḏq im Alten Testament*, (Dissertation, Heidelberg) 1953; *ṣḏq*, *THAT* II 507–30; and "Wesen und Ursprung der Gemeinschaftstreue in der Königszeit", *ZEE* 5, 1961, 72–90; W. Kokenmüller, *Die Gerechtigkeit Gottes in den Psalmen*, (Dissertation, Jena) 1936; A. Klöpper, "Die Erörterung des Verhältnisses von Glauben und Werken im Jakobusbriefe (cap. 2, 14–26)", *ZWT* 28, 1885, 280–319; P. Kölbing, "*Dikaiosynē Theou* in Röm. 1. 17", *ThStKr* 68, 1895, 7–17; H.-J. Kraus, *Die prophetische Verkündigung des Rechts in Israel*, 1957; E. Kühl, *Die Stellung des Jakobusbriefes zum alttestamentlichen Gesetz und zur paulinischen Rechtfertigungslehre*, 1905; O. Kuss, *Der Römerbrief übersetzt und erklärt*, 1957; R. Leivestad, *Guds straffende Rettfertighed*, 1946; E. Lohse, "Glaube und Werke. Zur Theologie des Jakobusbriefes", *ZNW* 48, 1957, 1–22; and "Die Gerechtigkeit Gottes in der paulinischen Theologie", in *Die Einheit des Neuen Testaments*, 1973, 209–27; S. Lyonnet, "Notes sur l'Exégèse de l'Epître aux Romains", *Biblica* 38, 1957, 35–61; "Justification, Jugement, Rédemption, principalement dans l'Epître aux Romains", *Recherches Bibliques* 5, 1960, 166–84; "De 'Justitia Dei' in Epistula ad Romanos i. 17 et iii. 21, 22", *Verbum Domini* 25, 1947, 23–34, 118–21, 129–34, 193–203, 257–63; R. Mach, *Der Zaddik in Talmud und Midrasch*, 1957; E. Ménégoz, "Etude comparative de l'Enseignement de Saint Paul et de Saint Jacques sur la Justification par la Foi", in *Etudes de Théologie et d'Histoire*, 1901, 121–50; O. Michl, *Der Brief an die Römer*, *KEK* 4, 1966 [13]; C. Müller, *Gottes Gerechtigkeit und Gottes Volk. Ein Untersuchung zu Römer 9–11*, *FRLANT* 86, 1964; W. Nagel, "Gerechtigkeit – oder Almosen?", *Vigiliae Christianae* 15, 1961, 141–5; F. Nötscher, *Die Gerechtigkeit Gottes bei den vorexilischen Propheten*, 1915; A. Oepke, "DIKAIOSYNE THEOU bei Paulus in neuer Beleuchtung", *TLZ* 78, 1953, 257–64; and *Der Brief des Paulus an die Galater*, *Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament* 9, 1965[3]; H. van Oyen, "Biblische Gerechtigkeit und weltliches Recht", *ThZ Basel* 6, 1950, 270 ff.; E. Pax, "Studien zum Vergeltungsproblem der Psalmen", *Stud. Bibl. Francisc. Liber Annuus* 11, 1960–61, 56–112; T. Preiss, "Die Rechtfertigung im johanneischen Denken", *EvTh* 16, 1956, 289 ff.; P. Schanz, "Jakobus und Paulus", *ThQ* 62, 1880, 3–46, 247–86; H. Schlier, *Der Brief an die Galater* 7, 1971[14]; G. Schwarz, "Jak. 2, 14–26", *ThStKr* 65, 1891, 704–37; H. H. Schmid, *Gerechtigkeit als Weltordnung*, 1968; S. Schulz, "Zur Rechtfertigung aus Gnaden in Qumran und bei Paulus", *ZTK* 56, 1959, 155–85; G. Strecker, *Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit. Untersuchung zur Theologie des Matthäus*, *FRLANT* 82, 1966 [2]; P. Stuhlmacher, *Gerechtigkeit Gottes bei Paulus*, *FRLANT* 87, 1965; T. Tielemann, "Versuch einer neuen Auslegung und Anordnung des Jakobusbriefes", *NKZ* 5, 1894, 580–611; H. Thyen, *Studien zur Sündenvergebung im Neuen Testament und seinen alttestamentlichen und jüdischen Voraussetzungen*, *FRLANT* 96, 1970; E. Tobac, *Le Problème de la Justification dans St. Paul*, 1941; L. Usteri, "Glaube, Werke und Rechtfertigung im Jakobusbrief", *ThStKr* 62, 1889, 221–56; R. Walker, "Allein aus Werken. Zur Auslegung von Jakobus 2, 14–26", *ZTK* 61, 1964, 155–92; H. H. Walz und H. H. Schrey, *Gerechtigkeit in biblischer Sicht*, 1955; W. Weiffenbach, *Exegetisch-theologische Studie über Jak. 2*,

14–26, 1871; A. H. van der Weijden, *Die Gerechtigkeit in den Psalmen*, (Dissertation, Rome) 1952; H. D. Wendland, "Zur kritischen Bedeutung der neutestamentlichen Lehre von den beiden Reichen", *TLZ* 79, 1954, 321 ff.; U. Wilckens, *Rechtfertigung als Freiheit. Paulusstudien*, 1974; G. Wildeboer, "Die älteste Bedeutung des Stammes *ṣdq*", *ZAW* 26, 1906, 167 ff.; O. Zänker, "*Dikaiosynē Theou* bei Paulus", *ZST* 9, 1931–32, 398–420.

Rob, Steal

Robbing implies the idea of violence, but the distinction from stealing, with its overtone of secrecy, is not always preserved.

λῃστής

λῃστής (*lēstēs*), robber, highwayman, bandit, revolutionary; κλέπτω (*kleptō*), steal; κλέπτης (*kleptēs*), thief.

CL The use of *kleptō* (Lat. *clepere*) emphasises the secrecy, craft, and cheating involved in the act of stealing or embezzlement (cf. Eng. stealth). By contrast, *lēstēs*, which derives from the same root as *leia*, booty, and *apolauō*, to take advantage of, includes the element of violence, though not necessarily of dishonesty: a soldier exercising his right to seize plunder could be termed *lēstēs*. But the word usually meant robber, bandit, pirate.

OT In the LXX *kleptō* regularly translates the Heb. *gānaḇ*, which like the Gk. vb. includes the sense of stealth. Theft is a sin against God. The LXX uses *kleptō* without further definition in the Decalogue (Exod. 20:15; Deut. 5:19) and its echoes (Lev. 19:11; Jer. 7:9). What is stolen may include objects of value (Gen. 44:4; Exod. 22:6), animals (Gen. 30:33), men (Gen. 40:15; Exod. 21:16), things devoted to God (Jos. 7:11), household gods (Gen. 31:19), and genuine words of God, stolen by false prophets (Jer. 23:30). To be guilty of theft incurs punishment (Exod. 22:1 f.; Deut. 24:7). Even when prompted by need or poverty, stealing dishonours God (Prov. 30:9; cf. 6:30). To ascribe to men something which is the work of God is said by Philo to be thieving (*Leg. All.* 3:32 f.). The sense of stealth is brought out in Tob. 1:18, where bodies are said to be buried secretly (*kleptōn*). The noun *lēstēs*, which seldom occurs in the LXX, translates three Heb. words, all associated with violence: *gᵉḏûḏ* (raider, Jer. 18:22), from *gāḏaḏ*, to cut, used of lightly armed troops suddenly cutting into the enemy; *pārîṣ* (robber, Jer. 7:11), from *pāraṣ*, to break; and *šôḏēḏ* (plunderer, Obad. 5) from *šāḏaḏ*, to act violently. Rab. Judaism transmuted the Gk. *lēstēs* into *lêsṭês*, *lêsṭyā'*, and *lêsṭāyûṭ*. The Mishnah also used *gannāḇ* for theft and *gāzal* (flay, snatch) for robbery. By referring to both bandits and Zealots as *lēstai*, Josephus and the rabbis reveal their opposition to the methods employed by the nationalists.

NT The requirements of the Decalogue, including *mē klepsēs*, still apply in the Christian era. This commandment is quoted by Jesus to the rich young ruler (Matt. 19:18; Mk. 10:19; Lk. 18:20), and by Paul (Rom. 13:8), and alluded to in 1 Cor. 6:10 and 1 Pet. 4:15. As the breaking of a divine commandment, theft is an offence against God's will, and in terms of human relationships, an activity which is loveless:

it betrays fellowship (Jn. 12:6). On the other hand, the positive fulfilment of this commandment, as of the other commandments in the second table, is brought about by love to one's neighbour (Rom. 13:9 f.; Matt. 22:39). In practical terms, the thief must stop stealing and instead do honest work, so that he can serve not his own selfish ends but the needs of those who lack (Eph. 4:28). In Matt. 6:19 f. (cf. Lk. 12:33 f.) Jesus warns against reliance upon accumulated wealth, because of the activity of thieves who can easily break through (lit. dig through) house-walls made of mud-brick and steal property. By contrast, treasures in heaven, i.e., what wins divine approval and reward in the coming kingdom, are beyond the reach of thieves or inflation.

In Matt. 27:64 the Jews fear that the disciples may quietly steal (*klepsōsin*) the body of Jesus, and in 28:13 they decide to put it about that this explains the empty tomb. The vb. *kleptō* and the noun *kleptēs* are used to describe the sudden arrival without warning of the messianic age. As by keeping alert the householder is able to forestall a thief approaching secretly, so the disciple needs to be on the watch for the parousia of the Lord (Matt. 24:43; Lk. 12:39). The same simile illustrates the unexpected moment of the Lord's coming in 1 Thess. 5:2, 4; 2 Pet. 3:10; Rev. 3:3; 16:15.

The Fourth Gospel's discourse on the Good Shepherd opens with a description of a prospective sheepstealer as *kleptēs kai lēstēs*, i.e., using stealth or force as required to get into the sheepfold, and not the proper entrance (Jn. 10:1). Judas, who pilfered money, was a *kleptēs* (Jn. 12:6); Barabbas, who was implicated in violence, was a *lēstēs* (Jn. 18:40). The plural phrase *kleptai kai lēstai*, used by Jesus in Jn. 10:8 to define *all* who came before him, is not intended to include the godly of earlier days, but refers to false messiahs, such as Theudas and Judas the Galilean (Acts 5:36 f.). "All who came" alludes to the tech. term for the messiah, the "coming one" (Matt. 11:3; Mk. 11:9; Lk. 7:19; Rom. 5:14). The purpose of the coming of the *kleptēs* was to destroy life in furthering his own ends. By contrast, Jesus had come to give life, even at the expense of his own, and abundant life at that (Jn. 10:10).

In the story of the Good Samaritan the term *lēstai* (Lk. 10:30, 36) may not refer to bandits in the general sense, but bear the rabbinic meaning of Zealots. The victim is a Jew. But he is not killed, and his injuries could have been due to his resisting the attack. When Zealots robbed to raise supplies for themselves, they are known not to have taken more than was necessary from their own countrymen. If the *lēstai* in the story are Zealots, this adds point to Jesus' response to the scribe's question about the neighbour, for the Pharisees were constantly pressing Jesus to declare his attitude towards the nationalistic movement (Matt. 22:15 ff.). At the cleansing of the → temple, Jesus charged the merchants trafficking there with making God's house of prayer (Isa. 56:7) into a den of robbers (Jer. 7:11; → *spēlaion*). Apart from the opportunities of profiting from sharp practice, the Jews' market in the forecourt robbed the Gentile nations (Mk. 11:7) of the only area in the temple which was available to them as a place of prayer (Matt. 21:13; Lk. 19:46). If *lēstēs* also has the tech. sense of Zealot, Jesus is saying that by their activities the temple authorities were opening the way for the building to be turned into a Zealot stronghold, as happened in the rebellion of A.D. 68–70 (G. W. Buchanan, "Mark 11, 15–19: Brigands in the Temple", *Hebrew Union College Annual* 30, 1959, 169–77).

At the arrest in Gethsemane, Jesus ironically demands to know whether his enemies, armed to the teeth as they are, now take him for a *lēstēs*, a bandit or in-

surrectionist who would sell his life dearly (Matt. 26:55; Mk. 14:48; Lk. 22:52). The two men crucified with Jesus are described as *lēstai* (Matt. 27:38, 44; Mk. 15:27), probably to be translated bandits rather than revolutionaries in view of the use of *kakourgoi*, criminals, in the parallel passage Lk. 23:33. A later scribe added the apposite quotation from Isa. 53:12: He was numbered with the transgressors (Mk. 15:28 AV), but this is omitted by the best MSS. Paul includes *lēstai*, highwaymen, among the perils he faced on his travels (2 Cor. 11:26). *N. Hillyer*

συλάω

συλάω (*sylaō*), plunder, rob; *συλαγωγέω* (*sylagōgeō*), rob, carry off as booty or captive.

CL & OT *sylaō*, or sometimes *syleuō*, means to strip off the arms from a fallen enemy, strip bare, deprive; to take a bow out of its case or the lid off a quiver, esp with the notion of violence or suddenness; to despoil secretly, i.e., cheat; to rescue, as in the formula used at Delphi in the manumission of slaves. In the LXX *sylaō* occurs only in Ep. Jer. (Bar. 6:18), referring to burglary, for fear of which priests bolt and bar their temples.

NT *sylaō* occurs only at 2 Cor. 11:8. By a bold military metaphor Paul dramatizes the fact that his ministry at Corinth was at no cost to the Christians there, because he had, as it were, plundered (*esylēsa*) other churches by accepting financial support (*opsōnion*, ration money, soldier's pay) from them, rather than expecting the Corinthians to keep him.

sylagōgeō, rob, carry off as booty or captive, is not found before the NT, and even there occurs only once. In Col. 2:8 the verb is used fig. of drawing someone away from the truth of Christ into the slavery of error. Paul warns the converts at Colossae against the threat of being seduced from the Lord. His verb gives the picture of prisoners being led away with a rope around their necks, like the long strings of captives portrayed on Assyrian monuments. *N. Hillyer*

ἀποστερέω

ἀποστερέω (*apostereō*), rob, defraud, deprive.

CL *apostereō* means to refuse to pay a debt or return property or money deposited with another for safe-keeping; defraud; become a defaulter; withdraw from a person or thing, i.e., break off relations; bereave; in logic, to draw a negative conclusion.

OT *apostereō* translates two Heb. words, *gāra'* and *'āšaq*. In Exod. 21:10 a husband who takes a second wife is warned not to deprive (*gāra'*) the first of food, clothes, or conjugal rights. In Deut. 24:14 the law requires an Israelite not to exploit a poor labourer by keeping back (*'āšaq*) wages due to him. Mal. 3:5 threatens judgment against those who oppress (*'āšaq*) the wage-earner.

NT In Mk. 10:19 the commandment *mē aposterēsēs*, do not defraud, is quoted by Jesus to the rich young ruler. The clause is omitted from the parallel passages Matt. 19:18 and Lk. 18:20, perhaps because a scribe noticed that with this exception all the other commandments are drawn straight from Deut. 5:16–20. The words are

probably intended to summarize the tenth commandment, not otherwise mentioned here, for he who covets what belongs to another has in his heart already deprived (*apostereō*) him of it.

In 1 Cor. 6 Paul censures the Corinthians for engaging in lawsuits with one another before heathen courts. As those who should know the law of love, and probably Christ's teaching in Matt. 5:39 ff., they ought rather to accept being defrauded (*apostereisthe*, 6:7), and certainly not actively defraud others (*apostereite*, 6:8). "To say then that the wronged man goes to law before wrongdoers is nothing else than to say that he desires to retaliate and wishes to do wrong to the second in return, which is likewise to do wrong also himself" (Clem. Alex., *Strom.* 7, 14). Paul uses the verb again in 1 Cor. 7:5. Because a married couple belong to each other, an attempt by one partner to spiritualize marriage amounts to fraud, a withholding of what is due. Abstention can be lawful only if it is by mutual consent, for a good purpose (prayer is Paul's example), and as a temporary measure. In 1 Tim. 6:3–5 he assails those who taught that an outward show of religion could be made a means of gain. Such were depraved in mind and bereft (*apesterēmenōn*) of the truth. Once they had known the truth in Jesus, but had allowed conceit to defraud them of the treasure (cf. 4:1). Having lost the centre of agreement with fellow Christians, they now knew only wrangling. *N. Hillyer*

ἀνδραποδιστής — *ἀνδραποδιστής* (*andrapodistēs*), slave-dealer, kidnapper.

CL *andrapodistēs* was never used as an ordinary term in connexion with slavery. It derives from the verbal idea of catching a man (*andra-*) by the foot (*pod-*) and crudely distinguished human chattels from quadrupeds.

NT 1 Tim. 1:9 f. refers to those who disregard God's law in general and break God's laws in particular, as set out in the Decalogue. Paul describes those guilty of breaking the eighth commandment as *andrapodistai*, slave-dealers, kidnappers, lit. men-stealers (cf. Exod. 21:16; Deut. 24:7). The term could include those who broke into Christian homes to carry off any belonging to the Way (Acts 9:1 f.), and, by extension, those who by false teaching (1 Tim. 1:3–7) drag away believers from their rightful place before God and rob them of their liberty in Christ. *N. Hillyer*

σπήλαιον — *σπήλαιον* (*spēlaion*), cave, den.

CL & OT *spēlaion* (from Plato onwards) is derived from *speos*, *speios* (Hom.), all three words meaning cavern, grotto. Almost always the LXX uses *spēlaion* to translate the Heb. *m^{e}ʿārâh*, cave: as a place of refuge (Gen. 19:30; Jos. 10:16; 1 Sam. 22:1; Josephus, *Ap.* 1, 292); as a tomb (Gen. 23:9; Test. Reub. 7:2); or as a robber's hideout (Jer. 7:11; Josephus, *Ant.* 14, 415).

NT In Matt. 21:13 (= Mk. 11:17; Lk. 19:46) Jesus, as Lord of the temple (Matt. 12:6), protests that the Jerusalem authorities have degraded God's house of prayer (Isa. 56:7) into a den (*spēlaion*) of thieves (→ *lēstēs*), robbing the helpless

while themselves enjoying the safe refuge of privilege. Their nefarious trading activities betrayed an insensitivity to the holiness of the outer court, and denied Gentiles the right of access to the only part of the temple area permitted to them for quiet worship. Jer. 7:11, alluded to here, had correctly forecast the destruction of the land in Jeremiah's day, in a similar context of the denial of the rights of aliens. The sale of animals in the temple forecourt was apparently a recent innovation by Caiaphas the high priest (*c.* A.D. 30), to compete against the four traditional markets on the Mount of Olives (V. Eppstein, *ZNW* 55, 1964, 42–58). So unpopular among ordinary Jews was the temple trading, because of the greed of those in charge, that a popular uprising three years before Jerusalem was destroyed in A.D. 70 swept away the "bazaars of Annas" (W. Hendriksen, *Matthew*, 768–771). Heb. 11:38 and Rev. 6:15 describe refugees seeking shelter in *spēlaia*, caves, a feature of the limestone rocks of Palestine (cf. 1 Macc. 2:28; 2 Macc. 6:11; 10:6). Natural caves could also be adapted as burial places (Baba Bathra 6:8; SB I 1049–51), as in the case of Lazarus (Jn. 11:38). *N. Hillyer*

→ Possessions, → Punishment, → Snatch

H. Preisker, *kleptō, kleptēs*, *TDNT* III 754 ff.; K. H. Rengstorf, *lēstēs*, *TDNT* IV 257–62.

Rock, Stone, Corner-Stone, Pearl, Precious Stones

πέτρα

πέτρα (*petra*), rock; πέτρος (*petros*), stone, rock, Peter; Κηφᾶς (*kēphas*), Cephas (Aram. *kêpā'*, rock), the Aram. form of the name given to Peter.

CL *petra* means rock, a mass of rock, boulder, and stone as material; it is used as early as Homer for a symbol of firmness (*Od.* 17, 463), and from the 5th cent. B.C. onwards of hard-heartedness (Aesch., *PV* 2, 244; Eur., *Andromache* 537). *petros*, likewise attested from earliest times, means a (broken off) piece of rock, stone (→ *lithos*). A strict distinction of meaning cannot however be maintained: *petros* can mean, rock, and *petra*, stone (cf. Homer, *Od.* 9, 243; Hesiod, *Theog.* 675; Soph., *OC* 1595; O. Cullmann, *petra TDNT* VI 95; and *Peter: Disciple, Apostle, Martyr, A Historical and Theological Study*, 1962 ², 20).

OT In the LXX *petros* is found only at 2 Macc. 1:16 and 4:41, in the sense of stone; *petra*, rock, is mostly used to translate the Heb. *ṣûr*, rock, large piece of rock, or *sela'*, rock, crag, cliff (e.g. Exod. 17:6; Num. 20:8), and twice for *kēp* (Job 30:6; Jer. 4:29; which also occurs at Sir. 40:14), occurring in all about 100 times. In a secular sense it is found in various contexts (e.g. Exod. 33:21; Job 39:28). In particular, rocks provide a refuge for animals (Ps. 104[103]:18; Prov. 30:26), and also for men (1 Sam. 13:6). On the day of Yahweh men will creep into the clefts of the rocks to escape from the terrible majesty of God (Isa. 2:19). Since a rock affords protection and therefore also strength, God himself is described as the Rock (2 Sam. 22:2; cf. Gen. 49:24); the LXX avoids the word *petra* in translating these passages, and makes use of circumlocutions (cf. also Pss. 31:4; 62:7). As the site of the cultus, the rock is also the scene of divine revelation (Jdg. 6:20, 21; 13:19). The numinous character of the divine revelation is evident in the way rocks are torn assunder by God or by his word

(1 Ki. 19:11; Jer. 23:29; Nah. 1:6). The memory of the miracle recorded in Exod. 17:1–6, Num. 20:1–13, where → Moses brought water out of the rock by striking it at God's command, remained alive at a later period (e.g. Neh. 9:15; Ps. 78[77]:15 f.). A similar miracle, the feeding of the people with honey from the rock, is recorded at Deut. 32:13 and Ps. 81(80):16. In a transferred sense the rock is also a symbol of firmness and resolution (Isa. 50:7; Ezek. 3:9), and of stubborn resistance (Jer. 5:3).

Later the rabbis, taking up Isa. 51:1, 2, describe → Abraham as a rock (SB I 731). In the Qumran texts the eschatological community is compared to a building with foundations on the rock; the image of the corner-stone (→ *gōnia*) which we find in the NT is likewise present in these writings: "It shall be that tried wall, that precious corner-stone, whose foundations shall neither rock nor sway in their place" (1QS 8:7 f.; cf. 1QH 6:26; 7:8; cf. A. R. C. Leaney, *The Rule of Qumran and its Meaning*, 1966, 217 ff.). In 1QS 8:7 f. the reference is to the Council of the Community.

NT In the NT *petros* is found 154 times, but in all but one of the instances (Jn. 1:42) it is used as a second name for Simon, whose biography goes beyond the scope of the present article (see the bibliography below for studies of Peter in contemporary theology). *petra* occurs 15 times: in the parable at the end of the Sermon on the Mount it is said that the man who hears and does the → word of Jesus is like one who builds his → house upon a rock, i.e. on a firm, sure foundation (Matt. 7:24 f; → firm art. *themelios* NT 1; cf. also Deut. 28:15, 30). In the parable of the sower, Lk. 8:6, 13 speaks of the seed which falls on the rock; Matt. 13:5, 20 and Mk. 4:5, 16 speak of "rocky ground" (*petrōdēs*). "As for what was sown on rocky ground, this is he who hears the word of God and immediately receives it with joy; yet he has no root in himself, but endures for a while, and when persecution arises on account of the word, immediately he falls away" (Matt. 13:20 f.). According to Matt. 27:51, the death of Jesus is accompanied by earthquakes and the splitting of the rocks; Joseph of Arimathea laid the corpse of Jesus in a tomb hewn out of the rock (Matt. 27:60; Mk. 15:46). In the last events of Revelation men will hide themselves in the caves and the rocks of the mountains; behind the portrayal of this in Rev. 6:15–17 lies not only Isa. 2, but a recollection of Hos. 10:8.

Three sets of passages merit particular attention: Rom. 9:33 and 1 Pet. 2:8; 1 Cor. 10:3 f.; and Matt. 16:18.

1. Two passages refer to the stone of stumbling which is interpreted christologically: "As it is written, 'Behold, I am laying in Zion a stone that will make men stumble, a rock that will make them fall [*lithon proskommatos kai petran skandalou*]; and he who believes in him will not be put to shame' " (Rom. 9:33; → Offence); "and 'A stone that will make men stumble, a rock that will make them fall [*lithos proskommatos kai petra skandalou*]'; for they stumble because they disobey the word, as they were destined to do" (1 Pet. 2:8). The words take up the thought of Isa. 8:14: "And he will become a sanctuary, and a stone of offence, and a rock of stumbling to both houses of Israel, a trap and a snare to the inhabitants of Jerusalem." This is further developed in Isa. 28:16 to that of the corner-stone (→ *gōnia*) which, according to Ps. 118(117):22 was rejected by the builders. Isa. 8:13 ff. promises that Yahweh will be a sanctuary to those who → fear him; but those who disdain him will break themselves on him. For rabbinic messianic interpretations of the idea of the stone see J. Jeremias, *lithos*, *TDNT* IV 272 f.; SB III 506. In Rom.

9:33 Paul sees a fulfilment of Isa. 8:14 in the Jewish rejection of Christ, and in particular because Israel pursued a righteousness based on law and works and not on faith (cf. vv. 31 f.). On the other hand, the Gentiles who did not pursue righteousness have found it through faith (v. 30). In 1 Pet. 2:8 the passage underlines the contrast between the disobedient (i.e. the old Israel which rejected Christ) and the "spiritual house" of God, the "holy priesthood" which offers spiritual sacrifices (v. 5) (i.e. the church, the body of believers, cf. v. 7). C. H. Dodd holds that the quotation is from an independent testimonium which was current in the early church and which differs slightly from the LXX (*According to the Scriptures: The Sub-structure of New Testament Theology*, [1952] 1965, 41 ff.). (For further discussion of the OT background see S. H. Hooke, "The Corner-Stone of Scripture", in *The Siege Perilous: Essays on Anthropology and Kindred Subjects*, 1956, 235–49.)

2. In 1 Cor. 10:3 f. Paul makes reference to the Exodus miracle of Exod. 17 and Num. 20. The fathers in the wilderness "all ate the same spiritual food and all drank the same spiritual drink. For they drank from the spiritual Rock which followed them, and that Rock was Christ." By comparing Exod. 17 and Num. 20 the rabbis had already come to the conclusion that the rock which provided the water had followed the Israelites on their journey (SB III 406); but Judaism does not know a messianic interpretation of the passage. Paul is the first to interpret the OT miracle in the light of the → Lord's Supper, which is spiritual food and spiritual drink having its origin in Christ. This OT narrative is in the apostle's view a type foreshadowing the Christ-event. For clarification of the passage attention has been drawn to Jn. 7:37; but the sayings of the Johannine Christ about the bread of life should also be noted, since these likewise allude to the miraculous feeding in the wilderness (manna, Jn. 6:35–58; → Bread). The early fathers of the church interpreted this passage with reference to the Lord's Supper. On this passage → further Hunger, art. *pinō* NT 4 (a).

3. (a) In Matt. 16:18 Jesus calls Peter the rock on which he will build his → church: "And I tell you, you are Peter [*petros*] and on this rock [*petra*] I will build my church, and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it" (→ Gate; → Hell). The basis here is play on the words *petros* and *petra*. According to Mk. 3:16 and Jn. 1:42, Jesus himself gave Simon the name of Peter. In Matt. Simon already bears this name when he is mentioned for the first time in 4:18; many commentators conclude from this that in Matt. 16:18 he is not given the name, but rather that the name is interpreted. Paul mostly uses the Aram. form Cephas *kēpā'*, rock, stone (1 Cor. 1:12; 3:22; 9:5; 15:5; Gal. 1:18; 2:9, 11, 14; cf. 1 Clem. 47:3). In Jn. 1:42, the only place in the NT where the noun *petros* is used in its normal sense, it is stated that the name *Kēphas* means *petros*: "He [Andrew] brought him [his brother, Simon] to Jesus. Jesus looked at him, and said, 'So you are Simon the son of John? You shall be called Cephas' (which means Peter)." Both the Aram. transliteration and the Gk. translation, *kēphas/petros*, can mean rock, and therefore *petra* in Matt. 16:18 can be translated as rock. The assonance of the words makes it immediately evident that Peter is the "rock-man", the foundation on which Jesus will build his church. O. Cullmann suggests that the sense would require *petra* in both halves of the pronouncement (cf. Jer. 4:29; Job 30:6 LXX), but since *petra* is a fem. noun, the NT chooses the less usual Gk. word which has the masc. ending *-os* for the masc. name (*Peter*, 20).

Cullmann's interpretation does more justice to the text than the reconstruction of

Max Wilcox who thinks that the original saying behind Matt.'s text referred to Jesus as the rejected stone of Ps. 118(117):22 f. which was linked with the rock-stone testimonia of Isa. 8:14; 28:16; and possibly Dan. 2:34; 7:13 ("Peter and the Rock: A Fresh Look at Matthew xvi. 17–19", *NTS* 22, 1975–76, 73–88). Wilcox attributes the *petra-Petros* link to the evangelist, though the original saying may well go back to Jesus himself. Despite the "primacy" given to Peter (cf. Matt. 10:2), the purpose is not to glorify Peter (cf. the rebuke of Matt. 16:23). But it accords with the fact that Peter is regularly associated in Matt. with the themes of church, authority, discipline and rulings on disputed points (cf. Matt. 15:15; 17:1, 4, 24; 18:21; 19:27; 26:33–75; see G. D. Kilpatrick, *The Origins of the Gospel according to St. Matthew*, 1946, 95 f.). This latter point in no way militates against Cullmann's argument. In fact, it helps to show how the "primacy" of Peter is to be understood. (For Cullmann's arguments about the authenticity of the use of the term *ekklēsia*, church, and the authority of the keys → Open, art. *kleis* NT3.)

(b) But in what sense is Peter the rock? The saying is recorded only by Matt. and is added after the confession that Jesus is the Christ, which is also recorded in Mk. 8:29 and Lk. 9:20 (cf. Jn. 6:68, 69). The other evangelists do not have the saying about the rock-man of Matt. 16:18. This is, however, no reason for denying the authenticity of the saying, as is often done. In the opinion of E. Dinkler, for example, the early church put the saying in the mouth of our Lord in order to mark out Peter, on the ground of his Easter experience (1 Cor. 15:5), as the one appointed by Jesus to be leader of his church (*RGG*^{3} V 248). The theory remains, nevertheless, hypothetical. The form *Kēphas*, which is a transliteration of the Aram. and is attested by Paul, shows us that the tradition stems from the earliest days of the church. Moreover, parallels in the Qumran texts make it appear likely that Matt. 16:18 is of Palestinian origin; though it cannot be concluded from this that the Qumran sect influenced the writing of the Gospel, for Jesus describes Peter and not, like the Qumran tradition, the community as the rock.

But what does this saying of Jesus mean? It is probable that as early as the beginning of the 3rd cent. A.D. the Roman pope was using it to support his claim to be head of the church, asserting that this position had been given to him by Christ as the successor of Peter. The Gospel account, however, makes no mention of Peter's successors. Indeed, some Protestant commentators of today deduce from the text that Peter was accorded a position of unique significance in the church, a position given to him alone and limited to the duration of his own life. Peter may have no significance as far as the work of building is concerned, but he is of great importance in the laying of the foundation (O. Cullmann, *TDNT* VI 107 ff.; J. Schniewind, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*, *NTD* 2, 1968 [15], ad loc.). It may be doubted, however, whether such an explanation is satisfactory: in Matt. 16:18 Jesus is not speaking of the laying of foundations, but of the building of the church. It is important to observe further that Paul, who acknowledges the apostleship of Peter (Gal. 2:8), and himself appears in his letters as the standard exponent of apostolic authority, states clearly in Gal. 2:14 that "the truth of the gospel" stands as the norm binding on all apostles, even on Peter. It is this truth again which underlies the conferring of apostolic authority on Peter in Matt. 16:18. It is implied in the confession that Jesus is the Christ, for like the gospel itself this confession is based upon divine → revelation (Matt. 16:17; Gal. 1:12). This confession, which is the source of all apostolic

authority, points us to Christ as the true foundation of the church. Seen in this light, the words of Matt. 16:18 are simply an interpretation of the confession of Christ in Matt. 16:16 par., and there is no reason why this interpretation should not be attributed to Jesus himself. This view accords in the main with that of the Reformers. They had no wish to found their church on the person of Peter, and certainly not on his subjective act of faith: for them the rock foundation on which Christ would build his church was the eternal, unchangeable truth of the confession of Christ. It is not, of course, the act of confession on which attention is focused, but its content: the eternal Christ, upon whom the church is founded in every age. The church founded upon this rock is covered by Christ's promise even today, that the gates of hell will not prevail against it. *W. Mundle*

(c) Matt. 16:18 has been a crucial passage in the interpretation of claims to papal supremacy and indeed in the question of whether there should be a pope at all (for a review of the arguments down the ages see H. Burn-murdoch, *The Development of the Papacy*, 1954; and for relevant documents see E. Giles, *Documents Illustrating Papal Authority A.D. 96–454*, 1952; C. Mirbt, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Papsttums und des römischen Katholizismus*, I *Von den Anfängen bis zum Tridentinum*, revised by K. Aland, 1967 [6]; H. Denzinger, *Enchiridion Symbolorum, Definitionum et Declarationum de Rebus Fidei et Morum*, revised by A. Schönmetzer, 1965 [33]). The term pope derives from the Lat. *papa*, father. In the ante-Nicene church there were such "fathers" at Alexandria and Antioch, but already in the 2nd cent. Rome was claiming an ascendency.

By the time of Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage (248–58), papal primacy was a burning issue. In his treatise *On the Unity of the Catholic Church* Cyprian affirmed: "No doubt the others were all that Peter was, but a primacy is given to Peter, and it is [thus] made clear that there is but one Church and one Chair. So too, if they are all shepherds, we are shown but one flock which is to be fed by all the Apostles in common accord. If a man does not hold fast to this oneness of Peter, does he imagine that he still holds the faith? If he deserts the Chair of Peter upon whom the Church was built, has he still confidence that he is in the Church?" (Cyprian, *De Lapsis and De Ecclesiae Catholicae Unitate*, edited by M. Bévénot, 1971, 63 ff.). However, in the second edition of the work this position was somewhat modified. "No doubt the other Apostles were all that Peter was, endowed with equal dignity and power, but the start comes from him alone, in order to show that the Church of Christ is unique. Indeed this oneness of the Church is figured in the Canticle of Canticles when the Holy Spirit, speaking in the Lord's name, says: '*One is my dove, my perfect one: to her mother she is the only one, the darling of her womb.*' If a man does not hold fast to this oneness of the Church, does he imagine that he still holds the faith?" (ibid.; cf. Cant. 6:9[8]). The difference between the two texts is best explained by attributing the revision to Cyprian's quarrel with Pope Stephen which caused him to modify his own allegiance to Rome, whilst still maintaining the visible unity of the church (cf. Bévénot, op. cit., xiii ff.). Nevertheless, it illustrates the kind of primacy that was already an issue in the 3rd cent.

In the Middle Ages Boniface VIII promulgated the Bull *Unam Sanctam* (1302) which concludes: "Further, We declare, say, define, and pronounce that it is absolutely necessary for the salvation of every human creature to be subject to the

Roman Pontiff" (Denzinger-Schönmetzer § 875). This umbrella statement of universal papal authority was, of course, made against the background of the conflict of temporal and ecclesiastical power in which the Holy Roman Emperors vied with the medieval popes. Nevertheless, it is clearly felt to be a source of embarrassment to ecumenically minded Catholic theologians who are uneasy about the irreformability of Catholic dogma (cf. G. Baum, "The Magisterium in a Changing Church", *Concilium* 1, 3, 1967, 34–42).

In *The First Dogmatic Constitution of the Church of Christ* (1870) Vatican I appealed to Jn. 1:42; Matt. 16:16–19; Jn. 21:15 and 17 to establish the apostolic primacy of Peter: "We teach and declare, therefore, according to the testimony of the Gospel that the primacy of jurisdiction over the whole Church of God was immediately and directly promised to and conferred upon the blessed Apostle Peter by Christ the Lord" (Denzinger-Schönmetzer § 3053). The *Constitution* then went on to argue for the continuation of this primacy in the bishops of Rome (Denzinger-Schönmetzer §§ 3056 ff.) and its extension not only to the whole church but also to the entire world in order to fulfil Christ's charge to feed his flock (Denzinger-Schönmetzer §§ 3059–64). Finally the Council defined papal infallibility: "that the Roman Pontiff, when he speaks ex cathedra, that is, when, acting in the office of shepherd and teacher of all Christians, he defines, by virtue of his supreme apostolic authority, doctrine concerning faith or morals to be held by the universal Church, possesses, through the divine assistance promised to him in the person of St. Peter, the infallibility with which the divine Redeemer willed his Church to be endowed in defining doctrine concerning faith or morals; and that such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are therefore irreformable because of their nature, not because of the agreement of the Church" (Denzinger-Schönmetzer § 3074).

In view of such claims it was perhaps inevitable that Protestant apologists should seek to deny that Peter was the rock, and claim that the rock that Jesus had in mind was either his faith or his confession (for a review of interpretations see Cullmann, *Peter*, 164–76). The fathers were by no means unanimous that the rock was Peter. Thus, Augustine held that the rock was Christ himself (Sermons 76; 147; 149; 232; 245; 270; 295; cf. *Retractationes* 1, 21, 1). However, in the light of the arguments of 3 (a) above, it seems most likely that the original word that Jesus used for both *petra* and *Petros* was the Aram. *kêpā'*, and that the difference in the Greek was due to the appropriateness of giving Peter a masc. form of the word for "rock". Although *petros* can mean a detached rock or stone and *petra* a mass of living rock, the two words could be used interchangeably. Without further clear indication it is impossible to build any firm argument on the distinction between the two words.

If, therefore, the rock is Peter himself, the passage gives no grounds for thinking that Jesus gave him this name in virtue of his stable character. In fact, his vacillation under pressure gives a certain irony to the name (cf. Matt. 26:30–35 par. Mk. 14:26–31; Lk. 22:31–34; Matt. 26:57–75 par. Mk. 14:53–72; Lk. 22:54–71; Gal. 2:11 ff.). Moreover, as Cullmann points out, "On exegetical grounds we must say that the passage does not contain a single word concerning successors of Peter" (op. cit., 213). It would seem that Peter was the rock in the sense that he was the first member of the → church proper. In the context of Christ's pronouncement Peter is the representative spokesman of the disciples, the first to confess Jesus as the Christ, the Son of the living God. As such, he is assured that flesh and blood has not reveal-

ed this to him but the Father in heaven (Matt. 16:16 f.). He used the keys of the kingdom (Matt. 16:19; cf. 23:13; Rev. 1:18; 3:7; Isa. 22:22; Rev. 21:25; Matt. 18:18; Jn. 20:23; → Open, art. *kleis*) in opening the church first to the Jews (Acts 2) and then to the Gentiles (Acts 10) by proclaiming the gospel to them. He exercised leadership in the appointment of Matthias to the apostolic band in replacement of Judas (Acts 1) and discipline in the case of Ananias and Sapphira (Acts 5:1–11). He figured prominently in the early days of the church in bearing witness before the Jews and their leaders (Acts 4:8 ff.; 5:15, 29; 9:32).

However, once the church was thus opened and established, Peter's foundational rôle is essentially over. After his imprisonment (Acts 12) he began to occupy a less prominent place. His work was confined to the Jewish mission (Gal. 2:8). In the first great council of the church depicted in Acts 15 it was James, the Lord's brother, who presided (Acts 15:19 ff.). Although Peter played an important part in the debate (Acts 15:7 ff.), it was James who delivered the decisive judgment. Moreover, nowhere in the NT does Peter lay claim to primacy. In the opening verses of the two epistles of Peter, the author describes himself as an apostle, and this is how Paul views him (1 Cor. 9:5).

It would seem that there were tensions in the apostolic church which centred on personalities, and this may explain certain passages in which Paul counterbalances possible claims by a Petrine faction. In 1 Cor. 1:12 he rebukes those who claim to belong to Paul, Cephas or Apollos rather than to Christ. Baptism into Christ precludes such factious divisions (v. 13). 1 Cor. 3:11 may in this light also be a counter to a partisan understanding of the foundational rôle of Peter: "For no other foundation can any one lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ" (→ Firm, art. *themelios*). Perhaps Paul's subsequent remarks may also be influenced by this: his warning about what one builds on the foundation which will be tried by fire (vv. 12–15); and the reminder "Do you not know that you are God's temple and that God's Spirit dwells in you? If any one destroys God's temple, God will destroy him. For God's temple is holy, and that temple you are" (vv. 16 f.; → Temple). In Gal. 2:9 there is a certain irony in the allusion to James, Cephas and John "who were reputed to be pillars [*hoi dokountes styloi einai*]" which is underlined by Peter's vacillation in the face of the Jewish → circumcision party (vv. 11–21). Eph. 2:20 allows a foundational rôle to the → apostles and → prophets but insists with the Gospels that Christ is the → *gōnia*: believers constitute "the household of God, built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus himself being the chief cornerstone" (Eph. 2:19 f.). Similarly the new → Jerusalem in Rev. 21:14 is built on the foundation of the apostles. This theme is taken up by Peter himself when he describes believers as "living stones ... built into a spiritual house" (1 Pet. 2:5). There is no thought of the foundation of Peter continuing right through the building. Neither the epistles nor Acts give any hint of a permanent primacy and jurisdiction of Peter, still less of such authority being handed on to possible successors.

As Cullmann says, the command to Peter to feed Christ's lambs (Jn. 21:16 ff.) "is certainly limited by his martyrdom" (op. cit., 214). In itself the passage indicates the kind of task to which Peter was commissioned; not his place in the hierarchy of the church. The promise that the gates of hell shall not prevail against the church pictures Hades as the abode of the dead and the *ekklēsia* as the people of God wandering (like ancient Israel) before it through a land occupied by hostile powers which it

cannot avoid, but which it will assuredly overcome. Not even the armed fortress of death through which Christ and his people must pass will be able to prevent them from attaining their goal (→ Gate; → Hell, art. *Hadēs*). On the powers promised to Peter → Bind; → Open, art. *kleis* NT 3. Whilst it seems probable that Peter visited Rome (cf. 1 Pet. 5:13), there is no hint that Peter was ever bishop of Rome. Indeed, the primary document for the church at Rome in the sub-apostolic age is 1 Clement, but this letter seems to know nothing of the primacy of a bishop of Rome. The church of Rome at that time seems to be governed by a college of presbyters. The letter was sent in the name of the church, and is attributed to Clement personally only by a variant ending preserved in some later manuscripts. Such considerations undermine not only the idea of a special teaching primacy vouchsafed to Peter but also the idea of a hierarchical teaching magisterium formally vested in the episcopal office of the church (cf. C. Brown, "The Teaching Office of the Church", *The Churchman* 83, 1969, 184–96). *C. Brown*

γωνία

γωνία (*gōnia*), corner; *κεφαλὴ γωνίας* (*kephalē gōnias*), corner-stone or keystone; *ἀκρογωνιαῖος* (*akrogōniaios*), lying at the extreme corner, corner-stone or capstone.

CL & OT 1. *gōnia* is found in secular Gk. from Hdt. onwards and also in the LXX meaning corner. Theological interest lies in the expression *kephalē gōnias* in Ps. 118(117):22: "The stone which the builders rejected has become the chief cornerstone [MT *l^erō'š pinnâh*; LXX *eis kephalēn gōnias*]." This cultic Psalm which was performed at the temple gates (vv. 19 f., 26 f.) celebrates the victory and salvation which Yahweh gives in his righteousness (vv. 10–21), and Yahweh's steadfast love (vv. 1–4, 28 f.) in the face of distress (vv. 5 ff.). It is probably pre-exilic (cf. A. A. Anderson, *The Book of Psalms*, *New Century Bible*, II, 1972, 797 ff.). Anderson sees v. 22 as "in all probability a proverbial saying, that what appeared to be worthless has now taken the place of honour. This was also the experience of the singer in verses 5–21: at one point he was hard pressed and near death; now he is delivered by Yahweh and recognized as righteous or victorious" (op. cit., 802). The Heb. *rō'š pinnâh* means lit. (like the Gk.) "head of [the] corner". It was not necessarily the only such stone, but one of the most important parts of the building. Anderson sees it as either one of the large corner-stones which bind together two rows of stones especially in the foundations or the keystone which completes an arch or structure.

2. The word *akrogōniaios* has the same meaning. It occurs first in Isa. 28:16: "Therefore thus says the Lord GOD, 'Behold, I am laying in Zion for a foundation a stone, a tested stone, a precious corner-stone [MT *'āḇen 'eḇen bōḥan pinnaṯ yiqraṯ mûsāḏ mûssāḏ*; LXX *lithon polytelē eklekton akrogoniaion entimon eis ta themelia*]: "He who believes will not be in haste." ' " The saying comes in the context of a woe-pronouncement on the dissolute and unbelieving nobles who had evidently made a treaty with → Egypt, invoking the protection of pagan gods in the hope of being saved from the Assyrian armies. Isaiah denounces this as a "covenant with death" (v. 15), death (Heb. *māweṯ*) being the name of the Canaanite god of the underworld and infertility, alluding perhaps to the comparable Egyptian deities (Osiris and Seth?). But this will be of no avail "when the overwhelming scourge passes through"

(v. 15). The scheming politicians should have known better than to pin their hopes to such tangible but in fact flimsy shelter. The true refuge is the building which Yahweh has founded in Zion, the corner-stone of which is faith and which is built in accordance with justice and righteousness (vv. 16, 17a). The *boḥan* stone is an Egyptian word, denoting a hard type of stone suitable for carving (Koehler-Baumgartner, 117). It bears the inscription "He who believes [i.e. trusts] will not be in haste [i.e. alarmed]" (cf. 7:9; 28:12; 30:15). Isaiah can hardly be thinking of this building as the → temple, even though it was rich in association for him (Isa. 6). For the temple was already erected. It is more likely that he is thinking of Yahweh's purposes for the Davidic monarchy with the promises which he sees attached to it, but which was discounted by the mighty of the land as being unable to save in the situation.

The mention twice of *themelia*, foundation, suggests that *akrogōniaios* means a foundation stone (→ also *lithos* OT 2 (d)). Probably the word is a biblical coinage, as there is no clear evidence of its use in secular Gk.

NT 1. *gōnia* is used in Matt. 6:5 of a street corner in Jesus' warning not to be like the "hypocrites" who "love to stand and pray in the synagogues and at street corners, that they may be seen by men. Truly, I say to you, they have their reward." In Jesus' day prayer in the synagogue was led by a member of the congregation standing before the ark of the law. But at times of public fasting, and perhaps in response to the call to prayer at the time of the afternoon temple sacrifice, prayers could be offered in the streets (Taanith 2:1 f.; cf. D. Hill, *The Gospel of Matthew, New Century Bible*, 133). Jesus' criticism is not directed at the practice of prayer but at ostentation.

In Acts 26:26 Paul reminds Festus that King Agrippa knows what has happened to Paul, "for this was not done in a corner", i.e. in secret. In Rev. 7:1 the seer sees four angels from the four corners of the earth; the ancient East regarded the world as a quadrilateral (so in Jer. 49:36 four winds come from the four ends of heaven). Rev. 20:7 ff. recalls Ezek. 38 f. and describes how Satan leads forth Gog and Magog, the Gentile hosts, from the four corners of the earth to do battle against "the beloved city". This struggle ends with the destruction of these powers that are hostile to God.

2. All 5 NT passages which refer to the *kephalē gōnias* are derived from Ps. 118:22. The corner-stone as the most important stone in the foundation is laid first. Because of its position it could be "a stone of offence and a rock of stumbling", as 1 Pet. 2:8 says (lit. translated), referring to Isa. 8:14 (→ Offence). The *kephalē gōnias* of v. 7 certainly here means the corner-stone. Presumably the same is true of Matt. 21:42 par. and Acts 4:11, since these also refer back to Ps. 118:22.

However J. Jeremias has proposed another interpretation. He suggests that *kephalē gōnias* should, like *akrogōniaios*, mean not the corner-stone, but the keystone which was placed over the entrance of the temple (see bibliography). But none of the evidence that Jeremias cites for this interpretation is earlier than the second half of the 2nd cent. A.D. That is true of Symmachus' translation of the OT, which translates the Heb. *kōṯeret* (capital) of 2 Ki. 25:17 with *akrogōniaion*, and of the Testament of Solomon 22:7 ff. which Jeremias adduces as of the first importance for his view; it is an apocryphal Christian document of the 3rd/4th cents. A.D. See also 1QM 8:4 ff. (For details of evidence of a top corner-stone → *lithos* OT 2 (d).) The "stone of offence and rock of stumbling" in 1 Pet. 2:8 cannot refer to the keystone at

the top of the building; hence we must set aside Jeremias' interpretation, since firm evidence for it is lacking in the NT period. This interpretation of the stone of Ps. 118:22 (Isa. 28:16) arose later; perhaps it goes back to Eph. 1:22. Here Christ is said to have been made "the head over all things for the church". This concept may have replaced that of "the head of the corner" (Ps. 118:22) on the grounds that this was no longer clearly understood. It was transferred to the keystone which forms the → "head" of the spiritual building, the church. ([Ed.] This seems barely plausible in view of the other OT allusions in Eph. including the wandering people of God, the reference to covenants, law and the temple in Eph. 2:11–22.)

In essence the point of the statements in the NT about the corner-stone is the same. The builders who have rejected the stone are the Jewish nation and its leaders; they have rejected Christ, but through his saving action in Christ's death and resurrection God has made this same Christ into the corner-stone of a new building, the → church. The likening of the community to a building is found elsewhere in the NT (e.g. Matt. 16:18; 1 Cor. 3:9 ff.; 14:12; → House). According to Matt. 21:42 par. Mk. 12:10; Lk. 20:17, Jesus himself directed his Jewish opponents' attention to Ps. 118:22. But, according to 1 Pet. 2:8, what applies to them also applies to all who do not accept the message of Christ. If Jesus is for unbelievers the cause of their judgment, the stone of offence and rock of stumbling, he is for Christians the "living stone" which is chosen and precious (1 Pet. 2:4, 6). The description of Christ as the corner-stone thus expresses most pregnantly the truth that man's eternal destiny is decided in him. For further discussion see R. J. McKelvey, "Christ the Corner-stone", *NTS* 8, 1961–62, 352–59.

3. The word *akrogōniaios*, corner-stone, occurs in the NT only in Eph. 2:20 and 1 Pet. 2:6. In both passages the saying of Isa. 28:16 is given a christological interpretation. This messianic view of the passage is visible already in Rom. 9:33 and we can see that it was widely held in early Christianity (→ *petra* NT 1). The juxtaposition in Eph. 2:20 of "foundation" and "corner-stone" shows that the apostle has the Isa.-passage in mind. In Christ the prophetic utterance finds its fulfilment. The foundation upon which the community is built is the apostles and prophets, the corner-stone is Jesus Christ. Upon this foundation the community grows into a holy temple in the Lord, into whom Christians, through the Holy → Spirit, are also built. The statement in 1 Cor. 3:11, in which Christ is spoken of as the foundation of the church (→ Firm, art. *themelios*), thus takes on a subtle shade of meaning. In 1 Pet. 2:6 the *akrogōniaios* is identical with the *kephalē gōnias* of vv. 4, 7. This confirms that the stone is a corner-stone. The living stone which is chosen by God and is precious is Jesus Christ. Christians need to join him in order to be themselves built in as "living stones" (v. 5) into the spiritual house, the church. This is the original meaning of the word edification, whose biblical sense we constantly need to remember.

W. Mundle

λίθος

λίθος (*lithos*), stone; λίθινος (*lithinos*), of stone; μύλος (*mylos*), mill, millstone; μυλικός (*mylikos*), belonging to a mill; μύλινος (*mylinos*), belonging to a mill.

CL *lithos* (Homer onwards) means stone, *lithinos* (Pindar, Hdt. onwards) of stone. In general *lithos* can describe stones of every sort (cf. Lucian, *Hermotimus* 81: *ho*

theos ouk en ouranō estin, alla dia pantōn pephoitēken: hoion xylōn kai lithōn kai zōōn, God is not in heaven, but goes about permeating all things, bits of wood, stones and living creatures). In particular one can distinguish building stones (Diog. Laert., 2, 72; Diod. Sic., I, 66, 3, *lithoi kaloi*, fine stones, here works of marble) and precious stones (together with gold, silver, pearls, etc., *lithoi timioi*, jewels, are mentioned, e.g. in Herodian, 5, 2, 4).

OT 1. Usually the LXX translates the Heb. *'eḇen* by *lithos*. The Heb. uses a further 10 words to specify different sorts of stone like mill-stones, boundary-stones, stone pillars, piles of stones, precious stones, emeralds, diamonds, etc. These the LXX also translates by *lithos*, usually without differentiating them. The most important of the numerous occurrences of this word (which is found some 350 times) are those passages in which *lithos* occurs in a theological context and which are occasionally taken up in the NT.

2. (a) In a threatening passage (Isa. 8:11–15) the prophet Isaiah warns his people not to free themselves from the danger of an Assyrian invasion through self-sufficient and faithless exertions. He testifies that the real danger for Judah is not the Assyrians, but the proximity of God their judge, who will become a "stone of offence" and a "rock of stumbling" (Isa. 8:14). "Just as someone wandering in the night suddenly stumbles over a stone and falls to the ground, or on a mountain steps upon a loose fragment of rock and falls, the people of the covenant ... will be smitten unexpectedly by the judgment of God" (O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 1–12*, 1972, 118).

(b) Isa. 28:16a uses the image of the building of a house and the foundation-stone. In contrast to the Jerusalem rulers' policy of alliances against Assyria, a policy that is doomed to fail, for they make alliances with death (v. 16), Yahweh is laying in Zion a firm foundation-stone, which gives a stable base for the foundation, its walls and the whole building. Possibly there is a comparison here with the Jerusalem temple. However, the interpretation, "He who believes will not be confounded" (v. 16b), interprets the foundation-stone, upon which the building of the nation and state is to be erected, as faith and trust in Yahweh's help, which makes the anxious search for alliances superfluous. On this passage → *gōnia* CL & OT 2.

(c) Likewise Psalm 118:22 cites what looks like a proverb about a corner-stone (→ art. *gōnia* OT 1). The one who offers the prayer thanks Yahweh for the salvation which he shares. He likens his existence threatened by death to a stone which the builders discarded as useless and his rescuing by Yahweh to a corner-stone or keystone of a building.

(d) Zechariah prophesies the completion of the building of the post-exilic → temple by Zerubbabel: " 'What are you, you great mountain? Before Zerubbabel, be a plain! He will pull out the keystone [MT *hā'eḇen hārō'šâh*, lit. 'the head stone'; LXX *ton lithon tēs klēronomias*, lit. 'the stone of inheritance'] to shouts of: Blessings on it, blessings on it!' The word of Yahweh was addressed to me as follows. 'The hands of Zerubbabel have laid the foundation [MT *yissᵉḏû*; LXX *ethemeliōsan*] of this Temple; his hands will finish it. (And you will learn that Yahweh Sabaoth has sent me to you.) A day for little things, no doubt, but who would dare to despise it? People will rejoice when they see the chosen stone [MT *hā'eḇen habbᵉḏîl*; LXX *ton lithon ton kassiterinon*] in the hands of Zerubbabel' " (Zech. 4:7–10 JB). The great mountain is

not to be taken literally (cf. J. G. Baldwin, *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, TC*, 1972, 121; cf. Isa. 40:4; 41:15). The thought is that the mountains of opposition to God's work cannot impede it. A. Petitjean claims that Zechariah means a foundation stone in v. 7 (*Les Oracles du Proto-Zacharie*, 1969, 243–51; cf. *ANET*, 340 f.). But Baldwin holds that the sense of the passage requires it to mean a completion stone, for the promise concerns the completion of the building (cf. v. 9). The completion is symbolic of the victory of God's Spirit (cf. v. 6). Miss Baldwin notes parallels in Babylonian Chronicles where the king proclaims that he has raised the head of the temple to its height (op. cit., 122). The expression *hā'eḇen habbᵉḏîl* (v. 10) means lit. "the stone the tin". RSV has plumbline (cf. the LXX), although plumblines were normally made of lead. NEB has "the Stone called Separation", parallel with the stone of inheritance or possession (v. 7). This follows the Syriac which sees the noun connected with the vb. *bāḏal*, to separate (cf. G. R. Driver, "Babylonian and Hebrew Notes", *Die Welt des Orients* 2, 1954, 22). This translation would symbolize the separated, holy nature of the Jewish community, and from this it is but a short step to "the chosen stone" (JB). "The cause of rejoicing, therefore, is the placing of this last ceremonial stone, the crown of all their work, on the height of the Temple walls, by Zerubbabel" (Baldwin, op. cit., 123). A top corner-stone has, in fact, been discovered in Jerusalem (cf. B. Mazar, *The excavations in the Old City of Jerusalem near the Temple Mount, Preliminary Report of the Second and Third Seasons*, Institute of Archaeology, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, The Israel Exploration Society, Jerusalem, 1971, 2, see also figs. 1 and 3).

(e) Dan. 2:34 f. tells of Nebuchadnezzar's → dream in which he saw a stone break off from a mountain without any human agency and shatter the great image on its feet of iron and clay. The image was dispersed without trace. "But the stone that struck the image became a great mountain and filled the whole earth." In Dan. 2:44 f. the dream is interpreted as the establishment of God's kingdom which will crush the image, i.e. all other kingdoms: "And in the days of those kings the God of heaven will set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed, nor shall its sovereignty be left to another people. It shall break in pieces all these kingdoms and bring them to an end, and it shall stand for ever; just as you saw that a stone was cut from a mountain by no human hand, and that it broke in pieces the iron, the bronze, the clay, the silver, and the gold. A great God has made known to the king what shall be hereafter. The dream is certain, and its interpretation is sure." (For interpretations of the kingdoms see J. A. Montgomery, *The Book of Daniel*, ICC, 1927, 165–92; E. W. Heaton, *The Book of Daniel*, 1956, 130–35; N. W. Porteous, *Daniel*, 1965, 44–51; and E. J. Young, *The Prophecy of Daniel*, 1949, 71–80, cf. 295–306.)

3. In late Judaism various OT sayings about stones were given a messianic interpretation. Already in the LXX an *ep' autō* ("in him") has been added to the *ho pisteuōn* ("he who believes") of Isa. 28:16. Similarly the stones in Isa. 8:14 (San. 38a), Zech. 4:7 (Tg. ad loc.), Zech. 4:10 (Tanh. Toledot 20) and Dan. 2:34 ff. (Num. R. 13:14 on 7:13) are given messianic interpretations (cf. Targum Ps. 118:24; Zech. 3:8 f.; detailed evidence in J. Jeremias, *TDNT* IV 272 f.). Judaism expected a glorification or renewal of the temple (SB I 1003 f.; but cf. Jesus in Lk. 13:35). The Qumran community regarded itself as the eschatological Israel, as God's true temple, and cited Isa. 28:16 as evidence (1QS 8:7 f.).

NT In the NT most instances of the word *lithos* are in the Synoptic Gospels, especially Matt.; it occurs only occasionally in Paul, in 1 Pet. and in Rev. It is used lit. of a mill-stone (Lk. 17:2), a boulder (Matt. 27:60 par. Mk. 15:46; Matt. 28:2 par. 16:3 f.; cf. Lk. 24:2; Jn. 20:1) or a precious stone (Rev. 18:12, 16; 21:11, 19). Its fig. use is chiefly in connexion with OT quotations which are given a messianic interpretation.

1. (a) The saying about the stones crying out (Lk. 19:40) is to be understood against an OT and Jewish background, where we occasionally get references to the accusing cry of lifeless objects (Gen. 4:10; Hab. 2:11; 2 Esd. 5:5; cf. SB II 253). J. Jeremias gives this intepretation to Jesus' saying: "If my disciples were to withhold their acclamation, the stones by the wayside would cry out and accuse them" (loc. cit. 270).

(b) It is doubtful whether John the Baptist's saying, that "God can raise up children of Abraham from these stones" (Matt. 3:9; Lk. 3:8), is citing Isa. 51:1 f. (taking → Abraham as the rock; so Jeremias, loc. cit. 271). For those whom the Baptist addresses certainly ought not to appeal to the descent of the whole nation from one man (which is emphasized in that passage) as God can make children of Abraham from stones. The offensive saying means that God can fashion a new → Israel from men who can claim no qualifications (like descent, etc.) of their own (cf. Rom. 4:9–25).

(c) On the saying of Jesus about no stone of the temple being left standing on another (Mk. 13:2 par.) → Present, art. *The Parousia and Eschatology in the NT* 2 (a).

2. (a) Occasionally Jesus is likened to a stone. Mk. 12:10; Lk. 20:17 f. cites Ps. 118:22 in connexion with the parable of the husbandmen: the stone rejected by the builders has become the corner-stone or keystone. He who is rejected by men is the One exalted by God (J. Schniewind, ad loc.). According to Acts 4:10 f., this exaltation has already taken place in Jesus' resurrection. Eph. 2:20–22 also makes Jesus the *akrogōniaios*, the corner-stone or keystone, which holds the whole building together (→ *gōnia* NT 3), while the apostles and prophets form the foundation.

(b) On the other hand, Jesus is likened in Lk. 20:18 to a destroying stone which will crush its opponents, an allusion to Dan. 2:34 (cf. above, OT 2 (e)). In Rom. 9:32 f. Paul quotes Isa. 8:14 and interprets the stone of offence of Christ who has been the undoing of the Jews (→ *petra* NT 1).

(c) In Rom. 9:33 and 1 Pet. 2:4–8 (cf. also Lk. 2:34) the positive interpretation of Jesus as the corner-stone or keystone is combined with the negative one of him as the destructive stone of offence by combining different OT quotations (→ *petra* NT 1). This serves to show the dialectical significance of Jesus as gospel and law, as salvation and disaster. It is the faith of individual men that decides whether Christ the stone has a vital (1 Pet. 2:4) or a fatal (Lk. 20:18) effect (cf. the citation of Isa. 28:16 in Rom. 9:33 and 1 Pet. 2:6 f.).

3. In 1 Pet. 2:5 Christians are likened to "living stones": "as living stones be built up into a spiritual house" (cf. Eph. 2:20). The inanimate image of the building here is inadequate for the truth expressed. Because Christ lives, the foundation and thus the entire building is living; and because Christians live with and through him they can be addressed as "living stones". (See further N. Hillyer, " 'Rock-Stone' Imagery in I Peter", *TB* 22, 1971, 58–81.) *H.-G. Link, E. Tiedtke*

4. The word *mylos*, mill, is found in secular Gk. and the LXX (cf. Exod. 11:5; Deut. 24:6; Isa. 47:2; Sib. 8:14). It consisted of two round, flat stones, and figures in Jesus' warning about the suddenness of the parousia and how unprepared some will be for it: "Two women will be grinding at the mill; one is taken and one is left" (Matt. 24:41; cf. Num. 11:8). The fact that "the sound of the millstone shall be heard no more" is one of the vivid ways of expressing judgment on → Babylon, i.e. godless civilization (Rev. 18:22). This follows the event described in Rev. 18:21: "Then a mighty angel took up a stone like a great millstone and threw it into the sea, saying, 'So shall Babylon the great city be thrown down with violence, and shall be found no more.' " The judgment on Babylon recalls Jer. 51:60–63 (cf. 7:34; 16:9; 25:10), and the destruction by a stone is reminiscent of Dan. 2:34 f. (see above OT 2 (e)). In Jdg. 9:53 Abimelech was killed by a millstone thrown by a woman as he besieged the tower at Thebez. "For some of John's readers this passage would have awakened more recent memories of that August night in A.D. 79 when the lamps and gaiety of Pompeii and Herculanum were extinguished for ever by a pall of volcanic ash. It is not after all the heroic sins that bring the downfall of cities, but sheer heedlessness of approaching disaster" (G. B. Caird, *The Revelation of St. John the Divine*, *BNTC*, 1966, 231). Babylon is thus as unprepared as the woman in Jesus' saying. There is an irony in the contrast between the *lithon hos mylinon megan* of v. 21 and the *phonē mylou* of v. 22. The latter denotes a harmless and necessary activity; the former becomes the instrument of destruction as it is in the saying of Jesus, "Whoever causes one of these little ones who believes in me to sin, it would be better for him if a great millstone were hung round his neck and he were thrown into the sea" (Mk. 9:42 par. Matt. 18:8, Lk. 17:1 f.; → Offence, art. *skandalon* NT 3). The *mylos onikos* of Matt. and Mk. means lit. a "donkey stone"; Lk. has *lithos mylikos*, stone belonging to a mill (cf. Mk. 9:42 *v.l.*; Rev. 18:21 *v.l.*). It signifies a large stone worked by donkey power. W. L. Lane draws attention to its context in Mk., where it follows Jesus' rebuke of the disciples for forbidding the unknown exorcist. "The stern warning has immediate relevance for those who had sought to prevent the exercise of faith in Jesus' name, and corresponds in severity to the word addressed to Peter when he sought to turn Jesus from the path of obedience (Ch. 8:33). Verse 42 performs the same function as Ch. 8:33: it serves to expose a grievous misconception and by graphic language to impress the seriousness of the matter indelibly upon the hearers' hearts" (*The Gospel of Mark*, *NLC*, 1974, 345). *C. Brown*

→ Apostle, → Bind, → Church, → Firm, Foundation, → Offence, → Open, → Punishment

μαργαρίτης

μαργαρίτης (*margaritēs*), pearl.

CL *margaritēs*, pearl, is that rarest phenomenon, a certain translation of an ancient term for a gemstone (from Theophrastus, 4th cent. B.C.). In a rare flight of poesy, Pliny describes how pearls originate as dewdrops falling into open oysters (*Nat. Hist.* 9, 106–23).

OT There are no certain references to pearls in the OT, and *margaritēs* does not occur in the LXX. The "pearl" of Job 28:18a AV (Heb. *gāḇîš*) is probably crystal.

RSV translates *pᵉnînîm* in Job 28:18b as pearls, but elsewhere always as jewels, costly stones. The use of pearls for the gates of new Jerusalem was a familiar messianic picture (Baba Bathra 37:1; Sanhedrin 100, 1; Mid. Ps. 87; Exod. R. 15, 114, 4).

NT In Matt. 7:6 Jesus urges discrimination in offering "what is holy", that which stands in special relation to God, to the irresponsible and unappreciative, an action tantamount to casting costly pearls before swine. The saying is quoted in Did. 9:5 and by Tertullian (*De praesc.* 41) against the admission of the unbaptized to the Lord's Supper. Pearls are mentioned in 1 Tim. 2:9; Rev. 17:4 as extravagances of feminine finery, and in Matt. 13:45 f.; Rev. 18:12, 16 as articles of merchandise.

Each gate of the heavenly city is a gigantic pearl, some 200 feet across (Rev. 21:21; cf. Isa. 54:12). On each gate is inscribed the name of one of the tribes of Israel (21:12). It is less likely that this implies that there is one particular entrance for a man assigned to any given tribe, than that the large number of gates suggests free and ample access to the city. The names of the 12 tribes on the gates should be related with the names of the 12 apostles on the foundations (21:14). The implication is that the true children of God under the old covenant and under the new alike share in the heavenly city. The gates of the city are not intended to stand against assault – indeed, they are always open (21:25). The angels on duty (21:12) are not armed (cf. Gen. 3:24) but a guard of honour. Pearl is not utilitarian, but only for decoration, beauty, ornament.

In the parable the prudent merchant was prepared to sell all that he had to acquire a single pearl of great price (Matt. 13:46). It is suggestive that alone among precious stones the pearl is the product of a living organism. More precisely, the pearl results from an injury done to a living organism. A foreign body invading the shell of an oyster is covered by layers of nacre, until the pearl is formed. The pearl of great price in the parable can be taken to represent the church which Jesus purchased with his own blood (Acts 20:28). For the substance of the gates of the heavenly city to be described as pearl, therefore, is apt, for entrance into the Father's presence is only by way of the work of Jesus himself (Jn. 14:6). *N. Hillyer*

Precious Stones in the Apocalypse

Systematic mineralogy was not established as a science until *c.* 1780. Today, identifying a gemstone by the use of optical and other instruments still involves a careful process of elimination. Even so, nomenclature often remains confused: *topaz* is a term loosely used for many yellow or sherry-brown stones which have only their colour in common; none is the same as ancient topaz, usually thought from contexts to be green (modern peridot). The uncertainty surrounding the names of precious stones in antiquity is therefore not surprising, especially since most of the corresponding Heb. roots simply mean glitter, sparkle, gleam, and the like. Furthermore, many stones are found in a great variety of colours.

The problem can be highlighted with one illustration. The first gemstone in Rev. 21:19 is *iaspis*, usually translated jasper. The Gk. noun is used in the LXX to render three different Heb. words: (a) *yāšᵉpēh*, Ezek. 28:13; from an unused root meaning to polish (*iaspis* and *jasper* simply transliterate the Heb.); (b) *yahᵃlōm*, Exod. 28:18;

36:18 (39:11); something hard, derived from *hālam*, to strike down with force; (c) *kaḏkōḏ*, Isa. 54:12; sparkling, from *kāḏaḏ*, to strike fire from metal. Even as early as the Mishnah, the meaning of *kaḏkōḏ* was the centre of an argument (Baba Bathra 75a). Modern translators propose agate, red jasper, or ruby. Pliny has a long discussion about precious stones in *Nat. Hist.* 37. He refers to *iaspis* as a translucent green, with a Persian variety in sky-blue. The reference in Rev. 21:11 to crystal suggests translucence, but present-day jasper cannot be meant since that is opaque. J. S. Harris concludes that *iaspis* is a variety of quartz, found in red, brown, green, or yellow, occasionally in blue or black, and rarely in white. According to L. Ginzberg, the *iaspis* was Benjamin's stone: "This stone changes colour even as Benjamin's feelings towards his brothers changed."

Recent translations of the Bible offer the following possibilities for the 12 precious stones of the wall of New Jerusalem (Rev. 21:19–21): *iaspis*, jasper, diamond; *sappheiros*, sapphire, lapis lazuli; *chalkēdōn*, agate, chalcedony, turquoise; *smaragdos*, emerald, crystal; *sardonyx*, onyx, sardonyx, agate; *sardion*, carnelian, cornelian, ruby, sardius; *chrysolithos*, chrysolite, gold quartz, yellow quartz; *bēryllos*, beryl, malachite; *topazion*, topaz; *chrysoprasos*, chrysoprase, emerald, chalcedony; *hyakinthos*, jacinth, turquoise, sapphire; *amethystos*, amethyst.

Although in a different order, the names of the precious stones in Rev. 21 closely resemble those on the high priest's breastplate in Exod. 28:17–20 LXX (= Ezek. 28:13 LXX). Eight of the LXX names recur in Rev. 21. Of the stones in Exod. 28, *anthrax* (Heb. *nōp̄eh*), *ligyrion* (*lešem*), *achatēs* (*šᵉḇô*), and *onychion* (*yāšᵉp̄ēh*) are replaced in Rev. 21 by *chalkēdōn*, *chrysoprasos*, *hyakinthos*, and *sardonyx*, none of which appears in the LXX as the name of a precious stone. W. Bousset (*Die Offenbarung Johannis*, 1906) shows that the variations between Revelation and Exodus can be explained, so we may safely assume that John intended to reproduce the OT list. But Bousset is unable to account for the order of the stones, which in fact differs widely in all the lists (Exod. 28; Ezek. 28 MT; and ibid., LXX).

Rev. 17:4 is part of a picture of depravation and decadence in the description of the woman on a scarlet beast representing "Babylon the great, mother of harlots and of earth's abominations" and "bedeckt with gold and jewels and pearls" (*chrysiō kai lithō timiō kai margaritais*), an expression which sounds like a perversion of the high priest's breastplate.

The Samaritan Targum on Exod. 28:17–20; 39:10–13 (dated to the Roman period) indicates that the stones on the high priest's breastplate gave three variations of four basic colours: red, bright red, intense red; and similarly with black, green, and white. This grouping by shades appears a more likely explanation of the biblical lists, since 12 totally different colours in gemstones, even if known to the ancients, would almost certainly have presented violent clashes of colour (J. S. Harris, *ALUOS* 5, 1965, 58–62).

Philo (*Vit. Mos.* 2, 122–35) regards the gemstones on the breastplate as symbolic of the months of the year, or of the signs of the Zodiac. Josephus (*Ant.* 3, 166–71; *War* 5, 233–5) also associates the stones with the Zodiac (though he enumerates them differently in the two writings). So too does Clem. Alex. (*Strom.* 5, 38, 4). The Mishnah associates the 12 tribes with the 12 constellations (Berakoth 32b), and this prompts A. Farrer (*A Rebirth of Images*, 1949, 216–44) to attempt to match tribes with zodiacal signs. Since such signs are depicted in mosaics in synagogues in

Palestine, it is clear that Judaism was prepared to make use of pagan symbols in the cause of Jewish ideas. Such symbolism was extremely primitive and widespread. The architecture of the city of the gods, according to Babylonian mythology, was marked by cosmic symbols. The city rested on four columns covered by jewels (= stars), had 12 foundation stones and 12 gates (12 signs of the Zodiac), and was traversed by a golden street (the Galaxy).

R. H. Charles (*ICC*, 1920) suggested that the gemstones in Rev. 21 represent the signs of the Zodiac arranged in the reverse order to which the sun travels through the Zodiac, thus indicating that Christianity and the New Jerusalem are opposed to religions of sun-worship (cf. Rev. 22:5). The 12 signs of the Zodiac had jewels allocated to them, beginning with amethyst and ending with jasper. John reversed the order "to attack astrology", a suggestion since followed by other commentators (e.g. G. B. Caird, *The Revelation of St John*, 1966). But this is an odd way to attack astrology (T. F. Glasson, *JTS* ns 26, 1975, 95): no constellations are mentioned in Rev. 21; any zodiacal reference is obscure, though John is quite capable of making his points forcibly. The best method of attack would have been to scramble the order, not to adopt correspondences to the Zodiac. Charles had relied on Athanasius Kircher (1602–80), but Glasson exposes the latter as a fraud.

A. Farrer (*Revelation of St John*, 1964, 219) suggests that John simply compiles his list in general correspondence with Exodus, but euphoniously. The writer arranges the Gk. terms to emphasize a division by three. Nine of them end with *s* sounds, and the three exceptions end with *n* sounds, as if to underline the points of division: *iaspis, sappheiros, chalkēdōn*; *smaragdos, sardonyx, sardion*; *chrysolithos, bēryllos, topazion*; *chrysoprasos, hyakinthos, amethystos*. John has already listed the 12 tribes in Rev. 7:5–8. The stones represent the tribes, according to Exod. 28:21. But there is no need to repeat woodenly the stones in the exact order of the tribes.

Although the stones on the high priest's breastplate are usually assumed to have been set in four rows of three, some early writers suggest that the arrangement was in the form of a square (Mid. R. 2:7 on Num. 2:2; Clem. Alex., *Strom.* 5, 38, 4), corresponding to the position of the tribes around the tabernacle (Num. 2) and the gates of the city (Ezek. 48:30; Rev. 21:13). It is also possible that, like the 12 gates of the city (Rev. 21:12), the 12 stones not only symbolize the 12 apostles (21:14), but also relate to the 12 tribes of Israel (A. M. Farrer, *A Rebirth of Images*, 1949, 216 ff.). A convincing identification of individual stones with tribes is unlikely, with one possible exception. *iaspis*, at the head of the list of precious stones adorning the wall, may stand for the first tribe in John's list, Judah (7:5), and its corresponding apostle (21:14). *iaspis* is also the general material of the city (21:11). Jesus the messiah is of the tribe of Judah (Lk. 3:26; Heb. 7:14; Rev. 5:5), termed apostle (Heb. 3:1) and the chief corner-stone (Eph. 2:20; cf. 1 Pet. 2:6, 8). It is from him that the church acquires the substance and colour of the divine glory (Rev. 4:3). The wall of the city is associated with both tribes and apostles (Rev. 21:12, 14). The symbolism is of a perfect city of God in which all the saints of both the old and the new covenants alike have their portion. As 12 tribes represent the chosen people of God in completeness, so 12 apostles represent the apostolic company in totality. Discussion as to whether Judas is excluded or Paul included has no place in this symbolism.

The main outline of the description of the heavenly city in Rev. 21 is foreshadowed in Isa. 54:11 f. (cf. Tob. 13:16–18). Precious stones are frequently connected with

theophanies (e.g., Ezek. 1; Rev. 4), probably because of their quality of reflecting light and emitting radiance. A midrash on Isa. 54:11 f. from Qumran represents the community of the elect as precious stones and their priests as lapis lazuli or sapphires (4QpIsa). But in Revelation the focus of attention is on God himself.

The constant mention of transparency indicates that the heavenly city is designed to transmit the glory of God in the form of light without hindrance. In Rev. 4:3, 6 the presence of God is likened to the appearance of *iaspis* and *sardion*, the rainbow around the throne to *smaragdinos* (cf. Ezek. 1:26–28; 10:1), and the sea before the throne to *krystallos*, rock-crystal. Rev. 21 suggests a scene of indescribable beauty, with the light of the heavenly city playing upon the layers of multi-coloured stones built one upon the other, each layer extending all round the city. The city is a blaze of light (from the Lamb, 21:23) and its radiance compared to the brightness of *iaspis*, a term used for stones of various colours, but here qualified by *timiōtatō*, most costly, and *krystallizonti*, translucent like rock-crystal (21:11) – costly to man but used lavishly in the new Jerusalem (21:19) for the purpose of manifesting the glory of God. The believer in Christ does not generate the light of Christ, but should both reflect and transmit its glory without blurring the beauty and loveliness of Christ.

N. Hillyer

On *petra, gōnia* and *lithos* etc.:
(a). Arndt, 167, 475, 660 f.; A. A. Anderson, *The Book of Psalms, New Century Bible*, I–II, 1972; G. Bornkamm, "The Authority to 'Bind' and 'Loose' in the Church in Matthew's Gospel: The Problem of Sources in Matthew's Gospel", *Perspective* 11, 1970, 37–50; C. Brown, "The Teaching Office of the Church", *The Churchman* 83, 1969, 184–96; R. E. Brown, "Peter", *IDB Supplementary Volume*, 1976, 65–57; R. E. Brown, K. P. Donfried and J. Reumann, eds., *Peter in the New Testament: A Collaborative Assessment by Protestant and Roman Catholic Scholars*, 1974; F. F. Bruce, "The Corner Stone", *ExpT* 84, 1972–73, 231–35; O. Cullmann, *petra, TDNT* VI 95–99; *Petros, Kēphas, TDNT* VI 100–12; and *Peter: Disciple, Apostle, Martyr*, 1962[3]; M. Dahood, "Is *'eḇen yiśrā'ēl* a Divine Title (Gn. 49, 24)?", *Biblica* 40, 1959, 1022–7; B. van Elderen, "Peter, Simon", *ZPEB* IV 733–39; F. V. Filson, "Peter", *IDB* III 749–57; J. K. Elliott, "*Kēphas; Simon Petros; ho Petros*: An Extension of New Testament Usage", *NovT* 14, 1972, 241–56. R. H. Fuller, "The 'Thou art Peter' Pericope and the Easter Appearances", *McCormick Quarterly* 20, 1967, 309–15; L. Gaston, *No Stone on Another: Studies in the Significance of the Fall of Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospels, Supplements to NovT* 23, 1970; M. D. Goulder, *Midrash and Lection in Matthew*, 1974, 383–94; C. N. Hillyer, " 'Rock-Stone' Imagery in I Peter", *TB* 22, 1971, 58–81; S. H. Hooke, "The Corner-Stone of Scripture", in *The Siege Perilous: Essays in Biblical Anthropology and Kindred Subjects*, 1956, 235–49; J. Jeremias, *gōnia, akrogōniaios, kephalē, gōnias, TDNT* I 791 ff.; and *lithos, lithinos, TDNT* IV 268–80; O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 1–12*, 1972; *and Isaiah 13–39*, 1974; A. S. Kapelrud, *'eḇen, TDOT* I 48–51; O. Karrer, *Peter and the Church: An Examination of Cullmann's Thesis, Quaestiones Disputatae* 8, 1963; G. D. Kilpatrick, "Galatians 1:18: *historēsai Kēphan*", in A. J. B. Higgins, ed., *New Testament Essays: Studies in Memory of Thomas Walter Manson*, 1959, 144–49; B. Mazar, *The Excavations in the Old City of Jerusalem, Preliminary Report of the Second and Third Seasons 1969–1970*, Institute of Archaeology, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, The Israel Exploration Society, 1971; R. J. McKelvey, "Christ the Cornerstone", *NTS* 8, 1961–62, 352–59; C. F. D. Moule, "Some Reflections on the 'Stone' Testimonia in Relation to the Name Peter", *NTS* 2, 1955–56, 56 ff.; R. T. O'Callaghan, "Vatican Excavations and the Tomb of Peter", *BA* 16, 1953, 70–87; D. W. O'Connor, *Peter in Rome*, 1969; K. L. Schmidt, *kaleō, TDNT* III 487–91; O. J. F. Seitz, "Upon this Rock: A Critical Re-examination of Matt. 16, 17–19", *JBL* 69, 1950, 329–40; J. W. Wenham, "Did Peter Go to Rome in AD 42?", *TB* 23, 1972, 94–102; M. Wilcox, "Peter and the Rock: A Fresh Look at Matthew xvi. 17–19", *NTS* 22, 1975–76, 73–88.
(b). O. Betz, "Felsmann und Felsengemeinde (Eine Parallele zu Mt 16, 17–19 in den Qumranpsalmen)", *ZNW* 48, 1957, 49–77; H. Clavier, *petros kai petra*, in *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann, BZNW* 21, 1954, 101 ff.; O. Cullmann, "Petrus, Werkzeug des Teufels und Werkzeug Gottes. Die Stellung von Mt. 16, 17–19 in der ältesten Überlieferung", in *Vorträge und Aufsätze*, 1966, 202–13 (French version in A. J. B. Higgins, ed., op. cit., 94–105); G. Beer,

Steinverehrung bei den Israeliten, 1921; E. Dinkler, "Petrus", *RGG*[3] V 247 ff.; E. von Dobschütz, "Matthias als Rabbi und Katechet", *ZNW* 27, 1928, 338–48; J. Dupont, "La Révélation du Fils de Dieu en Faveur de Pierre (*Mt* 16, 17) et de Paul (*Ga* 1, 16)", *RSR* 52, 1964, 411–20; K. Galling, "Serubbabel und der Wiederaufbau des Tempels in Jerusalem", in *Festschrift für W. Rudolph*, 1961, 67–96; H. Gressmann, "Der Eckstein", *Palästina-Jahrbuch* 6, 1910, 38 ff.; E. Haenchen, "Petrus-Probleme", *NTS* 7, 1960–61, 187–97; H. W. Hertzberg, "Der heilige Fels und das Alte Testament", *The Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society* 11, 1931, 32 ff.; R. Hirzel, *Die Strafe der Steinigung*, (1909) 1967; J. Jeremias, "Der Eckstein", *Angelos* 1, 1925, 65 ff.; *Golgotha*, 1926; and *Kephalē gōnias – Akrogōniaios*, *ZNW* 29, 1930, 264 ff.; H.-J. Kraus, *Psalmen*, *BKAT* 15/2, 1966[3]; W. G. Kümmel, "Jesus und die Anfänge der Kirche", *StTh* 7, 1953, 1–27 (reprinted in *Heilsgeschehen und Geschichte*, 1965, 289–309); H. Lehmann, "Du bist Petrus. . .", *EvTh* 13, 1953, 44 ff.; W. Marxsen, "Der Fels der Kirche", in *Der "Frühkatholizismus" im Neuen Testament*, *BSt* 21, 1958, 39–54; F. Obrist, *Echtheitsfragen und Deutung der Primatstelle Mt. 16, 18 f. in der deutschen protestantischen Theologie der letzten dreissigen Jahre*, *NTAbh* 21, 3/4, 1960 (with extensive bibliography); G. Sass, *Der Fels der Kirche*, 1957; K. T. Schäfer, "Zur Deutung von *akrogōniaios* Eph. 2, 20", in *Neutestamentliche Aufsätze*, Festschrift J. Schmid, 1963, 218 ff.; H. Schlier, *Christus und kie Kirche im Epheserbrief*, *BHTh* 6, 1930, 47 ff.; G. Schulze-Kadelbach, "Die Stellung des Petrus in der Urchristenheit", *TLZ* 81, 1956, 1 ff.; A. Schwarzenbach, *Die geographische Terminologie im Hebräischen des Alten Testaments*, 1954, 118–22; G. Stählin, *Skandalon*, 1930, 187 ff.; A. Vögtle, "Messiasbekenntnis und Petrusverheissung: zur Komposition Mt 16, 13–23 Par.", in *Das Evangelium und die Evangelien. Beiträge zur Evangelienforschung*, 1971, 137–70; A. S. van der Woude, *ṣur*, *THAT* II 538–43.

On *margaritēs* and Precious Stones:

(a). E. Burrows, "The Pearl in the Apocalypse", *JTS* 43, 1942, 177–9; G. R. Driver, "Jewels and Precious Stones", in *HDB*[2], 496–500; A. Farrer, *A Rebirth of Images*, 1949, 216–44; L. Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews*, 1946–61, vol. 3; T. F. Glasson, "The Order of Jewels in Revelation XXI. 19–20: A Theory Eliminated", JTS ns 26, 1975, 95–100; J. S. Harris, "An Introduction to the Study of Personal Ornaments of Precious, Semi-Precious and Imitation Stones used throughout Biblical History", *Annual of Leeds University Oriental Society* 4, 1962–3, 49–83: and "The Stones of the High Priest's Breastplate", idem., 5, 1963–5, 40–62; E. F. Jourdain, "The Twelve Stones of the Apocalypse", *ExpT* 22, 1910–11, 448–50; G. F. Kunz, *The Curious Lore of Precious Stones*, 1913; G. C. Morgan, *The Parables and Metaphors of our Lord*, 1943 (ch. 13).

(b). H. Quiring, "Die Edelsteine im Amtsschild des jüdischen Hohenpriesters und die Herkunft ihrer Namen", *Sudhoffs Archiv* 39, 1954, 193–213.

Rule, Standard, Measure

κανών

κανών (*kanōn*), rule, standard, norm.

CL & OT The Gk. word *kanōn* is a loan word from Semitic, where its original meaning was reed, cane, stalk of grain. *kanōn*, attested from Homer onwards, means anything that can be held against something else in order to stretch, roll up or measure it. The idea of measurement became predominant and from the 5th cent. B.C. *kanōn* meant above all a measuring line, measuring rod, balance arm, fixed rule, norm. In mathematics, astronomy and history *kanōn* means list or table; in art a guideline. Polyclitus' "Spearbearer" was called the *kanōn* by his contemporaries (Pliny, *Natural History* 34, 55). In philosophy *kanōn* denotes the criterion of judgment.

In this sense *kanōn* also occurs in 4 Macc. 7:21, while in Jud. 13:6 it stands for something like the supporting frame of a bed. In that almost unintelligible verse, Mic. 7:4, *kanōn* seems to be a meaningless and recent conjecture with no Heb. equivalent. For the thoughts expressed by *kanōn* the OT has neither terms nor understanding. The nearest Heb. is *qānêh*, reed.

NT 1. The word *kanōn* is rare in the NT; only Paul uses it. He employs it in the sense of norm or standard. *kanōn* is thus both the rule for the individual Christian's life and the standard by which to judge others. "Peace and mercy be upon all who walk by this rule, upon the Israel of God" (Gal. 6:16). With the phrase "by this rule [*tō kanoni toutō*]" Paul sums up all that he has previously said. *kanōn* is a rule of life, the content of which is the death of Christ on the cross, which gives a new relationship to God and with it a new basis for existence. The *kanōn* determines what is to be done, what is to be rejected and what is to be accepted; it establishes a new scale of values, which is distinguished from everything which is to be found outside the salvation given by Christ. It is a rule which is to be applied in the everyday conduct of life; the "new creation" (Gal. 6:15) corresponds to it. "Walking by this rule" means that the new being, shaped by Christ's saving work, manifests itself in the processes of thought and action. Whoever lives by the rule of Christ belongs to the "Israel of God".

2. *kanōn* occurs in some variant readings of Phil. 3:16 which in the RSV reads: "Only let us hold true to what we have attained." Here Paul speaks of being taken hold of by Christ, an experience which enables him to press towards the goal of his heavenly calling. These readings introduce the word *kanōn* in the same sense as in Gal. 3:16. It is the norm of conduct to which all have yielded with a common attitude. (On the variety of readings see Metzger, 615.)

3. *kanōn* is used three times in 2 Cor. 10:13–16: "But we will not boast beyond limit [*ouk eis ta ametra*], but will keep to the limits God has apportioned to us [*alla kata to metron tou kanonos hou emerisen hēmin ho theos metrou*], to reach even you. For we are not overextending ourselves, as though we did not reach you; we were the first to come all the way to you with the gospel of Christ. We do not boast beyond limit [*ouk eis ta ametra*], in other men's labours; but our hope is that as your faith increases, our field among you may be greatly enlarged [*en hymin megalynthēnai kata ton kanona hēmōn eis perisseian*], so that we may preach the gospel in lands beyond you, without boasting of work already done in another's field [*en allotriō kanoni*]." The RSV thus interprets *kanōn* in a geographical sense, i.e. the area of work measured out or allotted to Paul. But interpreters differ on this. In the opinion of the present writers *kanōn* stands for the rule that Paul is active wherever the gospel has not yet been proclaimed (cf. Rom. 15:20 f.). A. Schlatter says of v. 13 that, "The measure, *metron*, is measured by the measuring-rod, *kanōn*" (*Paulus der Bote Jesu*, 1962, 624). But C. K. Barrett rejects this and translates *kanōn* as "province": "If Paul is going to boast at all, he will do so not in terms of what he himself has done, but of what God has done through him in the evangelization of hitherto untouched territory" (*The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, *BNTC*, 1973, 265). "The geographical reference here [i.e. in Rom. 15:23 f. which was probably written while Paul was in Corinth] confirms the view of *measure* and *province* (*metron* and *kanōn*) taken above against Käsemann ... though he may well be right in thinking that it was Paul's adversaries who first employed these words; and they may have used them in a different way" (op. cit., 268; cf. E. Käsemann, "Die Legitimität des Apostels", *ZNW* 41, 1942, 56–61; reprinted as a separate work, 1956, 43–51).

J. Guhrt, H.-G. Link

4. In later church usage the term canon stands for the rule of faith and especially for the list of writings recognized by the church as documents of divine revelation.

The church took over the OT Scriptures of the LXX, but there is no clear evidence that those books were widely regarded as canonical which were not in the Heb. By the time of Jesus there was widespread agreement as to the content of the canon with regard to those books which we know as the OT. In the 2nd cent. A.D. Melito sent to Palestine to discover the content of the Heb. Bible, because it was assumed that this was the norm for the church.

After the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 an assembly of Jewish religious teachers was established at Jamnia, a city some 13 miles south of Joppa. This body was regarded to some extent as replacing the Sanhedrin. Among the questions discussed by the rabbis was the status of certain books like Est., Prov., Eccles., Cant. and Ezek. H. E. Ryle suggested that a particular synod held around A.D. 100 settled the extent of the Jewish canon (*The Canon of the Old Testament*, 1892). But although this view is widely assumed, there is no evidence to confirm it. The Roman Catholic church accepted among the canonical Scriptures the books included in the LXX, and this was confirmed by the Council of Trent (Session IV, 1546).

E. Käsemann has argued that it is not the NT canon that establishes the unity of the church but the different confessions ("The Canon of the New Testament and the Unity of the Church", in *Essays on New Testament Themes*, *SBT* 41, 95–107). He holds that there was a variety of confessions in the early church and that we must not imprison God arbitrarily. On the other hand, it must be pointed out that the concept of the canon was not something that was ever formally pronounced upon by a general council of the church. Thus it would be wrong to say that the church has given us the canon of Scripture. Rather, it was a matter of recognizing which books the Spirit was speaking through. The earliest list of NT writings which corresponds exactly to the NT canon which we have today occurs in the 39th Festal Letter of Athanasius in A.D. 367 to guard the church against heretics and their writings. The reason why the Scriptures are distinguished from other writings is that they are "springs of salvation"; they are "god-inspired" (*theopneustos*; cf. 2 Tim. 3:16) in a way which other writings are not; and they have been handed down "by those who were eye-witnesses ... of the word from the beginning." However, the authority of the four Gospels, Acts and the Pauline epistles was generally recognized early in the 2nd cent.

The earliest known canon of the NT was that of the heretic Marcion who was excommunicated c. A.D. 144. He excluded everything except ten Pauline epistles and the Gospel of Luke, the latter in a mutilated form. The church's canon was formulated in response to the appeal by heretical groups to secret books and tradition and the emergence of a large number of apocryphal works (cf. E. Hennecke and W. Schneemelcher, eds., *New Testament Apocrypha*, I–II, 1963–65; → Hide). The recognition of the authority of the canonical writings depended on whether they could be traced to an apostle or alternatively had some kind of apostolic backing. And this was coupled with the intrinsic authority of the books themselves in which the church heard God speaking. This recognition constituted an extension of the authority of the *kērygma* (→ Proclamation). But already in the NT itself Paul could "thank God constantly for this, that when you received the word of God which you heard from us, you accepted it not as the word of men but as what it really is, the word of God, which is at work in you believers" (1 Thess. 2:13). 2 Pet. 3:15 f. brackets the "letters" of Paul with "the other scriptures".

By the close of the 2nd cent. all the NT books were generally accepted, apart from James, 2 Pet., 2 and 3 Jn., Heb. and Rev. Sometimes the *Shepherd* of Hermas and the *Didache* were regarded as Scripture. The first decision on the subject of scripture by a church council was probably made at Laodicea in A.D. 363. A list similar to Athanasius's was confirmed by the Synod of Carthage (A.D. 397). It was through the influence of Jerome and Augustine that the western church was finally persuaded of the authority of some of the doubted books. *C. Brown*

μέτρον

μέτρον (*metron*), measure; *ἄμετρος* (*ametros*), without measure; *μετρέω* (*metreō*), take the dimensions of, measure, give out, deal out, apportion.

CL *metron* (Homer onwards) means a measure, as that with which one measures and that which is measured, a proportion, order, and measure in verse. In philosophy it is significant as the measure by which all things are measured (Protagoras, *Frag.* 1). Plato identifies the measure with God (*Leg.* 4, 716c; cf. also Plotinus, *Enneads* 1, 8, 3; 6, 8, 18; 5, 5, 4). The vb. *metreō* (also from Homer) means to measure, traverse, evaluate, judge.

OT *metron* stands chiefly for *middâh.* In theological contexts it is used of cultic measurements of the tabernacle and temple (especially Ezek. 40–48); weights and measures which stand under Yahweh's surveillance (Lev. 19:35; Deut. 25:14 f.; 2 Chr. 23:29; Prov. 25:14 f.; Amos 8:5); the measures of the world in connexion with creation (Job 11:9; 28:25; 38:5; Wis. 11:20); and in pronouncements of judgment and salvation (2 Ki. 21:13; Isa. 5:10; Ezek. 4:11, 16; Lam. 2:8; Ps. 80[79]:5; Zech. 1:16; 5:6 ff.). *metreō* is used for *māḏaḏ* (e.g. Exod. 16:18).

NT In the NT the noun and the vb. are found particularly in contexts of judgment and the gift of grace allotted to believers.

1. Both the noun and the vb. occur in Matt. 7:2: "For with the judgment you pronounce you will be judged, and the measure you give will be the measure you get" (cf. par. Mk. 4:24; Lk. 6:38). This is "not simply a recommendation to be moderate in judgment on others. The meaning is that, if you condemn, you exclude yourself from God's pardon" (D. Hill, *The Gospel of Matthew, New Century Bible*, 1972, 146). The saying in the second half of the v. may be proverbial. The Mishnah tractate on the adulteress states: "With what measure a man metes it shall be measured to him again: she bedecked herself for transgression – the Almighty brought her to shame; she laid herself bare for transgression – the Almighty laid her bare; she began transgression with the thigh first and afterwards with the belly – therefore the thigh shall suffer first and afterward the belly; neither shall aught else of the body go free" (Sotah 1:7). It may be that Jesus was citing a common proverb to bring home a truth of judgment from which no man is exempt. Whereas the rabbis formulated criteria of judgment, Jesus drew the conclusion: "Judge not, that you be not judged" (Matt. 7:1). It is the reverse side of the exhortation to forgive (Matt. 6:14 ff.). And it is on a par with the other exhortations in the Sermon on the Mount to leave everything to God, whether it be rewards (Matt. 6:1 ff.), petitionary prayer (Matt. 6:7 ff.), or concerns for wordly needs and cares (Matt. 6:19–34). Lk. 6:38b contains the statement:

"For the measure you give will be the measure you get back." In Lk. this follows exhortations not to judge and also to give.

In the context of condemnation for shedding the blood of the prophets, Jesus declares: "Fill up then the measure of your fathers" (Matt. 23:32). K. Stendahl sees in the v. a change to the style of the apocalyptic oracle (*Peake's Commentary on the Bible*, ed. M. Black and H. H. Rowley, 1962, 793). D. Hill sees here an allusion to the Jewish view that the final judgment will come only after men have reached the absolute nadir of sinfulness (op. cit., 314; cf. SB I 939 f.).

2. Jn. 3:34 states: "For he whom God has sent utters the words of God, for it is not by measure that he gives the Spirit." Leon Morris notes three possible interpretations: (a) The Father gives the Spirit to the Son without measure, i.e. there is perfect communion between them, and no limit to the gift; (b) The Son gives the Spirit to believers without measure; (c) The Spirit does not give by measure, i.e. when the Spirit gives, he does so liberally (*The Gospel according to John, NLC*, 1971, 246). In the light of the first half of the v. the first of these interpretations best fits the context. Elsewhere John speaks of the Spirit as given by the Father (Jn. 14:26), but also by the Son (Jn. 15:26).

The noun *metrētēs*, meaning a liquid measure, occurs only in the account of the wedding at Cana, where each of the jars is said to contain between two and three measures apiece. This is estimated as equivalent to the Heb. *baṯ* which the RSV renders as "twenty or thirty gallons".

3. *metron* occurs 4 times in Paul. In Rom. 12:3 Paul writes: "For by the grace given to me I bid every one among you not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think, but to think with sober judgment, each according to the measure of faith which God has assigned him." C. E. B. Cranfield suggests that the phrase *metron pisteōs* means " 'a standard (by which to measure himself), namely (his) Christian faith'. But since the all-important thing in Christian faith is not the activity of the believer but the Object believed in, to say that the Christian is to measure himself and all things by his faith is really to say that he is to measure himself and all things by Jesus Christ. The *metron pisteōs* is really Jesus Christ himself as the Standard and Norm. For the Christian Jesus Christ himself – and he alone – is the true *pantōn chrēmatōn metron*" ("*metron pisteōs* in Romans xii. 3", *NTS* 8, 1961–62, 351).

In Eph. *metron* occurs in connexion with → gifts: "But grace was given to each according to the measure of Christ's gift" (Eph. 4:7); "until we all attain to the unity of the faith and the knowledge of the Son of God, to mature manhood, to the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ" (Eph. 4:13; → Age, Stature, Maturity, art. *hēlikia* NT 3); "from whom the whole body, joined together by every joint with which it is supplied, when each part is working properly [*kat' energeian en metrō henos hekastou merous*], makes bodily growth and upbuilds itself in love" (Eph. 4:16 RSV). M. Barth sees the phrase as meaning "according to the needs of each single part": "the church is not treated by her head as a collective of mutually exchangeable individuals who are as equal as drops in a bucket of water or grains of sand in a pile" (*Ephesians*, II, *Anchor Bible*, 1974, 449).

On *metron* in 2 Cor. 10:13 → *kanōn* NT 3. It takes up the use of the vb. in v. 12 in connexion with Paul's opponent: "Not that we venture to class or compare ourselves with some of those who commend themselves. But when they measure themselves by

one another, and compare themselves with one another, they are without understanding." The action of these opponents contrasts with Jesus' teaching on measuring. The adj. *ametros*, without measure, occurs also only in this passage (2 Cor. 10:13, 15).

4. Otherwise the noun and the vb. occur only in Rev. In Rev. 11:1 f. Jn. is given a measuring rod like a staff (*kalamos homoios rhabdō*) and is told: "Rise and measure the temple of God and the altar and those who worship there, but do not measure the court outside the temple; leave that out, for it is given over to the nations, and they will trample over the holy city for forty-two months." The vision takes up the theme of Ezek. 40–48, where the measuring was with a view to the reconstruction of the new temple after the destruction of the old. Here the people are also measured. It symbolizes the separation of the church, the new temple of God, from the rest of the world, with the implied promise that God will preserve it. (See further G. R. Beasley-Murray, *The Book of Revelation, New Century Bible*, 1974, 181 f.) Rev. 21:15, 17 again take up the measuring in Ezek. in connexion with the dimensions of the new Jerusalem with its perfect proportions (→ Number, art. *dōdeka*). *C. Brown*

→ Book, → Revelation, → Scripture

(a). K. Aland, *The Problem of the New Testament Canon*, 1962; G. W. Anderson, "Canonical and Non-Canonical", in P. R. Ackroyd and C. F. Evans, eds, *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, I, 1970, 113–58; W. Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*, 1971; H. W. Beyer, *kanōn*, *TDNT* III 596–602; H. von Campenhausen, *The Formation of the Christian Bible*, 1972; C. E. B. Cranfield, "*metron pisteōs* in Romans xii. 3", *NTS* 8, 1961–62, 345–51; R. M. Grant, *The Formation of the New Testament*, 1965; and "The New Testament Canon", in P. R. Ackroyd and C. F. Evans, eds., op. cit., 284–307; K. Deissner, *metron* etc., *TDNT* IV 632 ff.; E. Käsemann, "The Canon of the New Testament and the Unity of the Church", in *Essays on New Testament Themes*, *SBT* 41, 95–107; A. R. C. Leaney, *The Rule of Qumran and its Meaning*, 1966; S. Z. Leiman, *The Canonization of Hebrew Scripture: The Talmudic and Midrashic Evidence*, 1976; B. M. Metzger, *An Introduction to the Apocrypha*, 1969[3]; H. M. Orlinsky, "The Canonization of the Bible and the Exclusion of the Apocrypha", in *Essays in Biblical Culture*, 1974, 257–86; H. Ridderbos, "The Canon of the New Testament", in C. F. H. Henry, ed., *Revelation and the Bible: Contemporary Evangelical Thought*, 1959, 187–202; H. E. Ryle, *The Canon of the Old Testament*, 1904[2]; J. A. Sanders, *Torah and Canon*, 1972; A. Souter, *The Text and Canon of the New Testament*, revised by C. S. C. Williams, 1954; E. J. Young, "The Canon of the Old Testament", in C. F. H. Henry, ed., op. cit., 153–68.

(b). N. Appel, *Kanon und Kirche, Konfessionskundliche und kontroverstheologische Studien* 9, 1964; H. Braun, W. Andersen and W. Maurer, *Die Verbindlichkeit des Kanons*, *Fuldaer Hefte* 12, 1960; E. Fuchs, "Kanon und Kerygma", *ZTK* 63, 1966, 410 ff.; S. Greidanus, *Bizondere Canoniek van de Boeken van het Nieuwe Testament*, I–II, 1947–49; O. Joest, "Erwägungen zur kanonischen Bedeutung des Neuen Testaments", *KuD* 12, 1966, 27 ff.; E. Käsemann, ed., *Das Neue Testament als Kanon. Dokumentation und kritische Analyse zur gegenwärtigen Diskussion*, 1970; W. G. Kümmel, "Notwendigkeit und Grenze des neutestamentlichen Kanons", *ZTK* 47, 1950, 277–313 (reprinted in *Heilsgeschehen und Geschichte. Gesammelte Aufsätze 1933–1964*, 1965, 230–59); W. Marxsen, "Das Problem des Kanons aus der Sicht des Exegeten", *Neue Zeitschrift für systematische Theologie* 2, 1960, 137 ff.; H. Oppel, *KANŌN. Zur Bedeutungsgeschichte des Wortes und seiner lateinischen Entsprechungen*, *Philologus*, *Suppl. Band* 30, Heft 4, 1937.

S

Sabbath, Lord's Day

σάββατον

σάββατον (*sabbaton*), sabbath, the seventh day of the week in the Jewish calendar which was set aside as a day of rest and for worship of Yahweh; παρασκευή (*paraskeuē*), preparation, the day of preparation.

OT 1. *Origin of the Term.* The Gk. *sabbaton* transliterates the Heb. *šabbāṯ*. It is found in the sing. and also the plur. (*sabbata*) for a single sabbath day. The derivation of the Heb. word is still uncertain. Etymologically the most likely explanation still seems to be that it is derived from the vb. *šāḇaṯ*, to cease, to pause. This is the explanation implied in Gen. 2:2 f.: "And on the seventh day God finished his work which he had done, and he rested [*wayišbōṯ*] on the seventh day from all his work which he had done. So God blessed the seventh day and hallowed it, because on it God rested [*šāḇaṯ*] from all his work which he had done in creation" (cf. Exod. 20:8–11). Attempts to derive the observance of the OT sabbath from Babylonian, Canaanite (F. Delitzsch, *Babel and Bible*, 1903, 40 f.) or Kenite sources (H. H. Rowley, "Moses and the Decalogue", *BJRL* 34, 1951–52, 81–118; reprinted in *Men of God: Studies in Old Testament History and Prophecy*, 1963, 1–36), have not proved fruitful. There does not seem to be any difference in meaning between the sing. and plur. forms of the Gk. equivalent in the LXX.

2. *The Sabbath in the OT.* The sabbath is mentioned in all parts of the law and in the conjectured source strata (Exod. 34:21[J]; 23:12[E]; 31:12–17; 35:1–3[P]; Lev. 23:1–3[H]). No other commandment is so strongly emphasized as this, showing what great importance it held in Israel's history and carrying the death penalty for its infringement (Exod. 31:14; cf. 35:3; Num. 15:32–36). The rite of → circumcision was performed on the sabbath if it fell on the eighth day after the boy's birth (Lev. 12:3; cf. Jn. 7:22). It is not necessary to insist, as some have, that its origin lay in a settled agricultural community; it would be equally possible for it to have been practised among a nomadic people (E. Lohse, *sabbaton* etc., *TDNT* VIII 3). It may well go back to a pre-Mosaic period (H. H. Rowley, *Men of God*, 27–32), and have been known to the Hebrews when they were in Egypt or even earlier (B. S. Childs, *Memory and Tradition in Israel*, *SBT* 37, 1962, 52).

Sabbath observance is strongly emphasized in both versions of the Decalogue, though in a slightly different form and with a different reason suggested. "Remember the sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days you shall labour, and do all your work; but the seventh day is a sabbath to the LORD your God; in it you shall not do any work, you, or your son, or your daughter, your manservant, or your maidservant, or your

cattle, or the sojourner who is within your gates; for in six days the LORD made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that is in them, and rested the seventh day; therefore the LORD blessed the sabbath day and hallowed it" (Exod. 20:8–11). "Observe the sabbath day, to keep it holy, as the LORD your God commanded you. Six days you shall labour, and do all your work; but the seventh day is a sabbath to the LORD your God; in it you shall not do any work, you, or your son, or your daughter, or your manservant, or your maidservant, or your ox, or your ass, or any of your cattle, or the sojourner who is within your gates, that your manservant and your maidservant may rest as well as you. You shall remember that you were a servant in the land of Egypt, and the LORD your God brought you out thence with a mighty hand and an outstretched arm; therefore the LORD your God commanded you to keep the sabbath day" (Deut. 5:12–15). Thus the Exod. form is linked with creation and the Deut. form with redemption from bondage in → Egypt. In both cases it is for the benefit of man and for calling to mind the fact that man owes everything to God who provides for all his needs. The sabbath is included in the so-called cultic Decalogue: "Six days you shall work, but on the seventh you shall rest; in ploughing time and in harvest you shall rest" (Exod. 34:21).

The emphasis on the aspect of rest from labour in both forms of the Decalogue and in Exod. 34:21 shows that its main purpose was the cessation of ordinary work for one day in seven. In the Exodus form of the Decalogue this is based on the claim that in creation God rested on the seventh day from his activity. Because of this he blessed the day and set it apart as holy. The same view is taken in the account of the creation in Gen. 1:1–2:3. Here, though the noun "sabbath" is not used, the vb. *šābaṯ* occurs together with the exact words used in the commandment: "God blessed the seventh day and hallowed it." As the creation story in Gen. 1 centres on the creation of man on the sixth day, the author evidently intends the inauguration of the sabbath to be seen as the climax of the creation process as it applied to the man who had been formed (B. S. Childs, *Exodus*, 1974, 416). As Eichrodt has pointed out, this shows that the day was regarded as a source of blessing of universal significance and not merely for Israel, and as being coeval with the human race (W. Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament*, I, 1961, 133).

The day then was looked on as a cessation from labour, a pause, a rest, but this with a view to its being dedicated to God, an opportunity for getting to know God and for worshipping him.

Most writers have claimed that a different reason is given for its observance in the Deuteronomic decalogue, emphasizing the strongly humanitarian aspect, which elsewhere marks Deuteronomy. Certainly the command includes the slave and the stranger, as Exod. 20:10 does. It underlines the fact by the comment, "that your manservant and your maidservant may rest as well as you." But the primary reason for the commandment is given in the next verse; and as B. S. Childs rightly points out, it is basically theological (*Exodus*, 417). God's people had been slaves in Egypt, but God mightily delivered them. The sabbath was to be kept holy, because Israel was a redeemed people. The Deuteronomic version then includes a second reason for its observance. Creation and redemption are both motives for its observance, the one for all men, the other especially for Israel.

This second aspect appears also in the law under another form. In Exod. 31:17 the sabbath is looked at as a sign between God and Israel. As B. S. Childs points out,

"the sabbath as a sign is a reminder both to God and Israel of the eternal covenant relationship which was the ultimate purpose of creation" (*Exodus*, 416).

In Lev. 23:1–3 the sabbath is included in the → feasts of the Lord. The feasts were commemorations, days set apart so that Israel might spend time in meditation on different aspects of God's good hand over the nation. Included in their observance were "holy convocations", public acts of worship. Both for the individual and for the community the sabbath then was to be a day of public worship as well as an opportunity for a joyful observance of the day in the home. This was so in pre-exilic times (Hos. 2:11; Amos 8:5; Isa. 1:13). It was a suitable time for consulting a prophet (2 Ki. 4:23).

On the sabbath special sacrifices were to be offered (Num. 28:9), and with them the renewal of the → Bread of the Presence (Lev. 24:8); thus linking the sabbath with the official ritual of tabernacle and temple. It seems that special Psalms were appointed (cf. the title of Ps. 92).

The insistence on the laying aside of work, even in the busiest times of ploughing and harvest (Exod. 34:21), and the infliction of the death penalty for its breach (Num. 15:32; Exod. 31:14), show the supreme importance attached to this command in the life of Israel.

Yet it was to be looked at, not as a burden, but as a joyful feast, a delight, "holy to the LORD" (Isa. 58:23). Special blessings were attached to its observance (Isa. 56:2).

After the exile, in the disordered state of the nation, it is natural to find that it is emphasized strongly in Nehemiah's reforms (Neh. 10:32; 13:15–22).

To summarize, the OT attitude to the sabbath was to regard it as a divine ordinance which was universal, but especially relevant to Israel as a redeemed people. Negatively it was observed by a cessation of labour; positively it was a feast of the Lord, an opportunity to concentrate in private and in public on the things of God. Its atmosphere was to be that of a joyful festival; its observance to be taken very seriously by all.

3. *The Sabbath in the Intertestamental Period.* During this period Judaism gradually began to divide into two types. In Palestine itself and in Mesopotamia a more rigid and legal attitude emerged; while in other parts of the diaspora a more liberal attitude prevailed. Both sections insisted on the observance of the sabbath as a divine institution and, with → circumcision, as one of the signs of the → covenant. Synagogue worship on the sabbath was a regular feature of both types (S B IV, 1, 153–88).

In Hellenistic circles a more mystical and spiritual attitude to the sabbath emerged. Philo insisted that it was not meant for *argia*, emptiness, but should be dedicated to the study of the spiritual (*Decal.*, 100). On that day the slave became a free man. With the translation of the OT into Greek, while the word itself was transliterated, *anapausis* (rest) was given as its meaning (Josephus, *Ant.* 1, 33; Philo, *De Cherubim*, 87).

Palestinian Judaism tended towards a more literal and rigid attitude. In order to safeguard its observance, a "hedge" came to be set round the commandment. Traditions of how it was to be observed began to crystallize. To protect it from loose Gentile influences, a stereotyped code of what could or could not be done on the sabbath came into existence. Jub. 2:17–33 is the earliest record. Much the same occurs in the Damascus Document (CD). Even the rescue of an animal from death on the sabbath

was forbidden (CD 10:14–11:18). The traditions, later incorporated into the Mishnah, became codified. The first tractate of the second division of the Mishnah is devoted to the Sabbath. In Shabbath 7:2 the main classes of work forbidden on the sabbath are given as "forty save one". However, under certain circumstances, the sabbath law could be superseded. These included the service of the priests in the temple, the saving of life in emergency and circumcision on the eighth day.

Yet in spite of these burdensome regulations the sabbath was welcomed with joy. It was to be celebrated at home as rest and refreshment and corporately in public worship (Shabbath 119a). On the day before, the Preparation, everything was to be got ready and the lamps lit as the sabbath commenced at sunset. A meal extra to the normal two was added and the best clothes worn (Shabbath 16:2). Guests would be invited (cf. Mk. 14:3). Half the day was to be spent in eating and drinking and half in instruction in the things of God (Babylonian Talmud Pesahim 68).

The noun *paraskeuē*, which is found in secular Gk. from Hdt. onwards, means preparation, but in Christian literature it is used only of the day of preparation for a festival or sabbath. According to Jewish usage, it was the Friday on which everything had to be prepared for the sabbath (Josephus, *Ant.* 16, 163; Synesius, *Epistola* 4, p. 161D; cf. Matt. 27:62; Mk. 15:42; Lk. 23:54; Jn. 19:31, 42). In the Didache it is regarded as a fast day, marking the death of Jesus (Did. 8:1).

NT 1. *The Gospels.* The Palestinian attitude to sabbath observance is in evidence in the Gospels. Christ's conflicts with the Jews, mentioned in all four Gospels, centre on the question of what was or was not permissible on the sabbath. In each case Jesus or his disciples are challenged over this. In all but one of these it is a question of healing on the sabbath day. The other occasion is when the disciples plucked the ears of corn as they passed through the field.

R. Bultmann has suggested that the sayings attributed to Jesus on some, if not all, these occasions are in fact the thoughts of the early church as it grappled with the problems of the situation in which it found itself (*Jesus and the Word*, 1958, 14). But it seems most unlikely that in this case, in the process of abandoning the seventh day sabbath observance, it would have put into Jesus' mouth words which make no decisive pronouncement. Is it not much more likely that, particularly in Luke, there would have been an outright condemnation of Jewish sabbath observance, if this were the case? It may well be that the authors of the Gospels, in selecting their material, did have the immediate problems of the church in view, but unlikely that their choice was limited to this. It seems reasonable then to take the words of Jesus in these controversies as authentic.

Taking the six recorded confrontations with the Jews over the sabbath question, the replies of Jesus will offer some clues as to whether he was in fact abrogating a day of rest or merely challenging the restrictions which in their traditions the rabbis had imposed.

(a) Mk. 2:23–26; Matt. 12:1–8; Lk. 6:1–5. These par. accounts relate the incident of the plucking of the ears of corn on the sabbath day. According to the → Pharisees, this was breaking the law. In Matt.'s account the reason given is that the disciples were hungry. This is not mentioned in Mark, though the answer seems to assume it. Jesus claims that, as in the case of → David and his men (1 Sam. 21:1–6; cf. 2 Sam. 8:17; Deut. 23:25), human need overrides the ritual law, in this case the

sabbath law (cf. Exod. 23:12; Deut. 5:4). The law itself is not challenged, but Jesus claims an overriding factor.

(b) Mk. 3:1–6; Matt. 12:9–14; Lk. 6:6–11. These passages describe the healing of the man with the withered hand. In this case, before healing him, Jesus asks the Jewish leaders whether it is lawful on the sabbath day, "to do good or to do harm, to save life or to kill?" Again there is no challenge to the law itself; in fact the wording assumes its relevance. The right use of the law, the salvation, the making whole of man, is the great object behind that law and therefore the healing is justified.

(c) Lk. 13:10–17 relates the story of a woman bowed down with infirmity. She came into the synagogue and Jesus restored her. This roused the anger of the ruler of the synagogue. Jesus' reply includes two points. What he had done was an act of mercy such as they themselves would have allowed to an animal. It was also the destruction of a work of → Satan. There is no hint that the principle of a day of rest was being questioned, but merely the right use of the day.

(d) Lk. 14:1–6. In this case Jesus again opens the discussion by asking the Pharisees whether it is right to heal on the sabbath day or not. To this they offered no reply. This is a particularly important incident, as the question was addressed to those who were expert in the law (*nomikous*). Jesus proceeded to heal the man and then explained that healing the sick is in fact just as much an act of mercy as the pulling out of an animal from a well. The fact that the experts could offer no reply suggests that they agreed that Jesus was not challenging the sabbath law.

(e) Jn. 5:1–9, 16, 17; 7:22. Here the man who had been infirm for thirty-eight years was healed by Jesus on the sabbath day and told to take up his bed and walk, possibly a part of the complete healing. The Jews persecuted Jesus. He replied, "My Father is working up till now and I am working." In other words, he is continuing, in the healing, the work that the Father has all the while been doing. The Jews then plotted to kill him, because he was breaking the sabbath and making himself equal to → God. Some commentators take this as being the view of the author that Jesus was in fact annulling the sabbath (E. Lohse, *TDNT* VII 27); but it seems best, after what has been said in the other controversies, to take it that it was the view of his accusers. This is confirmed by the words in Jn. 7:22, where Jesus explains that the law of circumcision overrides the law of the sabbath. Had he been annulling the sabbath law, he would hardly have argued in this way, and again the words "until now [*heōs arti*]" suggest that, all the while that the sabbath command was in force, God was in fact working. In other words, the sabbath command does not mean doing nothing (*argia*), but the doing of the work of God. This was in fact what Christ had been doing in the healing of the infirm man.

(f) Jn. 9. In the case of the man born → blind, no words are spoken by Christ to defend his action, but in the answer to the disciples' question in v. 2, Christ claims the sabbath healing was "that the works of God might be made manifest."

(g) In addition to these incidents there is the reference in Lk. 4:16 to Jesus' attendance at the synagogue "as was his custom". The natural meaning of this expression is that Jesus followed the ordinary habits of Jewish worship on the sabbath day. This certainly had been the pattern of his boyhood (Lk. 2:22, 41). It may be significant that, at his trial before the Sanhedrin (Matt. 26:57–68 par. Mk. 14:53–65; Lk. 22:54–71; Jn. 18:13–24), while the accusation of destroying the temple is included, there is no mention of an annulling of the sabbath law.

(h) In Matt. 24:20, Christ's followers are told to pray that in the coming destruction of Jerusalem their flight should not occur in the winter or on the sabbath day. This need not imply that Christ foresaw his followers continuing to observe the sabbath, but merely that it would be impossible to get help or buy what was needed in the emergency on a sabbath day in the vicinity of Jerusalem.

We may conclude then, that though Jesus broke through the rabbinic traditions about the sabbath, there was no annulling of the observance of the day.

(i) Turning now to Mk. 2:27, there is a positive statement of Christ's about the sabbath. Here its institution is stated to have been made for man's good and it would seem that there is at least an indirect reference to the account in Gen. 2:1, 2 (J. Jeremias, *New Testament Theology*, I, 1971, 208). It would then imply that the ordinance was not merely for Israel, but had a pre-Israelite, worldwide, humanitarian, implication. This is followed by the claim, mentioned in the other two Gospels, that Jesus was "Lord of the sabbath". In other words, he has the authority to decide about its observance. Far from suggesting that, though a benefit to man, it was to be annulled, it would suggest that the manner of its observance was under the control of Christ himself.

The *paraskeuē*, lit. preparation, i.e. day of preparation, is mentioned only in the Gospels in connexion with chronology (Matt. 27:62; Mk. 15:42; Lk. 23:54; Jn. 19:14, 31, 42). The corresponding vb. *paraskeuazō* which has the general meaning of to prepare occurs in Acts 10:10; 1 Cor. 14:8; 2 Cor. 9:2 f.

2. *The Acts of the Apostles.* Turning to the Acts of the Apostles, we find that in the decrees of the Jerusalem Council in ch. 15 no mention is made of the sabbath. This would imply that it was not a point of disagreement between Jewish and Gentile Christians. Paul on his missionary journeys seized the opportunity to preach as occasion arose in the synagogues on the sabbath day and this was his custom (Acts 13:5, 14, 44; 14:1; 16:13; 17:2, 17; 18:4; 19:8). Yet we find him meeting with the Christians on the → first day of the week, although he was at Troas for seven days (Acts 20:7; cf. 1 Cor. 16:2; → *kyriakē*).

3. *The Epistles.* There are three significant passages in the Epistles of Paul, where the Christian attitude to the sabbath is dealt with.

(a) Rom. 14:5 f. There is no direct reference here to the sabbath, but the passage touches on this theme. It deals with the weak Christian, one who still is influenced by the letter of the law. In the case of days, instead of thinking of one day as being specially sacred, the strong Christian considers all days as God's days. All days are to be lived to God. No day *in itself* has any special sanctity.

(b) Gal. 4:10. Paul is addressing Gentile converts who now, after their conversion, are turning to a scrupulous observance ("you observe [*paratēreisthe*]") of Jewish ritual, special days, new moons, feasts and the yearly observances enjoined in the Levitical regulations. They are taking on themselves the Jewish law. Paul will not countenance a reversal to Jewish practices for Gentile Christians.

(c) Col. 2:16. Here Paul argues that the Jewish law (the legal demands) were cancelled in the death of Christ (v. 14), and therefore the Jewish food regulations and religious calendar are not binding on the Christian. Included in this ritual was the Jewish sabbath observance. These observances, Paul claims, pointed to a spiritual reality fulfilled in Christ.

(d) There remains one other passage bearing on the sabbath. This is Heb. 4:9;

"there remains a keeping of sabbath [*sabbatismos*] to the people of God." Here the rest typified by the sabbath is seen as the rest of heart, provided in Christ (cf. Matt. 11:28) to be realized partially now and fully in the life to come.

4. *Theological Insights.* As the rest of God after creation did not exclude the idea of the sabbath day each week, but included it, may it not well be that the rest of heart remaining to the people of God still includes the foretaste of the final rest in the weekly rest day? Or are we to take it that in this spiritual conception of a sabbath rest to the people of God, clearly not limited to one day, the practical observance of a day of rest and worship has been annulled? We have seen that the sabbath concept includes both a national aspect as part of the covenant relationship with the Jews, and a universal aspect as a spiritual and humanitarian benefit for mankind as a whole. The end of the sabbath, as a sign of the covenant with Israel, does not necessarily involve the abolition of the concept of a weekly day of rest. From Christ's words in Mk. 2:27 it would seem that such an outward enjoyment of a sabbath rest was an integral part of the inward heart rest, of which the sabbath under the old covenant had been a shadow. The fact that before the close of the NT an analogous day for Christians, the Lord's Day, had already come into being suggests that this is the right solution of the problem.

W. Rordorf has suggested that Christians did not look upon the Christian Sunday as a day of rest, the sabbath ideal, until the decree of Constantine in A.D. 321 (*Sunday: The History of the Day of Rest and Worship in the Earliest Centuries of the Christian Church*, 1962). Until that time they had made use of the first day as a day on which they worshipped, without considering it a day of rest. Apart from the unlikely suggestion that a pagan emperor would order a day of rest which had never been practised before, and that day not the Jewish sabbath, there is evidence against this view in pre-Constantine patristic texts. (For detailed discussion see W. Stott, *The Theology of the Christian Sunday in the Early Church*, Dissertation, Oxford, 1966.)

W. Stott

κυριακή — κυριακή (*kyriakē*), the Lord's (day).

OT 1. *The Origin of the Word kyriakē in Secular Literature and in the NT. kyriakē*, belonging to the Lord, is an adj. derived from *kyrios*, → Lord. It is doubtful if the word was used in LXX. In 2 Macc. 15:36 it is more probable that *Syriakē* is the right reading. It occurs in inscriptions and papyri from 68 B.C. with the meaning of belonging to, or connected with the lord, the proprietor, and officially of the emperor.

It is used only once in the NT besides the reference in Rev. 1:10. This is in 1 Cor. 11:20 *kyriakon deipnon*, the → Lord's Supper. Here it would mean "the supper instituted by the Lord" or "belonging to the Lord". In patristic writings it is used of "the words" of Christ, the covenants, the people, the house, the cross, but most commonly of the Lord's Day.

2. *Its Use in Rev. 1:10.* While it has been claimed that it refers to the last day, or even to Easter, it seems certain that the expression is the name which had come to be given to the first day of the week. From Ignatius (Mag. 9:1) onwards this is its mean-

ing in patristic writers (cf. W. Stott, "A Note on the Word KYRIAKĒ in Rev. 1:10", *NTS* 12, 1965–66, 70–75).

It may be taken for granted that the adj., rather than the genitive of the noun, was used to differentiate it from "the day of the Lord" (2 Thess. 2:2). In the versions it is translated by an adj. and not a genitive. But as the word had already been attached to the supper in Pauline literature, and there it hinted at a special connexion with Christ in its institution, it may well carry something of this meaning as it is used here in Rev. 1:10.

3. *The Theological Deductions.* If, as we have suggested, "the Lord's Day" referred to the Christian Sunday, the first day of the week, in order to see its theological significance it will be necessary to examine other passages which refer to the first day of the week. The earliest reference is in 1 Cor. 16:2, where Paul asks the Corinthian Christians to lay something aside on each first day of the week. It seems unlikely that this was a pay-day and more likely that, while the laying aside was at home, the day's connexion with Christian worship would make it easy to remember this duty. This suggests that the first day was becoming the regular day of worship. In Acts 20:7 also we find Paul meeting with the Christians at Troas to break bread, probably the Eucharist, on the first day of the week, although he was with them for seven days. By the time of the Didache this was certainly the regular day of worship for the church. The strong emphasis on the first day of the week, as the day on which Christ rose from the dead in all four Gospels, suggests that the theological reason for the change from the seventh to the first day was the resurrection of our Lord (Matt. 28:1; Mk. 16:2, 9; Lk. 24:1; Jn. 20:1).

From what we have seen of the institution of the sabbath in the OT with its humanitarian and spiritual advantages, of Christ's insistence that it was made for man, of Paul's insistence that no day in itself has any special sacredness, nor are we to be involved in the Jewish ritual calendar, we may fairly assume that the Christian church was guided by the Holy Spirit to attach the same privileges and blessings of one sacred day of rest in seven to the new Lord's Day. This was the day on which Christ in his resurrection was revealed as Lord, and the day would be celebrated with this thought in view. *W. Stott*

→ Present, → Redemption (for sabbatical year), → Time, → Work

(a). N.-E. A. Andreasen, *The Old Testament Sabbath: A Tradition-Historical Investigation. Society for Biblical Literature Dissertation Series*, 7, 1972; J. N. Andrews, *History of the Sabbath and First Day of the Week*, I–II, 1876; N. A. Barak, *A History of the Sabbath*, 1965; A. Barry, "Lord's Day", *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, II, 1880, 1042–53; K. Barth, *CD*, III, 4, 47–72; J. B. Bauer, "Lord's Day", *EBT* II 513–18; R. T. Beckwith and W. Stott, *This is the Day: The Biblical Doctrine of the Christian Sunday in its Jewish and Early Church Setting*, 1977; E. J. Bickerman, *Chronology of the Ancient World*, 1968; J. Brown, "Karl Barth's Doctrine of the Sabbath", *SJT* 19, 1966, 409–25; K. Budde, "The Sabbath and the Week", *JTS* 30, 1929, 1–15; W. W. Cannon, "The Weekly Sabbath", *ZAW* 49, 1931, 325 ff.; F. H. Colson, *The Week*, 1926; P. Cotton, *From Sabbath to Sunday: A Study in Early Christianity*, 1933; R. Cox, *The Literature on the Sabbath Question*, I–II, 1865; J. Daniélou, *The Bible and the Liturgy*, 1960, 222–86; D. Daube, *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*, 1956, 67–71; A. Deissmann, "Lord's Day", *EB* III 2813–16; G. Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, 1945, 303–83; S. R. Driver, "Sabbath", *HDB* IV 317–23; C. W. Dugmore, *The Influence of the Synagogue upon the Divine Office*, 1944; and "The Lord's Day and Easter", in *Neotestamentica et Patristica in Honorem Sexagenarii O. Cullmann*, 1962, 272–81; M. G. Glazebrook, "Lord's Day", *ERE* XII 103–11; J. van Goudoever, *Biblical Calendars*, 1961², 164–73; R. M. Grant, "The Decalogue in Early Christianity", *HTR* 40, 1947, 1 ff.; M. Greenberg *et al.*, "Sabbath", *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, XIV, 1971,

557–72; C. B. Haynes, *From Sabbath to Sunday*, 1928; A. J. Heschel, *The Sabbath: Its Meaning for Modern Man*, 1951; J. A. Hessey, *Sunday, its Origin, History and Present Obligation*, 1860; E. Hilgert, "Jubilees and the Origin of Sunday", *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 1, 1963, 44–51; E. G. Hirsch *et al.*, "Sabbath, Sabbatical Year and Jubilee", *Jewish Encyclopedia*, X, 1905, 587–608; W. Hodgkins, *Sunday: Christian and Social Significance*, 1960; S. T. Kimbrough, Jr., "The Concept of Sabbath at Qumran", *Revue de Qumrân* 5, 1966, 483–502; W. Kornfeld, "Sabbath", *EBT* III 797–800; E. G. Kraeling, "The Present Status of the Sabbath Question", *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures* 49, 1932, 218–28; R. A. Kraft, "Some Notes on Sabbath Observance in Early Christianity", *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 3, 1965, 18–33; H.-J. Kraus, *Worship in Ancient Israel*, 1966, 76–88; F. Landsberger, "Ritual Implements for the Sabbath", *Hebrew Union College Annual* 27, 1956, 387–415; S. Langdon, *Babylonian Menologies and the Semitic Calendars*, 1935; J. Z. Lauterbach, *Rabbinic Essays*, 1951, 437–72; J. W. Leitch, "Lord also of the Sabbath", *SJT* 19, 1966, 426–33; E. Levine, "The Sabbath Controversy according to Matthew", *NTS* 22, 1975–76, 480–83; J. and H. Lewy, "The Origin of the Week and the Oldest West Asiatic Calendar", *Hebrew Union College Annual* 17, 1942–43, 1–152; E. Lohse, *sabbaton, sabbatismos, paraskeuē*, *TDNT* VII 1–35; A. A. McArthur, *The Evolution of the Christian Year*, 1953, 13–29; S. V. McCasland, "The Origin of the Lord's Day", *JBL* 49, 1930, 65–82; L. L. McReavy, "The Sunday Repose from Labour", *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 12, 1935, 291–323; A. E. Millgram, *Sabbath: The Day of Delight*, 1944; G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, II, 31–39; J. Morgenstern, "Sabbath", *IDB* IV 135–41; R. North, "The Derivation of Sabbath", *Biblica* 36, 1955, 182–201; R. L. Odom, *Sunday in Roman Paganism*, 1944; H. B. Porter, *The Day of Light: The Biblical and Liturgical Meaning of Sunday, Studies in Ministry and Worship* 16, 1960; G. von Rad, "There Remains Still a Rest for the People of God: An Investigation of a Biblical Conception", in *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays*, 1965, 94–102; F. A. Regan, *Dies Dominica and Dies Solis: The Beginnings of the Lord's Day in Christian Antiquity*, (Dissertation, Washington) 1961; H. Riesenfeld, "The Sabbath and the Lord's Day in Judaism, the Preaching of Jesus and Early Christianity", in *The Gospel Tradition*, 1970, 111–38; W. Rordorf, *Sunday: The History of the Day of Rest and Worship in the Earliest Centuries of the Christian Church*, 1968; H. H. Rowley, "Moses and the Decalogue", *BJRL* 34, 1951–52, 81–118 (reprinted in *Men of God: Studies in Old Testament History and Prophecy*, 1963, 1–36); B. E. Shafer, "Sabbath", *IDB Supplementary Volume*, 1976, 760 ff.; W. Stott, "A Note on the Word KYRIAKĒ in Rev. i. 10", *NTS* 12, 1965–66, 70–75; and *The Theology of the Christian Sunday in the Early Church*, (Dissertation, Oxford) 1966; K. A. Strand, "Another Look at 'Lord's Day' in the Early Church and in Rev. i. 10", *NTS* 13, 1966–67, 174–81; W. E. Straw, *Origin of Sunday Observance in the Christian Church*, 1940; S. Talmon, "The Calendar Reckoning of the Sect from the Judaean Desert", *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 4, 1958, 162–99; W. B. Trevelyan, *Sunday, The Oxford Library of Practical Theology*, 1902; M. Tsevat, "The Basic Meaning of the Biblical Sabbath", *ZAW* 84, 1972, 447–59; R. de Vaux, *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions*, 1961, 475–83; G. H. Waterman, "Sabbath", *ZPEB* V 181–89; N. J. D. White, "Lord's Day", *HDB* III 138–41; H. W. Wolff, *Anthropology of the Old Testament*, 1974, 135–42; G. Yamashiro, *A Study of the Hebrew Word Sabbath in Biblical and Talmudic Literatures*, (Dissertation, Harvard) 1955; F. H. Yost, *The Early Christian Sabbath*, 1947. (b). J. Bauer, "Vom Sabbat zum Sonntag", *BuL* 23, 1955–56, 106–10; J. Beckmann, "Der Sonntag in der Geschichte der Kirche", in *Verlorener Sonntag? Kirche im Volk* 22, 37–60; G. Beer, *Schabbath*, 1908; and "Sabbat", Pauly-Wissowa Ia, 1920, 1551–57; J. Boehmer, *Der christliche Sonntag nach Ursprung und Geschichte*, 1931; F. Bohn, *Der Schabbat im Alten Testament und im altjüdischen religiösen Aberglauben*, 1903; B. Botte, "Les Dénominations du Dimanche dans la Tradition Chrétienne", *Le Dimanche. Lex Orandi* 39, 1965, 7–18; G. J. Botterweck, "Der Sabbat im Alten Testament", *ThQ* 134, 1954, 134–47; K. Budde, "Antwort auf J. Meinholds 'Zur Sabbathfrage' ", *ZAW* 48, 1930, 138–45; C. Callewaert, "La Syntaxe eucharistique à Jérusalem, Berceau du Dimanche", *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 15, 1938, 34–73; H. Chirat, "Le Dimanche dans l'Antiquité Chrétienne", *Etudes de Pastorale Liturgique*, 1944, 127–48; Y.-M. Congar, "La Théologie du Dimanche", *Le Jour du Seigneur* (Papers read at the Liturgical Congress, Lyons, 1947), 1948, 131–80; D. Correns, *Die Mischna Schebit (vom Sabbatjahr)*, (Dissertation, Göttingen) 1954; O. Cullmann, "Sabbat und Sonntag nach dem Johannesevangelium. *Heōs arti* (Joh. 5, 17)", *In Memoriam E. Lohmeyer*, 1951, 127–31; J. Daniélou, "La Doctrine Patristique du Dimanche", in *Le Jour du Seigneur* (papers read at the Liturgical Congress in Lyons, September 1947), 1948, 105–30; and "La Typologie millénariste de la Semaine dans le Christianisme primitif", *Vigiliae Christianae* 2, 1948, 1–16; F. J. Dölger, "Die Planetenwoche der griechisch-römischen Antike und der christliche Sonntag", *Antike und Christentum*

6, 1941, 202–38; E. Dublanchy, "Dimanche", *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*, IV, 1, 1911, 1308–48; H. Dumaine, "Dimanche", *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie et de Liturgie*, IV, 1921, 858–994; and *Le Dimanche Chrétien, ses Origines, ses Principaux Charactères*, 1922; B. D. Eerdmans, "Der Sabbath", *Vom Alten Testament, Festschrift K. Marti*, 1925, 79–83; I. Ellbogen, "Eingang und Ausgang des Sabbats nach talmudischen Quellen", *Festschrift zu I. Lewys 70. Geburtstag*, 1911, 173–87; and *Der jüdische Gottesdienst in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung*, 1931[3], 107–22; H.-M. Féret, "Les Sources Bibliques", *Le Jour du Seigneur*, 1948, 39–104; G. Förster, "Die christliche Sonntagsfeier bis auf Konstantin den Grossen", *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Kirchenrecht* 16, 1906, 100–13; "Römisch-rechtliche Grundlagen der Sonntagsruhe", *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Kirchenrecht* 20, 1910–11, 211–71; "Alttestamentliche Grundlagen der Sonntagsfeier. Der Sabbat", ibid. 21, 1911-12, 349–85; J. Froger, "Histoire du Dimanche", *Le Huitième Jour. Vie Spirituelle* 76, 1947, 502–22; M. Goguel, "Notes d'Histoire Évangélique. Appendix I: Le Dimanche et la Résurrection au troisième Jour", *RHR* 74, 1916, 29 ff.; E. Haupt, *Der Sonntag und die Bibel*, 1878; J. Hehn, *Siebenzahl und Sabbat bei den Babyloniern und im Alten Testament, Leipziger Semitische Studien* 2, 5, 1907; and "Zur Sabbatfrage", *BZ* 14, 1917, 198–213; E. W. Hengstenberg, *Über den Tag des Herrn*, 1852; O. Henke, "Zur Geschichte der Lehre von der Sonntagsfeier", *Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift* 5, 1894, 727–60; E. Hertzsch,"Sonntag", *RGG*[3] VI 140 ff.; J.-P. Hild, "Jour d'Espérance et d'Attente", *Le Huitième Jour. Vie Spirituelle* 76, 1947, 592–603; "La Mystique du Dimanche", *Dimanche et Célébration Chrétienne. La Maison-Dieu* 9, 1947, 7–37; and *Dimanche et Vie Pastorale*, 1949; H. Huber, *Geist und Buchstabe der Sonntagsruhe. Eine historisch-theologische Untersuchung über das Verbot der knechtlichen Arbeit von der Urkirche bis auf Thomas von Aquin, Studia Theologiae Moralis et Pastoralis* 4, 1958; A. R. Hulst, "Bemerkungen zum Sabbatgebot", in *Studia Biblica et Semitica. Festschrift Th. C. Vriezen*, 1966, 152–64; A. Hülster, "Die ältesten patristischen Zeugnisse für die Sonntagsheiligung", *Theologie und Glaube* 1, 1909, 211 ff.; E. Jenni, *Die theologische Begründung des Sabbatsgebotes im Alten Testament, Theologische Studien* 46, 1956; A. Jülicher, "Sonntag im Urchristentum", *RGG*[1] V 735–38; J. A. Jungmann, "Beginnt die christliche Woche mit Sonntag?", *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 55, 1931, 605–21; W. Kornfeld, *Der Sabbath im Alten Testament: Der Tag des Herrn. Die Heiligung des Sonntags im Wandel der Zeit*, 1958; E. Kutzsch, "Sabbat", *RGG*[3] V 1258 ff.; G. Kunze, "Die gottesdienstliche Zeit", *Leiturgia. Handbuch der evangelischen Gottesdienstes*, I, 1954, 438–534; P. Leupin, "Der Sonntag in der Kirchengeschichte", *Schweizerische theologische Umschau* 31, 1961, 18–34; E. Lohse, "Sabbat und Sonntag im Neuen Testament", *Verlorener Sonntag? Kirche im Volk* 22, 1959, 25–36; and "Jesu Worte über den Sabbat", in *Judentum – Urchristentum – Kirche. Festschrift für J. Jeremias zum 60. Geburtstag, BZNW* 26, 1960, 79–89; W. Lotz, "Sabbath und Sabbathjahr", *RE* XVII 283–95; E. Mahler, "Der Sabbath", *ZDMG* 62, 1908, 33–79; and *Handbuch der jüdischen Chronologie*, 1916; J. H. Meesters, *Op Zoek naar de Oorsprong van de Sabbat*, 1966; J. Meinhold, *Sabbat und Woche, FRLANT* 5, 1905; "Sabbat und Sonntag", *Wissenschaft und Bildung* 45, 1909; "Die Entstehung des Sabbats", *ZAW* 29, 1909, 81–112; and "Zur Sabbatfrage", *ZAW* 36, 1916, 108 ff.; "Zur Sabbatfrage", *ZAW* 48, 1930, 121–28; *Le Jour du Seigneur* (papers read at the Liturgical Congress at Lyons, 1947), 1948; R. Naz, "Dimanche", *Dictionnaire de Droit Canonique*, IV, 1949, 1227–31; J. Nedbal, *Sabbat und Sonntag im Neuen Testament*, (Dissertation, Vienna) 1956; J. M. Nielsen, *Das Zeichen des Herrn. Sabbat und Sonntag in biblischer und urchristlicher Bezeugung*, 1940; W. Nowack, *Schabbat*, 1924; H. Peichl, ed., *Der Tag des Herrn. Die Heiligung des Sonntags im Wandel der Zeit*, 1958; F. Pettirsch, "Das Verbot der Opera Servilia in der Heiligen Schrift und in der altkirchlichen Exegese", *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 69, 1947, 257–327 and 417–44; A. Prešeren, "Die Beziehungen der Sonntagsfeier zum 4. Gebot des Dekalogs", *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 37, 1913, 563–603 and 709–59; H. Rahner, *Griechische Mythen in christlicher Deutung*, 1945, 125–89; H. Riesenfeld, "Sabbat et Jour du Seigneur", in A. J. B. Higgins, ed., *New Testament Essays: Studies in Memory of Thomas Walter Manson*, 1959, 210–18; W. Rordorf, "Der Sonntag als Gottesdienst- und Ruhetag im ältesten Christentum", *Zeitschrift für evangelische Ethik* 7, 1963, 213–24; K. Rudolf, ed., *Der christliche Sonntag. Probleme und Aufgaben*, 1956; H. Rüscher, *Sabbat und Sonntag im Lichte des Neuen Testaments*, 1913; SB II 613–30; D. Schick, "Die historischen Voraussetzungen der Sonntagsfeier", *Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift* 5, 1894, 727–60; G. Schrenk, "Sabbat oder Sonntag", *Judaica* 2, 1946, 169–89; E. Schürer, "Die siebentägige Woche im Gebrauche der christlichen Kirche der ersten Jahrhunderte", *ZNW* 6, 1905, 1–66; G. Schwamborn, "Das älteste patristische Zeugnis über die Sonntagsruhe", *Theologie und Glaube* 1, 1909, 381 ff.; F. Steinmetzer, "Arbeitsruhe", *RAC* I 590–95; H. Stockar, *Sonntagsgesetzgebung im alten Zürich*, (Dissertation, Zürich) 1949; F. Stolz, *šbt*, *THAT* II 863–69; H. W. Surkau, "Sonntagsruhe", *RGG*[3] VI 142 ff.; A. Szabó,

"Sabbat und Sonntag", *Judaica* 15, 1959, 161–72; W. Thomas, *Der Sonntag im frühen Mittelalter*, (Dissertation, Göttingen) 1929; N. H. Tur-Sinai (Torczyner), "Sabbat und Woche", *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 8, 1951, 14–21; E. Vogt, "Hat Sabbat im Alten Testament den Sinn von Woche?", *Bibliotheca* 40, 1959, 1008 ff.; J. Vuilleumier, *Le Jour du Repos à travers les Âges*, 1936; E. Wetzel, *Über den Ursprung der christlichen Sonntagsfeier*, 1874; T. Zahn, *Geschichte des Sonntags, vornehmlich in der alten Kirche*, 1878 (reprinted in *Skizzen aus dem Leben der alten Kirche*, 1894, 196–240); H. Zimmern, "Sabbat", *ZDMG* 58, 1904, 199–202; and "Nochmals Sabbat", ibid., 458 ff.; O. Zöckler, "Sonntagsfeier", *RE* XVII 521–29.

Sacrifice, First Fruits, Altar, Offering

Sacrifice, which forms a part of all cultic religions, is a ritual action intended to influence unseen powers, and in certain cases render their malignant activities innocuous by offering them satisfaction and so effecting positive blessings. The general import of sacrifice can be most easily characterized by the ancient Roman formula *do ut des* ("I give, so that you may give"). However, the sacrifices of the Israelite cultus are to be seen within the context of Israel's → covenant relationship with Yahweh. In the NT the idea of sacrifice plays an important rôle, where it is a category for the interpretation of the → death of Jesus. It is also found, as in general in the ancient world, pictorially and in ethical contexts. The regular, general term for sacrifice in the Gk. world is *thysia*. The special form of the gift of the first fruits, *aparchē*, is dealt with in its own individual section on linguistic and material grounds. See also → Cross, → Death, → Gift, → Lord's Supper.

ἀπαρχή — ἀπαρχή (*aparchē*), the gift of the first fruits, offering, gift.

CL *aparchē*, used since Soph. and Hdt., is a technical term of sacrificial language and denotes the first fruits of any sort, e.g. of natural products or of livestock, which were sacred to the deity and had to be consecrated to it before the whole could be given over to profane use (Hdt., 1, 92). In religious contexts there is also occasional mention of the offering of individual men or of whole groups to the deity (Plut., *De Pythiae Oraculis* 16; *Quaestiones Graecae* 35). This is mainly a question of the dedication of men to life-long service in the sanctuary (*hierodouloi*, temple slaves). Later the meaning of *aparchē* grew to include the payment of regular taxes in the secular sphere, such as death-duty to the state (cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 16, 172).

OT In the LXX *aparchē* translates initially the Heb. *rē'šît*, lit. beginning, chief, first (of fruits etc.), meaning the offering of the first fruits of natural products, such as wine and cereals, which were consecrated to Yahweh, the giver of fruitfulness (Num. 18:2; Deut. 18:4; 26:2, 10; 2 Chr. 31:5). It is also found at Exod. 23:19; Lev. 2:12; 23:10; Num. 15:20 f.; Deut. 33:21; 1 Sam. 2:29; Neh. 10:3; 12:44; Pss. 78(77):51; 105(104):36; Ezek. 20:40; 44:30. But most commonly *aparchē* renders *t'rûmâh*, contribution, offering, which denotes the contribution of natural products or money to the cult for the → priests and → Levites (Exod. 25:2 f.; Deut. 12:11, 17; 2 Chr. 31:10, 12, 14), which is similarly understood as a thank-offering to Yahweh. Other

instances are: Exod. 35:5 f.; Lev. 22:12; Num. 5:9; 18:8, 11; 31:29; 2 Sam. 1:21; 2 Esd. 8:25; Neh. 10:40(39); 13:5; Mal. 3:8; Ezek. 20:40; 44:30; 45:1, 6 f., 13, 16; 48:8 ff., 12, 18, 20 f. This cultic practice is supported by the Israelite belief in → creation: Yahweh is the glory and owner of human, animal and plant life. The gift of the first fruits of everything living therefore belongs to him (Num. 18:15 [Heb. *bᵉkôr*, LXX *prōtotokos*]; Exod. 23:19; → First).

aparchē also renders *ḥēleḇ*, fat (Num. 18:12, 29 f., 32), *ma'ᵃśēr*, tenth part, → tithe (Deut. 12:6 *v.l.*), and *tᵉnûpâh*, offering (Exod. 38:24[39:1]), a term which is also used of the wave-offering. It is without Heb. equivalent at Exod. 22:28(29); Num. 18:1; 1 Sam. 10:4; Tob. 1:6; Jud. 11:13; Sir. 7:31 *v.l.*; 24:9 *v.l.*; 35(32):8; 45:20; Ezek. 20:31.

NT In the NT *aparchē* occurs only 9 times, of which 7 instances are in Paul.

1. In Rom. 11:16 Paul takes up the thought of Num. 15:17–21: "If the dough offered as first fruits is holy, so is the whole lump; and if the root is holy, so are the branches." Admittedly, there is a certain difference between the OT example and Paul's conclusions. In the case of the Israelites, the rest of the dough could be put to profane use. On the other hand, as M. Black points out, "By offering the 'first fruits' of the dough, i.e. probably the first loaf baked, the whole mass of dough is consecrated (Num. 15:17 ff.) Israel, as a whole, is consecrated through the Patriarchs (the 'holy root'; and cf. verse 28)" (*Romans*, *New Century Bible*, 1973, 144). By means of this exegesis, which is not untypical of rabbinic thought, Paul argues that the first fruits of Israel, the faith of the patriarchs (e.g. of → Abraham, Rom. 11:28), guarantee the rôle in salvation history of the nation as a whole. For the analogy of the root and branch → Olive.

2. *aparchē* has a similar figurative sense in Rom. 16:5, where Paul speaks of Epaenetus as the first fruits ("the first convert", RSV) of the province of Asia. Similarly, in 1 Cor. 16:15 the household of Stephanas is called the first fruits of Achaia. They were the first Christian converts as a result of the evangelization of these provinces. The same thought is found in the *v.l.* of 2 Thess. 2:13: "But we are bound to give thanks to God always for you, brethren beloved by the Lord, because God chose you from the beginning [*ap' archēs*; *v.l.* "as the first fruits", *aparchēn*] to be saved, through sanctification by the Spirit and belief in the truth." The similarity of form explains the difficulties in copying. Perhaps "first fruits" is to be preferred, by analogy with the other Pauline passages, and because Paul nowhere else uses the phrase "from the beginning" (cf. Metzger, 636 f.).

More generally, James addresses his readers as the first fruits of God's creation: "Of his own will he brought us forth by the word of truth that we should be a kind of first fruits of his creatures" (Jas. 1:18). According to Philo, the people of Israel were set apart "as a kind of first fruits to the Maker and Father" (*Spec. Leg.* 4, 180). Here in Jas. Christians are thought of as the first fruits of the new created order which supersedes the old Israel. They are "a temporary down-payment to be followed by the remaining members of the species" (M. Dibelius and H. Greeven, *James*, *Hermeneia*, 1976, 106).

In Rev. 14:4 the hundred and forty-four thousand are similarly so described: "It is these who have not defiled themselves with women, for they are chaste; it is these who follow the Lamb wherever he goes; these have been redeemed from mankind as

first fruits for God and the Lamb". (On the hundred and forty-four thousand → Number, art. *chilias* NT 4.)

3. Rom. 8:23 reverses the OT relationship of giver and receiver: "and not only the creation, but we ourselves, who have the first fruits of the Spirit, groan inwardly as we wait for adoption as sons, the redemption of our bodies." Here it is not God but believers who are the recipients of the first fruits. The gift of the → Spirit is seen as the first instalment and guarantee of the eschatological → redemption of the → body. (On the interpretation of this passage → Prayer, art. *entynchanō*; and on the nature of the resurrection body → Resurrection, art. *The Resurrection in Contemporary Theology* 2.)

4. In 1 Cor. 15:20 *aparchē* is used in connexion with the → resurrection: "But in fact Christ has been raised from the dead, the first fruits of those who have fallen asleep." The assertion follows the reflection that, "If in this life we who are in Christ have only hope, we are of all men most to be pitied" (v. 19). If Christ has not been raised both preaching and faith are → empty (v. 14). Christ's resurrection is thus a guarantee of the believer's resurrection. "This analogy may have come more readily to Paul's mind if he was writing between Passover (5:7 f.) and Pentecost (16:8): the presentation of the first fruits soon after Passover inaugurated the seven weeks which terminated at Pentecost (Lev. 23:15 ff.; cf. verse 4 above)" (F. F. Bruce, *1 and 2 Corinthians*, *New Century Bible*, 1971, 145). The thought is further developed in v. 23 in relation to the eschatological order of resurrection life: "But each in his own order: Christ the first fruits, then at his coming those who belong to Christ" (→ Present, art. *The Parousia and Eschatology in the NT* 2 (c)).*H.-G. Link, C. Brown*

θύω

θύω (*thyō*), to sacrifice, slaughter, kill, celebrate; *θυσία* (*thysia*), sacrifice, offering, act of offering; *θυσιαστήριον* (*thysiastērion*), altar; *προσφορά* (*prosphora*), offering, the act of offering, the offering that is brought; *εἰδολόθυτον* (*eidōlothyton*), a thing sacrificed to idols; *ὁλοκαύτωμα* (*holokautōma*), whole burnt offering.

CL 1. *thyō* (used since Homer) has in secular Gk. the basic meaning of to sacrifice, though originally in connexion with the smoke-offering it meant to smoke, and in particular, in the active form, to offer a smoking or a burnt sacrifice (Homer, *Il.* 9, 219; Xen., *Cyr.* 8, 7, 3). Because sacrificial animals or portions of animals – and human beings also – were burnt, *thyō* also assumed the meaning to slaughter for cultic ends (Hdt., 1, 216; Eur., *Iph. Taur.* 621). The noun *thysia* (since Pindar) signifies the ritual of sacrifice as well as the sacrificial animal or any other similar sacrificial gift (Hdt., 4, 60; Thuc., 8, 70).

2. *prosphora* meant originally bringing, presenting. It was also used of income, revenue, and the offering of sacrificial gifts, then in particular an offering of food, especially in the form of a gift of cereals. From Sophocles onwards, in the connotation of making an offering in the form of a gift, the expression came to indicate total submission to the deity in cultic acts (Theophrastus, *Characteres* 30, 19). For further discussion see R. K. Yerkes, *Sacrifice in Greek and Roman Religion and in Early Judaism*, 1952. *F. Thiele*

OT 1. *Principal Sources.* Many passages in the OT exhibit the wide-ranging significance which sacrifice acquired in Israel. The most important sources are the Cultic Decalogue (Exod. 34), the Book of the Covenant (Exod. 20:22–23:33), Deut. 12–26, the final part of the book of Ezekiel (chs. 40–48), and the so-called Priestly Code (especially Exod. 24–Num. 10). The OT does not present a single concept of sacrifice which embraces the whole, but rather a variety of inter-related ideas. Many scholars hold that most of the sacrificial rites of the OT did not originate in faith in Yahweh (cf. G. von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, I, 1962, 252; R. Dussaud, *Les Origines Cananéennes du Sacrifice Israélite*, 1941 [2]; H. H. Rowley, "The Meaning of Sacrifice in the Old Testament", *BJRL* 33, 1950–51, 74–110; reprinted in *From Moses to Qumran: Studies in the Old Testament*, 1963, 67–107; R. de Vaux, *Studies in Old Testament Sacrifice*, 1964). It is widely held that they developed in part in the struggle with neighbouring heathen, particularly Canaanite, cults (cf. Lev. 20:2 ff.; Deut. 18), and that they were the product of a lengthy and complex development. In the OT the sacrificial cultus forms part of the Mosaic legislation.

2. *Cultic Sites.* The offering of sacrifice is localized at a cultic site which centres on the altar (Heb. *mizbēaḥ*, place of sacrifice, which is related to the vb. *zāḇaḥ*, to slaughter or sacrifice, and the noun *zeḇaḥ*, a sacrifice). The LXX is the first place where the corresponding Gk. noun *thysiastērion*, sacrificial table, altar, occurs. It is found in the LXX 419 times. Its use remains confined to Jewish and Christian literature. *thysiastērion* is always used as the "altar of the God of the Bible" (J. Behm, *TDNT* III 182), e.g. the altar of burnt offering (Lev. 4:7 etc.), the altar of incense (Exod. 30:1; 40:5), and the altar on which Abraham intended to offer Isaac (Gen. 22:9 f.). For the altars of foreign gods *bōmos* is used (for *mizbēaḥ*, Exod. 34:13; Num. 3:10; 23:1 f., 4, 14, 29 f.; Deut. 7:5; 12:3; Jos. 22:10 f., 16, 19, 23, 26, 34; 2 Chr. 31:1; Isa. 17:8; 27:9; Jer. 11:13; for *bāmâh*, high place, Hos. 10:8; Amos 7:9; Isa. 15:2; 16:12; Jer; 7:31; 48[31]:35; 32[39]:35; cf. also 1 Macc. 1:46, 54, 59; 2:23 ff., 45; 5:68; 2 Macc. 2:19; 10:2; 13:8). This distinction was not, however, preserved by Philo (cf. *Spec. Leg.* 1, 285 ff.; 1, 290; *Vit. Mos.* 2, 196) and Josephus (*Ant.* 8, 88 and 230).

The patriarchs built their own altars and offered sacrifice without recourse to priesthood: → Noah (Gen. 8:20); → Abraham (Gen. 12:6 ff.; 13:18; 22:9); Isaac (Gen. 26:25); Jacob (Gen. 33:20; 35:1–7); → Moses (Exod. 17:15). Archaeologists have discovered Canaanite altars from the 14th and 13th centuries B.C. onwards. Moses was instructed to tell the people to make an altar of earth (Exod. 20:24 ff.). The altar built by → Elijah on Carmel consisted of twelve uncut stones representing the twelve tribes (1 Ki. 18:31 f.). Altars were also built by Joshua (Jos. 8:30 f.; cf. Deut. 27:5), Gideon (Jdg. 6:24 ff.) and David (2 Sam. 24:18–25). See also Jos. 22:10–34; 1 Sam. 20:6, 29. Solomon's altar was probably a new one (1 Ki. 8:22, 54, 64; 9:25). This bronze altar for burnt offerings stood in the inner court. It was 20 cubits square and 10 cubits high (2 Chr. 4:1). Between this and the porch was the bronze laver (1 Ki. 7:23–26; cf. 16:17). Within the holy place in the tabernacle was a miniature altar of → incense, overlaid with gold (Exod. 30:1–10; → Tent). To this altar only Aaron and the high priests had access, for burning incense morning and evening and for making atonement once a year on the Day of Atonement. The horns of the altar were projections which were smeared with the blood of the sacrifice (Exod. 29:12; 30:10; Lev. 4:7). On the large altar the victims were tied to them (Ps.

118:27). Offenders might cling to them for safety (1 Ki. 2:28). In Ezekiel's vision of the temple no incense altar is mentioned, but the altar of burnt offering is described in detail (Ezek. 43:13–17), employing Babylonian concepts. When the temple was rebuilt after the exile it was provided with altars (cf. Josephus, *Ap.* 1, 21; and the Letter of Aristeas). Antiochus Epiphanes removed the golden altar in 169 B.C. (1 Macc. 1:21), and two years later surmounted the altar of burnt offering with the → abomination of desolation (1 Macc. 1:54). The Maccabees built a new altar and restored the altar of incense (1 Macc. 4:44–49). In the time of Herod the altar of burnt offering was a pile of unhewn stones approached by a ramp (for description see the Mishnah tractate Middoth 3).

3. *Types of Sacrifice.* Various forms of sacrifice are described in the OT, and they are named according to the occasion and form of the gift.

(a) The *ḥaṭṭā't* (LXX *peri hamartias*, lit. "for sins") is generally rendered "sin offering" (cf. the vb. *ḥāṭā'*, to miss a goal or way, to sin, and the noun *ḥēṭ'*, sin). However, "purgation offering" has been proposed as an alternative on the grounds that the name is derived from the piel form of the vb. *ḥiṭṭē'* which is synonymous with *ṭihar*, to purify (e.g. Ezek. 43:23–26) and *kipper*, to purge (Ezek. 43:20, 26) (cf. J. Milgrom. *IDB Supplementary Volume*, 1976, 766). In this sacrifice the → blood of the animal is not used on the person. The rites for the healed leper (Lev. 14) and the consecration of the priest involve this sacrifice and the daubing by blood, but the blood is taken from a different sacrifice. The priest purges the sanctuary by means of the *ḥaṭṭā't* on the behalf of the person or group of persons who have polluted it. The reason for the pollution may be physical impurity (e.g. Lev. 12–15) or an unwitting offence against Yahweh (e.g. Lev. 4). Unrepented impurities cannot be so purged (Num. 15:27–31) but must be dealt with by the Day of Atonement ritual (→ Reconciliation, art. *hilaskomai* OT).

The underlying idea of purging is further illustrated by the fact that a person was contaminated by the blood of the sacrifice (Lev. 6:27). Earthenware objects used for the sin offering had to be broken and metal ones scoured (Lev. 6:28; 11:33, 35; 15:12; Num. 31:22 f.). Those who burned the sin offering after it had purged the sanctuary had to submit to ablutions (Lev. 16:16, 28; cf. also Num. 19:8 ff., 21). The sacrifice absorbed the impurity, and by that fact could also contaminate. For a similar idea outside the OT cf. the Hittite Code § 44 (*ANET*, 191). On occasion the priests could eat it (Lev. 6:29). "But no sin offering shall be eaten from which any blood is brought into the tent of meeting to make atonement in the holy place; it shall be burned with fire" (Lev. 6:30). It was thus burned outside the camp (Lev. 4:11 f., 21), and the one who burnt it must also purify himself before returning (Lev. 16:28).

Three stages have been noted in the purging of the sanctuary (cf. J. Milgrom, op. cit., 767): (i) When an individual commits an inadvertent sin or contracts impurity, the blood of the sin offering is daubed on the horns of the outer altar (Lev. 4:25; 9:9; 14:19). (ii) When the entire community commits an inadvertency, the blood is brought inside the shrine, where it is sprinkled before the veil and daubed on the horns of the inner altar (Lev. 4:5 ff., 16 ff.). (iii) For presumptuous sins the blood is brought inside the adytum where it is sprinkled before and upon the ark, followed by the ritual of the previous two stages in reverse order (cf. the Day of Atonement ritual in Lev. 16).

Repentance is a precondition of the sin offering (Lev. 4:22 f., 27 f.). The sacrifice

covers the inadvertent violation of prohibitive commandments (Lev. 4:2, 13, 22, 27), but not the neglect of performative commandments. The type of animal offered is related to the social and economic position of the offender: a bull for the high priest and community, a he-goat for a chief, and a female of the flock for a common Israelite (cf. Lev. 4:2–21; 9:2 f., 15; 16:5, 11; with Num. 15:22–26). The very poor could offer birds or flour (Lev. 5:1–13). Where more than one kind of sacrifice is offered, the sin offering take precedence, because the altar must first be purged before other gifts may be offered (cf. Lev. 5:8 with Num. 6:14 ff.). The man who deliberately delayed purification is warned that he will bear his iniquity (Lev. 17:16; Num. 19:13, 20).

(b) The *'āšām* (LXX *plēmmeleia*) is generally translated as "guilt offering". It is related to the vb. *'āsam*, to offend, be guilty, incur liability to someone (cf. Lev. 5:19), and where it has no personal object, to feel guilty (e.g. Lev. 5:5, 17; 6:4[5:23]). J. Milgrom sees the underlying meaning as reparation (cf. Lev. 5:6), especially in view of the vbs. used in connexion with it: *hēšîḇ*, restore (Num. 5:7 f.; 18:9; 1 Sam. 6:3 f., 17) and *šillēm*, repay (Lev. 5:24[6:5]) (op. cit., 768). It thus implies indemnities. Moreover, the *'āšām* is the only sacrifice upon which value is set in terms of money (Lev. 5:15, 18; 6:6[5:25]).

The guilt offering was to be offered, together with a fine to the value of one fifth, for unwitting trespass in any holy thing (Lev. 5:14; cf. also Lev. 27). The nature of the trespass is not defined in the OT, though in Hittite documents it can be related both to the animate and the inanimate (*ANET*, 208). Particular cases where the guilt offering has to be made include reparation by the Nazirite for desecrating his hair and vow (Num. 6:1–12), the desecration of Israel by foreign nations (Jer. 2:3), and the desecration of Israel by mixed marriages (Ezra 10:19). Lev. 5:17 ff. prescribes the guilt offering for unwitting sins in order to avoid divine retribution (cf. *ANET*, 34 ff., 391 ff.). The healed leper had to offer the *'āšām* (Lev. 14:10–32; → Leprosy). It was also to be offered in cases of breach of faith (Lev. 6:1–7[5:20–26]), which also entailed restoration of the value of the property plus a one-fifth fine. This is furher elaborated in Num. 5:6 ff. which stipulates that in cases where the owner dies without heirs the total reparation belongs to the sanctuary, and also that the guilty party must express his repentance in confession.

Isa. 53:10 f. declares of the servant of Yahweh: "Yet it was the will of the LORD to bruise him; he has made him sick; when thou makest his soul an offering for sin [MT *'im-tāśîm 'āšām napšô*; LXX *ean dōte peri hamartias*], he shall see his offspring, he shall prolong his days; the will of the LORD shall prosper in his hand; he shall see the fruit of the travail of his soul and be satisfied; by his knowledge shall the righteous one, my servant, make many to be accounted righteous; and he shall bear their iniquities [MT *ʿāwōnōṯām*; LXX *tas hamartias auton*]" (RSV mg.). In this unique passage the servant of Yahweh takes over the rôle of the animal in the guilt offering by the offering of his own life. (On the question of the servant → Serve.) In the NT Jesus' self-giving as a *lytron*, ransom (Matt. 20:28), recalls this passage (→ Redemption; → Lord's Supper). Some scholars consider the text to be corrupt, and the RSV emends: "he has put him to grief; when he makes himself an offering for sin . . . ." J. Begrich emended the text to read "he healed him who made his life a guilt offering" (*Studien zu Deuterojesaja*, 1938, 58; reprinted in *ThB* 20, 1963, 63; cf. R. N. Whybray, *Isaiah 40–66*, *New Century Bible*, 1975, 179, for this and other conjec-

tured emendations). Thus Begrich eliminates the idea that Yahweh desires to make the life of the servant a guilt offering. However, it has to be asked whether all such emendations are not made in the light of a preconceived theological interest.

(c) The *ʿōlâh* is commonly translated "whole burnt offering". It is related to the vb. *ʿālâh*, go up, hiph. cause to ascend, i.e. in the sacrificial fire. For this the LXX has *holokautōma* and *holokautōsis*, "holocaust", and also *holokarpōma* and *holokarpōsis*, "whole food offering", and *karpōma* and *karpōsis*, "food offering". The Heb. *kālîl* is also used as a synonym (cf. Deut. 33:10; 1 Sam. 7:9; Ps. 51:21). All of the beast or fowl was laid on the altar, except the skin (Lev. 7:8) and those parts which could not be washed clean (Lev. 1:9 ff., 13), and it was entirely consumed by → fire. The beast had to be a male without blemish from the herd or flock (Lev. 1:3, 10; 22:18 f.). But the offering could also be a fowl (Lev. 1:14 ff.; 5:7; 12:8; 14:22; 15:14 f., 29 f.; Num. 6:10 f.). A → lamb was offered by individuals (Lev. 12:6; Num. 6:14) and by the nation with the sheaf-waving (*ʿōmer*; Lev. 23:12) and also daily at the morning and evening sacrifices (Num. 28 and 29; cf. also Exod. 29:42; Lev. 9:17; 2 Ki. 16:15; Ezra 3:5; Neh. 10:34; Ezek. 46:13, 15). The whole burnt offerings were increased on important occasions such as certain feasts and the reconsecration of the → temple (2 Chr. 29:32; cf. Ezek. 45:23; 46:4).

The offerer imposed his hands on the head of the animal and then slaughtered it himself (Lev. 1:4 f.; 4:24, 33; 6:8; 7:2; 9:12; 14:13, 19, 31; Ezek. 40:39, 42; 44:11). He also flayed it (Lev. 1:6; 2 Chr. 29:34), though it was the priests that presented the blood and arranged the sacrifice on the altar and burned it (Lev. 1:5–10; cf. Ezek. 40:38). It was devoured by fire (Lev. 1:9, 13, 17; 6:2–6; 8:21; 9:24; Num. 28:13; 1 Ki. 18:38; 2 Chr. 7:1). To the devout Israelite it was a matter of great concern that his whole burnt offerings should be accepted (1 Sam. 15:22; Pss. 20:3; 40:6; 51:19; Isa. 56:7; Jer. 6:20). Performance of the cultic act without penitence and heartfelt longing for Yahweh was not enough.

The atoning character of the *ʿōlâh* is made explicit in Lev. 1:4, and is implied in certain rituals (Lev. 9:7; 14:20) and also in non-cultic passages (Job 1:5; 42:8). Counterparts to it outside Israelite religion have been found in Greece, Anatolia and Canaan, but not in Egypt or Mesopotamia. The OT speaks of human burnt offerings being made to other gods (2 Ki. 3:27; Jer. 19:5). Jephthah offered his daughter as such a sacrifice (Jdg. 11:31), though human sacrifice is condemned in the OT (Lev. 18:21; 20:1–5; Mic. 6:7; Ezek. 20:25 f.; Jer. 32:35; 2 Ki. 23:10; Deut. 12:31; 18:10; cf. de Vaux, op. cit., 63–90). Abraham was prepared to offer Isaac as an *ʿōlâh*, though God drew his attention to a ram instead (Gen. 22:2, 13). The *ʿōlâh* may well have been the earliest expiatory sacrifice. Outside the Pentateuch early references to its use on behalf of individuals are found in Job 1:5 and 42:8, and on behalf of the community in 2 Sam. 24:25.

(d) The noun *minḥâh* (LXX *thysia*, and also twice *thysiasma*) means a gift or present (Gen. 32:14, 19, 21 f.; Jdg. 6:18 etc.), tribute (Jdg. 3:15–18; 2 Sam. 8:2, 6; Hos. 10:6 etc.), and an offering made to God of any kind whether of grain or animals (Gen. 4:3 ff.; Num. 16:15; 1 Sam. 2:17, 29; 26:19; Isa. 1:13; Ps. 96:8; Zeph. 3:10). Thus the sacrifices of Cain and Abel are both described by the same term; it is the context which indicates that Abel's offering of the firstlings of his flock and their fat portions (Gen. 4:3) was acceptable to God rather than Cain's offering of the fruit of the ground. But Cain's decisive sin was to resent God with an impenitent heart (Gen.

4:6 f.), which in turn led to the murder of his brother and his attempted cover-up (Gen. 4:8 f.).

But *minḥâh* is also used in the special sense of the cereal offering in passages attributed to P (Exod. 30:9; 40:29; Lev. 7:37; 23:37; Num. 18:9; 29:39; Hos. 2:23, 29). It is found in various forms: *'ābîḇ*, the grain in the ear parched with fire, oil and incense (Lev. 2:14 f.); *sōleṯ*, fine flour usually mixed with oil and incense (Lev. 2:1; 6:7 f.; 14:10, 21; 23:13; but cf. 5:11 ff. for the very poor; Num. 7:13 ff.; 8:8; 15:4, 6, 9; 28:5 ff.; 29:3, 9, 14); *sōleṯ*, baked in an oven as cakes (Lev. 2:4; 7:9; Num. 6:15) or some form of a pan (Lev. 2:5, 7; 6:14; 7:9). These were always unleavened (*maṣṣôṯ*) and mixed with oil and salt (Lev. 2:11 ff.; → Leaven). They figured at → Pentecost (Lev. 23:16 f.; Num. 28:26). Barley meal without oil or incense was also used (Num. 5:15, 18, 25).

The *minḥâh* may have been a cheap *'ōlâh* for the poor (cf. Men. 104b; Lev. Rabbah 1:5; 8:4). In Mesopotamia cereal offering was an alternative to animal sacrifice for the poor (J. Milgrom, op. cit., 769). In Israel it regularly went with the *'ōlâh* (e.g. Lev. 14:20; Num. 28 and 29) and had a similar range of functions including expiation (Men. 110a; Philo, *Spec. Leg.* 1, 271).

(e) The *šᵉlāmîm* (LXX *sōtērion, eirēnikē*) is a plur. formation. The sing. is found only in Amos 5:22. It is frequently translated as "peace offering", on the grounds that it is etymologically linked with *šālôm*, peace, and that it effects → peace (Tosefta Zeb. 11:1). Some scholars see support for this view of the *šᵉlāmîm* in the early sources which depict it as a shared meal eaten before Yahweh (e.g. Gen. 31:54; Deut. 27:7; 1 Sam. 2:13–16). But the evidence of the OT itself does not warrant the further suggestion that the peace offering effected a mystic union between the offerer and the deity (cf. Jdg. 6:18–21; 13:16; Ps. 50:12 f.). The sacrifice was eaten "before [*lipnê*] Yahweh", not "with" him.

Other conjectured derivations include seeing it as a → covenant or gift sacrifice in view of the Akkadian *salimu* (covenant) and *šulmānu* (gift). In view of the Heb. *šālēm* (whole, sound), it has been seen as a sacrifice in which the offerer expresses thanks for his well-being (cf. Tosefta Zeb. 11:1; Sifra, Nedaba 16:2; Philo, *Spec. Leg.* 1, 212). A further suggestion is to relate it to *šillēm* (repay), and see it as a sacrifice repaying God for his blessings (cf. Rashbam on Lev. 3:1; Prov. 7:14).

The *šᵉlāmîm* is thought to be old, and was eaten close to the altar (1 Sam. 2:13; 9:24; cf. Ezek. 46:24; Num. 6:18 f. in the case of the consecration of the Nazirite). Birds could not be offered. In the wilderness period birds were considered game. Their blood was not dashed on the altar but buried (cf. Lev. 17:13 f.).

In passages atributed to P the *sᵉlāmîm* are often linked with or replaced by the noun *zeḇaḥ*, the generic term for sacrifice. In Ugaritic, Punic and rabbinic Heb. the root *zbḥ* can refer to all types of blood sacrifice. But in the OT it is used for those sacrifices in which the flesh is eaten (except possibly 2 Chr. 7:12), e.g. feasts at altars (1 Sam. 2:13), the yearly (1 Sam. 1:21) and family (1 Sam. 20:29) *zeḇaḥ*.

The character of the *šᵉlāmîm* as thankoffering, votive offering and freewill offering is brought out in Lev. 22:21: "And when any one offers a sacrifice of peace offerings to the LORD, to fulfil a vow or as a freewill offering, from the herd or from the flock, to be accepted it must be perfect; there shall be no blemish in it" (cf. Lev. 7:11–16; 19:5 ff.; Deut. 27:7; Philo, *Spec. Leg.* 1, 224; Plato, *Laws* 909 f.). The ritual is prescribed in Lev. 3. The offerer lays his hand on the animal's head and kills it at the

door of the tent of meeting (v. 2; cf. v. 7 for a lamb and v. 13 for a goat). The priest throws the blood on the altar and round about (v. 2; cf. vv. 6–17). The entrails are removed (vv. 3 ff.) and the fat burnt as a pleasing odour to Yahweh (v. 5). It was mainly a private and family sacrifice, but was offered in public at → Pentecost (Lev. 23:19) and at the consecration of priests (Lev. 9:4).

The sacrifice was evidently of less sanctity than the burnt offerings, for female animals could be offered (Lev. 3:1 etc). It was additional to the mandatory offerings laid down by the law, and physically imperfect animals were accepted for freewill, but not votive offerings (Lev. 22:23). Certain parts went to the priest and the rest was eaten by the offerer and his friends (Lev. 7:15 f.). In general, the *šᵉlamîm* were not associated with propitiation or expiation, and the OT largely avoids using the vb. *kipper* in association with it (→ Reconciliation, art. *hilaskomai*, OT). Possible exceptions are Ezek. 45:15, 17; 1 Sam. 3:14; and Lev. 17:11, where the context seems to refer to *šᵉlāmîm*. But the warning against eating flesh with → blood that makes atonement seems intended to ensure that the sacrifice is eaten as a proper peace offering (cf. Lev. 17:3 f.).

The *šᵉlāmîm* could be offered as a thanksgiving or thankoffering, *tôḏâh* (Lev. 7:12 f., 15; 22:29; cf. also 2 Chr. 29:31; 33:16; Pss. 50:14, 23; 56:12; 107:22; 116:17; and the title of Ps. 100; Jer. 17:26; 33:11; Amos 4:5). It is linked with a bread offering and eaten the same day in Lev. 7:11–16. The offering in fulfilment of a vow (*neḏer*, *nᵉḏāḇâh*) might be brought as an *ʿōlâh* as well as a *šᵉlāmîm* (Num 15:3; Ezek. 46:2, 12), but apparently not the *tôḏâh* (2 Chr. 29:31).

(f) Several other cultic rites are mentioned by the OT. For the *qorbān*, offering (Lev. 1:2 f., 10; 2:1, 5; 7:38; Num. 6:14 etc.) → Gift, art. *korban*. The *nesek*, drink offering (LXX *spondē*), which consisted of wine, is mentioned in Gen. 35:14 (attributed to E) and elsewhere in passages attributed to P (Lev. 23:37; Num. 4:7; 29:39). It was usually offered with the *ʿōlâh* (Exod. 29:40; Lev. 23:13, 18; Num. 15:5, 7, 10, 24; 28:7, 14, 31; 28:9–24; 29:6–37). It is mentioned in connexion with the morning offering (Exod. 29:41; Num. 28:8), and with other offerings (Num. 6:15, 17; 15:5, 7, 10; 1 Chr. 29:21; 2 Chr. 29:35; Ezek. 45:17; Jos. 1:9, 13; 2:14). Drink offerings were also offered to other deities (2 Ki. 16:13, 15; Isa. 57:6; Jer. 7:18; 19:13; 32:29; 44:17–25; Ezek. 20:28; Ps. 16:4). On the memorial *ʾazkārâh*, a term associated with the meal offering (Lev. 2:2, 9, 16; 6:8; Num. 5:26) → Remember. It was used of the frankincense burned for the show-bread (Lev. 24:7). A meal offering could be used as a sin offering and a memorial before Yahweh by the very poor (Lev. 5:12).

The → bread of the presence or show-bread (*leḥem-panîm*, lit. "bread of face") was to be set on the table in the sanctuary perpetually before Yahweh (Exod. 25:30). Some critics have seen it as a survival of the idea that the deity was nourished by the food presented by the worshippers. It was unleavened recalling the exodus (→ Leaven). It was renewed each → sabbath, the old bread being eaten by the priests within the precincts of the sanctuary (Lev. 24:5–9). As such it is seen as a memorial before Yahweh and an expression of the covenant, being offered with fire and frankincense. 1 Sam. 21:1–6 tells how → David and his men ate this bread, which in the NT is appealed to by Jesus to justify the disciples' action in plucking grain on the sabbath (Matt. 12:1–8 par. Mk. 2:23–28, Lk. 6:1–5). See also 1 Ki. 7:48 = 2 Chr. 4:19; Exod. 35:13; 39:36; 40:23; Num. 4:7; 1 Chr. 9:32; 23:29; 2 Chr. 13:11; Neh.

10:34. Lev. 23:17 speaks of the wave-loaf, and Lev. 23:20 and 2 Ki. 4:42 of the bread of the first fruits.

The wave-offering *t*nûp̄âh* (LXX *epithema*), wave offering, was waved at the high priest's ordination (Exod. 29:26). The → Levites were also offered as a wave offering (Num. 8:11, 13, 15, 21). The offering was so called because it was waved, signifying that the sacrifice was Yahweh's: "And you shall consecrate the breast of the wave offering, and the thigh of the priest's portion, which is waved, and which is offered from the ram of ordination, since it is for Aaron and for his sons" (Exod. 29:27; cf. also Lev. 7:34; 8:27; 10:14 f.; 14:14, 21, 24; 23:15, 17, 20; Num. 6:20; 18:18).

On the separate questions of cursing and tithing → Curse, → Tithe. On the festivals, including the Passover, → Feast.

4. *Theories of Sacrifice.* Various theories have been put forward as to the fundamental idea behind sacrifice in general.

(a) The view that sacrifice is intended to provide food for the god is argued by W. Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament*, I, 1961, 141 f.; E. Westermarck, *The Origin and Development of Moral Ideas*, II, 1908, 611; R. H. Pfeiffer, *Religion in the Old Testament*, 1961, 35. Some support for taking this view in the OT has been found in certain idioms, such as "my table" (Ezek. 44:16), "the food of his God" (Lev. 21:22, cf. v. 17), "my food ... my pleasing odour" (Num. 28:2) (cf. J. Milgrom, op. cit., 764). The furniture of the sacred → tent and later of the → temple (the table for the bread of the presence, the candelabrum, and the incense altar) have been seen as the means for providing Yahweh with the necessary means of partaking of the food offered. There are also passages which treat Yahweh as an honoured guest who must receive his share of the sacrifice before man (e.g. 1 Sam. 2:29). But the latter may also be construed as an expression of reverence. At most, as Milgrom points out, "these words and mores are only fossilized vestiges from a dim past, which show no signs of life in the Bible" (ibid.). There is never any thought in the biblical writers that Yahweh actually *needs* food from man. Although this may have been in the minds of some Israelites influenced by Canaanite religion, it was trenchantly denounced by the psalmist: "I do not reprove you for your sacrifices; your burnt offerings are continually before me. I will accept no bull from your house, nor he-goat from your folds. For every beast of the forest is mine, the cattle on a thousand hills. I know all the birds of the air, and all that moves in the field is mine. If I were hungry, I would not tell you; for the world and all that is in it is mine. Do I eat the flesh of bulls, or drink the blood of goats? Offer to God a sacrifice of thanksgiving, and pay your vows to the Most High; and call upon me in the day of trouble; I will deliver you, and you shall glorify me" (Ps. 50:8–15). What is striking about this Psalm is that it does not condemn sacrifice as such, but misconceptions of it. Commenting on v. 14, A. A. Anderson writes: "The point of this verse seems to be that sacrifice is not *food* for Yahweh, but that it can become a vehicle for expressing the right attitude to him, and a means of blessing for the worshipper" (*The Book of Psalms*, *New Century Bible*, I, 1972, 386).

(b) An alternative view is that sacrifice releases the life force of the animal through its death. This has been argued by E. O. James, "Sacrifice (Introductory and Primitive)", *ERE* XI 1 ff.; and *Origins of Sacrifice: A Study in Comparative Religion*, 1937[2]; R. Dussaud, *Les Origines Cananéennes du Sacrifice Israélite*, 1941[2]; A. Bertholet, *RGG*[2] IV 704. But whilst such views can be found in animism

they are absent from the accounts of sacrifice in the OT. Appeal is sometimes made to the statement that life is in the blood (cf. Gen. 4:4; Lev. 17:11, 14; Deut. 12:23), and the inference is drawn that the death of the victim enables its life to be released. But this view cannot be sustained in the light of detailed examination of the passages concerned (→ Blood; → Reconciliation, art. *hilaskomai* OT 3 (d)).

(c) Sacrifice has also been understood as a means of effecting a union with the deity by sharing in the body of the sacrificed animal (cf. W. Robertson Smith, *The Religion of the Semites: The Fundamental Institutions*, [1889] 1927[3], ed. S. A. Cook; F. B. Jevons, *An Introduction to the History of Religions*, 1927[9], 144 ff., 285; C. F. Burney, *Outlines of Old Testament Theology*, 1930[3], 55 f.). The nearest that the OT comes to this view is in the *šᵉlāmîm*. For discussion of this see above, 2 (e). Detailed examination of this and the other sacrifices shows that, while there are elements of union and reconciliation, there is no thought of the sacrifice effecting a mystical identity between the offerer and Yahweh. This goes far beyond the idea which is present of expressing thanks or vowing one's commitment to Yahweh.

(d) A fundamental idea of sacrifice outside Israelite religion is that of inducing the aid of the deity (cf. E. B. Tylor, *Primitive Culture: Researches into the Development of Mythology, Philosophy, Religion, Language, Art, and Custom*, 1929 [5], II, 375 ff.; S. I. Curtiss, *Primitive Semitic Religion Today*, 1902, 218 ff.; O. Baumgarten, *RGG*[1] IV 956). The motive may be to secure fertility, blessing, deliverance from enemies, sin, or impurity. There would seem to be a profound awareness in man of need of power outside himself. In its crudest form sacrifice constitutes a bribe or a superstitious act, designed to secure success. But in its deepest form it represents an awareness of the need to be reconciled and to commit oneself without reserve to the God with whom man needs → reconciliation and who is worthy of total commitment. This finds expression, e.g. in Ps. 50 (quoted above under (a)). The variety of sacrifices in the OT expresses the varied aspects of this need and the divine provision made for them under the old → covenant. With the death of Christ the NT writers see the sacrifices of the OT superseded.

5. *Sacrifice in the History of OT Religion.* The OT presents sacrifice as dating back to primeval history. Cain and Abel both brought sacrifices, though Cain's cereal offering was unacceptable (Gen. 4:4 f.). Noah offered burnt offerings (Gen. 8:20 ff.) and the pleasing odour is stressed. Job likewise made burnt offerings (Job 1:5; 42:7 ff.). The patriarchs "called on the name of Yahweh" (e.g. Abraham in Gen. 12:8; 13:4; 21:3; and Isaac in Gen. 26:25). The association of the phrase with the building of altars shows that it was linked with sacrifice. In the case of Jacob the particular altar is named (Gen. 33:20; 35:7; cf. also 31:54; 46:1). Abraham was tested by the call to offer his son, Isaac, though God provided a ram instead (Gen. 22). Sacrifice formed an essential part in the → covenant between God and Abraham (Gen. 15:4 ff.; cf. Jer. 34:18 ff.).

The Mosaic covenant was inaugurated with sacrifice (Exod. 24:3–8). Burnt and peace offerings were first offered. The blood from them was then thrown, half against the altar and half against the people.

In the land of Canaan sacrifices were held at various places, e.g. Bochim (Jdg. 2:1–5) and Ophrah (Jdg. 6:24 ff.). Jephthah sacrificed his daughter in fulfilment of a vow to sacrifice whatever he first met, if he returned victorious (Jdg. 11:30–40). The Book of Judges offers no comment on the rightness of his action. It would seem to

combine a devotion to Yahweh with a pagan view of sacrifice which permitted human offering. Elsewhere human sacrifice is denounced (cf. above 3 (c)). Jephthah's action appears to be the product of a → conscience which obliged him to keep a promise, regardless of the moral character of the act.

Shiloh emerged as the main centre for sacrifice (1 Sam. 1:3 ff.; cf. Jos. 18:1 ff.; Jdg. 18:31; 21:12 ff.; 1 Sam. 4:3 ff.; 14:3; 1 Ki. 2:27; 14:2 ff.; Ps. 78:60; Jer. 7:12 ff.; 26:6, 9; 41:5), where annual festive offerings were made. Eli's sons were condemned for their greed and treating the sacrifice with contempt (1 Sam. 2:12–17). Other legitimate centres were Bethshemesh (1 Sam. 6:14 f.), Mizpah (7:9), Ramah (7:17; 9:11–24), Gibeah (10:5) and Gilgal (10:8; 11:15; 13:9). Family and clan sacrifice is described in 1 Sam. 16:2–5.

Under Saul the chief centre was Nob (1 Sam. 21:1 ff.). The families of Saul and David made peace offerings and held family feasts at the new moon (1 Sam. 20:5, 24 f.).

Under → David the cultus came to be centralized at → Jerusalem which he made into his capital. Here he brought the ark and offered burnt and peace offerings (2 Sam. 6:16 ff.; 1 Chr. 16:2, 40). 1 Chr. 21:18–30 describes how David was commanded to build an altar on the threshing floor of Ornan. The horned altar had been located at Gibeon prior to its move to Jerusalem (1 Chr. 21:29; 22:1; 2 Chr. 1:6). David evidently reorganized the ritual (1 Chr. 23:28–31).

David was not allowed to build a permanent → temple (2 Sam. 7). This fell to his son, → Solomon (1 Ki. 7–9). Jerusalem now became the centre of the cultus (1 Ki. 8:5, 62–65; 2 Chr. 5:6; 7:4–8). Nevertheless, people continued to resort to the high places (cf. 1 Ki. 3:2; 13:2 ff.; 18:30 ff.; 19:10; 2 Ki. 14:4; 15:4, 35; cf. P. H. Vaughan, *The Meaning of 'bāmâ' in the Old Testament: A Study of Etymological, Textual and Archaeological Evidence, Society for Old Testament Study Monograph Series* 3, 1974). With the separation of the northern and southern kingdoms they constituted rival centres to Jerusalem. Jeroboam I of the northern kingdom established shrines at Dan and Bethel (1 Ki. 12:27 f.). Beersheba may also have been a rival centre (Amos 5:5). Although sacrifice continued to be offered at Jerusalem (2 Ki. 12:4–16; 16:13 ff.; 2 Chr. 13:10 ff.; 28:18; 24:14), sacrifice on the high places was also tolerated in Judah (2 Chr. 15:17; 20:33). From time to time godly kings sought to implement reform. Many of the high places were abolished by Hezekiah (2 Ki. 18:4; cf. 2 Chr. 29:21–35). But they returned under Manasseh (2 Ki. 21:3; 2 Chr. 33:3 f., 19). 1 Ki. 18 gives an account of the contest between → Elijah and the priests of Baal on Mount Carmel at the time of Ahab and Jezebel. Here both parties presented rival sacrifices. But whereas the priests of Baal failed to bring fire from heaven to consume the sacrifice, Elijah's prayers to Yahweh were answered by the fire of the Lord. The priests of Baal were then slaughtered. The compiler of the Books of Kings writes from the standpoint of the Deuteronomic Code. Josiah's reform which was based on the code led to the desecration of the high places from Geba to Beersheba (2 Ki. 23:5–9; cf. 2 Chron. 35:6–14). But they subsequently reappeared in the valley of Ben Hinnom and throughout Judah (Jer. 7:31; 17:3; cf. Ezek. 6:3, 6; 20:29), causing Israel to turn away from Yahweh and contributing to the downfall of Judah.

Following J. Wellhausen, many critics have seen two types of religion in Israel which were in tension: a moral religion taught by the → prophets and a ritualistic

religion based on the cult and the law (cf. J. Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History* of Israel, 1885; for discussion of this subject generally see H. H. Rowley, "The Law and the Prophets", in *The Unity of the Bible*, 1953, 30–61; A. C. Welch, *Prophet and Priest in Old Israel*, 1936; N. W. Porteous, "Prophet and Priest in Israel", *ExpT* 62, 1950–51, 4 ff.; and R. E. Clements, *A Century of Old Testament Study*, 1976, 7–30, 51–75).

A number of passages in the prophets denounce sacrificial ritual (Hos. 6:6; Amos 5:21–27; Mic. 6:6 ff.; Isa. 1:11–31; Jer. 6:20; 7:21 f.). Righteous conduct and obedience are contrasted with empty ritual. Amos 5:25 and Jer. 7:22 are sometimes taken to imply that sacrifice was unknown in Israel prior to the settlement in Canaan. They do, however, suggest that sacrifice was not practised in the wilderness wanderings. The evidence from Ras Shamra and the OT itself indicates that sacrifice was practised by the Canaanites and that some sacrifices had the same names. But Rowley contends: "No one can deny that Israelite sacrifice came out of a wider background of ritual practice, but while it is probable that much of Israelite sacrificial ritual was modelled on Canaanite, we have no evidence that it was identical with it in form or meaning, and no evidence that for Israel sacrifice began after their entry into the land of Canaan" (op. cit., 31 f.). Rowley takes Amos 5:25 to mean "Was it only flesh-sacrifices and meal-offerings that ye brought me in the wilderness?" with the expected answer "We brought more than this; we brought true worship of heart and righteousness" (op. cit., 42). Clearly Jeremiah was not opposed to the temple as such (Jer. 7:11), but he denounced the attitudes of those who made ritual a substitute for obedience and righteousness. His attitude and that of the other prophets is comparable with that of Samuel in condemning Saul for sparing the Amalekites: "Has the LORD as great delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of the LORD? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams" (1 Sam. 15:22). The fact that the Israelites had to eat manna and quails in their wilderness wanderings (Exod. 16 ff.) indicates that they lacked animals for sacrifice in any case during this period.

A pronouncement like Hos. 6:6 (cf. Matt. 9:13; 12:7) is best understood as a statement of priorities expressed by means of hyperbole: "For I desire love and not sacrifice, the knowledge of God, rather than burnt offerings." On the other hand, the prescriptions of passages like Lev. 5:5 f. and Num. 5:6 f. make it clear that the offering of sacrifice must be accompanied by penitence and confession. Isaiah condemned not only vain offerings, new moons and sabbaths but also prayer (Isa. 1:15; 29:13), when it was made without the right inner attitude. Linked with the lack of right attitudes was the intrusion of alien elements into the worship of Yahweh, and these were also condemned by the prophets both in Judah (cf. Jer. 7:17 f.; Ezek. 8) and Israel (Amos 4:4 f.; Hos. 2:13 ff.; 4:11 ff.; 13:2).

The same emphasis on moral righteousness, as contrasted with mere ritual, is also found in the Psalms (e.g. 40:7 f.; 50:8–15; 51:18 f.) and the Wisdom literature (cf. Prov. 15:8; 21:3, 27).

In the post-exilic period, sacrifice was restored soon after the return (Ezra 3:2–7). Darius authorized not only the rebuilding of the temple but provision for the cultus (Ezra 6:9 f.). Henceforth, the second temple remained the centre for Israelite religion (Ezra 6:17; 7:17; 8:35; 10:19; Neh. 10:33–37; 13:5, 9). But for Samaritan practice → Samaria. A Jewish colony in Egypt had its own temple at Elephantine which dates

from before 525 B.C., when Cambyses invaded Egypt. It was destroyed by opponents in 410 B.C. There was also a shrine at Lachish in the Hellenistic period, but without an altar for burnt offering. The Jerusalem temple was destroyed in A.D. 70, and with it the sacrificial rites died out. But already in NT times the growth of synagogue worship had tended to displace sacrificial ritual which could only be participated in at Jerusalem. The Qumran community had already cut itself off from the temple cult. Here obedience to the Torah and the community rule and the praise of God replaced material sacrifices. In the writings of Philo the cultic rites of the OT are given spiritual interpretations, although the practice of sacrifice is still endorsed by other late writings of the intertestamental period (cf. Jub. 50:11; Sib. 3:570–79; 1 Macc. 1:45; 2:68; 2 Macc. 1:19 ff.; 3:1 ff., 32 ff.; for a survey of views in later Judaism and Hellenism see J. Behm, *TDNT* III 186–89). In Yoma 8:8 f. repentance is said to effect atonement for lesser transgressions, although the sin offering, guilt offering and Day of Atonement are still necessary. (For rabbinic teaching see R. A. Stewart, *Rabbinic Theology: An Introductory Study*, 1961, 119–40.)

NT *thyō* and its cognates are found in various NT writings. The vb. *thyō* occurs chiefly in Lk. and Acts (4 times each; once each in Matt., Mk. and Jn.; twice in 1 Cor.). Out of the 28 instances of the noun *thysia* 15 are in Heb. (it occurs twice each in Matt., Lk. and Acts; 5 times in Paul; and once each in Mk. and Jas.). Of the 23 passages with *thysiastērion* 8 are in Rev., 6 in Matt., 4 in Paul, 2 each in Lk. and Heb., and 1 in Jas. The whole word-group retreats into the background in the Pauline corpus and the Johannine writings. Examination of the context of these passages reveals how far the NT writers have dissociated themselves from the OT cult. Even the allusions to the altar in the visions of Rev. which formally lean heavily on the imagery of the OT exhibit a new interpretation of the concept of sacrifice.

1. In the Synoptic Gospels Jesus is seen in confrontation with the Jerusalem temple cult. He does not reject it any more than the prophets. Rather he directs his polemic against the attempt to evade God's radical demand of love through ritual and hair-splitting observance of the law. In the Sermon on the Mount priority is given to reconciliation, but not to the exclusion of formal worship. "So if you are offering your gift at the altar, and there remember that your brother has something against you, leave your gift there before the altar and go; first be reconciled to your brother, and then come and offer your gift" (Matt. 5:23 f.). The saying presupposes the continued practice of Judaism (cf. Matt. 5:17 f.), and would thus fit into the earthly ministry of Jesus. D. Hill draws attention to the existence of the idea of reconciliation in contemporary Judaism (Yoma 8:9), but it was overshadowed by the desire to avoid desecrating the temple or defiling oneself (cf. CD 6:14–7:4) (*The Gospel of Matthew*, *New Century Bible*, 1972, 122). For Jesus, doing one's utmost to seek reconciliation between men is the *sine qua non* of true worship.

Hos. 6:6 is cited twice in Matt. On the first occasion the → Pharisees had complained that Jesus was guilty of defilement by eating with tax collectors and sinners. In reply Jesus says: "Those who are well have no need of a physician, but those who are sick. Go and learn what this means, 'I desire mercy, and not sacrifice.' For I came not to call the righteous, but sinners" (Matt. 9:12 f.; the par. in Mk. 2:13–17 and Lk. 5:27–32 omit the quotation). On the first part of the reply about "those who are well" → Heal, art. *hygiēs* NT 1 (b). The introductory words "Go and learn" are a

rabbinic formula (SB I 499), and correspond to Jesus' teaching method of appealing to → Scripture (cf. Matt. 5:17 f.; and Jn. 5:39). Although the precise relevance of the quotation is sometimes questioned (cf. D. Hill, op. cit., 174 f.), it is in fact germane to the issue and also in line with the previous teaching in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. 5:23 f.). For "sacrifice", as the highest form of Israelite worship, stands for the keeping of the Mosaic law, which itself demanded separation from anything that defiles as a prerequisite for worship. The greater includes the less. But Jesus makes the radical point that what defiles is not what the Pharisees think, i.e. formal association with sinners, but the heart which lacks → mercy (Heb. *ḥesed*). However, the radical demand is not something new, invented by Jesus. It is already present in the Scriptures which both Jesus and the Pharisees accept.

Hos. 6:6 is again appealed to in Matt.'s account of the disciples plucking the ears of grain on the → sabbath (Matt. 12:7 but not in the par. Mk. 2:23–28 and Lk. 6:1–5). Here too "sacrifice" stands for the observance of the religious prescriptions of the law, and the principle is the same. Humane considerations take precedence over formal observance of the letter of the law. Moreover, something greater than the → temple is here (Matt. 12:6). "And if you had known what this means, 'I desire mercy, and not sacrifice,' you would not have condemned the guiltless. For the Son of man is lord of the sabbath" (Matt. 12:7 f.).

In the series of woes pronounced on the scribes and Pharisees Jesus condemned the practice not only of swearing by the temple but also of swearing by the gold of the temple (Matt. 23:16 f.) and the altar and the sacrifice: "And you say, 'If any one swears by the altar, it is nothing; but if any one swears by the gift that is on the altar, he is bound by his oath.' You blind men! For which is greater, the gift or the altar that makes the gift sacred? So he who swears by the altar, swears by it and by everything on it; and he who swears by the temple, swears by it and by him who dwells in it; and he who swears by heaven, swears by the throne of God and by him who sits upon it" (Matt. 23:18–22; → Swear). The scribal rulings operated on the principle that oaths by the most holy things were to be avoided, because they were as binding as an oath made in God's name. But oaths made by less holy things were less serious and thus less binding (cf. D. Hill, op. cit., 312; SB I 931 f.). Jesus simply swept such rulings aside as chicanery. Men should not make an oath at all (whether before God or man), unless they intend to keep it (cf. Matt. 5:33–37). Again this later teaching illustrates the principles enunciated in the Sermon on the Mount.

In all this Jesus is not rejecting sacrifice and the temple as such; he is putting them in perspective. B. Gerhardsson has pointed out that Matt. does not present the death of Jesus as a sacrifice ("Sacrificial Service and Atonement in the Gospel of Matthew", in R. J. Banks, ed., *Reconciliation and Hope; New Testament Essays on Atonement and Eschatology Presented to L. L. Morris*, 1974, 25–35). "For Matthew, Jesus' deed is not a sacrifice from which mankind is only to reap the fruits. Jesus invites Israel to participate in the deep spiritual temple service he himself carries out" (op. cit., 31). For the terms in which Matt. presents the death of Jesus, see his use of *lytron*, "ransom" (Matt. 20:28; → Redemption) and Matt. 26:28 (→ Lord's Supper).

All four Gospels record the cleansing of the temple by Jesus (Matt. 21:10–17 par. Mk. 11:11, 15 ff.; Lk. 19:45 f.; Jn. 2:13–17). (For details of temple trade see J.

Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus*, 1969, 48 f.) In the Synoptics it occurs as a symbolic act after Jesus' entry into Jerusalem in the last week of his ministry. It represents his coming into his own and the purging judgment of God on God's own house. Jn. likewise sets the account before the Passover, but places it before his narrative of the public ministry of Jesus. It is possible to read the whole section of Jn. 2:13–22 as a detached pericope which John has placed, not in its chronological sequence, but as a kind of trailer epitomizing Jesus' relationship with the Jews. In the synoptic account Jesus cites Isa. 56:7 ("these will I bring to my holy mountain, and make them joyful in my house of prayer; their burnt offerings and their sacrifices will be accepted on my altar; for my house shall be called a house of prayer for all peoples") and Jer. 7:11 ("Has this house, which is called by my name, become a den of robbers in your eyes? Behold, I myself have seen it, says the LORD") in a conflated saying ("He said to them, 'It is written, "My house shall be called a house of prayer"; but you have made it a den of robbers' ", Matt. 21:13; cf. Mk. 11:17; Lk. 19:46; and Jn. 2:16). The saying combines the eschatological proclamation of Isaiah with Jeremiah's denunciation of the temple as it was in his day. Jesus' action is also a fulfilment of Mal. 3:1 ff. and was thus a messianic sign. The purification of Jerusalem and the temple was part of Jewish expectation (cf. Ps. Sol. 17:30). In Jn. 2:17 "His disciples remembered that it was written, 'Zeal for thy house will consume me' " (cf. Ps. 69:9). The Ps. itself adds: "and the insults of those who insult thee have fallen on me." This may well be implied in Jesus' action; the attitude of men to the temple expresses their attitude to God. Jn.'s narrative then compares the Jerusalem temple with the temple of Jesus' body – both of which are the dwelling place of God. And in both cases the attitude of the Jews of Jesus' day showed how oblivious they were to the presence of God among them.

Lk. 2:24 refers to the offering made by Joseph and Mary on behalf of their infant son (cf. Lev. 12:2–8; Exod. 13:2, 12) which consisted of two → birds on account of their poverty. Lk. 13:1 refers to the blood of those Galileans which Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices. Josephus does not mention this particular incident but describes Pilate's cruelty on another occasion (*War* 2, 175). In this connexion Jesus rebutted the inference that anyone who so suffered must have been particularly guilty of sin. "I tell you, No; but unless you repent you will all likewise perish" (Lk. 13:3). The later predictions of judgment on Jerusalem (Lk. 17 and 21) underline the warning.

The guilt of those who reject God's servants is expressed in the saying "that upon you may come all the righteous blood shed on earth, from the blood of innocent Abel to the blood of Zechariah the son of Barachiah, whom you murdered between the sanctuary and the altar" (Matt. 23:35 par. Lk. 11:51). Not only were these the first and last victims of murder in the OT (Gen. 4:8; 2 Chr. 24:21); they were also murdered in connexion with sacrifice. The words "the son of Barachiah" are generally explained as a copyist's error, in the light of Zech. 1:1, and that the allusion is to Zechariah the son of Jehoiada. Lk. omits the appellation. On this passage → also Rule, art. *metron* NT 1.

The *holokautōma*, whole burnt offering, is mentioned in Mark's account of the two great commandments. The scribe acknowledges that Jesus is right and adds "and to love him with all the heart, and with all the understanding, and with all the strength, and to love one's neighbour as oneself, is much more than all whole burnt offerings

and sacrifices" (Mk. 12:33; → Command; → Love). For the other instances of this term in Heb. 10:6, 8 see below 3.

Stephen's speech in Acts 7 similarly adopts a negative attitude to sacrifice. The first allusion is to the sacrifice to the golden calf (Acts 7:41; cf. Exod. 32:4, 6), and the second cites Amos 5:25 on the absence of sacrifice in the wilderness wanderings (cf. above OT 5). Stephen draws the conclusion that Israel's failure to worship God in a spiritual way resulted in God giving Israel over to paganism.

There is a distinct note of futility in the reference to a pagan altar in the account of Paul's Areopagus address: "Men of Athens, I perceive that in every way you are very religious. For as I passed along, and observed the objects of your worship, I found also an altar [*bōmon*] with this inscription, 'To an unknown god.' What therefore you worship as unknown, this I proclaim to you" (Acts 17:22). (On the use of the word *bōmos* for pagan altars in the Bible see above OT 2. It occurs only here in the NT. On this passage → God, art. *theos* NT 4 (b); → Knowledge, *agnoeō* NT 2 (b)).

2. The apostle Paul evidently continued to make occasional offerings himself. Acts 21:26 tells how Paul released four men who were under a vow: "Then Paul took the men, and the next day he purified himself with them and went into the temple, to give notice when the days of purification would be fulfilled and the offering presented for every one of them." The four men concerned had evidently undertaken a Nazirite vow (cf. Num. 6:1–21 and the Mishnah tractate Nazir; and Acts 18:18). By associating himself with the men in their vow Paul was consistent with his principle of being all things to all men in order to win them (1 Cor. 9:22; cf. H. L. Ellison, "Paul and the Law – 'All Things to All Men' ", in W. W. Gasque and R. P. Martin, eds., *Apostolic History and the Gospel: Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F. F. Bruce*, 1970, 195–202). Whereas Paul repudiated the extension of → circumcision to the Gentiles, he nevertheless kept the law among Jews. "To the Jews I became as a Jew, in order to win Jews; to those under the law I became as one under the law – though not being myself under the law – that I might win those under the law. To those outside the law I became as one outside the law – not being without law toward God but under the law of Christ – that I might win those outside the law" (1 Cor. 9:20 f.; cf. his rejection of circumcision in Gal. with his circumcision of Timothy, Acts 16:3). Similarly, Acts 24:17 f. reports how Paul made offerings (*prosphoras*) and was purified in the temple.

In his letters Paul took over the Jewish-Christian interpretation of the death of Jesus which saw its saving efficacy in terms of OT sacrificial language. In urging moral purity to the Corinthians, Paul writes: "Cleanse out the old leaven that you may be fresh dough, as you really are unleavened. For Christ, our paschal lamb, has been sacrificed. Let us, therefore, celebrate the festival, not with the old leaven, the leaven of malice and evil, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth" (1 Cor. 5:7 f.; → Leaven; → Feast, art. *pascha*). Rom. 3:25 sees Jesus' death as a *hilastērion*, propitiation (→ Reconciliation, art. *hilaskomai*). Rom. 15:16 sums up the grace of Paul's calling "to be a minister of Christ Jesus to the Gentiles in the priestly service of the gospel of God, so that the offering (*prosphora*) of the Gentiles may be acceptable, sanctified by the Holy Spirit." Here the Gentile Christians are the offering and Paul the priest (cf. the *minḥâh* of the Diaspora Jews in Isa. 66:20; SB III 153). In Phil. 4:18 Paul describes the gifts sent by the Philippians as "a fragrant offering, a sacrifice acceptable and pleasing to God." And in Phil. 2:17 he sees his own

impending martyrdom in similar terms: "Even if I am to be poured [*spendomai*] as a libation upon the sacrificial offering [*epi tē thysia kai leitourgia*] of your faith, I am glad and rejoice with you all" (cf. Phil. 1:19–26). It has been argued that the use of the vb. *spendomai* ("pour out") is never used of the pouring out of blood sacrifice, and that Paul has in mind not his death but his apostolic labours (cf. R. P. Martin, *Philippians*, *New Century Bible*, 1976, 108). However, the use of the word *thysia* and the fact that Paul was in prison expecting the possibility of execution suggest that Paul was thinking of his death, not as a propitiatory sacrifice but as a freewill offering for the sake of the church.

In Rom. 12:1 Paul sees the Christian life as a sacrifice: "I appeal to you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, to present your bodies as a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God, which is your spiritual worship." The word "therefore" implies that the act of total commitment is a response to all that has gone before. It is life, not ritual, which is now the true sacrifice of the people of God. For further discussion of this passage → Serve, art. *latreuō*; → Prayer, art. *entynchanō*.

Eph. 5:2 urges its readers to "walk in love, as Christ loved us and gave himself up for us, a fragrant offering and a sacrifice to God [*prosphoran kai thysian tō theō eis osmēn euōdias*]." M. Barth sees here a fusion of the unbloody and bloody sacrifices of the OT (the Heb. *minḥâh* and *ʿōlâh*), and draws two conclusions: "(a) The author designates Jesus Christ's death as an atoning sacrifice offered by the pouring out of blood. Sacrifice is not just a metaphor, but here – as much as in Rom. 3 and Hebrews – its essence and fulfilment are declared to be present on the cross. The author's theology and soteriology are priestly. (b) The reference to the 'love' of the one who was priest and victim at the same time shows that the prophetic, i.e. ethical and metaphorical meaning of sacrifice was joined with the cultic and priestly understanding. Equally in Heb. 9:14; cf. 5:7–9; 10:5–10, the 'Spirit' in which Jesus Christ brought his sacrifice, i.e. the obedience of the priest, is pointed out. In summary, the reference to the Messiah's death in Eph. 5:2 has a double function. The 'cross' (2:16) is a once and for all valid saving event that cannot be duplicated or imitated, *and* it is an example which is to be followed" (*Ephesians*, II, *Anchor Bible*, 1974, 558 f.).

In Corinth there was an acute problem for the church over whether Christians should eat meat that had been sacrificed to idols. The term *eidōlothyton* (Acts 15:29; 21:25; 1 Cor. 8:1, 4, 7, 10; 10:19; Rev. 2:14, 20) refers to meat which had been sacrificed according to the rites of the locality, and thus offered to a pagan deity, part of which had been burned on an altar, part eaten at a solemn meal in the temple and part sold in the market for domestic consumption (cf. A. Ehrhardt, "Social Problems in the Early Church. I: The Sunday Joint of the Christian Housewife", in *The Framework of the New Testament Stories*, 1964, 276–90; C. K. Barrett, "Things Sacrificed to Idols", *NTS* 11, 1964–65, 138–53). The eating of it was condemned by the Jerusalem council. The church of Pergamum was accused of allowing men to eat it and of practising immorality, as was the church of Thyatira. From the Jewish standpoint it was unclean and therefore forbidden. For the Christian it raised the question of whether eating such meat implied some kind of allegiance to or communion with a pagan deity. The strong at Corinth said that they could do it with good → conscience and impunity (cf. 1 Cor. 4:4, 10; 8:1 f.). But the scrupulous had a conscience about it. Paul replied that the Christian should be guided by love rather than

any vaunted "knowledge", and therefore Paul would not eat meat at all, if it caused others to stumble (1 Cor. 8:1–13). In the course of his argument he points out that it is God from whom all things exist, regardless of whether one regards idols as something or nothing (vv. 4 ff.). The Christian should be guided by concern for the conscience of others, rather than by what he feels from his own conscience (vv. 10 ff.). To participate knowingly in something offered to demons is to be a partner with demons, and as such is incompatible with partaking of the Lord's table (1 Cor. 19:19 ff.). On the other hand, where the Christian is unaware of demonic associations, he may eat the meat (10:23–30). But he should do everything to the glory of God, giving offence to none (10:31 ff.).

Between the two passages in which he deals with meat offered to idols Paul deals with the question of freedom and the Christian worker's right to upkeep. Alluding to Deut. 18:1, he asks: "Do you not know that those who are employed in the temple service get their food from the temple, and those who serve at the altar share in the sacrificial offerings?" (1 Cor. 9:13 with reference to the → Levites; cf. also 10:18; Heb. 13:10; J. Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus*, 1969, 105 f. 46–49, 105 f.; though the practice was also known in pagan religion).

3. The central theme of the Epistle to the Hebrews is the way in which, through Christ, believers enter into the reality of which the OT institutions represent only an anticipation. This is developed in terms of → angels (Heb. 1:5–2:18), → Moses (3:1 ff.), → rest (3:7–4:13), the high priesthood of Jesus which is after the order of → Melchizedek (4:14–7:21) and which thus supersedes the OT order of → priests, the new → covenant which supersedes the old (8:7–13; 10:15 ff.), the Day of Atonement ritual (9:1–10:39), and Mount Zion as compared with Mount Sinai (12:18–29). At the same time the epistle shows that God deals with men on the basis of → faith, just as he did under the old covenant (ch. 11).

The noun *thysia* occurs in the following passages. The function of the high priest is defined in terms of offering gifts and sacrifices for sin (5:1; cf. 8:3). But Jesus "has no need, like these high priests, to offer sacrifices daily, first for his own sins and then for those of the people; he did this once for all when he offered up himself" (7:27). The gifts and sacrifices of the old tabernacle "cannot perfect the conscience of the worshipper" (9:9). Their very repetition shows that they "can never take away sins. But when Christ had offered for all time a single sacrifice for sins, he sat down at the right hand of God" (10:11 f.; cf. the use of *prosphora*, offering, in vv. 14 and 18). The earthly tabernacle is but a copy of the heavenly one. "Thus it was necessary for the copies of the heavenly things to be purified by these rites, but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these" (9:23). Adopting the symbolism of the Day of Atonement ritual (Lev. 16), Christ is seen by his resurrection and ascension, following his death, as entering the inner sanctuary once and for all on behalf of his people. "Nor was it to offer himself repeatedly, as the high priest enters the Holy Place yearly with blood not his own; for then he would have had to suffer repeatedly since the foundation of the world. But as it is, he has appeared once for all at the end of the age to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself" (9:25 f.; cf. 10:1).

Heb. 10:5–10 sees the coming of Christ anticipated in Ps. 40:6 ff.: "Consequently, when Christ came into the world, he said, 'Sacrifices and offerings thou hast not desired, but a body hast thou prepared for me; in burnt offerings and sin offerings thou hast taken no pleasure. Then I said, "Lo, I have come to do thy will, O God," as

it is written of me in the roll of the book.' When he said above, 'Thou hast neither desired nor taken pleasure in sacrifices and offerings and burnt offerings and sin offerings' (these are offered according to the law), then he added, 'Lo, I have come to do thy will.' He abolishes the first in order to establish the second. And by that will we have been sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all." The Ps. is cited in the LXX which reads "a body didst thou prepare for me" in place of the MT "ears hast thou digged for me." This is best regarded as an interpretative paraphrase of the Heb. which uses the part for the whole (cf. F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, NLC, 1964, 232). The idea of "digging" refers to the fashioning of the human body, the imagery indicating obedience expressed in bodily action. Alternatively, the "digging" of the ear may refer to the custom of Exod. 21:6. The four types of sacrifice mentioned in vv. 5ff. are *thysia* (= *zeḇaḥ*), *prosphora* (also vv. 8 and 10) (= *minḥâh*), *holōkautōma* (= *ʿōlâh*), and *peri hamartias* (= *ḥaṭṭāʾṯ*). "The spiritual principles which underlay these various types of sacrifice are fulfilled and transcended in the perfect self-offering of Christ. Our author's contrast is not between sacrifice and obedience, but between the involuntary sacrifice of dumb animals and 'sacrifice into which obedience enters, the sacrifice of a rational and spiritual being, which is not passive in death, but in dying makes the will of God its own' " (F. F. Bruce, op. cit., 234, citing J. Denney, *The Death of Christ*, revised by R. V. G. Tasker, 1951, 131). Unlike the purificatory rites of the old covenant which required constant repetition, the offering of Christ effects the sanctification of believers once and for all (*ephapax*, v. 10). But "if we sin deliberately after receiving the knowledge of the truth, there no longer remains a sacrifice for sins" (10:26; cf. 3:12; 6:4–8; 10:29; 12:25 ff.). This denotes contempt of the most flagrant kind, comparable with the rebellion of the Israelites who failed to enter the promised land (cf. chs. 3 and 4; Ps. 95:7 f.; Num. 14:1–35).

Heb. 11:4 sees the essential difference between the sacrifices of Cain and Abel (Gen. 4:3–10) as lying in the fact that, "By faith Abel offered to God a more acceptable sacrifice than Cain, through which he received divine approval as righteous, God bearing witness by accepting his gifts; he died, but through his faith he is still speaking."

The sacrifices that remain for the Christian are those of praise and good living: "Through him then let us continually offer up a sacrifice of praise to God, that is, the fruit of lips that acknowledge his name. Do not neglect to do good and to share what you have, for such sacrifices are pleasing to God" (13:15 f.). The linking of praise with practical living shows that such sacrifice extends beyond liturgical worship. The argument is set in the context of a reminder that we have no lasting city on earth (v. 14), and the break with Judaism. The writer has earlier seen Christ's death in terms of the Day of Atonement tabernacle ritual. But now he argues that, "We have an altar [*thysiastērion*] from which those who serve the tent have no right to eat. For the bodies of those animals whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the high priest as a sacrifice for sin are burned outside the camp. So Jesus also suffered outside the gate in order to sanctify the people through his own blood. Therefore let us go forth to him outside the camp, bearing abuse for him" (13:10–13). The allusion is to the Day of Atonement animals (Lev. 16:27). The word "altar" is used by metonymy for "sacrifice", since the author does not have in mind a material altar (F. F. Bruce, op. cit., 399 f.). The saying is perhaps comparable with speaking of Christ

as a *hilastērion* (Rom. 3:25; → Reconciliation, art. *hilaskomai*). The "we" in question must mean "we Christians" (cf. 8:1) in contrast to the Jews who clung to the material sacrifices of the temple ritual. Those who do so have no right to feed on Christ. The absence of a visible altar (v. 10) is comparable with the absence of a visible city (v. 13). The Judaizers had both a visible altar and a visible city, Jerusalem, but not the spiritual reality. They also had material sacrifices in contrast to the spiritual sacrifices of praise and deed (v. 16). What the author has in mind is therefore something much wider than the eucharist, which he does not mention either here or by any reference to the bread and wine brought by → Melchizedek (7:1). It is only in writings of a much later date that the Lord's Table was spoken of as an altar (possibly Irenaeus, *Haer.* 4, 18, 6; Tertullian, *De Oratione* 19; *De Exhortatione Castitatis* 10; and regularly from Cyprian onwards; cf. B. F. Westcott, "On the history of the word *thysiastērion*", in *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, 1892², 453–61). *thysiastērion* is also mentioned in Heb. 7:13 in making the point that no one from a tribe other than that of Levi had ever served at the altar. But Jesus was descended from Judah (v. 14), which in itself is an indication that he was of a different order of priesthood.

4. The theme of the sacrifice of the Christian is taken up in 1 Pet. 2:4 f. in its assertion of the priesthood of all believers: "Come to him, to that living stone, rejected by men but in God's sight chosen and precious; and like living stones be yourselves built into a spiritual house, to be a holy priesthood, to offer spiritual sacrifices [*anenenkai pneumatikas thysias*] acceptable to God through Jesus Christ" (→ House; → Temple; → Priest; → Rock). This priesthood, which also includes being a holy nation, is defined in terms of declaring "the wonderful deeds of him who called you out of darkness into his marvellous light" (1 Pet. 2:9; cf. also Exod. 19:5 f.). It is grounded in the death of Christ which is described in sacrificial language. Thus the recipients of the letter are called "the exiles of the dispersion" (1:1), "chosen and destined by God the Father and sanctified by the Spirit for obedience to Jesus Christ and for sprinkling with his blood" (1:2a). The allusion here is probably to the enactment of the Mosaic covenant (Exod. 23:3–8) by which Israel was constituted the covenant people of God. It is by the death of Christ that believers of all nations are constituted the new people of God and the new priesthood of God. This latter thought takes up the symbolism of the consecration of Aaron and his sons to the priesthood (Exod. 29:19 ff.) who were likewise sprinkled with blood. 1 Pet. 1:18 f. sees the death of Christ as a ransom which is also understood in sacrificial terms and which in turn provides the basis for the Christian life: "You know that you were ransomed from the futile ways inherited from your fathers, not with perishable things such as silver or gold, but with the precious blood of Christ, like that of a lamb without blemish or spot" (→ Redemption, arts. *lyō* and *lytron*; → Blood; → Reconciliation, art. *hilaskomai*). "Since in 2:22–5 the writer draws deeply on Isa. 53 he may well have Isa. 53:7 in mind here (cf. Isa. 52:3 with its reference to redemption without money, suggestive of 1 Pet. 1:18)" (E. Best, *1 Peter*, *New Century Bible*, 1971, 90). The passover lamb and the atoning animal sacrifices in the OT were expected to be perfect (Exod. 12:5; 29:1; Lev. 22:17–25; Ezek. 43:22 f.; cf. Heb. 9:14). "The words serve to bring out the value of the sacrifice of Christ's blameless life (cf. 2:22)" (E. Best, op. cit., 90 f.).

5. In addition to the reference to *thysiastērion*, altar, noted above (Matt. 5:23 f.;

23:18 ff.; 23:35 par. Lk. 11:51; 1 Cor. 9:13; 10:18; Heb. 7:13; 13:10), altars are mentioned in the NT in the following passages. Zechariah received tidings of the birth of his son, John (the Baptist), from "an angel of the Lord standing on the right side of the altar of incense" (Lk. 1:11). The place indicates the solemnity and divine origin of the revelation. The right side was the south side, and the angel would be between the altar and the golden candlestick. On the north side was the table with the bread of the presence (cf. Exod. 40:22–27; → Incense; → Angel). Rom. 11:3 alludes to → Elijah's complaint in 2 Ki. 19:4: "Lord, they have killed thy prophets, they have demolished thy altars, and I alone am left, and they seek my life." The saying forms part of Paul's argument about the remnant and the people of God. God has not rejected his people, even though it may seem as if there are no godly men left. Just as God kept for himself seven thousand men who had not bowed the knee to Baal, so he keeps a remnant today. But it is by grace and not works (Rom. 11:4 ff.; cf. 1 Ki. 19:18). Jas. 2:21 asks: "Was not Abraham our father justified by works, when he offered his son Isaac upon the altar?" (→ Abraham; → Righteousness, art. *dikaiosynē* NT 7).

The remaining passages referring to altars all occur in Rev. The souls of the martyred saints are depicted under the altar crying out for vengeance (Rev. 6:9 f.). The vision is rich in OT allusions. Blood was poured out at the base of the altar (Lev. 4:7). Ps. 116:15 declares that "Precious in the sight of the LORD is the death of his saints." And the same Psalm speaks of commitment and thanksgiving in sacrifice (vv. 12–19). The cry recalls the death of Abel (Gen. 4:10; cf. Heb. 11:4). The sacrifices of the martyrs are in no sense atoning; but neither were all the sacrifices in the OT. The prayers of the saints have a sacrificial character: "And another angel came and stood at the altar with a golden censer; and he was given much incense to mingle with the prayers of all the saints upon the golden altar before the throne" (Rev. 8:3). The mingling of → incense indicates symbolically the hallowing of the prayers from a source outside man, without which his prayers would not be acceptable to God. The action of the angel in taking fire from the altar and throwing it on earth (Rev. 8:5) is a sign that the prayers are answered in the judgments that will befall the earth (cf. Rev. 6:9 f.). The judgment pronounced by "the voice from the four horns of the golden altar before God" (Rev. 9:13) again indicates the divine judgment in answer to the cries of the saints. The miniature golden altar of incense stood within the Holy Place of the tabernacle (Exod. 30:1–10). Similarly in Rev. 14:18 and 16:7 judgment comes from the altar.

In Rev. 11:1 John is told to "measure the temple of God and the altar and those who worship there." He is not, however, to measure the court outside the temple which is given over to the nations who will trample over the holy city for forty-two months (Rev. 11:2). The measuring symbolizes setting the holy places apart from that which is profane and will be subject to tribulation and judgment. But that which is set apart – the sanctuary which symbolizes the people of God – will come through the tribulation (cf. also Ezek. 40:5; 42:20; Zech. 2:1; → Rule, art. *metron*). Just as the sealed will come to no ultimate harm, so the sanctuary, which represents the true church which is sanctified by God himself, will be safe when the wrath of God falls on the holy city. *C. Brown*

→ Covenant, → Feast, → Gift, → Incense, → Lord's Supper, → Melchizedek, → Priest, → Reconciliation, → Redemption, → Salt, → Serve, → Sin

(a). Y. Aharoni, "Trial Excavation in the 'Solar Shrine' at Lachish", *Israel Exploration Journal* 18, 1968, 157–68; C. K. Barrett, "Things Sacrificed to Idols", *NTS* 11, 1964–65, 138–53; M. Barth, *Was Christ's Death a Sacrifice? SJT Occasional Papers* 9, 1961; and *Ephesians*, I–II, *Anchor Bible*, 1974; J. Behm, *thyō, thysia, thysiastērion*, *TDNT* III 180–90; S. Belkin, *Philo and the Oral Law*, 1940; E. Best, "Spiritual Sacrifice: General Priesthood in the New Testament", *Interpretation* 14, 1960, 280–90; and *1 Peter*, *New Century Bible*, 1971; F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, *NLC*, 1964; and "Altar, NT" *IDB Supplementary Volume*, 1976, 19 f.; H. Cazelles and R. Schnackenburg, "Sacrifice", *EBT* III 800–6; R. E. Clements, *A Century of Old Testament Study*, 1976; J. E. Coleran, "Origins of the Old Testament Sacrifice", *CBQ* 2, 1940, 130–44; O. Cullmann, *The Christology of the New Testament*, 1963[2]; G. Delling, *aparchē*, *TDNT* I 484 ff.; G. R. Driver, "Three Technical Terms in the Pentateuch", *JSS* 1, 1956, 97–105; A. Ehrhardt, "Social Problems in the Early Church. I: The Sunday Joint of the Christian Housewife", in *The Framework of the New Testament Stories*, 1964, 276–90; W. Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament*, I, 1961, 141–72; G. D. Fee, "II Corinthians vi.14–vii.1 and Food offered to Idols", *NTS* 23, 1976–77, 140–61; G. Fohrer, *History of Israelite Religion*, 1972; K. Galling, "Altar", *IDB* I 96–100; "Incense Altar", *IDB* II 699 f.; T. H. Gaster, "Sacrifices and Offerings, OT", *IDB* IV 147–59; B. Gerhardsson, "Sacrificial Service and Atonement in the Gospel of Matthew", in R. J. Banks, ed., *Reconciliation and Hope: New Testament Essays on Atonement and Eschatology Presented to L. L. Morris*, 1974, 25–35; G. B. Gray, *Sacrifice in the Old Testament: Its Theory and Practice*, 1925; J. Gray, "Cultic Affinities between Israel and Ras Shamra", *ZAW* 62, 1949–50, 207–220; A. Guglielmo, "Sacrifice in the Ugaritic Texts", *CBQ* 17, 1955, 196–216; M. Haran, "The Use of Incense in the Ancient Israelite Ritual", *VT* 10, 1960, 113–29; "The Complex of Ritual Acts Performed inside the Tabernacle", *Scripta Hierosolymitana* VIII, *Studies in the Bible*, ed. C. Rabin, 1961, 272–301; and "The Priestly Image of the Tabernacle", *Hebrew Union College Annual* 36, 1965, 191–226; and "*Zeḇaḥ hayyamîm*", *VT* 19, 1969, 11–22; M. Held, "Philological Notes on the Mari Covenant Rituals", *BASOR* 200, 1970, 32–40; D. R. Hillers, "Ugaritic *šnpt* 'Wave Offering' ", *BASOR* 198, 1970, 42; and "Additional Note", *BASOR* 200, 1970, 18; H. Hubert and M. Mauss, *Sacrifice: Its Nature and Function*, (1898) ET 1964; E. O. James, "Sacrifice (Introductory and Primitive)", *ERE* XI 1 ff.; *Origins of Sacrifice: A Study in Comparative Religion*, 1937[2]; and "Aspects of Sacrifice in the Old Testament", *ExpT* 50, 1938–39, 151–55; F. B. Jevons, *An Introduction to the History of Religion*, 1927[9]; D. Jones, "The Cessation of Sacrifice after the Destruction of the Temple in 586 B.C.", *JTS* New Series 14, 1963, 12–31; Y. Kaufmann, *The Religion of Israel*, 1961; D. Kellermann, *'āšām*, *TDOT* I 429–37; H.-J. Kraus, *Worship in Ancient Israel*, 1966; G. van der Leeuw, *Religion in its Essence and Manifestation*, 1964[2]; B. A. Levine, "The Descriptive Tabernacle Texts of the Pentateuch", *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 85, 1965, 307–18; "Comments on Some Technical Terms of the Biblical Cult", *Lešonenu* 30, 1966, 3–11; and *In the Presence of the Lord*, 1974; B. A. Levine and W. Hallo, "Offerings to the Temple Gates at Ur", *Hebrew Union College Annual* 38, 1967, 17–58; S. Lyonnet and L. Sabourin, *Sin, Redemption, and Sacrifice: A Biblical and Patristic Study*, *Analecta Biblica* 48, 1970; D. J. McCarthy, "The Symbolism of Blood and Sacrifice", *JBL* 88, 1969, 166–76; and "Further Notes on the Symbolism of Blood and Sacrifice", *JBL* 92, 1973; 205–10; W. T. McCree, "The Covenantal Meal in the Old Testament", *JBL* 45, 1926, 120–28; J. Milgrom, *Studies in Levitical Terminology*, I, 1970, 1–43; "The Function of the *ḥaṭṭā't* Sacrifice", *Tarbiz* 40, 1970–71, 1–8; "Sin-Offering or Purification-Offering", *VT* 21, 237–39; "Two kinds of *ḥaṭṭā't*", *VT* 26, 1976, 333–37; "Israel's Sanctuary: The Priestly 'Picture of Dorian Gray' ", *RB* 83, 1976, 390 ff; "Day of Atonement", *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, V, 1384–87; "Kipper", ibid., X, 1039–44; "Leviticus, Book of", ibid., XI, 138–47; *Cult and Conscience*, 1976; "Sacrifices and Offerings, OT", *IDB Supplementary Volume*, 1976, 763–71; "The Alleged Wave-Offering in Israel and in the Ancient Near East", *Israel Exploration Journal* 22, 1972, 33–8; and "A Prolegomenon to Leviticus 17:11", *JBL* 90, 1971, 149–56; T. C. Mitchell, "Altar", *NBD*, 27 f.; G. F. Moore, "Sacrifice", *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, IV 4183–4233; L. Morris, "'Asham", *EQ* 21, 1958, 196–210; W. O. E. Oesterley, *Sacrifices in Ancient Israel: Their Origin, Purposes and Development*, 1927; A. L. Oppenheim, *Ancient Mesopotamia*, 1964, 183–98, 206–27; W. P. Paterson, "Sacrifice", *HDB* IV 329–49; J. Pedersen, *Israel: Its Life and Culture*, III–IV, 1940, 299–375; G. von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, I, 1962, 250–72; A. F. Rainey, "The Order of Sacrifices in the Old Testament Ritual Texts", *Biblica* 51, 1970, 485–98; and "Sacrifice and Offerings", *ZPEB* IV 194–211; H. W. Robinson, "Hebrew Sacrifice and Prophetic Symbolism", *JTS* 48, 1942, 129–39; H. H. Rowley, "The Law and the Prophets", in *The Unity of the Bible*, 1953, 30–61; "The Meaning of Sacrifice in the Old Testament", *BJRL* 33, 1950–51, 74–110 (reprinted in *From Moses to Qumran: Studies in the Old Testament*, 1963, 67–110); and

"Ritual and the Hebrew Prophets", *JSS* 1, 1956, 338–60 (reprinted ibid., 111–38, and also in S. H. Hooke, ed., *Myth, Ritual and Kingship*, 1958, 236–60); E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*, 1977; P. Saydon, "Sin-Offering and Trespass-Offering", *CBQ* 8, 1946, 393–98; W. Robertson Smith, *The Religion of the Semites: The Fundamental Institutions*, (1889) 1927[3], ed., S. A. Cook; N. H. Snaith, "The Sin-Offering and the Guilt Offering", *VT* 15, 1965, 73–80; and "Sacrifices in the Old Testament", *VT* 7, 1957, 308–17; W. B. Stevenson, "Hebrew 'Olah and Zebach Sacrifices", in *Festschrift Alfred Bertholet*, 1950, 488–97; R. A. Stewart, *Rabbinic Theology: An Introductory Study*, 1961, 119–40; R. J. Thompson, *Penitence and Sacrifice in Early Israel Outside the Levitical Law*, 1963; R. J. Thompson and R. T. Beckwith, "Sacrifice and Offering", *NBD* 1113–23; E. B. Tylor, *Primitive Culture: Researches into the Development of Mythology, Philosophy, Religion, Language, Art, and Custom*, 1929[5]; D. M. L. Urie, "Sacrifice among the West Semites", *Palestine Exploration Quarterly*, 1949, 67–82; R. de Vaux, *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions*, 1961, 415–510; and *Studies in Old Testament Sacrifice*, 1964; T. C. Vriezen, *An Outline of Old Testament Theology*, 1958; K. Weiss, *prospherō, prosphora*, TDNT IX 65–8; B. F. Westcott, "On the History of the word *thysiastērion*", in *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, 1892[2], 453–61; R. B. Wright, *Sacrifice in the Intertestamental Literature*, (Dissertation, Hartford Seminary) 1966; R. K. Yerkes, *Sacrifice in Greek and Roman Religion and in Early Judaism*, 1952.

(b). M. Albertz, "Die 'Erstlinge' der Botschaft des Neuen Testaments", *EvTh* 12, 1952–53, 151 ff.; A. Bertholet, *Der Sinn des kultischen Opfers*, 1942; G. Bornkamm, "Lobpreis, Bekenntnis und Opfer", in *Apophoreta. Festschrift E. Haenchen*, 1964, 46 ff.; J. Carmignac, "L'Utilité ou l'Inutilité des Sacrifices Sanglants dans la *Règle de la Communauté* de Qumrân", *RB* 63, 1956, 524–32; A. Charbel, "Virtus Sanguinis non Expiatoria in Sacrificio *šᵉlāmîm*", *Sacra Pagina* 1, 1959, 366–76; P. Corssen, "Der Altar des unbekannten Gottes", *ZNW* 14, 1913, 309–23; S. Daniel, *Recherches sur le Vocabulaire du Culte dans la Septante*, 1966; R. Dussaud, *Les Origines Cananéennes du Sacrifice Israélite*, 1941[2]; O. Eissfeldt, *Erstlinge und Zehnte im Alten Testament*, 1917; K. Elliger, *Leviticus, Handbuch zum Alten Testament* 4, 1966; and "Zur Analyse des Sündeopfergesetzes", in A. Kuschke, ed., *Verbannung und Heimkehr*, 1961, 39–50; I. Fransen, "La Loi du Sacrifice", *Bible et Vie Chrétienne* 30, 1959, 21–30; K. Galling, *Der Altar in den Kulturen des Alten Orients*, 1925; G. Gerleman, "Der Wurzel *šlm*", *ZAW* 85, 1973, 1–14; H. J. Hermisson, *Sprache und Ritus im altisraelitischen Kult*, 1965; D. Hoffmann, *Das Buch Leviticus*, 1965; J. Hoftijzer, "Das sogenannte Feueropfer", *VT Supplements* 16, 1967, 114–34; J. Jeremias, *Der Opfertod Jesu Christi, Calwer Heft* 62, 1965[5]; E. Käsemann, *Das wandernde Gottesvolk*, 1957[2]; D. Kellermann, "*'āšām* in Ugarit", *ZAW* 76, 1964, 319–22; K. Koch, *Die israelitische Sühneanschauung und ihre historische Wandlungen*, 1956; J. Landersdorfer, *Studien zum biblischen Versöhnungstag*, 1924; G. van der Leeuw, "Die *do-ut-des* Formel in der Opfertheorie", *ARW* 20, 1920–21, 241 ff.; B. A. Levine, "Kippurim", *Eretz-Israel* 9, 1969, 88–95; A. Loisy, *Essai Historique sur le Sacrifice*, 1920; N. M. Loss, "La Partecipazione Dei Laici al Rito Dell' Olocausto", *Salesianum* 23, 1961, 353–62; and "Olocausto e Sacrificio Pacifico", ibid. 24, 1962, 525–33; E. Madar, *Die Menschenopfer der alten Hebräer und der benachbarten Völker*, 1919; A. Médebielle, *L'Expiation dans l'Ancien et le Nouveau Testament*, I, 1924; "De Sacrificii Israelitici Origine et Natura", *Verbum Domini* 7, 1926, 214–19, 338–44; and "Expiation", *Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplément*, III, 1938, 48–112; A. Metzinger, "Die Substitutionstheorie", *Biblica* 21, 1940, 159–87; O. Michel, *Der Brief an die Hebräer, KEK* 13, 1966[12]; L. Moraldi, "Terminologia Cultuale Israelitica", *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* 32, 1957, 321–37; and *Espiazione sacrificale e riti espiatori nell'ambiente biblico e nell' Antico Testamento*, 1956; S. Mowinckel, *Religion und Kultus*, 1953; H. G. Müller-Schwefe, "Die Bedeutung des Opfers für unsere Zeit", in *Zeitwende/Die neue Furche*, 1964, 163 ff.; R. Rendtorff, *Studien zur Geschichte des Opfers im alten Israel, WMANT* 24, 1967; R. Rendtorff, E. Kamlah, W. Anderson, "Opfer", *EKL* II 1691 ff.; L. Sabourin, *Rédemption Sacrificielle: Une Enquête Exégétique, Studia* 11, 1961; A. Schimmel, R. Hentschke, H. D. Wendland, E. Kinder, H. Beintker, "Opfer", *RGG*[3] IV 1637 ff.; R. Schmid, *Das Bundesopfer in Israel. Wesen, Ursprung und Bedeutung der alttestamentlichen Schelamim*, 1964; O. Schmitz, *Die Opferschauung des späteren Judentums und die Opferaussagen des Neuen Testaments*, 1910; D. Schötz, *Schuld- und Sündopfer im Alten Testament*, 1930; C. Spicq, *L'Épître aux Hébreux*, I–II, 1953[3]; A. Wendel, *Das Opfer in der israelitischen Religion*, 1927.

Sadducees, Herodians

Σαδδουκαῖοι	Σαδδουκαῖοι (*Saddoukaioi*), Sadducees.

The noun is always found in the plur. It designates a group, sect or party within Palestinian Judaism before and during the first century. It is usually assumed that the term goes back to the proper name Zadok (Heb. *Ṣāḏôq*; LXX *Saddouk*), the name of several priests, one as early as David's reign (2 Sam. 15:24 ff.; 17:15; 19:11) who with his family gained control of the high priesthood and temple under → Solomon (1 Ki. 2:35; 1 Chr. 29:22). "The Levitical priests, the sons of Zadok," minister in the sanctuary in Ezekiel's vision of the reconstructed temple (Ezek. 44:14). However, the identification of the Sadducees with the Zadokites is by no means certain, and there are conflicting traditions about their origin.

Information about the Sadducees with any claim to authenticity is found in only three bodies of ancient literature: (1) Josephus (*Ant.* 13, 117 ff., 293 ff.; 18, 11, 16 f,; 20, 199; *War* 2, 119, 162 ff.; *Life* 10); (2) the NT (Mk. 12:28 [par. Matt. 22:23; Lk. 20:27]; Matt. 3:7; 16:1, 6, 11, 12; 22:34; Acts 4:1; 5:17; 23:6, 7, 8); and (3) the Mishnah (Erubin 6:2; Makkoth 1:6; Parah 3:3, 7; Niddah 4:2; Yadaim 4:6, 7). There are numerous post-Mishnaic references to the Sadducees in the Talmud, but most are late, confused, unreliable, and sometimes makes "Sadducee" a synonym for "heretic" or → "Samaritan".

Josephus first mentions the Sadducees (*Ant.* 13, 293) in connexion with the reign of John Hyrcanus (135–105 B.C.) but assumes that they were a well-established group by that time. He says that they were rude in their conduct (*War* 2, 166; cf. *Ant.* 18, 16), few in number, included "men of high standing" (*Ant.* 18, 16), and held the "confidence of the wealthy alone" (*Ant.* 18, 293). When they assumed rule, the people tolerated them only when they reluctantly followed "the formulae of the Pharisees" (*Ant.* 18, 17).

Josephus usually refers to the Sadducees in the context of their continued controversy with the Pharisees. These groups differed because the Sadducees "own no observance of any sort apart from the laws" (*Ant.* 18, 16), by which Josephus means the Sadducees rejected the *oral law* ("regulations handed down by former generations and not recorded in the laws of Moses", *Ant.* 13, 297) which was authoritative for the Pharisees. The Sadducees also rejected belief in continued existence, bodily resurrection, or rewards and punishments after death (*War* 2, 165; *Ant.* 18, 16). Josephus twice notes Sadducean rejection of "Fate" (i.e., predestination); in order to dissociate God from evil they hold that "all things lie within our own power, so that we ourselves are responsible for our own well-being, while we suffer misfortune through our own thoughtlessness" (*War* 2, 164 f.; cf. *Ant.* 13, 173).

In the NT, Matt. 3:7–9 and 16:1–16 name the Sadducees along with the Pharisees as leaders of the Jewish people rebuked by both John the Baptist and Jesus. In Mk. 12:18–27 (par. Matt. 22:23–32, Lk. 20:27–39) the Sadducees, "who say that there is no resurrection", presented Jesus with a situation which to their notion made belief in the resurrection look ridiculous. Jesus constructed an argument based on the *written* law which silenced them (→ Resurrection, art. *anastasis* OT 4).

Acts places the Sadducees among the opponents of early Christians. In Acts 4:1 the Sadducees are associated with, but distinguished from, the priests; in 5:17, those

with the high priests are specifically identified as "the party of the Sadducees". Acts 4:2 tells that the opponents of the Christians were "annoyed because they were teaching the people and proclaiming in Jesus the resurrection from the dead." Acts 23:6–9 describes an uproar in the Jewish Council when Paul, perceiving the presence of both Sadducees and Pharisees, identified himself with the latter. Acts adds, "The Sadducees say that there is no resurrection, nor angels, nor spirits; but the Pharisees acknowledge them all."

Mishnaic and rabbinic references to the Sadducees describe them almost entirely in terms of their differences with the → Pharisees on ritual, ceremonial, and judicial matters. These issues involved a wide range of questions relating to such matters as the date and observance of certain feasts, → sabbath-keeping, the way sacrifices were to be offered and → temple ritual performed, the conduct and penalties in criminal cases, and procedures relating to ceremonial defilement and cleanliness (see L. Finkelstein, *The Pharisees*, 1940, II, 637 ff.; and J. W. Bowker, *Jesus and the Pharisees*, 1973, 53 ff.).

From these sources one might generalize as follows. The Sadducees came into existence during the intertestamental period, probably assuming their definitive stance after the Hasmonean priest-rulers gained firm control. They were closely associated with the priestly aristocracy (although not necessarily identical with it) and hence deeply involved in political matters. Like the priests, the Sadducees seem to have given at least some support to foreign influences (e.g., Hellenism) and powers (e.g., the Romans) present in Jewish Palestine in order to maintain their own position.

Their religious and theological views resulted from conservative, literal handling of the OT law. They were bitter opponents of the Pharisees for whom oral tradition was an attempt to interpret, up-date, and apply the written law in the face of changing circumstances. The Sadducees had their own traditions and hermeneutical methods which accepted the written law (i.e., the Pentateuch) alone as authoritative. Hence they refused the mass of post-biblical developments associated with Pharisaism, including belief in the imminence of divine activity and life after death.

The Sadducees were essentially secularists. This doubtless resulted from their exclusion of God ("Fate") from human history and their limitation of man's existence and blessing to this life. The consequences of their this-worldly orientation were many. For example, they went to great lengths to protect their power and prestige; many of their ceremonial positions, Lauterbach observes, benefited the priests financially.

These motives stirred the Sadducees to opposition against Jesus and the Jewish church. Jesus' preaching and activities posed a threat to the political *status quo* and the dominance of the priestly party within it (cf. Jn. 11:47 ff.). Jesus' emphasis upon the spiritual realm, his attacks upon the external religion of Jewry, and the popular acceptance accorded Jesus and his followers could have endangered the already precarious position of the Sadducees. Furthermore, Christianity was in agreement with much in the position of the Sadducees' enemies, the Pharisees. However, the Sadducees found one emphasis of Christian doctrine more objectionable than any Pharisaic teaching. While the latter taught the resurrection as a theory and future possibility, the Christians taught it as a present reality, accomplished in Jesus (cf. Acts 4:2).

The Sadducees were closely associated with the external institutions and concerns

of the Jerusalem-centred Judaism of the first and preceding centuries. With the destruction of the Second Jewish Commonwealth by the Romans, c. A.D. 70, Sadducean influence was lost. *J. Julius Scott, Jr.*

Ἡρῳδιανοί *Ἡρῳδιανοί* (*Hērōdianoi*), Herodians.

Although, as their name implies, the Herodians appear to have been supporters of the house of Herod, little is known about them. They are twice reported in the Gospels to have joined forces with the Pharisees in efforts to destroy Jesus. The first instance is the direct outcome of the sabbath healing of the man with the withered hand in a Galilean synagogue (Mk. 3:6). The second incident takes place in Jerusalem when the question is raised about paying tribute to Caesar (Matt. 22:16; Mk. 12:13). Josephus mentions *hoi ta Hērōdou phronountes* in Judea (*Ant.* 14, 450) and *Hērōdeioi* in Galilee (*War* 1, 139). Both Gk. expressions mean "partisans of Herod", but are unlikely to refer to the *Hērōdianoi* of the Gospels. In some circles they may have been known as Boethusians, a family providing many high priests in the 1st cent. A.D. But Mark does not use that term, and probably a rather amorphous group of pro-Herod aristocrats is intended by "Herodians" in the gospels.

H. H. Rowley (*JTS* 41, 1940, 14–27) reviews various interpretations of *Hērōdianoi*. He concludes that the Herodians were not members of Herod's domestic staff, for the Pharisees would hardly associate with such a class, let alone propose an alliance, implying equal status. Neither were the Herodians court officers, for to bring along those with official positions to question Jesus would be to menace him rather than lay a subtle snare against him. Nor are court officers accustomed to enquire of any beneath them as to the legality of the taxes they themselves levy. Herodians as a term, therefore, is likely to refer not to an organized party but to men of a particular political outlook, that of support for the house of Herod, and thus, as the best way to achieve that end, of support for the occupying Roman power. A. Schalit (*König Herodes*, 1969, 479–81) suggests that Herodians were men whose friendship Herod the Great bought in an effort to improve public relations. The Jews had an intense dislike of Herod and all his works.

It seems more probable that the Herodians arose during the principality of Antipas, who apparently adopted the name of Herod after the deposition of Archelaus. Herod the Great had not thought Jews fit for autonomy, or had not dared to entrust them with it. His cities had all been pagan, and the towns he had built on Jewish soil had been administered by his own officials. Antipas rebuilt Sepphoris, demolished by Varus in 4 B.C., and founded a new city on the West shore of the Sea of Galilee, naming it Tiberias after his imperial patron. As a cautious experiment, Antipas brought in Jewish officials to govern both cities, each with a regular Greek constitution. Thus Antipas proved that he could depend on the loyalty of the Jewish upper classes, who filled all the offices in councils and magistracies. Antipas' quarrel with Pilate, whatever its origin, no doubt caused his stock to rise among the populace, for there was widespread dissatisfaction with Pilate's rule. Many leading Jews had also been affronted at the low rank of the Roman governors sent to their province after the death of Herod the Great. The rule of the procurators had originated in the desire

of the Jews not to suffer another Herod the Great. But when they found that procuratorial rule was even less bearable, there was an upsurge of general support for the house of Herod in the person of Antipas. That support was in part given expression by the appearance in his reign of the Herodians, who as a group probably included not only the official aristocracy which Antipas had created, but other Jews of influence and standing. While the Herodians were pro-Roman, as the test question to Jesus about the tribute-money shows, they aimed at the indirect rule of Rome, mediated through its loyal agents, the Herodian dynasty (Origen, *Comm.* on Matt. 22:16). Furthermore, the Herodian kings might be a useful buffer against the arrogance and intolerance of the average equestrian governor. Antipas' experiment was justified by the results. The governing classes of Sepphoris and Tiberias remained outstandingly loyal to the Herodian house and to the Roman government during the Great Rebellion (A. H. M. Jones, *The Herods of Judea*, 1938, 179).

The Pharisees were no friends of the Herods, but for them to ally with the Herodians in the tribute-money incident is understandable. Both parties were seeking to get rid of Jesus as a potential trouble-maker, as they saw it, whose activities would sooner or later cause the Romans to intervene and thereby threaten the Jewish establishment. But why did the Pharisees turn to the Herodians in the other incident of the healing of the man with the withered hand in the synagogue on the sabbath? The issue, on the surface at least, is one involving the Torah. But the Herodians were apparently more concerned with political than with religious issues. Indeed, they seem not to have been present at the service, since it is said only of the *Pharisees* that they went out of the synagogue to take counsel with the Herodians (Mk. 3:6). At other times the Pharisees were prepared to swallow their dislike of the Sadducees and work with them in order to try to discredit Jesus (Matt. 16:1). Geography prevented a similar alliance on this occasion. The aristocratic priestly party of the Sadducees was based only on Jerusalem. By contrast, Pharisees were to be found all over the country. The controversial healing of the withered hand took place in Galilee. The Pharisees had to turn for support to the Herodians as the only other influential body in the area. The Herodians might not be interested in the religious question involved in Jesus' apparent breach of the sabbath, but they were concerned with preventing trouble which might lead to disturbances and so threaten the political and social order. The Herodians had a vested interest in maintaining the *status quo*. The Pharisees opposed Jesus on religious grounds for what they regarded as disrespect for the law, the Herodians on political grounds, for his messianic claims conflicted with their hopes for the restoration of Herodian rule in Judea.

Although he had an interest in the Herods, Luke never mentions the Herodians in his parallel accounts of the two incidents (Lk. 6:6–11; 20:20–26), presumably because Herodians would have had little significance for his readers. The absence of references to Herodians outside the gospels suggests their presence was short-lived.

In Mk. 8:15 some MSS read, "Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and the leaven of the Herodians" (the better attested reading is *Herod*), while the parallel passage in Matt. 16:6 speaks of Pharisees and *Sadducees*. But the equation that all Herodians were Sadducees is unlikely, though probably some were. (The two parties are mentioned as separate groups in Matt. 12:13, 18.) Politically, the Sadducees seem to have remained loyal to the memory of the Hasmoneans, a fact which Herod the Great recognized by never choosing a high priest from the Hasmonean house

(Josephus, *Ant.* 15, 22, 39–41, 320–322). Geographically, the Sadducees were centred solely on Jerusalem, whereas at Mk. 3:6 Herodians are also to be found in Galilee. In Jerusalem, however, where Herodians and Sadducees were likely to meet, the two parties would naturally tend to support one another on many issues. Both were the aristocrats of the day. Both depended for their positions on an understanding with the house of Herod. The marriage of Herod Antipas with Herodias about A.D. 29 may well have brought the two groups together. *N. Hillyer*

On the Sadducees:
(a). S. W. Baron, *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*, II, 1953, 35 ff.; J. W. Bowker, *Jesus and the Pharisees*, 1973, 53 ff.; G. H. Box, "Who were the Sadducees?", *The Expositor*, Eighth Series 15, 1918, 19–38; and "Scribes and Sadducees in the New Testament", ibid., 401–11, and 16, 1918, 55–69; W. W. Buehler, *The Pre-Herodian Civil War and Social Debate*, 1974, 95 ff.; E. E. Ellis, "Jesus, the Sadducees, and Qumran", *NTS* 10, 1963–64, 274 ff.; L. Finkelstein, *The Pharisees*, II, 1940, 637 ff.; D. A. Hagner, "Sadducees", *ZPEB* V, 211–16; P. Z. Lauterbach, "The Sadducees and Pharisees", in *Rabbinic Essays*, 1951, 23 ff.; J. W. Lightley, *Jewish Sects and Parties in the Time of Jesus*, 1925, 11–78; T. W. Manson, "Sadducees and Pharisees – The Origin and Significance of the Names", *BJRL* 22, 1938, 144–59; R. Meyer, *Saddoukaios*, *TDNT* VII 35–54; Schürer, II, 2, 29 ff.; M. H. Segal, "Pharisees and Sadducees", *The Expositor*, Eighth Series 13, 1917, 81 ff.; M. Simon, *The Jewish Sects at the Time of Jesus*, 1967, 22 ff.; A. C. Sundberg, "Sadducees", *IDB* IV 160–63.
(b). G. Hölscher, *Der Sadduzäismus*, 1906; R. Leszynsky, *Die Sadduzäer*, 1912; SB IV 334–52; M. Wagner, *Die Parteiungen im jüdischen Volke zur Zeit Jesu*, 1893; J. Wellhausen, *Die Pharisäer und die Sadducäer*, 1874.
On the Herodians:
(a). B. W. Bacon, "Pharisees and Herodians in Mark", *JBL* 39, 1920, 102–12; W. J. Bennett, Jr, "The Herodians in Mark's Gospel", *NovT* 17, 1974, 9–14; L. Finkelstein, *The Pharisees*, I–II, 1938; M. Grant, *The Jews in the Roman World*, 1975; H. W. Hoehner, *Herod Antipas*, 1972; A. H. M. Jones, *The Herods of Judaea*, 1938; H. H. Rowley, "The Herodians in the Gospels", *JTS* 41, 1940, 14–27; E. M. Smallwood, *The Jews under Roman Rule*, 1976.
(b). E. Bikerman, "Les Hérodiens", *RB*, 47, 1938, 184–97; P. Joüon, "Les 'Hérodiens' de l'évangile", *RSR*, 28, 1938, 585–8.

Salt

ἅλας

ἅλας (*halas*); ἅλς (*hals*), salt; ἁλυκός (*halykos*), salty; ἁλίζω (*halizō*), to salt, season with salt; ἄναλος (*analos*), saltless, insipid; συναλίζω (*synalizō*), to assemble with, eat (salt) with.

CL *halas*, or, more commonly, *hals*, salt (from Homer); poetically, the sea; proverbially, to have eaten a bushel of salt together, i.e., be old friends; to eat the proverbial salt in company, i.e., be bound by ties of hospitality (Aristot.). *halizō*, to supply with salt, to salt food (Aristot.); to collect, assemble, as military forces, fragments, etc. (Hdt.). *halykos*, salty (Aristoph.); *analos* (Aristot.) or *analmos* (Xen.), without salt, unsalted. *synalizō*, frequently in Hdt. and Xen., to bring together, collect; or if derived from *hals*, to eat (salt) with, eat at the same table. The passive means to come together, assemble.

The domestic and medicinal value of salt both as condiment and preservative was as universal in the ancient world as it is today. Pliny declared that "salt has something of the nature of fire", and he quotes a current saying, "To the whole body nothing is better than sun and salt" (*Nat. Hist.* 31, 98, 102). Salt on sacrifices no doubt originated from the primitive conception of sacrifice as the meal of a god

(Homer), but the association of salt with the deity (Plato) also balanced the notion of putrefaction and corruption being linked with demons. Lasting alliances were made by eating bread and salt, or salt alone (Aristot.). Cato, Virgil, and Pliny all refer to the ability of salt to improve the productivity of the soil.

OT The Heb. verb *mālaḥ*, to salt, is translated in the LXX by *halizō*, and the corresponding noun *melaḥ* by *hals*, *hala*, or *halas*. *halykos* occurs only in reference to the Dead Sea (Num. 34:3). It is used three times in Gen. 14 in an effort to interpret rather than translate the obscure Heb. term *śiddîm*, valley of Siddim, later submerged beneath the Salt Sea after the divine judgment upon Sodom and Gomorrah.

Apart from various outcrops, the main source of salt in Palestine was from the so-called Hill of Salt (Jebel Usdum) which stretched for some seven miles along the SW corner of the Dead Sea. Salt was also obtained by evaporation from water in salt pits in the same area (Zeph. 2:19; 1 Macc. 11:35) and from the incrustation of marshes along the shore (Ezek. 47:11). Incrustation salt was much less bitter, since as the saline water rose through the marsh soil much of the magnesium chloride causing the bitterness was absorbed. Salt was a necessity of life in Palestine (Ezr. 7:22; Sir. 39:26), as elsewhere in the ancient world, for a people whose diet was vegetables. The consequent commercial value of salt is illustrated by many references to taxation (1 Macc. 10:29), and to the Torah's being likened to salt "which the world cannot do without" (Sopherim 15:8). Salt was used to preserve fish and meat (Bar. 6:28), as a condiment (Job 6:6), and for toothache (Shabbath 6:5). The practice of rubbing a newborn baby with salt (Ezek. 16:4), still done among Arabs, may have been to preserve life, or to drive away evil spirits (T. Canaan, *Dämonenglaube im Land der Bibel*, 1929, 42), or to signify separation from its unclean state immediately after birth (J. Gray, *I & II Kings*, 1964, 427 f.).

The impressive scene of desolation around the Salt (Dead) Sea formed a natural boundary (Num. 34:3), and a perpetual reminder of the ability of large quantities of salt to destroy vegetation (Deut. 29:23) and leave an area uninhabitable (Jer. 17:6). Sowing an enemy city with salt after its capture (Jdg. 9:45) may not have implied using massive quantities to render the ground useless for cultivation. Token amounts could be sprinkled as a sign of cursing the city with infertility and barrenness (F. C. Fensham, *BA* 25, 1962, 48–50). No doubt the impure water at Jericho was a side-effect of the curse pronounced upon any who rebuilt the city (Jos. 6:26; 1 Ki. 16:34). The miracle of healing carried out by Elisha (2 Ki. 2:19–22) at the beginning of his ministry made use of the symbolism of salt staying corruption and death. "Sin must be cleansed at the fountain-head in the heart, not half a mile down the stream, in the deeds. Put the salt in the spring, and the outflow will be sweet" (A. Maclaren, *The Book of Kings*, 1906, 345). Small amounts of salt sprinkled on fodder were beneficial as an antiseptic for animals (Isa. 30:24), and a light application on soil to improve its quality for crop-bearing was well known. To eat someone's salt, i.e., his bread, was to be on friendly terms with him, to enjoy his hospitality. To eat the salt of the palace (Ezr. 4:14) was in practice to be on the royal pay-roll (cf. salary, from Lat. *salarium*, the allowance made to Roman soldiers for the purchase of the ever-necessary *sal*, salt). But the uppermost thought behind the expression is that of loyalty in the relationship of employee to employer. Similarly, the salt of the covenant (Lev. 2:13)

refers to the solemn irrevocable character of the relationship between God and his people. Hence the custom of salting all sacrifices (Exod. 30:35; Ezek. 43:24). *DCG* (art. "Salt") curiously declares that salt with sacrifices typified the prevention of putrefaction. H. C. Wilson (*ExpT* 35, 1923–4, 136 f.) points out that sacrifices were consumed not preserved, and salt was certainly not necessary to preserve cereals (Lev. 2:13). The symbolism was of the permanency of the covenant with God. The sacred incense (Exod. 30:35) and, according to the Mishnah, even the wood for the sacrificial fire (Menahoth 20b) were likewise sprinkled with salt. In Lev. 21:8, 17 such salted sacrifices are even termed the food of God (see above, CL). This is not to imply a pagan notion of divine need. Rather the allusion is to indispensability: as salt is essential to man, so sacrifice (i.e., the covenant signified by sacrifice) is essential to the divine-human relationship (Jn. 6:51). In rabbinic Judaism the cultic significance is weakened: "This is an eternal covenant with the Lord concluded with salt. Scripture (= God) made a covenant with Aaron by means of something (salt) which is not only in itself wholesome but which keeps other things (e.g., the covenant) wholesome" (Mid. Siph. Num. 118 on 18:19). Rabbinic instructions to the disciples of scribes included the exhortation to be modest and of a humble spirit, industrious and (lit.) *salted* (Derek 'Ereṣ Zuta). Here salt seems to mean wise, bright, sagacious (W. Nauck, *StTh* 6, 1952, 165–78). The same phrase occurs in the Mishnah: If a son is industrious and intellectually bright, the study of the Torah by the son takes precedence over its study by his father (Kiddushin 29b). Less seriously, witty speech is likened to salt (Kethuboth 66b).

NT Salt is mentioned in six passages. In Matt. 5:13 commentators usually take salt to be a preservative, but the context (*tēs gēs*, of the earth) more probably suggests the stimulating property of salt as a fertilizer: "for if the salt has lost its true nature, *en tini halisthēsetai*, with what shall it [*gē*] be salted?" This is a more edifying idea than the delay of putrefaction. Jesus came not to keep the world from putrefying but to save it (Jn. 3:17) and to provide life in abundance (Jn. 10:10). In quoting the same saying, Luke (14:34) and Mark (9:50) also indicate by their use of *artyō*, to season, that bringing out the quality, in food or soil, is meant. There is only one instance of salt being used to prevent putrefaction, a reference to the priests' wives salting down the priestly portion of sacrificial meat for later use by their families (Bar. 6:28). *hymeis este to halas tēs gēs* in Matt. 5:13, therefore, is best translated "You are salt *for* the soil" (*tēs gēs*, objective genitive), and balanced in the parallelism with 5:14, "You are light for the world" (*tou kosmou*). See E. P. Deatrick, *BA* 25, 1962, 41 ff. Though one cannot see salt which has been added to food, it can be tasted. Salt is noticed by the tongue, and light by the eye, and in either case the user is gratified. A city on a hill cannot be hidden, even at night because of its lights. Salt in food, or its absence, cannot be kept from the knowledge of the eater. "What can you salt with flavourless salt, or what can you illumine with a hidden lamp? Let your stimulating power be so evident that men will recognize the source of your good works" (W. R. Hutton, *ExpT* 58, 1946–7, 166–8). K. Bornhäuser (*Die Bergpredigt*, in *Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie*, 2.7, 1927, 45) draws attention to the emphatic *hymeis*, you, at the beginning of Matt. 5:13 and 14. The Sermon on the Mount has to be understood as being of a piece with Christ's opposition to the scribes and Pharisees. It is not they who are the salt and light, but his disciples. So Jesus calls his

disciples the real teachers, the true wise men, as against the Jewish wise men (→ Scribes). Savourless salt and a covered lamp are alike useless; so the Christian disciple who fails to be stimulating and bright in the work that God wants done is good for nothing. (Cf. a similar combination of light and wisdom in Eph. 5:8, 15 f.)

The stability of sodium chloride as a chemical compound has raised a problem about salt being said to be liable to lose its quality of saltness. Jesus is referring to one of the impure salts of Palestine in everyday use which can and does lose its savour through physical disintegration or through being mixed with wind-blown gypsum dust (Pliny, 3, 31, 34). This suggests that "*if* [*ean*] the salt has lost its savour" should be translated (as it may) as *whenever*, since what follows is not a condition contrary to fact but a real possibility.

Local colour on how Palestine salt can lose its savour is suggestive. (a) W. M. Thomson (*The Land and the Book*, 1882, 362) tells of a merchant of Sidon who imported twenty years' supply of incrustation salt and stored it in mountain cabins to evade the salt tax, only for the salt, in too close contact with the damp earthen floor, to disintegrate and leach away. (b) Blocks of salt were used by the village baker in his oven to maintain a moist atmosphere, so that the soft bread could later be torn into sops for dipping into stews. The intense heat over a period of time would cause the salt to deteriorate. The bread then turned out hard and to the eastern diner unpalatable, and the savourless salt had to be dug out and replaced. (c) At Gebul, near Aleppo, are sparkling veins of salt alongside a hill. The salt on the surface, exposed to rain, sun and air tastes like sand. But salt extracted from below the surface, in contact with the rock, is perfect. Spent natural salt cannot regain its quality, but the faltering disciple can be restored – by getting back to the Rock which is Christ. Present-day shepherds use the term "salt of the earth" as an idiom for rock-salt. (d) In modern Israel savourless salt is spread on the soil on the flat roofs of houses, thus making it hard and serving to prevent leaks. Since the flat roof is used as a meeting-place for adults and as a play-ground for children, the useless salt can still be said to be trodden under foot.

The difficulty of understanding Mk. 9:49 was evident from the earliest days. There are three major textual forms. The best attested reading is "for everyone will be salted with fire". Other MSS have "for every sacrifice will be salted with salt" (Lev. 2:13), or a combination of both readings. Even at the beginning of this century, H. A. W. Meyer could list fourteen different interpretations of the verse (B. Weiss, *Die Evangelien des Markus und Lukas*, 1901, 153–5). If nothing else, it highlights the problems surrounding this logion, and the verse following, and their connexion, if any, with the preceding sayings. Literary critics have usually concluded that an editor brought together the whole passage Mk. 9:42–50 on little more than catchwords: *skandalizō*, cause to stumble; *gehenna*, hell; *pyr*, fire; *halas, hals*, salt.

The secondary textual form may be right in interpreting "salted with fire" as a reference to the Christian disciple being seasoned with salt like the OT sacrifices. This will take place through trials (1 Pet. 1:7, 4:12; cf. 1 Cor. 3:13) and everything contrary to God will be purged away (F. Hauck, *TDNT* I 228 f.; W. Nauck, *StTh* 6, 1952, 165–78). The self-sacrifice metaphor in the whole context is appropriate to a situation of suffering and testing in which the principle of sacrifice is severely tried. Understood in this way, Jesus' word is a challenging pronouncement on suffering which sheds light on the experience of the church in Nero's Rome (W. L. Lane, *The*

Gospel according to Mark, *NLC*, 1974, 349). But F. C. Burkitt saw nothing about sacrifice in the entire passage. Cutting off the hand, etc., is not a sacrifice but a precaution. The only salting of a living person in Hebrew literature is Ezek. 16:4 (the newborn infant). The custom might have been in Jesus' mind, for the context is about "entering into life" and "little ones" (Mk. 9:42 f.). *halisthēsetai*, will be salted, may refer to the first bath of a Jewish infant (*JTS* 17, 1915, 16–18). T. J. Baarda (*NTS* 5, 1958–9, 318–21) suggests from the possible equivalence of the Gk. *halizō* and the Aram. *tabbel* that through a mishearing of the spoken word, derivative forms from the Aram. roots *tbl* and *ṭbl* were confused. An original *mitṭ^{e}ḇel* (baptized) may have been mistaken for *mittaḇal* or *m^{e}ṭabbal* (seasoned, salted), so that the translator targumized the Aram. with *halisthēsetai* (will be salted) where he should have written *baptisthēsetai* (will be baptized). A curious coincidence supports the possibility. Matt. 3:11 and Lk. 3:16 are the only NT passages in which baptism by fire is mentioned. In the same two passages the phrase *pyr asbeston* (unquenchable fire) appears, and this otherwise occurs only in Mk. 9:43, with the verbal form in 9:48, *to pyr ou sbennytai*, the fire is not quenched (Isa. 66:24). Fire is used as a metaphor of purification in rabbinic writings (Sanhedrin 39a; Siphre Num. 158 on 31:23), and similarly salt (Berakoth 5a).

The organic union of Mk. 9:49 and 9:50 has been questioned. The latter saying occurs in a different context in Matt. 5:13 and Lk. 14:34, and there seems no logical coherence in referring in Mk. 9:50a to something which is already a possession of the disciples of Jesus. The context of Mk. 9:50 shows that the evangelist took the saying to be part of Jesus' teaching to his disciples (9:35, he sat down, as teacher, and called the Twelve around him). Matthew and Luke both employ *mōrainomai*, usually in Gk. of a human characteristic (to become foolish), rather than a quality of things (to become savourless). But the Aram. *sry* or *sr'* has a similar double meaning, as does the Heb. *tpl*. *mōrainomai* maintains the rabbinic background of the saying, according to which savourless/foolish and salt/wisdom were associated. W. Nauck, therefore, understands "Have salt in yourselves" in the same sense as in the rabbinic instruction to disciples of scribes to be wise (→ OT). In Mk. 9:50 eschatological wisdom is meant, the wisdom of disciples lived out in their religious attitude, faith, and conduct, keeping in mind the last events to come (Matt. 10:16; Eph. 5:15 f.). These eschatological events provide the organic link between verses 49 and 50 in Mk. 9 (*StTh* 6, 1952, 165–78). Salt as Christian wisdom was taken up as a metaphor by the early church (Ephrem Syrus, Gelasian Sacramentary).

The last phrase of Mk. 9:50, *eirēneuete en allēlois*, be at peace with one another, resembles the continuation of the rabbinic instruction to scribes: "They should suffer insult and should be liked by all men." The last sentence of Mk. 9:50 is an example of two Gk. imperatives in conditional parataxis, linked by the consecutive *kai*: "Have salt in yourselves, *then* you will be able to maintain peace with one another" (Funk *§* 442 (2)).

If the disciple is thought of as a sacrifice (Rom. 12:1), "have salt in yourselves" is apt. Without it, their sacrifice, however great, would be of no use. "Be at peace with one another" follows on easily from "have salt in yourselves", for the disciples had just been arguing about who would be greatest (Mk. 9:34). But there should be no quarrel among the sacrifices as to whether the flesh, whole burnt-offering, cereal, or incense is the more important. All, if offered with salt, were acceptable. Salt was salt,

whether offered in one class or another. Furthermore, salt made those who ate at the common table friends. There should be no quarrelling among friends. Such a covenant was inviolable, and so the treachery of Judas is portrayed, it is said, by the upsetting of the salt in the picture of the Last Supper by Leonardo da Vinci (W. R. Hutton, *ExpT* 58, 1946–7, 168).

Because of the reading *salem*, for *sal*, in the Lat. text of Codex Bezae (d), J. R. Harris suspects a Latinism in the Gk. text, in which by word-play *salem* is mystically interpreted as peace, Heb. *šālôm* (cf. Heb. 7:2). See *ExpT* 35, 1923–4, 403–5; 48, 1936–7, 185 f.

A reference to ancient practices throws light upon the unity and meaning of the whole passage Mk. 9:42–50. Amputation of the hand was known in biblical times (Deut. 25:22). Ancient peoples in general cut off hands or feet, as the guilty members, in cases of theft, robbery, or forgery. Similarly, the eye was taken for adultery (Job 31:1; Gen. 19:11; Matt. 5:29 f.). Recent puritanical movements in Africa have revived the practice as government policy: Saudi Arabia, Libya, and Sudan all do so in 1977. Punishment by amputation was considered humane in an age when the death penalty was common for theft, robbery, sedition, and even adultery. The stump had to be cauterized, otherwise gangrene set in. In the ancient world worms bred in mortified flesh (cf. Mk. 9:48). Salt was a primitive treatment for wounds, including superficial injuries left after the most careful amputation. Fear of secular punishment partly, if inefficiently, deters from crime against secular society and its ruler. The deterrent in the sphere of sin is Isa. 66:24, quoted in Mk. 9:48. The threat also has its healthful side. Avoid the supernatural fire of the next world by applying a symbolic fire in this. Avoid the figurative worms of hell by preserving yourself from worms in this. The salt that draws off blood (it was used to prepare meat, Berakoth 3a) will also preserve meat. Salt is a medicament for damaged tissue. Apply the symbolic amputation to this life, and you not only avoid the circumstances whereby actual amputation might result, but you avoid the fire to come. The church leaders are the preserving salt of the community. By their skilful performance of "amputations" and by healing the wounds afterwards (bearing one another's burdens), they will preserve one another, so that they are the *beati* within the meaning of the closing verses of Isaiah (J. D. M. Derrett, *Theology*, 76, 1973, 364–8).

The passage Lk. 14:25–34 is a discourse on the need for persistent wholeheartedness in following Jesus. That takes precedence even over the family, though to abandon family life was quite outside the rabbinic ideal. The man who lays down the cross has no further testimony. The man who leaves his house roofless is a laughingstock. The man who sues for peace at the start is beaten without a struggle. Salt that has lost its flavour is like all these – no use at all: neither as a fertilizer for the land (*eis gēn*), nor even for the dunghill (*eis koprian*). Assuming word-play originally spoken in Aramaic, F. Perles (*ZNW* 19, 1928, 96) suggests that the translation should be: "It is fit neither for seasoning (*lᵉṭabbālā'*) nor for dunging (*lᵉzabbālā'*)", *tēḇēl* is five times rendered in the LXX by *gē*, earth, and might have been the original of *gē* in "You are the salt of the earth" (Matt. 5:13), the occurrence of the same consonants in a following line misleading the translator into rendering *lᵉṭabbalā'* by *eis gēn* (M. Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels*, 1967 ³, 166 f.).

In Col. 4:6 Paul declares that the Christian's speech should always be gracious, seasoned with salt (*halati ērtymenos*). Salt gives flavour to discourse and recom-

mends it to the palate (cf. Job 6:6), and this may be the primary idea of the metaphor here, as the use of *artyō*, to season, suggests. Salt also preserves from corruption and renders wholesome. Eph. 4:29 carries similar ideas: "Let no corrupt speech proceed from your mouth . . . that it may impart grace" (J. B. Lightfoot, *Saint Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon*, 1897, 230). W. Nauck interprets Col. 4:6 by the metaphorical sense of salt as wisdom: "Your talk should always be with grace; it should be wise, and you should learn how to answer every man (*StTh* 6, 1952, 165–78). Several church fathers take salt in this sense of wisdom (Origen, *Hom. in Gen.* 5:12).

halykos occurs only at Jas. 3:12. In nature it is impossible for both salt water (*halykon hydōr*) and fresh (*glyky*, lit. sweet) to come from the same spring. It ought to be just as unnatural for the tongue of the Christian to pour out curses as well as blessings.

The only occurrence of *synalizō* in the NT (Acts 1:4) poses several difficulties. The context seems to need not the present singular but a perfect plural. The translation is taken by Chrysostom and by the Vulgate's *convescens* to mean eating together. Many minuscules and patristic citations, however, read *synaulizomenos*, from *synaulizomai*, to spend the night with, stay with, and this meaning is followed by RSV (Arndt, 791). Behind the variant text may be the desire to avoid the difficulty of accepting that the risen Christ ate food, since his resurrection body had no need of physical sustenance. That he did take food is affirmed in Lk. 24:41–43 (cf. Acts 10:41), to convince the disciples of the reality of his presence. *N. Hillyer*

(a). T. J. Baarda, "Mark IX. 49", *NTS* 5, 1958–9, 318–21; N. D. Coleman, "Note on Mark IX. 49, 50: A new meaning for *halas*", *JTS* 24, 1923, 387–96; and " 'Salt' and 'Salted' in Mark ix. 49, 50", *ExpT* 48, 1936–7, 360–2; E. P. Deatrick, "Salt, Soil, Savior", *BA* 25, 1962, 41–8; J. D. M. Derrett, "Salted with Fire. Studies in Texts: Mark 9:42–50", *Theology* 76, 1973, 364–8; J. R. Harris, "An Unrecognized Latinism in St Mark", *ExpT* 35, 1923–4, 403–5; F. Hauck, *halas*, in *TDNT* I 228 f.; A. M. Honeyman, "The Salting of Shechem", *VT* 3, 1953, 192–5; W. R. Hutton, "The Salt Sections", *ExpT* 58, 1946–7, 166–8; W. Nauck, "Salt as a Metaphor in Instructions for Discipleship", *ExpT* 35, 1923–4, 136 f.; W. S. Wood, "The Salt of the Earth", *JTS* 25, 1924, 167–72.
(b). J. ten Hove, "Het zout der aarde", *Theologisch Tijdschrift* 46, 1912, 252–4; J. B. Souček, "Salz der Erde und Licht der Welt. Zur Exegese von Matth. 5, 13–16", *ThZ* 19, 1963, 169–79.

Samaritan, Samaria

Σαμαρίτης

Σαμαρίτης (*Samaritēs*), Samaritan; *Σαμάρεια* (*Samareia*), Samaria.

OT 1. *Linguistic Usage.* The Gk. word *Samareia* (*v.l. Samaria*) stands for the Heb. *šōmᵉrôn* and designates originally the capital city of the northern kingdom founded by Omri in 876 B.C. It later came to designate the area of the northern kingdom as an administrative unit of several successive empires. After the city was refounded by Herod in 27 B.C. the new name of *Sebastē* was widely accepted; hence the Arabian *Sebaṣṭiye*. In the NT *Samareia* always denotes the territory of Samaria, which can readily be seen in those passages which list Samaria together with other territories (Lk. 17:11; Jn. 4:4; Acts 1:8; 8:1; 9:31; 15:3). Josephus and 1 Macc. also use the terms *hē Samareitis* and (solely in *Ant.* 17, 319) *to Samareitikon* for the

territory of Samaria. The words *Samareitēs*, *Samaritēs* (fem. *Samareitis*, *Samaritis*) for the first time used in 2 Ki. 17:29 LXX (and in the LXX only here) denote the inhabitants of Samaria, both the city and the territory. In the NT they apply only to the latter. In Josephus *Samareitēs* alternates with *Samareus* and also *Sikimitēs*, Shechemite (e.g. *Ant.* 12, 10), because the Samaritans "had then Shechem for their metropolis" (*Ant.* 11, 340). Other synonyms are *hoi Sidōnioi en Sikimois*, the Sidonians in Shechem (according to *Ant.* 11, 344; cf. 12, 258, 262, it was a self-designation of the Shechemites) and *Chouthaioi*, Cutheans or Kuthites (*Ant.* 10, 184; 11, 88, 303; cf. 2 Ki. 17:24, 30).

The context shows *Samar(e)itēs* to be a geographical, and thus indirectly an ethnological term, but at the same time to be a religious group designation (cf. *Ioudaios*, Jew). The ethnological identity of the Samaritans is a point of dispute between the Jews and the Samaritans. The anti-Samaritan polemic of Judaism assumes a total deportation of the population of the northern kingdom; hence the equation of the Samaritans with the Cutheans. But the religious community centred on Shechem, or Mount Gerizim, until today sees itself as a confessional denomination within Israel, standing ethnologically in unbroken continuity particularly with the northern tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh. It draws a distinction between the admittedly mixed populace of the territory of Samaria and the worshippers of the Yahweh-cult of Shechem, and accepted the designation "Samaritan" only with hesitation as a term originally used only by outsiders.

Nevertheless, it is best not to follow Kippenberg and Macdonald in drawing a strict terminological distinction between Samaritans in the geographical and Samaritans in the religious sense (cf. G. H. Kippenberg, *Garizim und Synagoge. Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur samaritanischen Religion der aramäischen Periode*, 1971, 34; and J. Macdonald, *The Theology of the Samaritans*, 1964, 14).

For we must respect the lack of precision in the terminology of the sources as part of the evidence. The two strands cannot be disentangled historically. In any case, the territory of Samaria in the post-exilic period had no cultic centre acceptable to Israelites other than Mount Gerizim, near to ancient Shechem. Only after Alexander the Great's general, Perdiccas, had settled the city with Macedonians could the city of Samaria perhaps be said to stand apart from the religious faith of the rest of the population. However, Josephus (*Ant.* 12, 258–262) indicates possibilities of solidarity between the two groups. Similarly, there are numerous common factors in later history. John Hyrcanus destroyed both Shechem and Samaria. Neither side took part in the rebellion of 4 B.C. Jewish attacks were unitedly repulsed by armed Samaritans and soldiers from Sebaste in A.D. 52.

The term "Sidonians in Shechem" (cf. *Ant.* 11, 344; 12, 258, 262) is to be recognized as a self-designation of the Samaritans (so E. Bickerman, "Un Document relatif à la Persécution d'Antiochus IV Epiphane", *RHR* 58, 1937, 188–223; Ger. translation in *Zur Josephus-Forschung*, ed., A. Schalit, 1973, 241–77; and A. Schalit, "Die Denkschrift der Samaritaner an König Antiochos Epiphanes zu Beginn der grossen Verfolgung der jüdischen Religion im Jahre 167 v. Chr. (Josephus, AJ, XII, §§ 258–264)", *ASTI* 8, 1970–71, 131–83; against M. Delcor, "Vom Sichem der hellenistischen Epoche zum Sychar des Neuen Testaments", *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 78, 1962, 34–48; and H. G. Kippenberg, op. cit., 79).

However, it does not shed light on the ethnological identity of the Samaritans, but only on their political tactics which Josephus aptly describes (*Ant.* 11, 291, 341).

It is uncertain when the self-designation *šômᵉrîm* (pronounced by the Samaritans *šāmᵉ rîm*), lit. those who keep or preserve, came into use. Origen knows it (cf. *Homily* on Ezek. 9, 1; *John* 20, 25). But Philo too, who never explicitly refers to the Samaritans, appears to play on the term (cf. *Leg. All.* 3, 25 f.).

2. *The History of the Samaritans to the Arab Occupation.* The origins of the Samaritan community lie in obscurity and are covered over by the mutual polemic of the Jews and Samaritans. The tension between the northern and southern tribes, and between the northern and southern kingdoms in both politics and religion doubtless forms part of the antecedents of the schism. But the tracing of it to the Assyrian colonization by Jewish polemics based on 2 Ki. 17:24 ff. (which has also influenced the Christian picture of the Samaritans) is to be rejected. Likewise we cannot accept the Samaritan attempt to date the break as early as the time of Eli, who, according to the Samaritan Chronicles, is supposed to have founded the sanctuary at Shiloh as a rival centre to Mount Gerizim. Even the conflict between the Persian administration in Samaria, headed by the house of Sanballat, and the leaders of the restoration in Jerusalem (Nehemiah and Ezra) should be seen as only one contribution to the growing alienation between Judea and Samaria (cf. Ezr. 4; Neh. 4; 13:28). It is a matter of dispute whether the texts of the Heb. OT already mount a polemic against the Samaritans. Among these are the writings of the Chronicler; Isa. 56–66; Hag. 2:10–14; Zech. 11:14; Ps. 78. Recent writers tend to be more sceptical on this point than the earlier ones (cf. R. J. Coggins, *Samaritans and Jews: The Origins of the Samaritans Reconsidered*, 1975). In any case the conflict soon influenced the history of the text of the OT, in particular that of the Pentateuch which alone was canonical for the Samaritans (cf. the substitution of Mount Ebal for Mount Gerizim at Deut. 27:4 MT).

The most important single event in the history of the rise of the Samaritan community was probably the construction of the temple to Yahweh on Mount Gerizim towards the end of the 4th cent. B.C. According to Josephus, *Ant.* 11, 302–47, the initiative came from the priests who had been excluded from Jerusalem, because their marriages had been rejected as mixed marriages (cf. *Ant.* 11, 306 ff., 312). They were settled by Sanballat in Shechem (11, 312, 340). Permission to build the temple is supposed to have been granted by Alexander the Great in gratitude for military support by Sanballat (*Ant.* 11, 321–24, cf. 346; 13, 256; cf. F. M. Cross, Jr., "Aspects of Samaritan and Jewish History in Late Persian and Hellenistic Times", *HTR* 59, 1966, 201–11). In the mouth of Josephus this is a credible and historically plausible tradition, because the erection of a temple was in any case an act of state (cf. Ezr. 1:1–8).

This was not the only temple to Yahweh that was erected outside Jerusalem in the post-exilic period. We know of a temple at Elephantine in Upper Egypt in the 5th cent. B.C., and in the 2nd cent. B.C. temples were founded at Leontopolis in Lower Egypt (cf. Josephus, *War* 1, 33; 7, 420–736; *Ant.* 12, 387 f.; 13, 62–73) and 'Arâq el-'Emîr in Transjordan. However, the Gerizim temple alone became a real challenge to the Jerusalem temple, because it represented a considerable political faction, and because sooner or later the claims of Deut. about the sole, legitimate cultic centre came to be related to it. The idea cannot be excluded that the participants in the

founding of the sanctuary saw it as an act of restoration (cf. Jos. 24:2, the MT against the LXX), since Shechem and Gerizim have ancient Israelite traditions on their side (cf. Deut. 27:4, the Samaritan Pentateuch against the MT).

The next conflict which opened up deep wounds and which was perhaps decisive for the ultimate schism arose through the opportunist policy of Shechem under Antiochus IV (175–*c.* 164 B.C.), Epiphanes. In a petition preserved by Josephus, *Ant.* 12, 258–261 (on its authenticity see E. Bickermann, op. cit.) the Samaritans requested in 167/166 B.C. that their temple on Mount Gerizim (which, they pretended, had up to that very day been "anonymous", i.e. not connected with the name of any particular deity) should be dedicated to Zeus Hellenios (i.e. the Zeus worshipped on Aigina; cf. Schalit, op. cit.). They evidently did not intend thereby to implement any change of cultic practice. Rather, they were making use of the *interpretatio Graeca*, according to which other oriental deities could also be identified with Greek gods and worshipped under their names. Thus the Samaritans escaped persecution, whilst in Judea the Maccabees resisted the policy of cultural and religious Hellenization at the price of their lives. It was only natural that the success of the Maccabean revolt led as a consequence not only to the expansion of Judea at the expense of Samaria (cf. 1 Macc. 10:38; 11:24, 57), but also to the destruction of the temple on Mount Gerizim by John Hyrcanus in 129/128 B.C. (Josephus, *Ant.* 13, 255 f.; *War* 1, 63; Megillat Ta'anit 9).

It was Pompey that ended the Judean dominance over Samaria in 63 B.C. This explains the good relations of the Samaritans to the Romans which lasted until A.D. 67 and to the house of Herod which was closely tied to Rome (cf. Josephus, *War* 1, 213, 302 f., 355; *Ant.* 14, 411, 468; 18, 167). These were interrupted only by the blood bath precipitated by Pontius Pilate which, however, cost him his office (cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 18, 85–89), and a trial for breach of the peace in A.D. 52, when the Samaritans who were supported by the procurator Cumanus came into violent conflict with the Jews. Following the trial in Rome the leading Samaritans were executed and Cumanus banished (Josephus, *War* 2, 232–46; *Ant.* 20, 118–24). The execution may have provoked the mood which led to the tardy and vain participation in the Jewish rising of A.D. 67 (cf. Josephus, *War* 3, 307–15).

The basically pro-Roman attitude of the Samaritans was the logical consequence of their support of the Seleucids into whose inheritance the Romans entered in the region of Syria. Their support of Herod combined loyalty to the dominant world power with hostility to the Hasmoneans and Jewish patriotism. This traditional hostility found expression in isolated outbursts like the desecration of the Jerusalem temple under Coponius (*c.* A.D. 6–9; cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 18, 29 f.) and the murder of a Galilean pilgrim in A.D. 52 (according to Josephus, *War* 2, 232; cf. *Ant.* 20, 118).

It seems like an irony of history that the Samaritans, who were in general ready to co-operate with the world power of the day and to make compromises with the surrounding pagan world, did not regain their rights to practise the Israelite religion after the Bar Kochba revolt of A.D. 132–35. It was otherwise with the Jews. The Samaritans, however, were bloodily persecuted, especially on account of the practice of circumcision (cf. Origen, *Contra Cels.* 2, 13). The 4th cent. A.D. brought with it a time of revival for the Samaritans which lasted several decades. Their leader, Baba Rabba, reformed the life of the synagogue, and the oldest portions of the extant non-biblical literature of the Samaritans (the Memar Markah, parts of the liturgy) date

from this period. Growing pressure from the Christian Byzantine emperors (cf. the Code of Justinian 1, 5, 17) led to futile risings with considerable loss of life. As a consequence the Samaritans in the 7th cent. A.D. welcomed and gave support to the Arab conquerors.

3. *Geographical, Social and Cultural Aspects.* For a true appreciation of the relationship between the Samaritans, the Jews and the Christians an explanation of the geographical situation is of fundamental importance. The Samaritans lived in many places outside Samaria, even in Palestine. Archaeological finds indicate Samaritan synagogues in Bet Še'an (Scythopolis), Ṣabarin on Mount Carmel, Gaza, Jabneh, Kfar Bilu and Beth-Dagan in the coastal area, 'Amwâs (Emmaus/Nicopolis) and Shaalbin in the Shephelah, and possibly Mount Nebo and Namara in Transjordan. There is literary and archaeological evidence of a strong Samaritan concentration in and around Caesarea by the sea. Outside Palestine special mention may be made of Alexandria and the rest of Egypt (from the 4th cent. B.C.; cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 11, 345; 12, 7–10; 13, 74–79), and also of Damascus, Thessalonica, Athens and Rome.

The proximity of Samaria to Hellenistic cities and the presence of Samaritans in such cities ties up with reports of the pro-Greek attitude of the early Samaritans, forming a clear overall picture. Also pointing in this direction is the evidence of at least one Samaritan companion piece to the LXX (the Samareitikon; Symmachus?). So too does the Samaritan origin of a number of educated figures like Justin Martyr (2nd cent. A.D.), Siricius (the rhetorician in Athens in the 4th cent. A.D.) and Marinus (the Neo-Platonist of the 5th cent. A.D.). All these hailed from Neapolis which continued to be the religious centre of the Samaritans (cf. the synagogue inscription of Thessalonica). The philosophical grounding of Markah (4th cent. A.D.) merits considerable esteem. These data help to explain the cross-connexions with Hellenistic Judaism and Hellenistic Jewish Christianity (cf. Acts 8:4–25), both of which likewise grew up amid an urban civilization.

Of course, the liberal, cosmopolitan attitude of the Samaritans could not in the long term survive the painful encounters with the power of imperial Rome. The brief Samaritan renaissance of the 4th and 5th cents. A.D. that was terminated by force led, therefore, to a concentration on the Israelite inheritance canonized in the Torah. It decided the character of Samaritan theology and piety as an exclusively Mosaic religion. This was intensified rather than weakened by the encounter with Islam. It may be said that the Samaritans in the first centuries A.D. caught up with a development which had been extinguished in Judaism through the conflict with the Seleucids. In this connexion belongs the rise of a specific Samaritan eschatology (with the expectation of the "day of vengeance and recompense"), including the hope of resurrection which the Samaritans did not originally share.

NT 1. *Samaria and the Samaritans in the NT.* (a) Matt. 10:5 f. Within the framework of the commissioning of the disciples (Matt. 10:1–16, par. Mk. 3:13–19; 6:8–11; Lk. 6:12–16; 9:2–5, cf. 10:1–12) vv. 5 f. contain the saying peculiar to Matt.: "Go nowhere among the Gentiles, and enter no town of the Samaritans, but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." J. Jeremias sees the saying as an ancient tristich based on an Aram. tradition forbidding the disciples to work among either Samaritans or Gentiles. He reconstructs it as follows: "Go not

to the Gentiles/and enter not into the land of Samaria/but go (only) to the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (*TDNT* V 92; cf. J. Jeremias, *Jesus' Promise to the Nations*, *SBT* 24, 1958, 19 f.).

The parallelism with "the Gentiles" (*ethnē*) and the juxtaposition with "the house of Israel" show unmistakably that the Samaritans are here not recognized as Israelites. The saying is very closely related to Matt. 15:24, where Jesus says to the Canaanite woman: "I was sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." Here too in a Matthaean addition the same picture taken from Jer. 50:6 (LXX 27:6) is applied to Israel and a Canaanite woman is excluded from the mission of Jesus which is directed only to Israel. Against this background Matt. 10:5 f. is not to be understood as a purely geographical limitation of the mission of the disciples to Galilee (as against the commentaries of Gaechter, Holtzmann, Loisy, Montefiore, McNeile ad loc., and Jeremias, op. cit.). Rather, the reference to "the house of Israel" indicates that all members of the people of Israel are included wherever they live (cf. P. Nepper-Christensen, *Das Matthäusevangelium, ein judenchristliches Evangelium?*, 1958, 182). In the light of this, it is questionable whether *polin Samaritōn* here really means the province of Samaria, because in that case the way to the Jewish part of "the house of Israel" would actually be barred by the double command of v. 5. Rather, a distinction must be drawn between the journey through the province and entry into a Samaritan town or village (cf. Jn. 4:5). This is the view of A. Schlatter, *Der Evangelist Matthäus*, 1963 [6], 328 f. (cf. Lk. 9:52 f.; Jn. 4:8, 40).

Historically Matt. 10:5 f. stands in connexion with the conception of a mission solely to Israel, as is also evidenced in Matt. 10:23. But it is doubtful whether the negations of Matt. 10:5 are directed against a Samaritan or Gentile mission that was beginning or had already begun (cf. E. Käsemann, "The Beginnings of Christian Theology", in *New Testament Questions of Today*, 1969, 87 ff.; and R. Scroggs, "The Earliest Hellenistic Christianity", in J. Neusner, ed., *Religions in Antiquity*, 1968, 176–206, see especially 177), in view of the fact that the charge was clearly directed to the Twelve in Matt. 10:5 f. In any case, their rôle was related to the twelve tribes of Israel (cf. Matt. 19:28). Gal. 2:7 ff. could be, as far as Peter was concerned, a testimony to the same.

According to H. Schürmann ("Mt. 10, 5b–6 und die Vorgeschichte des synoptischen Aussendungsberichtes", in *Neutestamentliche Aufsätze für J. Schmid*, 1963, 270–82), these words were part of Q where they served as an introduction to Lk. 10:8 ff. and were interpreted, historicized and "neutralized" by the insertion of Lk. 9:51–56. Lk. then omitted the logion contained in Matt. 10:5 f., whereas Matt. omitted the pericope in Lk. 9:51–56.

An antipode of Matt. 10:5 f. from early Christian times (and an indirect testimony to Samaritans' view of their own identity) is the observation of Justin Martyr: "For all the other human races [*genē*] are called Gentiles [*ethnē*] by the Spirit of prophecy; but the Jewish and Samaritan races are called the tribe [*phylon*] of Israel, and the house of Jacob" (*Apol.* I, 53). For further discussion of the concepts involved in Matt. 10:5 f. → Israel; → Lamb, Sheep; → People.

(b) The Lucan Writings. (i) Lk. 9:51–56. The narrative fits perfectly into our picture of the mutual attitudes of the Jews and Samaritans of the 1st cent. A.D. (cf. Josephus, *War* 2, 232–46; *Ant.* 20, 118–36). The reaction of James and John, the sons of Zebedee (v. 54) takes up the → Elijah tradition of 2 Ki. 10:10–14 (cf. vv. 54 f.

v.l.) and recalls the judgment on the people of Sodom (Gen. 19; cf. Lk. 10:12), as well as the sin of the brothers Simeon and Levi (Gen. 34), which in Test. Lev. 6 is defended as a punishment for the notorious hostility to strangers of the Shechemites. The astonishing feeling of power of the two disciples is perhaps to be understood as an anticipation of Lk. 10:17–20. Jesus' rebuke (v. 55), even without the later addition of the words, "and he said, 'You do not know what manner of spirit you are of; for the Son of man came not to destroy men's lives but to save them' " (vv. 54 f. *v.l.*; cf. Metzger, 148 f.), serves as a repudiation of false notions of the character of his messianic way (Lk. 10:51, 53; cf. Matt. 16:22 f. par. Mk. 8:32 f.) and the apostolic commission (cf. Lk. 10:3, 5 f., 10 f.). It is debated whether v. 56 refers to another Samaritan village or indicates a detour of the whole Samaritan area (cf. Lk. 18:35; 19:1, 11, 28).

In the *Clementine Recognitions* 1, 57 in a great (legendary) debate with the religious parties of Israel the pericope is taken as the occasion to picture the sons of Zebedee eloquently confuting their Samaritan opponents.

(ii) Lk. 10:30–37. The parable of the Good Samaritan is a Lucan amplification of the pericope on the two great commandments (Matt. 22:24–40 par. Mk. 12:28–34, Lk. 10:25–28), giving an illustration in the form of a narrative and expounding Lev. 19:28 (→ Command, art. *entolē* NT 1; → Love, art. *agapaō* NT 2; → Brother, art. *plēsion*, NT; → Large, art. *megas* NT 4). The introductory question of v. 29 ("But he, desiring to justify himself, said to Jesus, 'And who is my neighbour?' ") stands in tension with the point of the parable drawn out in vv. 36 f. (" 'Which of these three, do you think, proved neighbour to the man who fell among the robbers?' He said, 'The one who showed mercy on him.' And Jesus said to him, 'Go and do likewise' "). This has given rise to various tradition-historical and redaction-critical hypotheses, without however attaining conclusive results. (For the history of the interpretation of the parable see W. Monselewski, *Der barmherzige Samariter. Eine auslegungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Lukas 10, 25–37, Beiträge zur Geschichte der biblischen Exegese* 5, 1967; cf. also J. D. M. Derrett, "The Parable of the Good Samaritan", in *Law in the New Testament*, 1970, 208–27.)

The fact that the positive figure in the present narrative is a Samaritan serves to detach the love command from all previous relationships with a person in need. In the juxtaposition with the priest and Levite (cf. Jn. 1:19) it contains an element of criticism of official Judaism (cf. Jn. 4:1–45). Attention is not drawn to any particular qualities of the Samaritan. The omission of the designation of "Samaritan" (v. 37) is, despite widespread opinion, probably without significance. For the name "Samaritan" as such was not important to the Samaritans, and it was not the subject of a taboo for the Jews. The story anticipates the saying of Rabbi Simeon ben Gamiel (*c.* A.D. 140), that the Samaritans keep the commandments which they observe more strictly than the "Israelites", i.e. the Jews (cf. Kid. 76a par.).

(iii) Lk. 17:11–19. The description of the grateful Samaritan as *allogenēs* could in itself be intended in an unpolemical way: "Was no one found to return and give praise to God except this foreigner?" (v. 18). For the Samaritans could occasionally describe themselves as being an independent nation (*genos*) alongside the Jews (cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 12, 261; Justin Martyr, *Dial.* 120, 6). This did not necessarily downgrade them as non-Israelites (cf. Justin Martyr, *Apol.* I, 53). But Jewish polemics gave point to talk about an independent Samaritan *genos* (cf. Josephus,

Ant. 18, 167) by stressing the alleged non-Israelite origin of the Samaritans (cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 13, 255, *to Chouthaiōn genos*, "the nation of the Cutheans"). It is not by accident that the term *allogenēs* is a key word in the mixed marriage texts in 1 Esd. 8 f. LXX, and a designation for the Shechemites of Gen. 34 in Jud. 9:2, where the deed of Simeon (and Levi) is represented as divinely willed (as against Gen. 49:5 ff.; cf. Jub. 30:5).

Another possible background for calling the Samaritans a foreign people is the use of Deut. 32:21 in anti-Samaritan polemics (cf. Sir. 50:25 f.).

The intention of Lk. 17:11–19 is comparable not only with Lk. 10:30–37 but also with Matt. 8:5–13 par. Lk. 7:1–10, where it is a heathen who puts the whole of Israel in the shade with his faith. In these texts the later way of mission (cf. Acts 8; 10 f.) is anticipated in paradigmatic cases in the pre-Easter history of Jesus (cf. Jn. 4:1–42).

Apart from the fact that as a Samaritan he would not have gone to the Jerusalem priests, the behaviour of the Samaritan in Lk. 17:15 f. might have had as its background a particular openness of the Samaritans to the charismatic (cf. Acts 8:4–13; Jn. 8:48(?); *Clementine Recognitions* 1, 57).

(iv) Acts 1:8; 8:1; 9:31. Acts 1:8 contains the promise and commission: "But you shall receive power when the Holy Spirit has come upon you; and you shall be my witnesses in Jerusalem and in all Judea and Samaria and to the end of the earth" (→ Spirit). The fact that "Samaria" in Acts 1:8 is attached to "Judea" without repetition of the preposition and article makes the phrase "in all Judea and Samaria [*en pasē tē Ioudaia kai Samareia*]" appear to be a single compound concept and not the designation of two consecutive stages in the history of the mission. This corresponds to the common administration of Judea and Samaria by a Roman procurator from A.D. 6.

Acts 9:31 concludes the account of Paul's conversion and first preaching with the statement: "So the church throughout all Judea and Galilee and Samaria [*kath' holēs tēs Ioudaias kai Galilaias kai Samareias*] had peace and was built up; and walking in the fear of the Lord and in the comfort of the Holy Spirit it was multiplied." The mention of Galilee between Judea and Samaria does not conflict with the above interpretation. For in Acts 1:8 and 8:1 Galilee was probably included in the notion of Judea, corresponding to the religious orientation of Galilee around Jerusalem. (For a more broadly based idea of "Judea" cf. e.g. Matt. 19:1; Josephus, *Ant.* 9, 280; Strabo, *Geography* 16, 21.) From a geographical standpoint the statement in Acts 1:8 has therefore three parts: Jerusalem, the land of Israel and finally the whole world are to be the scene of the testimony of the disciples. With the idea of "witnesses" the → proclamation of the word by the disciples is interpreted as a resumption of the trial of Jesus before the forum of the world. This in itself anticipates the many forensic scenes in Acts.

(v) Acts 8:4–25. In order to understand the account of Philip's missionary success in Samaria it is essential to grasp the geographical aspect. According to J. Jeremias, the expression "city of Samaria [*polin tēs Samareias*]" (v. 5) is an Aramaism meaning "the province of Samaria", reflecting the indefinite term *mᵉḏînā'* (*TDNT* VII 92; cf. *polis Iouda*, "city of Judah" in Lk. 1:39). But v. 8 ("So there was much joy in that city") appears to have a particular city in mind. The question arises as to which city could be intended. The narrator could be avoiding mentioning the name of the former capital Sebaste because that name paid tribute to the religious

veneration of Augustus (= Sebastos). He could have meant the *nea polis* of the Samaritans which was already standing before Vespasian (later named Flavia Neapolis, modern Nablus; cf. Josephus, *War* 4, 449; Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* 5, 69). Alternatively, he might have been thinking of Sychar which is mentioned in Jn. 4:5 as "a city of Samaria" (*polin tēs Samareias legoumenēn Sychar*).

Historically relevant here is the decision between a Hellenistic linguistic and cultural environment (Sebaste) and the Aramaic-speaking context of the Samaritan community. In favour of the latter is the fact that Simon Magus (→ Magic, art. *mageia* NT 1 (a)), who before the appearance of Philip dominated the religious scene in this area, was revered by the populace as *megalē dynamis*: "This man is that power of God which is called Great" (Acts 8:10). This expression is more readily explicable if it is seen as rendering the Aram. *ḥaylâh* (in the masc.) rather than as a Gk. title (for further discussion of the possibilities see F. F. Bruce, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 1952 [2], 185). Therefore, Acts 8:4–25 probably does not deal with the mission in Sebaste – and thus with the beginnings of the Gentile mission – but with the mission in a (possibly *the*) centre of the Samaritan community.

The report of this Simon in Acts 8:9 ff. must be compared with the traditions of a later gnostic group which claimed to derive from him (cf. Justin Martyr, *Apol.* I, 26:1–3 etc.; Iren., *Haer.* 1, 23; Hippol., *Haer.* 6, 19 f.; Epiph., *Haer.* 21, 1–4 etc.). Lack of non-polemical sources makes historical investigation on this point considerably difficult. Acts 8:9 indicates that Simon appeared as a miracle worker, and in this he was apparently later superseded by Philip (cf. Acts 8:6 f., 13). The mention of → "magic" in vv. 9 and 11 is not indicative of the manner of the phenomena, but is rather an expression of a negative theological judgment. The lofty, but not more precisely defined, claim that Simon evidently made for himself (v. 9; cf. Lk. 1:15, 32; 7:16; Heb. 4:4; 11:24) was, according to v. 10, superseded by the even more enthusiastic acclamation of the populace, which praised him as "that power of God which is called Great." This might be the expression of an angelology of a kind associated with Michael (→ Angel) or → Melchizedek (cf. Hippol., *Haer.* 7, 36; 10, 24 etc.; see K. Beyschlag, *Simon Magus und die christliche Gnosis*, *WUNT* 16, 1974, 109). The early origins of such an angelology have now been illuminated by 11QMelchizedek. But comparison with Lk. 22:69 (par. Matt. 26:64; Mk. 14:62) makes it probable that *theou* ("of God") is here a Lucan addition in the epexegetical genitive. "The great power" is a designation of divinity which was very widespread in the Syrian and Palestinian area (cf. Beyschlag, loc. cit.). If Simon was honoured as the "first" or "chief" divinity, i.e. as the incarnation of Zeus, it must be remembered that in Samaria Zeus was at times syncretistically identified with Yahweh (probably on the grounds of the title *'El 'elyôn*; cf. Pseudo-Eupolemos in Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9, 17, 2–9). Simon's consort Helena was equated with Athena, the daughter of Zeus (cf. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1, 23, 4), and designated as his *prōtē ennoia* ("first thought"). There is an obvious comparison with other female cult figures in Jewish (at Elephantine) and Samaritan (cf. Epiphanius, *Haer.* 78, 23, 6) syncretism. What is new, though not altogether without analogy, is the thought of incarnation, or rather of manifestation, which attaches to the miracle worker here as at Lystra (Acts 14:11 f.). The historical figure of Simon does not bear any specific gnostic traits, and the later assimilation to gnosticism of the Simon-movement is to be traced back to dependence on Christian gnosticism (K. Beyschlag, op. cit., against G. Lüdemann, *Untersuchungen zur*

simonianischen Gnosis, 1975). Perhaps Acts 8:18–24 already reflects the way in which the Simon-movement sought to adopt and modify the Christian tradition.

The fact that the newly formed Samaritan communities did not at once manifest the usual charismatic gifts of the primitive communities is unique in the NT. (Acts 19:1–7 is no real parallel!) The account cannot have as its intention the tying of the gift of the Spirit to the apostolic office (cf. Acts 9:17; 19:7). But it is conceivable that this may be the expression of the healing of the breach between Judea and Samaria and of the primacy of honour held by the Jerusalem church (cf. Jn. 4:22 ff.). O. Cullmann has suggested that Jn. 4:38 is a reflection of the relatively tardy participation of Jerusalem in the Samaria mission (cf. O. Cullmann, "Samaria and the Origins of the Christian Mission", in *The Early Church*, 1956, 183–92).

This hesitation on the part of the Jerusalem community was repeated in the case of the Gentile missionary drive, led by the same Hellenistic Jewish Christians (cf. Acts 11:19 f.). Whilst representatives of the Jerusalem church (cf. Acts 15:1, 23; cf. 11:27?) questioned the Gentile mission with its disregard for the law (Acts 15:2), and opposition in Jerusalem itself became vocal (15:3), the churches in Phoenicia and Samaria were overjoyed at the conversion of the Gentiles (15:3). Therefore, from a historical point of view (and thus also from the theological) one cannot overlook the fact that already in NT times cultural differences resulting from political and economic factors produced or at least fostered dissensions in the theology of Christian mission.

(c) John. (i) Jn. 4:1–42. Various aspects of this passage need to be taken into consideration:

(1) Geographical factors. Sychar (v. 5) may be identified with modern *'Askar* (cf. H. M. Schenke, "Jakobsbrunnen–Josephsgrab–Sychar", *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 84, 1968, 159–84; against G. E. Wright, *Shechem: The Biography of a Biblical City*, 1965, 243 f.) that is situated on the South Eastern slope of Mt. Ebal somewhat to the side of the road from Jerusalem to Galilee. This would explain the scene in vv. 6b and 8. The remarkable pinpointing of Sychar in v. 5b is best explained if Sychar stood not topographically, but historically, in continuity with ancient Shechem and its traditions (see below), perhaps as its successor between 128 B.C. and the emergence of Neapolis.

The geographical comment in v. 5b ("near the field that Jacob gave to his son Joseph") goes back to Gen. 48:22, and leans on the formulation of Jos. 24:32 LXX, where Gen. 48:22 is assimilated to Gen. 33:19 (cf. Acts 7:15 f.). Gen. 48:22 LXX identifies this particular heritage of Joseph with Shechem, on the grounds of the ambiguity of the Heb. *šᵉḵem* which means both "shoulder" (i.e. here a "mountain slope", cf. RSV with RSV mg.) and Shechem (cf. E. A. Speiser, *Genesis*, *Anchor Bible*, 1964, 358). The ET of the LXX reads: "Now to thee exclusively above thy brothers, I give Shechem, which I took out of the hand of the Amorites with my sword and with my bow." Philo interpreted this as an act of detachment: Jacob did not want to keep what he had not received from God, but had conquered in his own strength (*Leg. All.* 3, 26). As against this (or apart from this tradition which relates Gen. 48:22 to Shechem) the Samaritans have considered and revered a certain parcel of ground at the foot of Mt. Gerizim as the original plot of Gen. 33:18 (cf. Memar Markah [= MM] IV, 9, p. 102, 13–16). In the 4th cent. A.D. they built there a synagogue (cf. Chronicle V [*Salsalat*] 89 and 126; cf. perhaps also Epiphanius, *Haer.* 80, 1, 6). The

early church identification of Joseph's grave on this spot (cf. Jos. 24:32; MM V, 4, p. 128, 24) by Old Shechem (= *Balāṭa*; cf. Itin. Burdig., *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, XXXIX, 20, 3–7) seems to correspond to the ancient Samaritan tradition concerning the site (against Schenke, op. cit.).

The spring, or well, of Jacob (vv. 6, 11 f.) is not mentioned in the OT. The sole tradition about a well associated with the name of Jacob is found in Gen. 29:2–10, where the place is given as Haran. In the Haggadah it was enlarged into a wandering legend by association with Exod. 2:15–22 (→ Moses in Midian) and the miracle of the water in the wilderness (Exod. 17:1–7; Num. 20:1–11; 21:16 ff.). At the same time it was compressed into the picture of a single miraculous spring which "accompanied" the patriarchs and Moses on their wanderings (cf. 1 Cor. 10:4; Pirqê de R. Eliezer p. 268, Friedländer; see A. Jaubert, "La Symbolique du Puits de Jacob, Jean 4, 12", in *L'Homme devant dieu, Mélanges offerts au P. Henri de Lubac*, 1963, I, 63–73). The Samaritan concentration of the most diverse patriarchal traditions on Shechem and its environment (cf. Jn. 4:20) led logically to the local tradition of the well of Jacob. The fact that Jn. 4:6 is strongly reminiscent of Exod. 2:15 f. in the narrative in Josephus, *Ant.* 2, 257, shows that already in NT times the motives of this tradition were rather fixed while the names of places and people changed.

The information about the well in Jn. 4 (note the oscillation between "well" and "spring", the situation outside the village, and the depth of the well) corresponds to the well fed by a spring, and identified as Jacob's well, in a church 400 meters South-East of ancient Shechem.

(2) The problem of the relationship of the Jews to the Samaritans (vv. 7 ff.). The woman's amazement and the explanatory comment of the evangelist refer particularly to Jesus' request for water, which indicates a kind of meal fellowship. It is distinguished from the Pharisaic conception, according to which the vessels of the Samaritans were considered unclean and could not be used by the Jews (cf. D. Daube, *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*, 1956, 373–82).

(3) The symbolism of the living water (vv. 10–15) has been related by tradition history primarily to → wisdom (cf. Prov. 13:14; 18:4; Sir. 24:25–34; Philo, *Som.* 1, 6; Eth. Enoch 48:1; 19:1; and often) and secondarily to the → law (cf. Sir. 15:3; 24:23; CD 3:16; 6:4; 19:34; S.Dt. § 48[84a]). Jn. is acquainted with the symbolical correspondence of → water and → Spirit (cf. Jn. 3:5; 7:39). But Jn. 4:10, 13 f. (cf. also 7:37 f.) do not seem to have been designed originally to express the once-and-for-all reception of the Spirit, but rather the continued working of the words of Jesus (cf. 6:63).

In the Samaritan literature of the 4th cent. A.D. the picture of living water plays a significant rôle as part of the strong wisdom traditions of the Samaritans (cf. J. C. H. Lebram, "Nachbiblische Weisheitstraditionen", *VT* 15, 1965, 167–237). The emphasis on the person of Moses in these texts (in contrast with the stress on the impersonal law in Judaism) is reminiscent of Johannine christology, and prompts the question of historical connexions between the Johannine and the Samaritan tradition (see below). In Jn. 4:10–15 the striking *hallomenou* ("welling up", v. 14) refers back to the Moses tradition of Num. 21:16 ff.; cf. *ʿlî*, "spring up" in v. 17 (cf. T. F. Glasson, *Moses in the Fourth Gospel*, 1963, 55 f.). The same allusion occurs in MM VI, 3, p. 136, 18.

(4) The allusion to the life of the Samaritan woman in the course of the conversa-

tion (Jn. 4:16–19, especially vv. 17 f.) has often been interpreted allegorically, since D. F. Strauss, of the five gods of the Assyrian colonists in Samaria (five instead of seven is the number given in Josephus, *Ant.* 9, 287, against 2 Ki. 17:20 f.). Today this is generally and rightly rejected. The interpretation remains for us as ambiguous as that of Jn. 1:48, and has the same function in the context of the narrative, focusing on a special charismatic gift of Jesus and eliciting a corresponding confession (cf. Jn. 1:49; 4:19). The woman's belief that in Jesus she was being confronted by a prophet is to be understood from her standpoint only in the light of v. 18. One should not read into it any eschatological expectations, e.g. those derived from Deut. 18:15, 18.

(5) The allegiance to Mount Gerizim as the sole legitimate place of worship is the fourth and ultimately distinctive point of the Samaritan creed. The way in which the Samaritan woman introduces the theme (v. 20) is an excellent expression of the Samaritan standpoint: the age-old Israelite practice ("our fathers worshipped on this mountain") is set in opposition to the Jewish claims in favour of → Jerusalem ("and you say that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship"). According to Samaritan tradition, a long chain of important biblical figures from Adam right up to Joseph knew and recognized Gerizim as a holy place (cf. MM II, 10, p. 47, 7–12; IV, 10, p. 105, 7 f.). Pseudo-Eupolemos (an anonymous Samaritan) provides testimony already in the early 2nd cent. A.D. of the transference of the Abraham tradition of Gen. 14 to Mount Gerizim (cf. Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9, 17). The fact that the cultic centre in Jn. 4:20 is introduced as a place of worship corresponds to Samaritan linguistic usage (cf. MM II, 10, p. 47, 25 f.; II, 12, p. 52, 5; III, 2, p. 59, 2 f.; III, 6, p. 73, 5). Josephus gives account of disputes between Jews and Samaritans in Egypt over the legitimacy of Gerizim and Zion (*Ant.* 12, 10; 13, 74–79). All in all, Jn. 4:20 is formulated so authentically in the style of Samaritan traditions, that the narrator must be credited with a knowledge of them.

(6) Jesus' position on the problem of the right cultic centre (vv. 21–24) exhibits different lines of thought. The essentially futuristic pronouncements of vv. 21 and 23 f. relativize the question of the place in favour of stressing the dimension of Spirit and truth in which God will be worshipped (→ Prayer, art. *proskyneō* NT 4). V. 22, on the other hand, speaks in the present, and makes Jesus adopt clearly the Jewish standpoint and condemn the Samaritan one. V. 22 (or only 22c, "for salvation is from the Jews") has often been judged to be an editorial addition, though for differing reasons. But it fits completely into the context of the chapter (cf. vv. 9 and 42) and that of the entire Gospel (cf. Jn. 1:11; 4:43 f.; 12:37 ff.). Jesus is a Jew, and Judea is his actual domain; it is this that gives his conflict with the Jews its particular acerbity. Rather, vv. 21 and 23 f. could be understood as the Johannine addition to a previous narrative, if the juxtaposition of the two answers of Jesus were seen as intolerable. For it is an evident concern of the evangelist to present the Spirit as the decisive power of the new age inaugurated by Jesus (cf. Jn. 1:32 f.; 3:3–8; 6:63; 20:22; and the paraclete sayings, → Advocate).

The reproach in v. 22a ("You worship what you do not know") recalls Acts 17:23, and fits in well with the tendency in Judaism to place the Samaritans on the same level as the Gentiles on cultic questions. This was particularly pronounced in the 1st cent. A.D. (J. Jeremias, *TDNT* VII 90 f.). In any case, the petition preserved by Josephus which the Samaritans presented to Antiochus Epiphanes presents a concrete instance of the reproach of Jn. 4:22a. There the Samaritans represented their

sanctuary on Mount Gerizim as a nameless one (Josephus, *Ant.* 12, 259, 261), to allow it to be consecrated to Zeus. The whole affair was probably a move in a political game of chess, made possible by the strict *disciplina arcana*, which protected the name of Yahweh from profanation (→ God, art. *theos* OT 2), and which could cause people to think that the God of Israel had no name (cf. A. Schalit, op. cit., 150 f.). The form of Judaism influenced by the Maccabees and the Hasidim understood these manoeuvres of Samaritan politics as a declension from Yahweh to Greek religion. Hence, the parallelism between Jn. 4:22a and Acts 17:23 is no accident.

Over and above this, the accusation of a defective knowledge of God stands in the broader context of a Jewish polemic which characterized the Samaritans as "a foolish people" and the like, taking up the thought of Deut. 32:21 (cf. Sir. 50:25 f.; Test. Lev. 7). In contrast, Ps. 76:2 (LXX 75:2) speaks of the knowledge of God as a privilege of Judah (LXX Judea). (The fact that, in the Fourth Gospel, Jesus denies even his Jewish opponents a knowledge of God, stands on a different plane, in so far as it is grounded in the special situation of the rejection of Jesus; cf. Jn. 5:37, 42; 7:28; 8:54 f.)

The premise in Jn. 4:22c ("for salvation is from the Jews") sounds like the repetition of a generally accepted principle. In the context of the Jewish-Samaritan controversy this could be a sentence of the Torah (cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 13, 76, 78 f.). This could be identified as the oracle on Judah (Gen. 49:8–12), a text which in Judaism was related to Zion and the Davidic dynasty (cf. Ps. 78:67–72), but which was felt to be a problem by the Samaritans and was reinterpreted by them (cf. Chronicle II, 151 f.). Within the framework of Jn. 4 this allusion to Jacob's blessing in Gen. 49 is particularly eloquent, because the scene is set by the well of Jacob (vv. 5 f.) and the woman has previously compared Jesus with Jacob (v. 12). Against the background of Gen. 49:8–12 the question in v. 25 about the messiah follows on from Jesus' answer in v. 22. This is an added reason for seeing in vv. 21 and 23 f. an extension of a pre-Johannine narrative.

It is a striking fact that the question of the place of worship is also relativized in the Samaritan liturgical texts (cf. Markah, Hymn 12, 4–6, p. 27, 1–4; Amram Darah, Hymn 1, 4 f., 11, p. 28, 1–3, 11 f.; 2, 22, p. 29, 25; Durran 4, p. 40, 1–15; Durran 5, p. 40, 16–26; Durran 8, p. 41, 19–42 all in A. E. Cowley, *The Samaritan Liturgy*, 1909; cf. also MM IV, 7, p. 97, 28–31). In place of the topological question, anthropological categories stand in the foreground, especially uprightness and truth (cf. Markah, Hymn 2, 18 f., p. 18, 17 f.; 3, 17, p. 19, 13 f.; 5, 12, p. 21, 5, 8 f.; 10, 5, p. 25, 7 f.). The theological and historical relationship of these texts to Jn. 4:21, 23 f. is still in need of clarification. For the time being one may proceed on the basis of the widespread consensus of more recent exegesis that "Spirit and truth" means a reality proceeding from God. But does this not include the idea that the Spirit of God indwells man and becomes – admittedly in a way dependent on God – an inner reality? Opposition to the idealist understanding of the Holy Spirit should not obscure this fact.

O. Michel compares Jn. 4:23 f. with Acts 7:48; 17:25 (*Das Zeugnis des Neuen Testaments von der Gemeinde*, 1941, 16 f., n. 12; cf. Philo's use of *topos*, place, in the discussion of H. Köster, *TDNT* VIII 201 f.). Jn. 4:21, 23 f. and the comparable Samaritan texts probably stand in the broader stream of the theology of omnipresence which goes hand in hand with a sublimation of cultic observance.

(7) The woman's testimony to belief in the coming messiah (v. 25) relates to the Jewish expectation of salvation, endorsed by Jesus in v. 22. The idea of a messiah is lacking in Samaritan texts right up to the 16th cent. A.D.; to Samaritan ears it was probably too closely tied to the ideal of the Davidic king. The openness of the woman is probably to be understood as the consequence of the impression made on her by Jesus' prophetic knowledge (v. 19). This line is continued in her receptivity (v. 29) to his messianic claims (v. 26).

The present wording of vv. 25 f. hardly provides a basis for the frequently expressed opinion that Jesus is here shown as the fulfilment of Samaritan messianic expectation. The Samaritans did indeed expect that their Taheb (the coming one, the one who will return and overturn, the restorer, who was an eschatological figure) would reveal truth (cf. MM II, 9, p. 44, 31 f.; IV, 11, p. 108, 6 f.; IV, 12, p. 111, 13 f.). But in its context (and in contrast to Jn. 4:25) this is not to be understood in terms of proclamation, but as the realization of the divinely willed state of affairs (cf. 2 Esd. 6:27 f.), and in particular the restoration of worship on Mount Gerizim (cf. also MM IV, 12, p. 110, 33). Furthermore, the dating of the Taheb expectation is disputed (even the relevant texts in the Memar Markah are uncertain from the standpoint of textual criticism). And indeed the beginnings of Samaritan eschatology lie largely in obscurity. Therefore, Jn. 4:25c is to be understood, unless further light is forthcoming, entirely from the context of the Fourth Gospel as the expression of a christology that gives strong prominence to the element of proclamation and teaching as the mission of Jesus (cf. Jn. 1:18; 6:68; 18:37 and often). The fact that the Gk. word *christos* in Jn. 4:25 is not introduced as the translation of *messias* (as it is in Jn. 1:41) but as a second name suggests the conjecture that *messias* in v. 25 may have replaced some other term, but any further attempt to make this conjecture more specific must remain doubly hypothetical.

(8) Also the final confession of the Samaritans who were impressed by Jesus ("It is no longer because of your words that we believe, for we have heard for ourselves, and we know that this is indeed the Saviour of the world", v. 42) cannot be demonstrated as the expression of contemporary Samaritan theology. Judged by the texts from the oldest strata of the Samaritan liturgy (cf. Markah Hymns 2, 17 p. 18, 16; 6, 17 p. 22, 7; 7, 5 p. 22, 19), the title "Saviour of the world" would be an extension to Jesus of a divine title (cf. Acts 8:10?). The way in which vv. 39–42 refer back to v. 29 shows, however, that in the sense of the narrator "Saviour of the world" is a synonym for the title of messiah or Christ (cf. *alēthōs*, indeed or truly, v. 42). This is anticipated in the text of the Heb. prophetic canon (which the Samaritans did not recognize), where men appear as saviours commissioned by God (cf. Jdg. 3:9, 15; 2 Ki. 13:5; Isa. 19:20; Zech. 9:9; → Redemption, art. *sōtēr* OT). But it is in Jn. that the office of saviour is applied to the whole world for the first time (cf. even Jn. 4:14). This extension is probably connected with the Johannine pre-existence christology which binds the messiah closely with the concept of God and at the same time allots him a cosmological function (cf. Jn. 1:1 ff.). The above mentioned Markah texts stand perhaps in a wisdom tradition (cf. Wis. 16:7) which for their part have been adopted and transformed by John in his christology.

(ii) Jn. 8:48 f. In Jn. 8:48, in the context of a violent controversy, "the Jews" put to Jesus the question: "Are we not right in saying that you are a Samaritan and have a demon?" Jesus' reply gives an explicit answer only to the second part of the ques-

tion: "I have not a demon; but I honour my Father, and you dishonour me" (v. 49). Both the question and answer have been variously understood. Two main lines of thought may be noted. (1) For the majority of exegetes the two halves of the question in v. 48 are materially related or even mean the same thing, and the answer in v. 49 refers to the whole question as a *pars pro toto*. For Samaria was considered to be a demon-possessed land, in which people like Dositheus, Simon Magus (cf. Acts 8:9 ff.) and Menander appeared with blasphemous claims and found support. Alternatively, the Samaritans as heretics were regarded *eo ipso* as demon-possessed (cf. Gal. 3:1). In this connexion attention has been drawn to Sot. 22a, where Samaritan and magician are related categories. (2) On the other hand, some scholars stress the difference between the two halves of the question in v. 48 and Jesus' silence on the accusation of being a Samaritan in v. 49 (cf. the commentaries of Lagrange and Odeberg, ad loc.; J. Bowman, "Samaritan Studies", *BJRL* 40, 1958, 298–327; E. D. Freed, "Did John Write his Gospel Partly to Win Samaritan Converts?", *NovT* 12, 1970, 241–56; O. Cullmann, "Von Jesus zum Stephanuskreis und zum Johannesevangelium", in E. E. Ellis and E. Grässer, eds., *Jesus und Paulus*, Festschrift für W. G. Kümmel, 1975, 44–56). This is taken to be a conscious reference to a certain proximity of Jesus to the Samaritans (in his teaching or in his less hostile attitude), or perhaps to the corresponding interest of the Fourth Evangelist. But such conjectures are opposed by the clear rejection of Samaritan claims in Jn. 4:22. Neither do the sharp accusations against the Jews in Jn. 8 make Jesus into a Samaritan. Rather, they are sharper than any Samaritan polemic against the Jews that we know (cf. A. Merx, *Das Evangelium des Johannes nach der syrischen im Sinaikloster gefundenen Palimpsesthandschrift*, 1911, 216). The first interpretation (1) which is supported by the majority of expositors is exegetically more plausible. In any case, the reference to Simon Magus does not fit chronologically into the life of Jesus. Jn. 8:48 is, like other elements in the controversy between Jesus and "the Jews" in Jn., also of historical value as testimony to the relationship between Jews and Christians at the time of the composition of the Fourth Gospel (cf. A. Merx, op. cit., 218). In this connexion, it is worth asking whether *Samaritēs* is an inadequate, unduly restrictive rendering of the rabbinic term *mîn* (heretic), for which there was no exact Gk. equivalent in the NT age.

2. *Samaritan Influences in the NT?* (a) The Gospel of John. After A. Merx (op. cit.) and especially H. Odeberg (*The Fourth Gospel interpreted in its Relation to Contemporaneous Religious Currents in Palestine and the Hellenistic-Oriental World*, 1929) had brought their knowledge of Samaritan literature to the interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, J. Bowman gave impetus to further consideration (cf. his "Samaritan Studies", *BJRL* 40, 1958, 298–327, especially 298–308; and his *Samaritanische Probleme. Studien zum Verhältnis von Samaritanertum, Judentum und Urchristentum*, 1967). He raised the question whether the Gospel according to John could not have been directed in many respects to the needs of the Samaritan mission; e.g. by taking up positively Deut. 18:15, 18 and the thought of pre-existence into the Johannine christology; by thinking in terms of the unity of the people of God in Jn. 10:16; by stressing the idea of faith which was also important for the Samaritans. G. W. Buchanan ("The Samaritan Origin of the Gospel of John", in J. Neusner, ed., *Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of E. R. Goodenough*, 1968, 149–75) and E. D. Freed (op. cit.) took up and extended the hypothesis. H. G. Kip-

penberg expressed his approval (op. cit., 162, n. 95), and O. Cullmann combined it with his earlier thesis of the origin of the Fourth Gospel in the circle of Hellenistic Jewish Christianity (*The Johannine Circle: Its Place in Judaism, among the Disciples of Jesus and in Early Christianity. A Study in the Origin of the Gospel of John*, 1976). Alongside this, Samaritan texts have been adduced in the interpretation of Johannine thought by W. A. Meeks (*The Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology*, 1967) and K. Haacker (*Die Stiftung des Heils. Untersuchungen zur Struktur der johanneischen Theologie*, 1972). At first J. Macdonald followed Bowman ("The Samaritan Doctrine of Moses", *SJT* 13, 1960, 149–62), but later proceeded to reverse his opinion, and explained the common factors between John and the Samaritans as the borrowing by the latter from John or from early church christology (*The Theology of the Samaritans*, 1964). K. Haacker (op. cit., 127 f.) and R. Bergmeier ("Zur Frühdatierung samaritanischer Theologumena", *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 5, 1974, 121–53) have stressed that the arguments so far adduced are insufficient, in the light of the chronology of the Samaritan sources and the multiplicity of strata in the Johannine tradition, to provide the basis for a new theory of the origin and objectives of the Fourth Gospel.

Clarification is only possible if, in connexion with developments in research into the Samaritan religion, all significant linguistic and material parallels to Jn. of the really ancient literature and tradition of the Samaritans are brought together and inserted into the framework of the rest of the material from the history of religion. Only the concurrence of specifically Samaritan traditions with Johannine statements permits conclusions to be drawn about historical relationships in the one direction or the other. The stepping up of relevant research could make an important contribution to the understanding of the Fourth Gospel, and help to solve the riddle of how the Fourth Gospel has "alongside its Hellenistic traits such a strikingly Palestinian-Jewish character" (J. Schniewind, "Über das Johannesevangelium", in H.-J. Kraus, *Julius Schniewind. Charisma der Theologie*, 1965, 194).

(b) Stephen's Speech (Acts 7:2–53). Stephen's speech in Acts 7:2–53 contains several readings peculiar to the Samaritan Pentateuch and themes recalling specifically Samaritan traditions: Exod. 3:6 in v. 32; Deut. 2:5 in v. 5; the chronology of Gen. 11:32 in v. 4; the transfer of the tombs of the patriarchs from Hebron to Shechem (a combination of Gen. 23; 49:29–33; 50:13 with Gen. 33:19; [Jos. 24:32]) in vv. 15 f. (cf. the local tradition according to Jerome, *Epp.* 57, 10 and 108, 13).

However, a number of points remain uncertain (as against A. Spiro, "Stephen's Samaritan Background", in J. Munck, *The Acts of the Apostles*, revised by W. F. Albright and C. S. Mann, *Anchor Bible*, 1967, 285–300; and C. H. H. Scobie, "The Origin and Development of Samaritan Christianity", *NTS* 19, 1972–73, 390–414). (i) It is not clear whether the quotations from Gen. 12:7; 15:13 f. and Exod. 3:12 in vv. 5 ff. are intended to support the cultic claims of Shechem, because the revelation in Gen. 12 is located at Shechem. For the phrase *en tō topō toutō* ("in this place") in v. 7 differs from the Samaritan Pentateuch version of Exod. 3:12, and furthermore in context refers to the temple at Jerusalem (cf. 6:14). (ii) Nor is it clear whether v. 37 reflects the Samaritan text of Exod. 20, where Deut. 18:18 is interpolated. For on the one hand, it is not Deut. 18:18 but Deut. 18:15 that is quoted. And on the other hand, the Pentateuchal quotations in Acts 7 do not stand in the logical sequence of

their occurrence in the biblical text. (iii) It is not clear whether the polemic against the building of Solomon's temple in vv. 47–50 reflects the Samaritan position. For on the one hand, the Samaritans possessed a temple themselves for two hundred years on Mount Gerizim. On the other hand, the Samaritan polemic was not directed against a particular form of building (*oikos*, house, instead of *skēnē*, → tent, tabernacle, or *skēnōma*, tent, dwelling place), but exclusively in what in their eyes was the illegitimate site of Jerusalem. (iv) Finally it is not clear whether the link with Deut. 18:15, 18 points as such to a Samaritan background (against this cf. H. M. Teeple, *The Mosaic Eschatological Prophet*, 1956).

Spiro's assertion is quite erroneous that the "downgrading" of → Moses (and the law) by setting angels as intermediaries between God and Moses (vv. 30, 35, 38) is typically Samaritan. On the one hand, it is improbable in the light of v. 53 that the mention of angels here (as in Gal. 3:19) has a pejorative intention. And on the other hand, Spiro's opinion, that the Samaritans had taken centuries to accommodate themselves to Moses and the law in their detour via the patriarchs, rests upon an uncritical understanding of 2 Ki. 17 and Josephus, *Ant.* 11, 346, and is altogether untenable.

Over against the Samaritan readings and peculiar traditions stands the use of OT texts outside the Pentateuch, which the Samaritans did not regard as Holy Scripture: Amos 5:27 in vv. 42 f. and Isa. 66:1 f. in vv. 49 f. M. H. Scharlemann, Scobie and Spiro see further echoes of Jer. 7:18 and 19:13 in v. 42 and of Ps. 132:5 in vv. 45 f. (M. H. Scharlemann, *Stephen: A Singular Saint*, *Analecta Biblica* 34, 1968, 43; Scobie, op. cit., 395; Spiro, op. cit., 287). These quotations or allusions stand in an anti-Jewish context, or to be more precise, in the context of a sermon to the Jews summoning them to repentance. This in itself does not give them a Samaritan character (as against Scobie *et al.*; cf. above on Jn. 8:48). Rather, it may be explained without further problems from the situation narrated in Acts 7.

Spiro, following a tradition in Abul Fath (ed. Vilmar, 1865, 159), takes Stephen to be a Samaritan Christian who preached the gospel in Jerusalem and for homiletical reasons also quoted from the Jewish prophetical books. The latter is in principle feasible in view of Gen. R. 4:4a, where a Samaritan cites Jer. 23:24. But the price of the theory is to claim that Stephen did not belong to the circle of Hellenists of Acts 6:1. Rather, he is said to belong to that of the Hebrews whom Spiro reckons to be Christian Samaritans, because in his opinion the term *Hebraios* in the 1st cent. A.D. was ostensibly used only for Samaritans (but cf. Phil. 3:5).

More plausible is the conjecture of Scharlemann, that Stephen was probably a Jew, but (perhaps even before his conversion) came under Samaritan influence (cf. op. cit., 186). Scobie departs unnecessarily from the NT testimony, when he sees the speech as a product of the Samaritan mission which began only after Stephen's death (cf. *NTS* 19, 1972–73, 398).

The question is whether the Samaritanisms of Acts 7 are explicable only through direct, particular contacts with the Samaritans. The contemporary discussion is in danger of falling back behind the insights of P. Kahle (*Opera Minora*, 1956, 3–37, especially 8–12), which have been confirmed by the Qumran discoveries, and of underestimating the fact, that the text of the Samaritan Pentateuch and other Samaritan traditions were spread beyond the narrow confines of the Samaritan community (cf. Philo, *Migr. Abr.* 176 f. with Acts 7:4; Exod. 3:6 LXX *v.l.* with Acts 7:32). Readings

of the Samaritan Pentateuch are therefore no certain indication of the Samaritan provenance of a source.

Acts 7:2–53 is, therefore, until further evidence is discovered to be evaluated as testimony for the cross-connexions between Hellenistic Judaism and Hellenistic-Jewish Christianity (cf. Acts 6:1) on the one hand and Samaritanism on the other. The speech is not a literary fruit of the Samaritan mission, but it gives insight into its theological and cultural antecedents. *K. Haacker*

An alphabetical list of most of the literature of and on the Samaritans which had been published up to his time was produced by L. A. Mayer and edited by D. Broadribb under the title *Bibliography of the Samaritans* (Supplement to Abr-Nahrain I), 1964. This list has been supplemented by S. Noja, "Contribution à la bibliographie des Samaritains" in *AIŌN* 33, Naples, 1973, 98–113, and by R. Weis, "Supplements to the Samaritan Bibliography" in *AIŌN* 35, 1975, 265–273. For selected bibliographies see: J. A. Montgomery, *The Samaritans. The Earliest Jewish Sect. Their History, Theology and Literature*, (1907) 1968, 322–346, J. Macdonald, *The Theology of the Samaritans*, 1964, 457–463 (especially for the editions of sources), and R. Weis, *Leqeṭ bibliografî 'al ha-Šomeronim* (*A Selected Bibliography on the Samaritans*) 1974 [3]. For details of the Samaritan Chronicles and other writings see J. Macdonald, op. cit., 457, 460 ff.

(a). E. Baguley, *A Critical Edition, with Translation, of the Hebrew Text of the Malef, and a Comparison of its Teachings with those in the Samaritan Liturgy*, 1962; Z. Ben-Ḥayyim, *The Literature and Oral Tradition of Hebrew and Aramaic among the Samaritans: The Grammar, Masoretical and Exegetical Writings of the Samaritans*, I–III, 1957–67; J. Bowman, "Early Samaritan Eschatology", *Journal of Jewish Studies* 6, 1955, 63–72; "The Exegesis of the Pentateuch among the Samaritans and among the Rabbis", *OTS* 8, 1950, 22–62; "The Importance of Samaritan Researches", *Annual of Leeds University Oriental Society* 1, 1959, 43–54; "The Samaritans and the Book of Deuteronomy", *Transactions of Glasgow University Oriental Society* 17, 1959, 9–18; "Pilgrimage to Mt. Gerizim", *Eretz Israel* 7, 1964, 17–28; and "Samaritan Law and Liturgy", *BJRL* 40, 1958, 315–27; "The Fourth Gospel and the Samaritans", *BJRL* 40, 1958, 298–308; "Faith in Samaritan Thought", *BJRL* 40, 1958, 308–15; G. W. Buchanan, "The Samaritan Origin of the Gospel of John", in J. Neusner, ed., *Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of E. R. Goodenough*, 1968, 149–75; R. J. Coggins, *Samaritans and Jews: The Origins of the Samaritans Reconsidered*, 1975; A. E. Cowley, "The Samaritan Doctrine of the Messiah", *The Expositor*, Fifth Series 1, 1895, 161–74; "Samaritan Literature and Religion", *JQR* 8, 1896, 562–75; *The Samaritan Liturgy*, I–II, 1909; and "The Samaritan Liturgy and the Reading of the Law", *JQR* 7, 1894, 121–40; F. M. Cross, Jr., "Aspects of Samaritan and Jewish History in Late Persian and Hellenistic Times", *HTR* 59, 1966, 201–11; and "Papyri of the Fourth Century B.C. from Dâliyeh", in D. N. Freedman and J. Greenfield, eds., *New Directions in Biblical Archaeology*, 1969, 45–69; O. Cullmann, "Samaria and the Origins of the Christian Mission", in *The Early Church*, 1956, 183–92; and *The Johannine Circle: Its Place in Judaism, among the Disciples of Jesus and in Early Christianity. A Study in the Origin of the Gospel of John*, 1976; D. Daube, "Samaritan Women", in *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*, Jordan Lectures 1952, 1956, 373–82; J. D. M. Derrett, "The Parable of the Good Samaritan", in *Law in the New Testament*, 1970, 208–27; J. W. Drane, "Simon the Samaritan and the Lucan Concept of Salvation History", *EQ* 47, 1975, 131–37; R. A. Falconer, "Is 2nd Peter a Genuine Epistle to the Churches of Samaria?", *Expositor*, Sixth Series, 5, 1902, 459–72; M. S. Enslin, "Luke and the Samaritans", *HTR* 36, 1943, 277–98; E. D. Freed, "Did John Write his Gospel Partly to Win Samaritan Converts?", *NovT* 12, 1970, 241–56; M. Gaster, "The Samaritan Legends of the Birth of Moses", *The Quest* 21, 1930, 358–71; *Samaritan Oral Law and Ancient Traditions*, I, *Eschatology*, 1932 (only this volume was published); *The Samaritans: Their History, Doctrines and Literature*, Schweich Lectures for 1923, 1925; and *Studies in Texts in Folklore, Magic, Medieval Romance, Hebrew Apocrypha and Samaritan Archaeology*, I–III, 1925–28; T. H. Gaster, "A Samaritan Poem about Moses", in A. Berger, L. Marwick and I. S. Meyer, *The Joshua Bloch Memorial Volume* (Studies in Booklore and History), 1960, 115–39; B. Gerhardsson, *The Good Samaritan – the Good Shepherd*, 1958; C. Heller, *The Samaritan Pentateuch: An Adaptation of the Masoretic Text*, 1923; J. Jeremias, *Samareia, Samaritēs, TDNT* VII, 88–94; *Jesus' Promise to the Nations*, Franz Delitzsch Lectures, *SBT* 24, 1958; and

Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus: An Investigation into Economic and Social Conditions during the New Testament Period, 1969, 352–58; R. W. Klein, "Samaria Papyri", *IDB Supplementary Volume*, 1976, 772; J. Macdonald, *Memar Marqah*, I–II, *BZAW* 84, 1963; "The Tetragrammaton in Samaritan Liturgical Compositions", *Transactions of Glasgow Oriental Society* 17, 1959, 37–47; *A Critical Edition of the Text of the Samaritan Yom ha-Kippur Liturgy, with Translation thereof and Comparison with the corresponding Jewish Liturgies*, (Dissertation, Leeds) 1958; "Islamic Doctrines in Samaritan Theology", *Muslim World* 50, 1960, 279–90; "The Samaritan Doctrine of Moses", *SJT* 13, 1960, 149–62; "The Day of Judgement in Near Eastern Religions", *Indo-Iranica* 14, 1961, 33–53; and *The Theology of the Samaritans*, 1964; W. A. Meeks, *The Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology, Supplements to NovT* 14, 1967; S. L. Miller, *The Samaritan Molad Mosheh*, 1949; J. A. Montgomery, *The Samaritans: The Earliest Jewish Sect*, 1907; G. F. Nicholls, *A Grammar of the Samaritan Language*, 1858; J. D. Purvis, *The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Origin of the Samaritan Sect*, 1968; "The Fourth Gospel and the Samaritans", *NovT* 17, 1975, 161–98; "Samaritan Pentateuch", *IDB Supplementary Volume* 1976, 772–75; "Samaritans", ibid., 776 f.; H. H. Rowley, "Sanballat and the Samaritan Temple", *BJRL* 38, 1956, 166–96; C. H. H. Scobie, "The Origin and Development of Samaritan Christianity", *NTS* 19, 1972–73, 390–414; A. Spiro, "Stephen's Samaritan Background", in J. Munck, *The Acts of the Apostles*, revised by W. F. Albright and C. S. Mann, *Anchor Bible*, 1967, 285–300; J. E. H. Thomson, *The Samaritans: Their Testimony to the Religion of Israel*, 1919; R. J. F. Trotter, *Did the Samaritans of the Fourth Century Know the Epistle to the Hebrews?*, Leeds University Oriental Society Monograph Series 1, 1961; and *A Critical Study of the Ideological Background of Fourteenth-Century Samaritanism, with Special Reference to the Works of Abisha b. Phinehas, Abdallah b. Solomon and Ben Manir*, (Dissertation, Leeds) 1962; G. E. Wright, "The Samaritans at Shechem", in *Shechem: The Biography of a Biblical City*, 1965, 170–84.

(b). R. Bergmeier, "Zur Frühdatierung samaritanischer Theologumena", *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 5, 1974, 121–53; K. Beyschlag, *Simon Magus und die christliche Gnosis, WUNT* 16, 1974; B. H. Binder, "Das Gleichnis vom barmherzigen Samariter", *TZ* 15, Basel, 176 ff.; K. Bornhäuser, "Die Samariter des Neuen Testaments", *ZSTh* 9, 1932, 552–66; J. Bowman, *Samaritanische Probleme. Studien zum Verhältnis von Samaritanertum, Judentum und Urchristentum*, 1967; O. Cullmann, "Von Jesus zum Stephanuskreis und zum Johannesevangelium", in E. E. Ellis and E. Grässer, eds., *Jesus und Paulus*, Festschrift für W. G. Kümmel, 1975, 44–56; J. Daniélou, "Le bon Samaritain", *Mélanges bibliques rédigés en l'Honneur de André Robert*, 1957, 457–65; M. Delcor, "Vom Sichem der hellenistischen Epoche zum Sychar des Neuen Testaments", *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 78, 1962, 34–48; F. Diening, *Das Hebräische bei den Samaritanern. Ein Beitrag zur vormasoretischen Grammatik des Hebräischen*, Bonner Orientalischer Studien 24, 1938; A. F. von Gall, *Der hebräische Pentateuch der Samaritaner*, 1918; K. Haacker, *Die Stiftung des Heils. Untersuchungen zur Struktur der johanneischen Theologie*, 1972; M. Gaster, "Die 613 Gebote und Verbote der Samaritaner", *Festschrift zum Bestehen des jüdisch-theologischen Seminars Breslau*, 1929; M. Heidenheim, *Bibliotheca Samaritana*, I, *Die samaritanische Pentateuch-Version*, 1884; II, *Die samaritanische Liturgie*, 1885; III, *Der Kommentar Marqahs des Samaritaners*, 1896; A. Hilgenfeld, "Der Taheb der Samaritaner, nach einer neu aufgefundenen Urkunde", *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* 36, 1894, 233–44; J. Jeremias, *Die Passahfeier der Samaritaner und ihre Bedeutung für das Verständnis der alttestamentlichen Passahüberlieferung, BZAW* 59, 1932; P. Kahle, "Die zwölf Marka-Hymnen aus dem 'Defter' der samaritanischen Liturgie", in *Opera Minora*, 1965, 186–212; H. G. Kippenberg, *Garizim und Synagoge. Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur samaritanischen Religion der aramäischen Periode*, 1971; G. Lüdemann, *Untersuchungen zur simonianischen Gnosis*, 1975; *Der Messias oder Ta'eb der Samaritaner, BZAW* 17, 1909; A. Merx, *Das Evangelium des Johannes nach der syrischen im Sinaikloster gefundenen Palimpsesthandschrift*, 1911; W. Monselewski, *Der barmherzige Samariter. Eine auslegungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Lukas 10, 25–37, Beiträge zur Geschichte der biblischen Exegese* 5, 1967; D. Rettig, *Memar Marqa. Ein Samaritanischer Midrasch zum Pentateuch*, 1934; B. Reicke, "Der barmherzige Samariter", in O. Böcher and K. Haacker, eds., *Verborum Veritas. Festschrift für Gustav Stählin*, 1970, 103–9; J. Rosenberg, *Lehrbuch der samaritanischen Sprache und Literatur*, 1901; SB I 538–60; A. Schalit, "Die Denkschrift der Samaritaner an König Antiochos Epiphanes zu Beginn der grossen Verfolgung der jüdischen Religion im Jahre 167 v. Chr. (Josephus, AJ, XII, *§§* 58–264", *ASTI* 8, 1970–71, 131–83; H. M. Schenke, "Jakobsbrunnen – Josephgrab – Sychar", *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 84, 1968, 159–84.

Satan, Beelzebul, Devil, Exorcism

διάβολος

διάβολος (*diabolos*), adj., slanderous; noun, slanderer, the devil; *διαβάλλω* (*diaballō*), accuse, bring charges with hostile intent; *Βεεζεβούλ* (*Beezeboul*), *Βεελζεβούλ* (*Beelzeboul*), *Βεελζεβούβ* (*Beelzeboub*), Beelzebul, Beelzebub; *Βελιάρ* (*Beliar*), Beliar; *Βελιάλ* (*Belial*), Belial; *Σατάν* (*Satan*), indeclinable, and *Σατανᾶς* (*Satanas*), the Adversary, Satan.

diaballō (formed from *dia*, through, and *ballō*, to throw) means to throw over or across, divide, set at variance, accuse, bring charges, slander, inform, reject, misrepresent, deceive. In the NT it is only used in Lk. 16:1 of the Unjust Steward who was (justly!) accused of and denounced for embezzlement (→ House, art. *oikonomia* NT 1 (a)). From the vb. is derived the noun *diabolos*, slanderer, accuser, devil. It is hardly found outside the NT and LXX.

OT 1. In the LXX *diabolos* occurs 21 times (13 times in Job 1 and 2). Except for Esther 7:4 and 8:1 (which have *ṣār* and *ṣōrēr*, adversary) it is always a translation of Heb. *śāṭān*, which is also transcribed three times simply by *satan* (1 Ki. 11:14, 23a, 25b). The Aram. form is *sāṭānā'*. Satan in the OT means an adversary or wicked opponent. In 1 Sam. 29:4 *śāṭān* (LXX *epiboulos*) is used of a potential saboteur in the ranks; in 1 Ki. 11:23, 25 it denotes the leader of a faction and later Syrian king Rezon (but see also Ps. 109[108]:6, where the LXX gives *diabolos*). *śāṭān* is also used of the angel who stood in Balaam's way (Num. 22:22, 32). It is in the prologue to Job that Satan first appears as a heavenly being, who accuses the righteous to God's face (the Public Prosecutor in heaven!). He similarly appears in Zech. 3:1 f. The word is first used as a personal name in 1 Chr. 21:1, where Satan entices → David to undertake the census of the people. The earlier account emphasizes Yahweh's wrath (2 Sam. 24:1). In the OT Satan is not the devil in the later sense of the word; he is not an evil principle opposing God. The LXX perhaps shows a slight shift in this direction, when it avoids using *diabolos* in the translation of the Numbers and Samuel references; it makes the word less ambivalent and puts the main emphasis in Job. Other instances of *diabolos* in the LXX are Wis. 2:24; and 1 Macc. 1:36.

The AV translates the Heb. *hêlēl* (LXX *heōsphoros*) in Isa. 14:12 by "Lucifer", lit. it means the shining one, i.e. Day Star. The reference is not to Satan but to the king of Babylon (→ Light, art. *phōs* NT 4).

2. In late Judaism the devil is particularly identified with the "evil inclination" and with the "angel of death". He now has a clearly evil character. As in the OT, he is the accuser of men before God. The fall of the → angels plays a large rôle (being linked with Gen. 6:1 ff.; → Demon, art. *daimonion* OT 2) without having any fundamental significance (Eth. Enoch 86:1–88:3; Jub. 5:1–12; CD 2:18–21). The impure spirits who deceived → Noah's grandsons are children of "the Watchers" (Jub. 19:28). The greater number of these spirits were destroyed, but a tenth remained, and with these Mastema is able to carry out his purpose among men (Jub. 10:8). For the rest, the demons stand alongside Satan in their own right, while he functions as the sole accuser before God. There is no account of his fall from heaven: otherwise he could not be the accuser. He tries above all to disrupt the relationship between God and Israel, but he also endeavours to separate the rest of mankind from God. His activity is

briefly and tellingly described in Baba Bathra 16a: "It has been taught in Baraitha: Satan comes down and deceives, goes up and accuses, seizes power and souls." It is only later traditions that state that Satan had been an angel of high rank. The rabbis allowed that man had free will, to enable him to keep the law and to ward off the evil inclination or Satan-Sammael.

3. In the writings of Qumran Belial appears as the name of the evil spirit. God created two spirits, the spirit of light and the spirit or angel of darkness (Belial), who both exercise their power in the present (1QS 1:18; 2:5, 19; 3:20–23). Belial is the angel of malevolence (1QM 13:12), who lives in the hearts of his followers, the "sons of darkness" (1QS 1:10) and rules in the preacher of apostasy (CD 12:2). The enemies of the righteous are filled with "guiles of Belial" (1QH 2:16 f.; 6:21; 7:4). Belial's followers are called his "congregation" (1QH 2:22). Unchastity, riches and defilement of the temple are the "three nets of Belial" (CD 4:15). His power is like a flood, threatening the world and the righteous (1QH 3:29, 32; 5:39). But God protects his righteous ones (1QM 14:9). Belial and his followers are solemnly cursed (1QS 2:4–9; 1QM 13:4 f.). The "spirits of his company" are "angels of destruction" (1QM 13:12). In the last days, after the Qumran community has cut itself off from the rest of the people, Belial is let loose against Israel (CD 4:13). At the end of days in the final war, the "sons of darkness" constitute Belial's army (1QM 1:1, 13). But it will be destroyed (1QM 11:8 f.), because God himself is fighting against him (1QM 15:3; 18:1, 3), and his violent wrath is raised against him (1QM 4:1 f.). The → curse of Joshua (Jos. 6:6) signifies that an accursed man, one of the company of Belial, will again rebuild Jericho (4Qtest 23). In these writings, therefore, Belial no longer appears as accuser, and accordingly has no access to heaven or to God. Nor is it stated that Belial was the one who deceived → Adam and so brought sin into the world. This same figure appears as Beliar in the Test. XII, and, according to Eth. Enoch 54:6, Azazel and his hordes became subjects of Satan.

4. *Beelzeboul* is an indeclinable noun (other versions read *Beezeboul* and *Beelzeboub*). The origin and meaning of this name are not entirely clear. In 2 Ki. 1:2 f. and 6:16 *ba'al zᵉḇûḇ*, Lord of the Flies, appears to be god of Ekron. *Beelzeboul* could be derived from *ba'al zᵉḇûl*, lord of the heights, i.e. of heaven, and so lord of heaven or God of heaven. Most probably *Bee(l)zeboul* comes from *ba'al zibbûl* (from post-OT Heb. *zeḇel* manure, dung; *zibbûl* meaning an idolatrous sacrifice) – lord of the idol–sacrifice – which is at once equalled to dung. There is the further possibility of deriving the name from a Hittite deer-god Zaparwa, which, via Zebaba, became *ba'al zᵉḇûḇ* for the Philistines at Ekron. Derivation from the Aramaic would lead to *be'el dᵉḇāḇā*, lord of enmity, enemy; or to *be'el diḇaḇā*, lord of the flies (cf. Galilean-Aram. *diḇaḇā*, a fly).

NT 1. In the NT *diabolos* occurs 37 times, *Satanas* 36 times, *Bee(l)zeboul* 7 times. In addition there are the following names: the → enemy, *echthros*; the → evil one, *ho ponēros*; the prince of this world, *ho archōn tou kosmou toutou* (→Beginning); the adversary, *antidikos*, which is a literal translation of the OT *śāṭān* (1 Pet. 5:8). Mk. uses *satanas* exclusively. Lk. prefers this word in his special material, but no basic difference in meaning from *diabolos* can be established. The latter is never used as a form of address (cf. Matt. 4:10 with 4:1, 5, 8, 11).

2. In Matt. 25:41 angels of the devil (*tou diabolou*) are mentioned (cf. also 2 Cor.

12:7; → Fruit, art. *skolops*). Similarly, in the account of the temptation (Matt. 4:1–11, par. Mk. 1:12 f., Lk. 4:1–13), the devil, as in the Qumran writings, arrogates to himself the position of a lord of the world, hoping by this transference of title to deter Jesus from his way (→ Tempt). Appropriately he is called the "prince of this world" (*archōn tou kosmou toutou*, Jn. 12:31; 14:30; 16:11). The place of the devil is not → hell; the eternal fire is prepared for the devil and all his angels (Matt. 25:41). As in the OT, he has access to God, in order to accuse mankind (Lk. 22:21; Jn. 12:31; 16:11). Hence, Jesus prays for the faith of his disciples and teaches them to pray for deliverance from the evil one (Matt. 6:13).

According to Lk. 10:18, Jesus saw the downfall of Satan (the accuser in heaven). This follows the joyful return of the seventy who tell Jesus: "Lord, even the demons are subject to us in your name!" (Lk. 10:17). Rev. 12:5, 7–12 links this fall of Satan with the appearance of Jesus himself. In Rev. 12:9 *diabolos* and *Satanas* stand side by side as words of equal weight and significance, while in v. 8 this figure is described as a *drakōn*, → dragon, or *ophis*, serpent, and in v. 10 as → accuser, *katēgōr*. This breaks up the dualistic view of the world held in Qumran: Jesus has defeated and disarmed the devil, and can thus rob him of his plunder – i.e. Jesus is able to heal those who are possessed (Matt. 12:27–29). (On the bearing of this on the question of the millennium → Number, art. *chilias* NT 4.)

But even though Satan has been thrown out of heaven, this does not prevent him being able to act. The unbelieving Jews are of their father, the devil (Jn. 8:44). Peter finds himself being addressed and identified as "Satan", because he tried to turn Jesus back from his way of suffering obedience (Matt. 16:23 par. Mk. 8:53). It can also be said that Satan entered Judas, when he was prepared to betray Jesus (Lk. 22:3; Jn. 13:27; cf. Jn. 6:70; 13:2 [*diabolos*]). The hour of darkness is his hour (Lk. 22:53; note the dualistic terminology). Satan can – but does not necessarily! – stand behind illness (Lk. 13:16; cf. 2 Cor. 12:7; and Acts 10:38 [*diabolos*]). He snatches the saving word from men's hearts lest they believe and be saved, in the parable of the sower (*ho ponēros*, "the evil one", Matt. 13:19; *ho satanas*, "Satan", Mk. 4:15; *ho diabolos*, "the devil", Lk. 8:12). But it is not only in relation to individuals, but also in relation to the → church that anyone can be called *diabolos* who tries to impede God's word of salvation. For instance, in the parable of the wheat and the tares (Matt. 13:24–30), the presence of "evil" in the community is explained through the activity of the → "enemy". There are no intermediaries here as sometimes in rabbinic theology. In recording this → parable Matt. is making an implicit contrast with the Qumran solution to the problem. There the law-breakers are excluded from the community of the people of God by the community's own disciplinary measures before the final judgment, leaving only the pure saved community. The parable teaches the impossibility of an absolutely pure church; the church on earth is inevitably a mixed body. Separation is the special task of the eschatological judge alone (→ Present; art. The Parousia and Eschatology in the NT; → Judgment).

On "evil" in the Lord's Prayer and other instances of *ponēros* → Evil; → Prayer, art. *proseuchomai* NT 2.

3. (a) In the Pauline writings *diabolos* is found only in Eph. 4:27 and 6:11 (and 6 times in the Pastorals: 1 Tim. 3:6 f., 11; 2 Tim. 2:26; 3:3; Tit. 2:3). Otherwise *Satanas* is the regular word (which, in turn, appears in the Pastorals only in 1 Tim. 1:20, taking up the usage of 1 Cor. 5:5 and 1 Tim. 5:15 for Christians who fall back

into discipleship of Satan [→ Disciple, art. *opisō*]). But this name is not very common either; there are only 10 references (Rom.16:20; 1 Cor. 5:5; 7:5; 2 Cor. 2:11; 11:14; 12:7; 1 Thess. 2:18; 2 Thess. 2:9; 1 Tim. 1:20; 5:15). In 2 Cor. 6:15 Paul makes use of the name Beliar, found in the writings of Qumran. Indeed, the whole section 2 Cor. 6:14 ff. is reminiscent of the thought of Qumran, with its opposing pairs of ideas, such as righteousness and lawlessness, light and darkness, Christ and Beliar, believing and unbelieving, temple of God and temples of idols. Paul also attributes many misfortunes and difficulties to the work of Satan. The "thorn in the flesh" is a "messenger of Satan" sent to bruise him (2 Cor. 12:7; → Fruit, art. *skolops*). Satan wants to outwit Paul (2 Cor. 2:11). To prevent him from making a journey (1 Thess. 2:18) he can change himself into an → angel of → light, and with this disguise disseminate impure thoughts through those he sends out (2 Cor. 11:14). He tempts Christian communities (1 Cor. 7:5; 2 Cor. 2:1; 1 Thess. 3:5). He is wily and deceitful (Eph. 6:11; here and in the following references *diabolos* is used); he sets traps (1 Tim. 3:7; 2 Tim. 2:26) and is encountered in calamity and sin as the ruler of the air (Eph. 2:2, → Demon, art. *aēr*).

(b) In 1 Cor. 5:5 the notorious sinner is to be excluded from the congregation and given over to Satan for death (→ Destroy, art. *olethros*). This ban (→ curse) is intended to make it possible for the *pneuma*, the → spirit (the → soul?) of this man to be saved. Accordingly, Hymenaeus and Alexander are handed over to Satan to be punished, and to be dissuaded from their blasphemies (1 Tim. 1:20); they are not to be killed (cf. Acts 5:5 ff.). Behind these disciplinary instructions stands the Jewish conception of Satan as master of death and destruction, and as executor of the divine wrath, from whose control membership of the congregation secured freedom, and into whose control the culprit is now thrown back.

4. The devil's area of activity is primarily the non-Christian world (Acts 26:18; cf. 2 Cor. 6:16), and hence → magic is bound up with him (Acts 13:10). An apocalyptic story, presumably originating from the Assumption of Moses and telling of an attack of the devil on the archangel Michael, is presupposed in Jude 9 (→ Angel, art. *Michaēl*; → Revile, art. *blasphēmeō* NT 6). Acts 5:3, Rev. 2:9 f. and 20:7 also speak of Satan's fight against the Christian community.

5. At the time of the end Satan sends → Antichrist (2 Thess. 2:3–12; the beast of Rev. 13:17; → Animal, art. *thērion*). Matt. 25:41; Rev. 20:10 (cf. 1 Jn. 3:8; Heb. 2:14), and possibly also Rom. 16:20, speak of the destruction of the devil at the end. Angry and violent, he realizes that till then he only has a little time, and rages wildly against God's people (Rev. 12:12, 16 f.). On the binding of Satan and the question of the millennium → Number, art. *chilias* NT 4.

6. All that can help against temptation is the armour of God (Eph. 6:11, 16; → War), a determined turning to God (Jas. 4:7) and a sober and alert faith. This alone will cause the devil to lose his power, although he paces about like a roaring lion, irritated and dangerous (1 Pet. 5:8). The ultimate reason for his defeat, however, is the "blood of the Lamb" (Rev. 12:11), that is, the victory of Jesus through his death on the → cross.

7. The NT contains no speculations at all about the origin or nature of the devil. He is also not equated with the evil inclination or with the angel of death. Indeed, → death and the devil are distinguished (Rev. 20:10, 14); for Satan has power over death (Heb. 2:14).

8. In the Johannine writings there are occasional references (Rev. 12:9; possibly also Jn. 8:44; 1 Jn. 3:8) to the rôle of the devil in the primeval history of Genesis 3. Jewish exegesis interpreted the serpent as the devil. Thus, the devil is a sinner right from the beginning (1 Jn. 3:8), and has been a murderer from the beginning (Jn. 8:44b). He does not have a share in the truth; he lies, he speaks on his own account (Jn. 8:44c). This is the Bible's historical, non-metaphysical, speech. But it is noteworthy here that dependence on the power of the devil can show itself both in actions and decisions: the effects of this are expressed in John by means of the predicative statements of descent and relationship. One who sins belongs to the devil, like Cain (1 Jn. 3:8, 12); or he is a devil himself, like Judas, the betrayer (Jn. 6:70). Hence the children of God can stand over against the children of the devil (1 Jn. 3:10; cf. Qumran above OT 3). Jesus' enemies are called children of the devil, i.e. those who share his nature and behaviour (Jn. 8:44). When "young men" succeed in defeating the evil one (1 Jn. 2:13 f.), that is a gift of Christ (cf. Jn. 17:15). Jn. 8:44 does not speak of a father of the devil; rather, *tou diabolou* is in apposition to *patros*, i.e. of your father, namely, the devil.

H. Bietenhard

9. *Bee(l)zeboul* in the NT is the name of a chief demon. Jesus' enemies accused him of being possessed by him: "And the scribes who came from Jerusalem said, 'He is possessed by Beelzebul, and by the prince of demons he casts out the demons' " (Mk. 3:22; cf. par. Matt. 12:24 and the doublet in Matt. 9:34 "the prince of the demons", Lk. 11:15; cf. also Matt. 10:25; 12:27; Lk. 11:18 f. for further use of the name). In reply Jesus "called them to him, and said to them in parables, 'How can Satan cast out Satan? If a kingdom is divided against itself, that kingdom cannot stand. And if a house is divided against itself, that house will not be able to stand. And if Satan has risen up against himself and is divided, he cannot stand, but is coming to an end. But no one can enter a strong man's house and plunder his goods, unless he first binds the strong man; then indeed he may plunder his house. Truly, I say to you, all sins will be forgiven the sons of men, and whatever blasphemies they utter; but whoever blasphemes against the Holy Spirit never has forgiveness, but is guilty of eternal sin' – for they had said, 'He has an unclean spirit' " (Mk. 3:23–30; cf. par. Matt. 12:25–37; Lk. 11:17–23; 12:10, 43 ff.; and also Jn. 8:48–59 on the suggestion that Jesus was a → Samaritan and had a devil). Similar charges persisted in Jewish sources, ascribing Jesus' works to → magic: "Yeshu of Nazareth was hanged on the day of preparation for the Passover because he practised sorcery and led the people astray" (Sanhedrin 43a; cf. Sanhedrin 107b; Sotah 47a; T. J. Hagigah 2.2; and the references in the Christian fathers, Justin, *Dial.* 69; Origen, *Contra Cels.* 1, 6, 28, 68, 71; 2, 9, 14, 16, 44, 48, 49, 51; 3, 1; 5, 51; 8, 9, 39; Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.* 3, 6; W. L. Lane, *The Gospel of Mark*, *NLC*, 1974, 142; H. van der Loos, *The Miracles of Jesus*, *Supplements to NovT* 9, 1965, 158–67).

W. L. Lane comments: "By tacitly substituting 'Satan' for 'Beelzebul' Jesus brings the controversy within the perspective of his mission as a direct confrontation with Satan. His argument is cumulative in its force: If what you say is true there exists the impossible circumstance that Satan is destroying his own realm. For it is self-evident that a kingdom divided against itself will fall, while a household divided against itself cannot be established. If your accusation is factual, then Satan has become divided in

his allegiance. This should mean that he has become powerless. *Yet this is clearly not so.* Satan remains strong, and this fact exposes the fallacy of your charge" (op. cit., 142 f.). The evidence why Satan remains strong may be twofold. On the one hand, there is his activity among those who are already afflicted by the demons. (It is the mission of Jesus and his disciples to preach and to cast out demons, cf. v. 15.) On the other hand, there is his activity among those who are opposing Jesus and attributing the work of the Holy Spirit (v. 29) to Beelzebul. With v. 27 Jesus turns to the charge that he is demon-possessed. "Satan is the strong man whose strength is evidenced in the enslavement of men through sin, possession, disease and death; the demons are his servants in this destructive work. . . . Jesus' ability to cast out demons means that one stronger than Satan has come to restrain his activity and to release the enslaved. The heart of Jesus' mission is to confront Satan and to crush him on all fields, and in the fulfilment of his task he is conscious of being the agent of irresistible power. Jesus' statement raises the pressing question of the source of his power. The pronouncement on blasphemy indicates that Jesus' works are accomplished through the power of the Holy Spirit. It is as the Bearer of the Spirit that he stands as the Champion of God in the battle with Satan. In the face of the claim that he is possessed by an unclean spirit Jesus affirms that he possesses the Spirit of God" (W. L. Lane, op. cit., 143). On the question of the unforgivable sin → Revile, art. *blasphēmeō* NT 5. For further literature → the bibliography below and → Sin.

C. Brown

ἐξορκιστής

ἐξορκιστής (*exhorkistēs*), exorcist; ἐξορκίζω (*exhorkizō*), exorcize.

This whole word-group is rare both in the NT and elsewhere. *exhorkistēs* occurs only at Acts 19:13 and *exhorkizō* as a *v.l.* at Acts 19:13 f. (see below NT 7 (d)). The vb. *horkizō* means to adjure, implore (cf. Matt. 26:63). Hence, *exhorkizō* means to expel a spirit by a solemn adjuration. In the NT the usual vb. is *ekballō*, to cast out (→ Demon, art. *ekballō*). But the phenomenon of exorcism is much more widespread than the infrequent use of the cognate noun and vb. suggest. Exorcism is now used as a general term for driving out an evil spirit, described in the NT as a *daimōn* or *daimonion*, demon, or a *pneuma akatharton*, unclean spirit, or *pneuma ponēron*, evil spirit (→ Demon; → Spirit). In this article exorcism is used in the general sense of any form of such expulsion. Although the AV speaks of casting out devils, the Gk. always refers to demons. *diabolos*, devil, is always sing., and is used only of Satan in the Bible. Satan is only once said to have entered into a person, i.e. Judas (Lk. 22:3; Jn. 13:27).

CL *exhorkizō* (cf. *exhorkoō*, administer an oath) is found in Demosthenes 54, 26; the *Revenue Laws of Ptolemy Philadelphus* 56.12 in the 3rd cent. B.C.; Polybius 3, 61, 10 etc. (cf. Liddell-Scott, 598). In the sense of exorcize an evil spirit, it is found in *Defixionum Tabellae, Rheinisches Museum*, Frankfort, 55, 248. The noun *exhorkistēs* is found in Luc., *Epigr.* 23; Ptolemaeus, *Tetrabiblos* 182).

OT 1. *exhorkizō* is found in the LXX only at Gen. 24:3 and 1 Ki. 22:16 for the Heb.

šāḇa', swear; and at Jdg. 17:2 *v.l.* for *'ālâh*, swear, i.e. curse. In none of these instances is there any question of exorcism.

2. The only example of exorcism in the OT is that of Saul, when he was afflicted by "an evil spirit from the LORD" (1 Sam. 16:14 ff.). We may interpret the phrase as implying that the spirit was permitted by Yahweh to afflict Saul for a special purpose (as in, e.g., 1 Ki. 22:19 ff.; Job 1:12; cf. also 2 Cor. 12:7). The spirit was temporarily exorcized by the playing of → David.

NT 1. *Possession.* During the ministry of Jesus and afterwards there were afflicted people whose symptoms were diagnosed as different from ordinary illnesses, by their contemporaries, by Jesus and his disciples and by the evangelists. They diagnosed possession or other influence by one or more evil spirits. If we wish to regard some at least as mentally deranged (e.g. schizophrenics), we have the difficulty of their immediate cure by word of command in a way unmatched by modern psychotherapists.

Present-day descriptions of illness are mainly descriptions of symptoms. Possession is the description of a cause. It is recognized today that the origin and form of many illnesses and disabilities are far from clear. There may be two cases that are apparently similar, and yet one may be purely physical and the other psychological in origin. Dumbness, blindness, choking, heart symptoms, accident proneness, even pseudo-pregnancy (e.g. Joanna Southcott the prophetess), may be the result of some traumatic experience, now forgotten. Shellshock is a classic, though extreme, example. Genuine possession goes a step further back, so that the psyche is affected, not simply by some happening, but by the influence of a spirit. Nothing is said of how a spirit gains control, but repossession comes when the personality is merely cleaned up without being renewed and occupied by God's Spirit (Matt. 12:44; Lk. 11:25). This puts some responsibility upon the person.

An indication of possession is the confession of the spirits when face to face with Jesus. They confess him to be "the Holy One of God" (Mk. 1:24), "Son of God" (Mk. 3:11), "Son of the Most High God" (Mk. 5:7). Yet Jesus exorcized them, and would not accept their testimony as legitimate preaching of the gospel (Mk. 1:34; 3:11, 12), any more than Paul accepted the testimony of the spirit of divination (Greek *Pythōn*, originally the dragon who guarded the oracle at Delphi) (Acts 16:16–18; → Magic, art. *mageia* NT 2 (e)).

2. *The Nature of the Possessing Spirits.* Although the Gospels admit that departed spirits may return (Lk. 24:37 ff.; Mk. 9:4; Matt. 14:26), there is no suggestion that these are the spirits who possess (contra the belief of mediums and some modern exorcists). They belong to Satan's kingdom (Matt. 12:26, 27), and consequently face ultimate destruction (Mk. 1:24) in torment (Matt. 8:29) in the abyss (Lk. 8:31) (→ Hell, art. *abyssos*).

There are grades of possessing spirits. A spirit may take with him "seven other spirits more evil than himself" (Matt. 12:45; Lk. 11:26). Jesus spoke of one kind that needed intensive prayer before it could be cast out (Mk. 9:29). The argument about casting out by Beelzebul turns on the superiority of one spirit (i.e. the Holy Spirit) over another (Matt. 12:23 ff. par.; → *diabolos* NT 9).

3. *The Manner of Exorcism.* Jesus commands directly with absolute authority

(Lk. 4:36). His power is "the finger of God" (Lk. 11:20; → Hand, art. *cheir* NT 2) or "the Spirit of God" (Matt. 12:28). The word of command is "come out" (Mk. 1:25), with the addition once of "never enter again" (Mk. 9:26), or simply "Go" (Matt. 8:32), although this last has the further meaning of "go into the swine". The disciples were given authority to cast out in the name of Jesus (Matt. 7:22; Lk. 10:17; Acts 16:18; 19:13).

4. *Specific Cases.* (a) There are general references without details: *daimonia* (Matt. 10:8; Mk. 1:39; 3:15; 6:13[16:17]; Lk. 9:1; 13:32); *pneumata akatharta* or *ponēra* (Matt. 8:16; 10:1; Mk. 6:7; Lk. 4:36; 6:18; 7:21; 10:20; Acts 5:16; 8:7).

(b) Mary Magdalene is named with other women as "healed of evil spirits and infirmities" (Lk. 8:2). Seven demons are said to have come out of Mary, and traditionally these are linked to her life as a prostitute. But the identification of Mary with the prostitute of 7:36 ff. is very far from certain.

(c) An unusual factor in the exorcism of the Syro-phoenician's daughter (Matt. 15:21 ff.; Mk. 7:24 ff.) is that she was freed at a distance without any audible command. The only other distant exorcism, though of a different kind, is when handkerchiefs were taken from Paul and applied to the sufferers (Acts 19:12).

(d) Illnesses and disabilities (→ Weakness) include epilepsy (Matt. 17:14 ff.; Mk. 9:14 ff.; Lk. 9:37 ff). Matthew uses the word *selēniazomai* (17:15; only elsewhere at Matt. 4:24), which by derivation (*selēnē*, moon) means lunatic (Lat. *luna*, moon) but was commonly used to describe an epileptic. On this occasion Mark includes deafness and dumbness (9:17, 25). A dumb demoniac is also described in Matt. 9:32 ff.; Lk. 11:14 and is exorcized, whereas a normal deaf and dumb case is cured by a different miracle of healing (Mk. 7:31 f.; → Deaf, Dumb).

(e) A possessed girl followed Paul and Silas, declaring that they were bringers of God's salvation. Nonetheless, Paul cast out the spirit (Acts 16:16 ff.).

5. *The Fate of the Spirits.* There is likely to be a final show of violence (Mk. 1:26; 9:26), or defiance if the spirit refuses to come out (Acts 19:15). Once exorcized, the spirit is like a traveller in a barren land, while still looking for the relief of repossessing his victim (Matt. 12:43 ff.; Lk. 11:24 ff.).

The only other clue is not easy to understand. The legion of demons regarded permission to enter the swine as preferable to normal exorcism, and Jesus allowed this (Matt. 8:28 ff.; Mk. 5:1 ff.; Lk. 8:26 ff.). Did the demons intentionally drown their new hosts, and, if so, what did they expect to gain thereby (cf. Matt. 17:15)? There may have been a danger in releasing a host of demons into the crowd, and modern exorcists usually remove children and pets from the vicinity before an exorcism. A non-supernatural explanation is that the ravings of the possessed frightened the pigs.

6. *The Remainder of NT.* Apart from the Gospels and Acts, there is no other case of exorcism in the NT. It is likely that the gift of distinguishing between spirits (1 Cor. 12:10) has reference to exorcists. Deceiving spirits inspired false prophets (1 Jn. 4:1, 2), were to be tested and exposed by what they said of Jesus Christ, but apparently were not exorcized (cf. 1 Cor. 12:3). Unlike modern mediumship, which accepts the need to test spirits, the biblical test is to establish whether the "speaker" through the prophet is the Holy Spirit or a deceiver, never to determine whether the speaker is one's departed husband or wife.

7. *Non-Christian Exorcisms.* (a) Some would include the unattached exorcist who "does not follow with us" (Mk. 9:38; Lk. 9:49), but "following" in the synoptists nor-

mally means belonging to the group who travelled with Jesus. This man was a believer who chose not to leave home.

(b) Jesus spoke of successful exorcists who at the → judgment would be told, "I never knew you" (Matt. 7:22, 23).

(c) Jesus admits that Jewish exorcists cast out demons (Matt. 12:27; Lk. 11:19).

(d) The sons of Sceva appear to have had some success until they used the name of Jesus as a magical formula (Acts 19:13 ff.; → Magic). This is the only passage to use *exhorkistēs* and *exhorkizō* (in a *v.l.*) in the NT: "Then some of the itinerant Jewish exorcists undertook to pronounce the name of the Lord Jesus over those who had evil spirits, saying, 'I adjure you by the Jesus whom Paul preaches.' Seven sons of a Jewish high priest named Sceva were doing this. But the evil spirit answered them, 'Jesus I know, and Paul I know; but who are you?' And the man in whom the evil spirit was leaped on them, mastered all of them, and overpowered them, so that they fled out of that house naked and wounded" (Acts 19:13–16). It is a tribute to the effectiveness of Christian exorcism that the name of Jesus occurs in early magical formulae, e.g. "I adjure you by the God of the Hebrews, Jesus, Iaba, Iae, Abraoth" (*Great Paris Magical Papyrus*, IV, 3019 f. This material probably dates from *c.* A.D. 200).

(e) Exorcists and magicians, from Egypt and Babylon to the present day, have had varying success. Jewish believers in God could well have been used directly by God. Others have regularly followed the magical practice of calling on greater spirits, or even on angelic beings, to drive out the lesser. Some have used material means, as when Josephus saw an exorcist drawing out a demon through a victim's nostrils by applying herbs of a kind described by Solomon, who had secret knowledge of spells (*Ant.* 8, 45 ff.). All such exorcisms, whether effective or not, are complicated and second-rate compared with the instant authority of Jesus and his disciples in their wholesale assault on the kingdom of Satan wherever they met it.

J. Stafford Wright

→ Animal (for Beast), → Antichrist, → Demon, → Dragon, → Ecstasy, → Evil, → Heal, → Hell, → Judgment, → Magic, → Name, → Prayer, → Tempt

On the devil, Satan, Beelzebul, Beliar:
(a). W. E. M. Aitken, "Beelzebul", *JBL* 31, 1912, 34–53; W. F. Albright, *From Stone Age to Christianity*, 1957; D. G. Barnhouse, *The Invisible War*, 1965; K. Barth, *CD* III, 3, see index; G. B. Caird, *Principalities and Powers: A Study in Pauline Theology*, 1956; P. Carus, *History of the Devil*, 1900; E. Dinkler, "Peter's Confession and the 'Satan' Saying: The Problem of Jesus' Messiahship", in J. M. Robinson, ed., *The Future of our Religious Past: Essays in Honour of Rudolf Bultmann*, 1971, 169–202; S. Eitrem, *Some Notes on the Demonology of the New Testament*, 1966[2]; W. Foerster, *Beezeboul*, *TDNT* I 605 f.; and *Beliar*, *TDNT* I 607; T. H. Gaster, "Beelzebul", *IDB* I 374; "Belial", *IDB* I 377; and "Satan", *IDB* IV 224–28; L. Gaston, "Beelzebub", *ThZ* 18, 1962, 247 ff.; D. E. Hiebert, "Satan", *ZPEB* V 282–86; R. H. Hiers, "Satan, Demons and the Kingdom of God", *SJT* 27, 1974, 35–47; C. G. Jung, *Psychological Types*, 1923; and *Psychology and Religion*, 1938; J. Kallas, *The Satanward View*, 1966; R. S. Kluger, *Satan in the Old Testament*, 1967; E. Langton, *Satan, A Portrait: A Study of the Character of Satan through all the Ages*, 1945; and *Essentials of Demonology: A Study of the Jewish and Christian Doctrine, its Origin and Development*, 1949; R. Leivestad, *Christ the Conqueror: Ideas of Conflict and Victory in the New Testament*, 1954; C. S. Lewis, *The Screwtape Letters*, 1942; E. Lewis, *The Creator and the Adversary*, 1948; T. Ling, *The Significance of Satan: New Testament Demonology and its Contemporary Relevance*, *SPCK Biblical Monographs* 3, 1961; S. V. McCasland, *By the Finger of God*, 1951; D. Pentecost, *Your Adversary the Devil*, 1969; M. Prager, "Satan", *EBT* III 808–12; G. von Rad and W. Foerster, *diaballō*, *diabolos*, *TDNT* II 71–81; F. J. Rae,

"The Two Circles of Faith", *ExpT* 66, 1954–55, 212–15; J. M. Ross, "The Decline of the Devil", *ExpT* 66, 1954–55, 58–61; K. Schäferdiek, *satanas*, *TDNT* VII 151–65; F. A. Tatford, *The Prince of Darkness*, 1967.
(b). J. B. Bauer, "Libera nos a Malo", *Verbum Domini* 34, 1956, 12–15; M. E. Boismard, "Satan selon l'Ancien et le Nouveau Testament", *Lumière et Vie* 15, 1966, 61–76; H. Braun, *Qumran und das Neue Testament*, I–II, 1965–66; A. Brock-Utne, "Der Feind. Die alttestamentliche Satangestalt im Lichte der sozialen Verhältnisse des nahen Orients", *Klio* 38, 1935, 219–27; H. Bietenhard, *Die himmlische Welt im Urchristentum und im Spätjudentum*, *WUNT* 2, 1951; N. A. Dahl, "Der erstgeborene Satans und der Vater des Teufels (Polyc. 7, 1 und John 8, 44)", in *Apophoreta, Festschrift Ernst Haenchen*, 1964, 70 ff.; C. Duquoc, "Satan – Symbol oder Person?", in *Christus vor uns*, 1966, 49–57; E. Fascher, *Jesus und der Satan, Hallische Monographien* 11, 1949; H. W. Huppenbauer, "Belial in den Qumrantexten", *ThZ* 15, 1959, 81–89; and *Der Mensch zwischen zwei Welten, AThANT* 34, 1959; P. Jacobs, "Teufel, Teufelsglaube", *EKL* III 1336 ff.; K. Lüthi, *Gott und das Böse*, 1961; K. Marti, "Der Ursprung des Satans", *ThStKr* 65, 1892, 207 ff.; G. Mensching, F. Horst, A. Adam, W. Philipp, "Teufel", *RGG*^{3} VI 704 ff.; B. Noack, *Satanas und Sōteria*, 1949; P. von der Osten-Sacken, *Gott und Belial*, 1969; M. Prager, "Vater der Lüge. Aufriss einer biblischen Diabolologie", *Gloria Dei* 7, 1952, 105–18; H. Riniker, "Die theologische Frage nach dem Zürcher Hexenprozess", *Kirchenblatt für die reformierte Schweiz* 125, No. 10, 1969; D. de Rougement, *Der Anteil des Teufels*, 1949; SB I 118 f., 136 f.; IV, 1, 501–35; R. Scharf, "Die Gestalt des Satans im Alten Testament", in C. G. Jung, *Symbolik des Geistes*, 1948, 153–319; K. L. Schmidt, "Luzifer als gefallene Engelsmacht", *ThZ* 7, 1951, 161–79; I. Turmel, *Histoire du Diable*, 1931; F. Zeman, "De daemoniis in scriptis prophetarum Veteris Testamenti in luce daemonologiae Orientis antiqui", *Verbum Domini* 27, 1949, 270–77, 321–35; and ibid. 28, 1950, 18–28, 89–97; S. Légasse, "L'homme fort de Luc 11:21–22", *NovT* 5, 1962, 5–9.
On exorcism:
(a). C. Bonner, "Traces of Thaumaturgical Technique", *HTR* 30, 1927, 171–81; and "The Techniques of Exorcism", *HTR* 36, 1943, 39–49; C. H. Cave, "The Obedience of Unclean Spirits", *NTS* 11, 1964–65, 93–97; R. H. Hiers, "Satan, Demons and the Kingdom of God", *SJT* 27, 1974, 35–47; J. M. Hull, *Hellenistic Magic and the Synoptic Tradition, SBT* 28, 1974; and "Exorcism in the NT", *IDB Supplementary Volume*, 1976, 312 ff.; H. C. Kee, "The Terminology of Mark's Exorcism Stories", *NTS* 14, 1967–68, 232–46; W. L. Knox, "Jewish Liturgical Exorcism", *HTR* 31, 1938, 191–203; K. E. Koch, *Christian Counselling and Occultism*, 1972; and *Occult Bondage and Deliverance*, 1970; I. M. Lewis, *Ecstatic Religion*, 1971; J. L. Nevius, *Demon Possession*, (1894) 1968; T. K. Oesterreich, *Possession and Exorcism*, 1974; R. Petitpierre, ed., *Exorcism*, 1972 (Bishop of Exeter's Commission Report of 1965 with appendices); J. Richards, *But Deliver us from Evil*, 1974 (with extensive bibliography); W. Sargent, *The Mind Possessed*, 1974; C. Strachan, *Casting out the Devils*, 1972.
(b). O. Bauernfeind, *Die Worte der Dämonen im Markusevangelium*, 1927; A. Dupont-Sommer, "Exorcismes et Guérisons dans les Récits de Qumrân", *VT Supplement* 7, 1960, 251 ff.; R. Wünsch, *Antike Fluchtafeln*, 1912^2.

Scribe

γραμματεύς

γραμματεύς (*grammateus*), scribe, clerk, secretary, biblical scholar, teacher of the law of Moses; νομικός (*nomikos*), expert in Jewish law, lawyer; νομοδιδάσκαλος (*nomodidaskalos*), teacher of the law of Moses.

CL *grammateus*, derived from *gramma*, letter of the alphabet, is the title of officials at Athens and elsewhere, from secretary and registrar to clerk (Thuc.). *grammateus saphēs*, lit. accurate writer, means a scholar (Aristot.). *grammateus* can be used contemptuously: *olethros grammateus*, a pestilent scribe (Dem.); and metaph. of memory: the recorder (Plato).

OT *grammateus* translates two Heb nouns. *šōṭēr* (from *šāṭar*, to write) is used of an

officer or overseer (Exod. 5:6), the seventy elders (Num. 11:16), administrative officers in the army (Deut. 20:5), and magistrates (1 Chr. 23:4). More frequently, *grammateus* renders *sōp̄ēr* (from *sāp̄ar*, to scratch letters on stone, hence to write). *sōp̄ēr* was used for the royal private secretary (2 Sam. 8:17), the military scribe who kept the muster rolls (Jer. 37:15), and in the later books, one skilled in the law of Moses (Ezr. 7:6; Neh. 8:1).

In ancient Israel the writing art was preserved as a craft by certain families. Literary and artistic evidence, right up to the Middle Ages, give an unchanging picture of the scribe, either standing to make brief notes, or sitting on stool, bench, or floor, with a scroll or codex on his knees. A glimpse of an ancient scribe's appearance is in Ezek. 9:2. Among the Kenites were families of *sōp̄ᵉrîm* (LXX, *grammateis*) dwelling at Jabez (1 Chr. 2:55). Such scribal schools trained suitable priests and Levites, who in turn instructed the people in the law on the great feast days and made legal judgments (Deut. 33:10). The most noted of these earlier scribes was the priest Ezra, a *sōp̄ēr* skilled in the law of Moses, who had set his heart to seek the law of the Lord and to do it, and to teach in Israel statutes and judgments (Ezr. 7:6, 10). In the latter respect he is the prototype of the scribes of later times who were professional interpreters of the law.

During the monarchy Levitical scribes were needed in the fiscal organization of temple operations (R. de Vaux, *Ancient Israel*, 1961, 353–5). A Levitical scribe recorded the priestly assignments (1 Chr. 24:6), and scribes were involved in the business of temple repairs (2 Ki. 12:10; 2 Chr. 34:13). In this way developed the status of the *grammateis tou hierou*, temple scribes, first mentioned in the edict of Antiochus III (Josephus, *Ant.* 12, 142; cf. 11, 128). Since the furnishing of written copies of Torah and other parts of Scripture was a (scribal) Levitical responsibility (Deut. 17:18; Jer. 8:8), the reforms of Jehoshaphat (2 Chr. 17) are probably associated with scribes. At least one "writing prophet" employed an amanuensis (Jer. 36:4, 18, 32). It was probably a scribe who drew up the deed of sale in Jer. 32:10–12, since the document was entrusted to Baruch before witnesses.

Government scribes served in diverse ways, from giving the king counsel (1 Chr. 27:32) to mustering the army (2 Ki. 25:19). If David's cabinet is listed in order (2 Sam. 8:16–18; cf. 1 Chr. 18:15–17), the king's scribe ranked below the military commander, recorder, and high priest, but above the palace priests. By Josiah's reign Shaphan the scribe precedes the recorder as well as the governor of the city (2 Ki. 22:3–13; 2 Chr. 34:8–21). The high status of Shaphan's family is evident from the careers of his son Ahikam and grandsons Gedaliah (master of the palace, and later governor of Judea under the Babylonians) and Micaiah (who served as chief minister of state under Jehoiakim, Jer. 36:11). Such royal scribes apparently had offices at the palace (Jer. 36:12), which illustrates their importance in the Judean government. There was an Akkadian counterpart to the royal scribe, with equally high standing (Nah. 3:17) and military functions (Jer. 52:25). The multilingual pluralistic character of the Persian period likewise demanded administrative specialists (Est. 3:12; 8:9), and provincial commanders had scribes as their deputies (Ezr. 4:8 f.) (A. Rainey, *ZPEB* V, 298–302).

The profession of scribe received considerable impetus by the return of the Jews from exile, when the need arose to copy, study, and expound the Scriptures to make them the basis of national life. Thus the finest age of the *sōp̄ᵉrîm* was in the two cen-

turies between the only bearers of the title in that period whose names we know, Ezra (*c.* 398 B.C.) and Ben Sira (*c.* 180). The book of Ezra marks a development in the scribe's status. The earlier administrative sense of *sōp̄ēr* in 7:12–26 is set side by side with 7:6, 11, verses which refer to Ezra as a scribe whose learning enables him to interpret the law for the common people. Moreover, his priestly lineage symbolized the close connexion between the priesthood and this official interpretation of the law which existed probably until the second century B.C.

Ben Sira's portrait of the *grammateus* reveals how the position of the teacher is becoming less closely associated with the temple, though he retains a positive attitude towards the cult and stresses the inalienable privileges of the priesthood (Sir. 7:29; 35:6; 45:6–26). Proud of being in the profession, Ben Sira lauds the perfect scribe in Sir. 38:24–39:11 (part of this hymn appears in an earlier form in 11QPsDav; *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert* 4, 1965, 77 ff.). Ben Sira declares that the scribe, schooled in Torah and religious wisdom, understands the implications of both the written law and oral tradition (39:6). Thus he enters upon the heritage of the prophets (who include the law-giver Moses, 46:1). He invites the untaught to his school (51:23), though he carefully preserves the scribe's claim to exclusiveness by seeking to bar peasants and craftsmen from the study of wisdom (38:25 ff.). The scribe's learning makes him a public figure (39:4), able to administer justice among the people, and regarded by them as specially pious on account of his knowledge of the revealed will of God. Ben Sira claims to teach in his own name (50:27), a new departure, for stressing the personality of the teacher probably indicated that Hellen. individualism was gaining significance among the Jewish people. On the other hand, perhaps in reaction against Hellenism, the scribe soft-pedalled the notion of his being a wisdom teacher in favour of the reputation of being one learned in the Scriptures (39:1, 7 f.). But later rabbinic literature dropped the term *sōp̄ēr*, except in reference to earlier scholars, and called contemporary rabbis *ḥ*^{a}*k̲āmîm*, wise men. The two terms are combined at Qumran, where according to a wisdom collection of psalms, David was both a *sōp̄ēr*, filled with an understanding and enlightened spirit, and a *ḥāk̲ām*, who "composed all his 4,050 psalms and hymns by prophetic inspiration" (11QPs^{a} 154).

During the Maccabean revolt a company of scribes (*synagōgē grammateōn*), by now a numerous and independent group, sought a conference with the Seleucid-appointed high priest Alcimus and the Seleucid general Bacchides (1 Macc. 7:12 ff.). Although their confidence was short-lived (7:16), the incident illustrates the continuing association between scribes and the priesthood. By NT times scribal rules and practices had acquired binding authority among the orthodox, and were imposed upon proselytes in addition to the plain sense of the written Torah (Siph. Lev. 19:34). One tradition boldly claimed greater authority for scribal teachings than for the written law (Sanhedrin 11:3). Occasionally, when scribes had formulated rules without regard for a supposed biblical basis, later rabbis were distressed (Kelim 13:7). See SB I 79–82, 691–5; II 647–61.

grammateus appears only once in Philo (Flacc. 1, 4), where it means a political adviser. Josephus uses the term 29 times and in a wide sense. He pokes fun at garbled history in an Egyptian work which calls Joseph and Moses scribes (*Ap.* 1, 290), but at least the reference indicates that outsiders considered scribes to be men of authority and influence. Elsewhere in Josephus *grammateus* can mean anything from

David's secretary of state (*Ant.* 7, 110) or a leading council official (*War* 5, 532) to clerks recording David's ill-fated census (*Ant.* 7, 319). Several times Josephus adds scribes to OT narratives which do not mention them (e.g., 1 Sam. 14:33; 2 Sam. 14:2). Josephus 8 times uses the term *hierogrammateus*, interpreter of holy books, sacred scribe (*War* 6, 291; *Ant.* 2, 205; *Ap.* 1, 289), but this word does not appear in the LXX or NT.

NT *grammateus* occurs some 60 times in the Synoptic Gospels, 4 times in Acts, once in Paul. The Fourth Gospel makes no mention of scribes. *grammateus* appears at Jn. 8:3, but this is in the non-Johannine pericope, 7:53–8:11. Once *grammateus* is used of a civic official, the town clerk at Ephesus (Acts 19:35). Otherwise *grammateus* in the NT always has its Jewish meaning of one learned in Torah, rabbi, ordained theologian. Two other terms, equivalent to *grammateus*, are found in the NT: *nomikos*, lawyer, and *nomodidaskalos*, teacher (*didaskalos*) of the law (*nomos*). Tit. 3:13 mentions a certain Zenas the *nomikos*, though it is not clear whether he was an expert in Jewish or Roman law. Since Mark was writing for Romans, he never uses the word *nomikos*, to avoid misleading his readers, for in the Roman world *nomikos* was one versed in civil law. Elsewhere in the NT, *nomikos* always means a Jewish expert in the law of Moses (Matt. 22:35; Lk. 10:25; 11:45 f., 52; 14:3). Lawyers and Pharisees are associated together in Lk. 7:30; 11:53 (D), 14:3. *nomodidaskalos*, teacher of the law (of Moses), occurs only in Christian writings. In the NT the term is found at Lk. 5:17; Acts 5:34; 1 Tim. 1:7.

Judging by the frequency of their appearance in the Synoptic Gospels, scribes were clearly influential. Far from being simply clerks or copyists, they were teachers (Matt. 7:29; Mk. 1:22), lawyers, doctors of the law, and some were members of the Sanhedrin (Matt. 16:21; cf. 26:3). Scribes of the people (Matt. 2:4) and scribes of the Pharisees (Mk. 2:16) are phrases suggesting varied shades of meaning for the term *grammateus*. The scribes devoted themselves to several fields: (1) the study and interpretation of the law, which was both civil and religious; and to determining its application to the details of daily life; decisions of the great scribes became the oral law or tradition; (2) the study of the Scriptures generally in regard to historical and doctrinal matters; "Elijah must first come" (Matt. 17:10) is attributed to scribal doctrine; (3) teaching; each noted scribe, attracting around him a group of disciples (Matt. 7:29; Mk. 1:22), had a developed system of teaching of his own (Matt. 17:11; Mk. 8:11); (4) proselytizing (Matt. 23:15).

The Synoptic Gospels show scribes active on their own account, either as individuals (4 times) or as groups (16), and also in association with the priestly Sadducean party (Matt. 2:4; 21:15) or the Pharisees (Matt. 23). The grouping of scribes and Pharisees is mentioned 19 times, occasionally perhaps as something of a formula for Jesus' opponents; scribes and chief priests are coupled 11 times, scribes and elders once, scribes, chief priests, and elders 10 times. The order of names in the Gospels is not consistent, although precedence is usually given to scribes over Pharisees, for the former were the scholars of the party. More precisely they are defined as *nomikoi*, lawyers, and *nomodidaskaloi*, teachers of the law (as Gamaliel, Acts 5:34). The scholars of the Pharisees were the leaders of what became rabbinic Judaism, when they were known first as sages, then as rabbis. Rabbis formed a closed order. Only fully qualified scholars, who by ordination had received the

official spirit of Moses mediated by succession (SB II 654 f.; cf. Matt. 23:2), were legitimate members of the guild of scribes.

The high reputation of the rabbis among the people (Matt. 23:6 f.; Mk. 12:38 f.) rested on their knowledge of the law and oral traditions, but also of secret theosophic, cosmogonic, and eschatological doctrines concealed by an esoteric discipline. Jesus roundly condemned the scribal approach to the will of God (Matt. 23). Sociologically, the rabbis were the successors of the prophets, i.e., men who knew the divine will, and proclaimed it in instruction, judgment, and preaching. It was they who decided what was required, in all details of conduct, in order to give practical effect to the law – as interpreted by themselves. This was a necessary task, since biblical Hebrew was no longer widely understood. The scribes were not men of wealth or property; yet this was a responsibility which gave them powerful influence, not only in the council of elders which advised the king, but over public opinion as well (M. Grant, *The Jews in the Roman World*, 1973).

Prominent rabbis, as leaders of the Pharisaic communities, formed one of the three parties in the Sanhedrin, and as such they took part in the prosecution and condemnation of Jesus (Matt. 26:57). Matthew is more specific about the Pharisees being the ones who hounded Jesus, whereas Mark for "Pharisees" has "scribes of the Pharisees" (Matt. 9:11; Mk. 2:16), "disciples of the Pharisees" (Matt. 9:14; Mk. 2:18), or only "scribes" (Matt. 9:34; 12:24 = Mk. 3:22; Matt. 22:41 = Mk. 12:35). Scribes are associated with the rulers and elders in the persecution of Peter and John (Acts 4:5) and the martyrdom of Stephen (Acts 6:12).

At the end of the Sermon on the Mount, Matthew notes the astonishment of the crowd at the authoritative manner in which Jesus taught, and "not as the scribes" (Matt. 7:29). The scribes argued from Scripture and tradition, and by quoting older authorities to support their teaching. Jesus had spoken with freshness, directness, and in his own name: "I say to you" (D. Hill, *The Gospel of Matthew*, *New Century Bible*, 1972, 154). D. Daube suggests that the crowd's surprise was due to the novelty of hearing in Galilee of all places an ordained rabbi using his full rabbinic authority to promulgate new decisions (*The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*, 1956, 205–16). But it seems very unlikely that Jesus was ordained (Jn. 7:15; Matt. 21:23). In contrast to rabbinic exposition, with its dependence on the tradition of the elders, here was the disturbing activity of a prophet directly authorized and commissioned by God (W. L. Lane, *The Gospel according to Mark*, 1974, 72).

Some scribes are said to have accepted Christ's teaching (Matt. 8:19), but most were prejudiced against him. They challenged Jesus about his disobedience to traditional practices under the law, and found fault with much that he and his disciples said and did (Matt. 21:15), e.g., eating with those who ignored the traditions (Mk. 2:16) or without first ritually washing the hands (Matt. 15:2; Mk. 7:5). They were affronted by Jesus' apparent blasphemy in claiming to forgive sins (Matt. 9:3; Mk. 2:7; Lk. 5:21). Ignoring the miracles of healing, they demanded some other authenticating sign from heaven, i.e., by a Semitic idiom, from God (Matt. 12:38). For his part, Jesus attacked the scribes for their misuse of Corban (Matt. 15:1–20; Mk. 7:1–23), their spiritual blindness in failing to recognize him (Matt. 12:38–42; Lk. 11:16, 29–32) and ascribing his actions to Satanic inspiration (Matt. 12:24–32; Mk. 3:22–30; Lk. 11:15–22), and because of their worldly desire for prominence (Matt. 25:3–7; Mk. 12:38–40; Lk. 20:46 f.). As a by-product of the effort of study,

scribes came to be noted for their abilities in business and administration. This led to their being appointed as trustees for widows and orphans (2 Esd. 2:20 f.), and the temptation to live comfortably on "expenses", thus earning a rebuke from Jesus for thus swallowing up the victims' estates (Mk. 12:40; Lk. 20:47) (J. D. M. Derrett, *Jesus's Audience*, 1973, 57).

Jesus conceded that the scribes sat "on Moses' chair" (Matt. 23:2), i.e., that it was their business to teach God's will as revealed in the law of Moses. But he warned the people and the disciples against the scribes' example. They did not practise what they preached. Jesus then pronounced seven woes upon the scribes and Pharisees (Matt. 23:13–36) for obscuring the real issues of belief and conduct by casuistry and hypocrisy, so making it virtually impossible for men to fulfil the law of God (D. Hill, *The Gospel of Matthew*, 1972, 311–15).

Scribes of the Pharisees took Paul's part concerning the doctrine of the resurrection (Acts 23:9). Paul, himself an ordained scribe (deduced from his part in capital punishment, Acts 26:10), saw in the Jewish theologians' rejection of the preaching of the cross a fulfilment of Isa. 19:12; 33:18 (*pou grammateus*? what has become of the scribe?), which according to his exposition prophesied the futility of human wisdom, as illustrated by scribal dialectics, and the paradox of divine election (1 Cor. 1:10). In the early church the Christian *grammateus* continues as a scholar and instructor in God's law (Matt. 13:52; 23:34; cf. 5:19; 16:19; 18:18; 23:8–12), so that Mosaic law is not abolished but reapplied for the needs of the Christian church. Matthew's Gospel, especially in its proofs from Scripture, reveals a Christian scribe at work.

N. Hillyer

→ Law, → Pharisee, → Rabbi, → Scripture, → Word

(a). A. W. Argyle, "The meaning of *exousia* in Mark 1:22, 27", *ExpT* 80, 1968–9, 343; J. Bowman, "Scribes, Pharisees and Haberim", in *The Gospel of Mark*, 1965, 337–41; J. H. Dampier, "The Scrolls and the Scribes of the New Testament", *Bulletin of the Evangelical Theological Society*, 1.3, 1958, 8–19; D. Daube, "*exousia* in Mk. 1:22 and 27", *JTS* 39, 1938, 45–59; "Rabbinic Authority", in *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*, 1956, 205–33; M. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, I–II, 1974; J. Jeremias, *grammateus*, in *TDNT* I, 740–2; *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus*, 1969, ch. 10; A. Rainey, "Scribe", in *ZPEB* 5, 298–302; S. Safrai and M. Stern (ed.), *The Jewish People in the First Century* (*Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum* I), 1974–76.
(b). J. Hoh, "Der christliche *grammateus*", *BZ* 17, 1929, 256–69; S. Légasse, "Scribes et disciples de Jésus", *RB* 68, 1961, 497–502; E. Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, 1901–11, II. 1, 306–79.

Scripture, Writing

The following study focuses attention on writing and the written aspect of Scripture. For the revelatory aspect of Scripture → Revelation; → Word.

γραφή

γράφω (*graphō*), write; γράμμα (*gramma*), letter, document; γραφή (*graphē*), writing, in the NT always of Scripture; ἐγγράφω (*engraphō*), write in, record; ἐπιγραφή (*epigraphē*), inscription, superscription; προγράφω (*prographō*), write before(hand), set forth publicly.

CL 1. The root *graph-* has the primary meaning of to scratch on, engrave, with reference to an ornament, reports, letters, lists, and instructions. From it are derived the Eng. "graphic", "graph" etc. The material can be various: stone, wood, metal, wax, or leather. *graphō* is found in its original sense in Homer, *Il.* 17, 599. In Hdt., 4, 36 the word is used meaning to draw, of lines on maps; and scholars of the 3rd cent. B.C. used it of drawing of mathematical figures. In Homer *graphō* is already used in the sense of scratching signs on a tablet as a kind of letter (*Il.* 6, 169). From the time of Hdt. it is used generally in the normal sense of to write, and from the time of Pindar in the derived sense of to prescribe, to order. From the practice of handing in a written accusation, *graphō* came in judicial language to mean to accuse (Plato, *Euthyphro* 2b).

2. The passive forms *gegraptai* and *gegrammenon* mean that which is laid down in writing, the valid norm, especially in the legal sphere (Demosthenes, 58, 24; Plato, *Leg.* 6, 754c). The compound vb. *engraphō* means particularly to enter officially, in documents or official lists. *hypographō* means to sign, then, to sketch out; according to Plato, a teacher draws the lines for the children to write their letters (*Prt.* 326d).

3. The noun *graphē* originally carried the abstract verbal sense of the act of writing, drawing or painting; then the concrete sense of writing, inscription, letter (generally from 4th cent. B.C. onwards), indictment; in papyri of the 3rd cent. a list; in Plato the written law (*Leg.* 11, 934c).

gramma means: (a) the product of the action, especially where contrast with the spoken word is stressed; occasionally (b) the action itself; but then also (c) ability to write. It can mean the individual letters of the alphabet (Hdt., 5, 58 f.), but also papers, letters, documents. The plur. *grammata* is used in the sense of elementary knowledge, then literature, learning. The concept of "holy writings" or "holy scriptures" becomes important in the Hellenistic period: temple records, magic books and hermetic literature; also imperial letters and decrees which are regarded as quasi-divine. The authority of the written word leads, even in the classical period, to the composition of explanatory commentaries, especially on the writings of Homer.

OT The vb. *graphō* occurs about 300 times in the LXX, almost without exception for the Heb. *kāṯaḇ*, to write. Traces of the original meaning are still to be seen in its use to describe the signet engraving on the cultic crown of the high priest (Exod. 39:30), and the heathen custom of scratching marks on the skin (Lev. 19:28; cf. Ezek. 9:4). But the basic meaning is to write. *graphē* (about 40 times) always stands for forms of *kāṯaḇ* in the sense of (holy) writing, written decree, types of script (of different languages), letter. Only once (2 Chr. 24:27) is it used for *miḏrāš*, commentary. *gramma* (26 times) generally corresponds to the Heb. *sēp̄er*, less often for formations from *ktb* or *dāḇār*, → word. It has the meaning of writing, document, letter, book.

1. The 22 letters of the Old Canaanite script (all consonants), which were used in the land when Israel entered it, were carved (Exod. 32:16; cf. the Mesha stone, 840 B.C.; the Siloam inscription, *c.* 700 B.C.) or painted (Deut. 27:3, 8; Jos. 8:32) on stones, scratched or written with ink on potsherds (the ostraca of Lachish, Samaria, Arad), carved or painted on wood (Deut. 6:9; Isa. 8:1; Ezek. 37:16), and later written chiefly on leather or papyrus. They were also taught in the schools (cf. Isa. 28:9 ff.). Between the 4th and 2nd cents., with the spread of the Aramaic language, the Aramaic alphabet, the so-called square character, gradually gained predominance

in Israel. By the time of the second temple it seems to have found general acceptance (only in this alphabet is *Yôḏ* the smallest letter, Matt. 5:18; → Redemption, art. *lyō* NT 6 (a)). But even in texts written in square character Hebrew, the Old Canaanite script was used for writing the (unutterable) divine name (in Bible quotations in the Habakkuk commentary from Qumran: 1QpHab 6:14; 10:7, 14; 11:10; → God, art. *theos* OT 2; → Lord, art. *kyrios* OT 2). It is also retained on coins of the Maccabean period, and of the periods of revolt in A.D. 66 and A.D. 132, as a symbol of the fulfilment of messianic hopes, a return of the days of old (→ Possessions, art. *Coins in the Bible and Theological Issues*).

The purpose of writing can be very diverse. The OT mentions rods for drawing lots (Num. 17:1 ff.), letters (2 Sam. 11:14 f.; 2 Ki. 10:1, 6; Sennacherib's letter of contempt, 2 Chr. 32:17), lists (description of the land, Jos. 18:8 f.), deeds of purchase (Jer. 32:10 ff.), bills of → divorce (Deut. 24:1, 3), sentences and decrees (Ps. 149:9; 1 Sam. 10:25; Est. 8:8; 9:23), divine commandments (Deut. 17:18; 27:3; 31:9). The words of Jeremiah were written down by his disciple Baruch, at his master's dictation (Jer. 36:4).

2. (a) Theological observations. The most important act of writing in the Bible concerns the laws of God. The central part of this → law, the Decalogue, was written, according to the biblical narrative, by God himself, on stone tablets which he had prepared (the so-called Elohistic narrative: Exod. 24:12; 31:18; 32:16; also in Deut. 4:13; 5:22; 9:10). There is however another narrative (the so-called Yahwistic), which finds a place alongside and interwoven with this one: here it is → Moses who writes at God's behest (Exod. 34:1a, 4, 27 f.). Deut. describes how it was done (Deut. 10:1 ff.; Exod. 34:1b seems to have been inserted from the same source). Then it is stated that Moses (Exod. 34:4) wrote all the ordinances of the divine covenant in a → book (the Book of the Covenant, Exod. 20:22 – 23:33). This differentiation of the laws according to their importance may again be observed in the description of the other regulations about the holy tent and the service of the priests (Exod. 25–31), which Moses received from God by word of mouth only. For further discussion → Command, → Law. On the passages attributed to Moses → Moses, art. *Mōy̆sēs* OT 3.

Apart from this central complex relating to the giving of the commandments, other passages also state that God himself writes things. He keeps a book in which he writes those who commend themselves to him, and from which he can also blot them out again (Exod. 32:32). He writes his law in men's hearts (Jer. 31:33; cf. Deut. 6:6; → Covenant, art. *diathēkē* OT 5).

The writing of God's law is so important that Israel is commanded not only to pass it on by word of mouth, but individually and literally to write it upon the doorposts of their houses and upon pieces of parchment which were tied on their foreheads and arms (Deut. 6:8 f.; cf. Prov. 3:3). The written word thus serves as a reminder and a witness (Exod. 17:14; Hab. 2:2; Deut. 6:8). The power inherent in the written word can even have physical effects (water of bitterness, used for cursing, Num. 5:23 f.). When the written word is disobeyed, it can at a future date be used as a witness against evil doers (Isa. 30:8; similarly, Deut. 31:19); but where it has been fulfilled, it can become a pledge (Deut. 27:3).

(b) Tradition and interpretation. The written word has great authority which is invoked by later generations (2 Ki. 14:6; 2 Chr. 23:18; Ezr. 3:2; Neh. 10:34; 2 Macc. 10:26). Even non-canonical books are referred to in the Bible (2 Sam. 1:18; frequen-

tly in Ki. and Chr.). In other citations and allusions within the Bible we can see the beginnings of the interpretation of Scripture. Thus Deut. is in part a revision of the previous books in a new style (similarly Chr. is a revision of Ki.). God speaks not directly to Israel, but through Moses. In the case of the prohibition of images, we find a kind of proof from scripture (Exod. 20:4 in Deut. 4:9–24, especially v. 15). The prophets too speak God's word to Israel by referring to his traditional promises and commands, interpreting these afresh for the changed situation of the present.

(c) Josiah's reform in 621 B.C. (2 Ki. 23:24 f.) was made on the basis of the rediscovery of part of the book of Deut., which had apparently been found in the temple by Hilkiah, the priest. After the destruction of the temple, and the exile, Ezra in the middle of the 5th cent. put the "law of the God of heaven" (Ezr. 7:21), which is probably to be identified with the Pentateuch, into operation among the Jews (Ezr. 3:2; 7:6–26; 10:3; cf. Neh. 8:1–13:28). He bore the title of *sôpēr*, → scribe, as a secretary of state at the Persian court. Later this title came to be understood in the Judaistic sense of one learned in the scriptures, since he was reckoned as the founder of the system of scribes. In the period which followed, the scriptures were collected, set in order and finally edited; nevertheless disagreements about the canonicity of certain books (Ezek., Cant., Prov., Eccl., Est.) continued into the 1st cent. A.D. About A.D. 80 at Jamnia the number of books was fixed at 24, divided into three groups: *tôrâh*, the Torah, instruction, or law; *nᵉḇî'îm*, the Prophets; and *kᵉṯûḇîm*, Writings or Hagiographa (abbreviated *tᵉnaḵ* the Jewish name for the Heb. Bible). Josephus (Ap. 1, 8) and the Talmud (Baba Bathra 14b) are in substantial agreement over this. For the canon → Rule, art. *kanōn* NT 4. The fact that the three groups were already well defined before Jamnia is evidenced by Lk. 24:44.

The Scriptures were now formally constituted into a canon. The reading of them (→ Book, art. *anaginōskō*) was, along with prayer, the chief part of the service of worship from the time of Ezra onwards. Indeed, it seems that the reading out of the law gave the motivation for the first meetings for worship, where the word of God was heard (Neh. 8). In addition to *kāṯûḇ*, what is written, the word *miqrâ'*, what is read, thus becomes a common name for the Bible. For the reading of the Pentateuch there was a cycle of seven and then of three years. Finally the Babylonian cycle, which lasted one year, came to be used generally. Even in the pre-Christian period, this reading was followed by a passage from the prophetic books (Megillah 4:4 and the accompanying Gemara; cf. Lk. 4:17, Acts 13:15). This *haptārâh* was supposed to relate to the passage from the law, or to the meaning of the day. Early on an exposition came to be added, a kind of sermon, which had among all the groups of Jews an important function in their service.

(d) With the supersession of Heb. by Aramaic as the everyday language, the necessity arose of translating the passages which were read out. Similarly, in the Greek-speaking Diaspora they had to be translated into Gk. Next to the reader stood the *mᵉṯûrgᵉmān*, the interpreter, who gave a free, explanatory translation. Thus there arose targums in many languages, where there were Jewish communities in the area. The relatedness of content between such targums can be seen, e.g., in the similarity of method found in the Gk. translation of Aquila and the somewhat later, very important Aramaic targum of Onkelos, which bears his name.

The most significant of all these translations is the LXX, which was commenced in the 3rd cent. B.C. in Alexandria, with the translation of the Pentateuch, and probably

completed in the 2nd cent. It is partly a literal rendering and partly free translation, in the style of a targum. In it the Heb. text was translated into the concepts of Gk. culture. As a result what was intended in a concrete and immediate sense was sometimes transformed into a promise for the future. The LXX became the Bible of the Christians (for details of the LXX see S. Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study*, 1968). All groups of Jews had the same Bible and the same historical situation as their basis; but they drew different conclusions from it, depending on their characteristic doctrines and experience. Consequently, there arose side by side many legitimate possibilities within the whole range of Israel for realizing their history and interpreting the Bible. Other translations included those of Symmachus and Theodotion (2nd cent. A.D.) (cf. H. B. Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, 1900). The adoption of the LXX by the church caused the Jews to abandon it.

3. Judaism after the closing of the OT canon. (a) In Philo and Josephus, the most important writers of the Jewish-Hellenistic symbiosis, we again find the whole range of meaning covered by the words. *graphē* is used in its original sense (Philo, *Vit. Mos.* 1, 287), then inscription (Josephus, *Ant.* 15, 417), and painting (Philo, *Vit. Mos.* 1, 158), and finally in a legal sense (Philo, *Vit. Mos.* 2, 203). *engraphō* is likewise used by both writers in connexion with official documents, etc. (Philo, *Conf. Ling.* 109; *Op. Mund.* 143; Josephus, *Ant.* 17, 226; *War* 1, 625). "Holy Scripture" (sing. and plur.) is used of the Bible particularly often by Philo (e.g. *Congr.* 34, 90). *gramma* is used in parallel to this (*Vit. Mos.* 2, 290, 292). In his great commentaries Philo attempts to bring the Jewish Bible into harmony with Gk. philosophy. For beginners he admittedly retains a literal exposition, but this forms only a foundation for the allegorical interpretation which reveals the true meaning of scripture. A precedent for this spiritualizing method may be seen in the Gk. interpretation of the myths, and in the expositions of the Essenes, but it also has points of contact with the contemporary Midrash in the land of Israel. The writings of Philo had less influence on later Judaism than on the Christian Fathers. In Josephus' historical work *The Antiquities of the Jews* the old traditional text is paraphrased to cover the biblical period.

(b) In the Essene community, which has left a relatively large library, writing and the written word were of especial importance. A wide range of different subjects were recorded in the writing room at Qumran, which has been discovered by excavations. Much may be learned about their expectation of an imminent end from the symbolic inscriptions on their military equipment (1QM 3:2 ff., 13 ff.; 6:2 f.; 9:14 f.).

As of old the patriarchs were "enrolled" as participators in the eternal covenant (CD 3:3 f.; similarly Jub. 30:19 ff.), so the saved members of the community are enrolled, according to their obedience before God, in a "book of remembrance" (CD 20:19). Members were enrolled in a literal sense according to families (CD 14:4 ff.) and according to status, which was reviewed annually (1QS 5:23 f.). Hence, they can be described simply as "the enrolled" (1QS 6:10 f., 26).

At Qumran a canon of Holy Scripture is presupposed, which serves as the foundation of the new covenant (1QS 7:1; CD 5:2 f.; 7:15 ff.). The study of this was continued even by night, when the scholars relieved one another in shifts (on this cf. 1QS 6:7 f.). The range of books regarded as holy scripture was wider than those of the canon adopted somewhat later by the → Pharisees. The Essene tradition differs in part from that of the Pharisees, and, probably because of common roots in the exilic

Zadokite tradition, shows similarities to the Samaritan tradition and the LXX. In addition to the biblical books, the Book of Enoch is cited as *graphē* in the Test. XII (cf. Test. Lev. 14:1; Test. Naph. 4:1; Test. Zeb. 3:4 *v.l.*, where words of Moses from Deut. 35:10 are attributed to Enoch). Other books regarded by the community as Holy Scripture are a "Book of the Divisions of Time into their Jubilees and Weeks" (CD 16:3 f.; probably a reference to the Book of Jubilees), a "Book of Meditation" for priests and judges (CD 10:6), and a "Book of Destiny" (1QM 15:5).

Through living with the Bible, the members of the Essene communities came to see the events of their day as foreshadowed and predicted in Scripture, and proof-texts are therefore used with the formula: "as it is written" (1QS 5:15, 17; 8:14; CD 1:13; 5:1 f.; 7:18 ff.). This is even more obvious in their biblical commentaries. Here a text will be cited from the Bible, which they regard as inspired, and there follows the formula *pišrô*, "its interpretation is", and then the exposition itself. The latter is based not on literal or historical considerations, but on an application to the present, which is veiled in mystery and revealed only to students who have the Holy Spirit (1QH 14:12 f.; 16:1 ff.). This is referred to as pesher exegesis. Paraphrases in the style of a targum or midrash are also found, however, like the Genesis Apocryphon or the Florilegium, in which Bible texts of various origins are woven together by link-words to form a thematic unity.

The community's own psalms, Hodayot, are likewise full of echoes of the Bible. The exegetical methods of the Essenes developed out of their daily liturgical reading of scripture, which was explained piece by piece by an expert (cf. Philo, *Omn. Prob. Lib.* 81 f.).

(c) In the literature of Pharisaic Judaism *kāṯaḇ* and its derivatives are frequently used of the writing of testaments, bills of → divorce, and other documents, but particularly for the writing of biblical scrolls and phylacteries (strips of parchment with the Bible texts, cf. Deut. 8:4–9; 11:13–21; Exod. 13:1–10, 11–16, which were placed in the small boxes worn for prayers), which required great care. To introduce citations, the Aram. expression *kᵉṯîḇ* is frequently used, even in Heb. texts; the Aram. *diḵtîḇ* corresponds to the Gk. *gegraptai gar*, "for it is written". Frequently *šenne-ᵉmar*, "as it is said", is used, in further citations interchangeably with *diḵtîḇ*. *kᵉṯîḇ* also means the traditional text of a word as written, in contrast to the word as it was read (*qᵉrē'*), which made possible a new interpretation of the text. *kāṯûḇ*, the noun derived from the pass. part., means a particular passage in the Bible, or the Scriptures as a whole, and is used with various vbs., particularly those of utterance. Scripture can now even be personified: it comes, speaks, teaches, proclaims. The plur. *kᵉṯûḇîm*, scriptures, is used like *kāṯûḇ* for the whole Bible, but it is also often used of the third division of the Heb. Bible, in contrast to the first two (the Torah and the Prophets). *kᵉṯāḇ* means the written word, writing in a concrete sense, but it can also refer to a piece of writing, book. The expression Holy Scriptures, *kiṯᵉḇê-haqqōḏeš*, is used par. to the simple *kᵉṯûḇîm*; it is roughly equivalent to *hiera grammata* and *graphai hagiai* in the NT (2 Tim. 3:15; Rom. 1:2).

It is a matter of importance that God writes people's → names in his → book at the New Year for life or death (Rosh ha-Shanah 16b), which is the origin of the traditional Jewish New Year wish.

Scholars among the → Pharisees took a great interest in the writing on the table of the commandments. Thus in Pesaḥim 54a it is said that these instructions were

created before the world, i.e. without any human assistance. The details are described in Gen. R. 1 (2b), where it is said that God made the script, the writing-instrument and the tables on the eve of the → Sabbath. Rabbi Hisda (Shabbath 104a) interpreted the words "the writing was graven" (Exod. 32:16) to mean that the table could be read on both sides, the writing being engraved right through. The *Sāmeḵ* and final *Mêm* were miraculously held in, and so did not fall out. The word *ḥārûṯ*, graven, could also, if differently vocalized, be read as *ḥerûṯ*, freedom: the Decalogue is and effects freedom. In accordance with this, Rabbi Joshua ben Levi concludes: "For thou findest no free man excepting him who occupies himself in the study of the Law" (Aboth 6:2).

The written Torah, *tôrâh šebbiḵtaḇ*, is distinguished by the Pharisees from the oral Torah, *tôrâh šebbᵉʿalpē* (Shabbath 31a). The law applies here (Gittin 60b): "The words of Scripture thou mayest not speak from memory, and the oral teaching thou mayest not commit to writing." When the Bible had been revealed by translation to the peoples of the world, the Pharisaic leaders guarded the oral tradition as the genuinely Jewish one. It was this giving of equal importance to the oral and the written traditions, and regarding them together as making up the one Torah, that constituted the principal difference, according to Josephus (*Ant.* 13, 297 f.), between the doctrine of the → Pharisees and that of the → Sadducees. Nevertheless, the oral tradition was written down early in the Christian era. The Mishnah of Rabbi Judah, the Prince, goes back in its turn to written collections of Mishnah.

In the schools of the Pharisees importance was attached to making the children learn writing while still young, then the text of the Bible, and finally its interpretation: the *pᵉšaṭ*, or literal meaning of a text, and the *dᵉraš*, interpretation, which arose out of the desire to find biblical authority for existing customs and ordinances, and for which in the 1st and 2nd cents. rules were developed. In the extended midrash literature the meaning for the present day is unfolded to cover the entire Scriptures. The meaning of a passage was sought in a democratic, didactic discussion, and fixed as far as it related to making a norm for living, by the majority in each case.

The apparent carelessness in quoting Scripture which may be observed throughout the literature of early Judaism is due to two factors. On the one hand, there was a great range of variations in the textual tradition. On the other, there was liberty to change the form of a text to accord with the theological basis and aims of the individual community, a liberty for which every community claimed an equal right to the Holy Spirit. The variety of interpretation within Judaism as a whole led to a spirit of competition, the expression of which ranged from friendly discussion to hostile polemics. The interpretative element in its quotation from the Scriptures may also be seen in the NT.

NT 1. (a) In the NT the vb. *graphō* in its various forms occurs about 180 times, of which scarcely half refer to the Bible. In about 70 cases we have an introductory formula, which is then followed by a Bible citation giving proof. Among the various verbal forms, particles and adverbs, one or two characteristic features may be singled out. The formula *kathōs gegraptai*, "as it is written", which is taken over from the LXX (found in the Synoptic Gospels, Rom. and 1 and 2 Cor.), is used for setting down a norm. Luke has a preference for *gegrammenon*, and especially for *panta ta gegrammena*, "all that is written" (Lk. 18:31; 21:22; Acts 13:29, each time in con-

nexion with "accomplish" or "fulfil", → Fullness, art. *plēroō*; cf. Jn. 15:25). John prefers the perf. participle *gegrammenon estin*, "[it] is written", by which he emphasizes the permanence of the written word. Sometimes the name of the writer or of the book concerned is mentioned in connexion with *graphō* (e.g. Jn. 1:45; Lk. 2:44).

Parallel to the use of *graphō* in the NT is often that of *legō*, to say, which can be used, as in Pharisaic Judaism, to express the directness with which the Scripture addresses us. Matthew in particular, in using his typical formula *hina plērōthē*, "that it might be fulfilled", constantly adds *to rhēthen*, what was said (*hypo* or *dia*, by or through) (Matt. 1:22; 2:15, 17, 23; 4:14; 8:17; 12:17; 13:35; 21:4; 22:31; 24:15; 27:9). John too links *plēroō*, to fulfil, with *logos*, → word, or *graphē*, writing. In Hebrews citations of scripture are generally introduced by verbs of saying, or are placed in the context without introduction. Revelation has much imagery which echoes OT allusions.

In another 17 cases, there follows no direct quotation, but merely a general allusion to the Scriptures (nearly always as a whole). More than half of these are in the Synoptic Gospels (cf. also Acts 13:29), and present (with the exception of Lk. 21:22) the suffering, death and resurrection of the Son of man, and John as his forerunner (Mk. 9:13) as events prophesied in the Bible. John sees the Scriptures as pointing directly to Jesus (Jn. 1:45; 5:46). Passages of this category in Paul (Rom. 4:22 ff.; 15:4; 1 Cor. 9:10; 10:11; also 5:6) emphasize, in a way exactly corresponding to the exegetical methods of Qumran, the relevance of the ancient Scriptures for the community of the present.

Only here and there is *graphō* used in a secular sense. Jesus drew in the sand (Jn. 8:6, 8). Paul wrote sentences in his own hand, especially at the end of letters, in order to authenticate their contents (Gal. 6:11; 2 Thess. 3:17; Phlm. 19; also 1 Cor. 16:21; Col. 4:18). Zechariah wrote his son's name on a tablet (Lk. 1:63). In the parable of the unjust steward the debtors' bills are written differently (Lk. 16:6 f.). Also mentioned are a letter of commendation, a letter to the governor, and the intention to write something to the emperor (Acts 18:27; 23:25; 25:26). The compound vb. *epigraphō* is used of the inscription of an altar in Athens (Acts 17:23), and noun *epigraphē* of the inscription on an imperial coin (Matt. 22:20; Mk. 12:16; Lk. 20:24), and of that on the cross (Mk. 15:26; Lk. 23:38).

(b) With the use and interpretation of the canonical Scriptures for edification and teaching purposes, by means of express citations, allusions, or general references and circumlocutions, an independent tradition came into being which acquired, entirely through being in a written form, a new authority of its own. According to Col. 4:16 and 1 Thess. 5:27, Christian writings were also read in services. Hence, the act of writing came sometimes to be emphasized; and certain writers made reference to their own writing, in order to assure the church of their love (2 Cor. 2:4), to guarantee the truth of the message (Lk. 1:3 f.; Phil. 3:11; 1 Jn. 2:21; 5:13; Rev. 19:9), to remind (Rom. 15:15; 2 Pet. 3:1), to exhort (1 Cor. 4:14; 5:9, 11; 1 Pet. 5:12), to testify (Jn. 21:24; 1 Pet. 5:12), and to stimulate faith (Jn. 20:30 f.).

graphō is used frequently, and is of great importance, in the Book of Revelation. As elsewhere in apocalyptic, the written word here acquires a directly sacramental character. He who would not fail to attain what is promised must, therefore, read (aloud) and hear this writing without adding or taking away anything (Rev. 1:3;

22:18 f.). As far as the letters to the seven churches are concerned, they are dictated to the visionary by the Son of man himself (Rev. 1:10 ff.; chs. 2 and 3). The apocalypse sealed with the seven → seals is written within and without (Rev. 5:1). The → Lamb's book of life contains the → names of those who will be saved (Rev. 13:8; 20:15; 21:27). The messiah riding on a white horse has a mysterious name, and also the title of King and Lord written upon him (Rev. 19:12, 16). The great harlot likewise has a mysterious name written on her (Rev. 17:5). The two protagonists – the Lamb and the beast – mark their followers on hand and forehead, where the Jews carried their phylacteries, which contained the confession of God's uniqueness (Rev. 13:16; 14:1; 22:4; cf. Deut. 6:4, 8). Those who endure do not accept the mark of the beast; they receive rather a stone on which is written a new name (Rev. 2:17; 20:4). Just as the gates of the city have the names of the twelve tribes as an inscription, so on the pillars of the → temple (i.e. the faithful) is written the name of God, of the Son of man, and of the holy city (Rev. 3:12; 21:12). While all apocalyptic attaches importance to its own, new writings (Qumran, Mk. 13 par., Rev.), the citation of Scriptures hallowed by age remains important also, so that further additions are interspersed with and determined by guiding texts. Since historical experience is here lacking, and for this very reason, some kind of link, such as visions and auditory experiences always found in the development of the tradition, is needed.

In connexion with *engraphō* we encounter the concept, universal in Judaism, of the heavenly book, in which the names of the faithful are inscribed (Lk. 10:20; → Book, art. *biblos*); and then also the picture of an inscription written by God on men's hearts as an assurance of his love. Similarly, Paul sees the church as a letter of Christ, not written with ink (2 Cor. 3:2; → Book, art. *epistolē*). The prophecy about the commandments written on men's hearts and minds (Jer. 31:33) was important to all the Jews (in the NT, especially cited at Heb. 8:10 and 10:16, *v.l. grapsō*, *epigrapsō*; cf. Rom. 2:15, *graptos*). Paul says that he "openly wrote out", or "made known officially" (another interpretation of *prographō* is to paint before someone's eyes) Jesus as the crucified (Gal. 3:1). (Elsewhere, *prographō* means write above [Eph. 3:3], mark out or write about [Jude 4], write about before [Rom. 15:4].) This sufferer is reckoned as the *hypogrammos*, example, who should be followed (1 Pet. 2:21; → Image, art. *hypogrammos*). *R. Mayer*

(c) The noun *graphē* is used 51 times in the NT, nearly always absolutely in either the sing. or plur. In the NT it is used exclusively of Holy Scripture. As such it may refer to an individual Scripture passage (Mk. 12:10; 15:28 *v.l.*; Lk. 4:21; Jn. 13:18; 19:24, 36 f.; Acts 1:16; 8:35; Rom. 11:2; 2 Tim. 3:16; Jas. 2:8, 23. The plur. *hai graphai*, the Scriptures, designates collectively all the parts of Scripture (Matt. 21:42; 22:29; 26:54; Mk. 12:24; 14:49; Lk. 24:27, 32, 45; Jn. 5:39; Acts 17:2, 11; 18:24, 28; Rom. 15:4; 2 Pet. 3:16). Matt. 26:56 refers to *hai graphai tōn prophētōn*, "the writings of the prophets". The sing. is also used as a designation of Scripture as a whole (Jn. 20:9; Acts 8:32; 2 Pet. 1:20).

Sometimes Scripture is quoted in a way which is tantamount to quoting God himself. Thus: *eipen hē graphē*, "Scripture said" (Jn. 7:38; cf. Isa. 44:3; 55:1; 58:11; Jn. 7:42; cf. Mic. 5:2); *legei*, "says" (Rom. 4:3; cf. Gen. 15:6; Rom. 9:17; cf. Exod. 9:16; Rom. 10:11; cf. Isa. 28:16; Gal. 4:30; cf. Gen. 21:10 ff.; 1 Tim. 5:18; cf. Deut.

25:4; Jas. 4:5, where a writing outside the canonical Scriptures is cited, cf. M. Dibelius and H. Greeven, *James*, *Hermeneia*, 1976, 220–24). For similar formulae in early Christian literature see Arndt, 165. Other passages speak of "it stands in Scripture [*periechei en graphē*]" (1 Pet. 2:6; cf. Isa. 28:16); "that the Scripture might be fulfilled [*plērōthē*]" (Jn. 17:12; cf. Ps. 41:9); "to fulfil [*teleiōthē*] the Scripture" (Jn. 19:28; cf. Ps. 22:15); "they believed [*episteusan*] the Scripture" (Jn. 2:22; cf. perhaps Ps. 16:10 which is interpreted of the resurrection in Acts 2:31; 13:35; and possibly Isa. 53:12). Jn. 10:35 states that "the Scripture cannot be set aside [*ou dynatai lythēnai hē graphē*]" (on this verse → Redemption, art. *lyō* NT 6 (d)). Scripture is personified in Gal. 3:8: "And the Scripture, foreseeing [*proïdousa*] that God would justify the Gentiles by faith, preached the gospel beforehand to Abraham, saying, 'In thee shall all the nations be blessed' " (cf. Gen. 12:3; 18:18, where in fact God is speaking). Similarly Gal. 4:22 declares: "But the Scripture consigned [*synekleisen*] all things to sin, that what was promised to faith in Jesus Christ might be given to those who believe." This evidently refers back to the argument of Gal. 3:10 ff. (cf. Deut. 27:26).

Jas. 2:8 uses the phrase *kata tēn graphēn*, "according to Scripture" (cf. Lev. 19:18); and 1 Cor. 15:3 f. uses the plur. *kata tas graphas*, "according to the Scriptures" (cf. Isa. 53:5–12; Ps. 16:8 f.). On the subject of the NT's use of the OT see especially C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, 1952; E. E. Ellis, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament*, 1957; and R. N. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*, 1975. For further discussion of passages which identify the words of Scripture with the Word of God → Revelation, art. *Revelation in Contemporary Theology* 1 (e); → Word.

Occasionally Scripture is qualified: *graphai hagiai*, "Holy Scriptures" (Rom. 1:2); *dia ... graphōn prophētikōn*, "through the prophetic writings" (Rom. 16:26 RSV). 2 Tim. 3:14 ff. urges Timothy, the convert from Judaism (Acts 16:1 ff.), to continue in the study of the Jewish Scriptures as a basis for his Christian life and work: "But as for you, continue in what you have learned and have firmly believed, knowing from whom you learned it and how from childhood you have been acquainted with the sacred writings [*hiera grammata*] which are able to instruct you for salvation through faith in Christ Jesus. All scripture is inspired by God [*theopneustos*] and profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, and for training in righteousness, that the man of God may be complete, equipped for every good work." The adj. *theopneustos* (v. 16) means lit. "God-breathed". It does not imply any particular mode of inspiration, such as some form of divine dictation. Nor does it imply the suspension of the normal cognitive faculties of the human authors. On the other hand, it does imply something quite different from poetic inspiration. It is wrong to omit the divine element from the term implied by *theo-*, as the NEB does in rendering the phrase "every inspired scripture". The expression clearly does not imply that some Scriptures are inspired, whilst others are not. The sacred scriptures are all expressive of the mind of God; but they are so with a view to their practical outworking in life. On the doctrine of inspiration in Judaism see Josephus, *Ap.* 1, 31 ff., and Philo's doctrine of the prophet possessed by God (*prophētēs theophorētos*) in *Spec. Leg.* 1, 65; 4:49 (cf. also *Rer. Div. Her.* 263 ff. referring to Plato, *Ion* 534b) (cf. M. Dibelius and H. Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles*, *Hermeneia*, 1972, 120). Dibelius and Conzelmann cite Epictetus' comment on the usefulness of the Eleusi-

nian mysteries: "Only thus do the Mysteries become helpful, only thus do we arrive at the impression that all these things were established by men of old time for the purpose of education and for the amendment of our life" (*Dissertationes* 3, 21, 15).

2 Pet. 3:15 f. evidently counts the apostolic writings of Paul on a par with the OT scriptures: "And count the forbearance of the Lord as salvation. So also our beloved brother Paul wrote to you according to the wisdom given him, speaking of this as he does in all his letters. There are some things in them hard to understand, which the ignorant and unstable twist to their own destruction, as they do the other scriptures."

C. Brown

2. 'Scripture' in the NT is generally identical with the Greek version of the Jewish Bible. Sometimes, however, known Pseudepigrapha (Jude 14 f. cites Eth. Enoch 1:9; Jude 9 perhaps Ass. Mos.) and unknown passages are quoted (Jn. 7:38 and Jas. 4:5 use the word *graphē*; see above). Similarly, *kathōs gegraptai*, "as it is written" (1 Cor. 2:9) and *egraphē*, "it was written" (1 Cor. 9:10) refer to the LXX (cf. also "therefore it is said", Eph. 5:14; "therefore also the Wisdom of God said", Lk. 11:49).

(a) Along with such broad and general Jewish literature, specifically Christian writings came to be given an equal authority. To the old prophetic writings has been added in the age of salvation the new revelation (Rom. 16:26; similarly at Qumran, 1QpHab 2:7 ff.; 7:1 ff.). In 1 Tim. 5:18, Deut. 25:4 is cited first as "scripture", and there follows, connected only by *kai* ("and") a saying which is known as a saying of Jesus (Lk. 10:7). Even if the second quotation were not meant to be included under the heading of scripture, something new is nevertheless expressed in this connexion by its place immediately after the citation. Here we may see the beginnings of a development, in the course of which the words of Jesus ("I did not come to call the righteous, but sinners" [Matt. 9:13; Mk. 2:17; Lk. 5:32] cited in 2 Clem. 2:4 as *graphē*), and then also the letters of Paul (2 Pet. 3:16; see 1 above), became authoritative in their own right alongside the old holy writings.

(b) In the Holy Scriptures God promised the good news beforehand through his prophets (Rom. 1:2); now in the day of salvation they are being or have been fulfilled (e.g. Matt. 26:54, 56; Lk. 4:21; Jn. 13:18; 19:24, 36), and that finally (Jn. 19:28). The Scripture cannot be annulled (Jn. 10:35; cf. Matt. 5:17; → Redemption, art. *lyō* 6 (a), (d)). As in Pharisaic Judaism, the Scripture is frequently personified, so that, as it were, it speaks (Jn. 7:42; Rom. 9:17; Gal. 4:30; Jas. 2:23; 4:5) and can be inquired of (Acts 17:11) in God's stead. It foresees and prophesies (Gal. 3:8; 2 Pet. 1:20), judges and gives encouragement (Gal. 3:22; Rom. 15:4), and can be the subject of faith (Jn. 2:22). The Scripture even becomes a means by which men can be made perfect (2 Tim. 3:16 f.). It is an object of investigation, is read and interpreted (Matt. 21:42 par. Mk. 12:10, Lk. 20:17; Lk. 24:27, 32; Jn. 5:39). It can give rise to and form the basis of dialogue (cf. Acts 17:2). It can be used to prove and confute (Acts 18:28), but it can also be twisted (2 Pet. 3:16). Some know and understand it, and others do not (Acts 18:24; Matt. 22:29 par. Mk. 12:24; Lk. 24:25; Jn. 20:9), an accusation which was, of course, reciprocal.

(c) *gramma* is used on 8 occasions (in the plur.) in a concrete sense, with a marked leaning towards the secular and legal. It can mean letters of the alphabet (Gal. 6:11; Lk. 23:38 *v.l.*), written information (Acts 28:21), a debtor's bill (Lk.

16:6); also learning (Jn. 7:15; Acts 26:24), which for Jews implies knowledge of the Scriptures; and finally the writings of → Moses (Jn. 5:47), and generally, the Holy Scriptures (2 Tim. 3:15). The other 7 examples show that Paul uses the term chiefly in a transferred sense, parallel to *nomos*, → Law, and contrasted with *pneuma*, → spirit. Probably in order to assimilate its form to that of *pneuma*, spirit, the sing. *gramma* is used in these passages (except for 2 Cor. 3:7). The tendency to make a contrast between *gramma* and *pneuma* – something already established in cl. Gk. and in Jeremiah (31:31–33) – was turned by Paul into a system (Rom. 2:27, 29; 7:6; 2 Cor. 3:3, 6 and 17 should for this reason be regarded as constituting an inner unity). The following scheme exhibits the juxtaposition of ideas set out in these passages which contrast the Jewish use of Scripture with the reality of life in Christ and the Spirit.

gramma	*pneuma*
letter	spirit
written on stone	written on the heart
with ink on stone tablets	with the Spirit on tablets of flesh
→ Law	→ Freedom
circumcision (literal)	circumcision of the heart
→ old	→ new
→ death	→ life

The detailed and consistent application of the contrast clearly shows that we have here a polemical scheme (see below for further comment).

3. (a) Attitudes to Scripture. The first Christians were Jews among Jews. For them, therefore, as for all other Jews, the Bible was "Holy Scripture", the foundation, rule and goal for faith and life. In it they encountered the living Word of God, experienced by means of interpretation as a personal message, and at first handed down in this form by word of mouth, and preserved intact by amazing powers of memory. At various times and for various reasons, the oral tradition was collected and committed to writing. No matter to what extent it had acquired definite form, tradition became, as soon as it was written down, an abiding, objective sign and testimony, outliving individual men, which could be experienced afresh by every generation (→ Teach). This process of constant appropriation of Scripture did not take place without sharp tensions. On the one hand, there is that between Scripture and actual life. On the other hand, there is that between the various interpretations made by particular groups. Scripture was seen by each group in the light of its own historical experience, while at the same time their experience of history was moulded by the word of the Bible. Since all Jewish communities believed the interpretation of Scripture to be the work of the Holy Spirit, its results were regarded as revealed truth, having the same dignity as the original; and thus there arose, in addition to the Heb. Bible, on the one hand the Mishnah, and on the other the NT, which with its christology was analogous and at the same time superior to the "Old Testament". On the rise of apocryphal writings → Hide, art. *kryptō* NT 6, and on the canon of Scripture → Rule, art. *kanōn*.

(b) Methods of Interpretation. These can be discovered by a study of the Bible quotations (cf. C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, 1952; R. N. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Age*, 1975). The variations are hardly coincidental, although oral citation was common. Use is made in interpretation of textual variants, and also of texts altered, shortened or lengthened in the style of a midrash, or quotations from different contexts linked together under one heading, or merged into one another, and even of texts changed round to mean the opposite to bring out a contrasting meaning (cf. Ps. 68:18 with Eph. 4:8 ff.; → Heaven, art. *anabainō* NT 5). Indications of the method of interpretation are also to be found in the form of the text which was used, although the textual tradition was at that time still fluid. Thus NT citations sometimes show similarities to forms of the text which were later used by Theodotion, Aquila and Lucian as the basis of their translations. Aram. targums are similar to texts used by Paul and Matthew (the latter is occasionally comparable with the Heb. text; nearest to the text of the LXX are apparently the citations in Luke–Acts and Heb.).

4. Theology of Scripture. The many and various Bible quotations in the New Testament are not incidental ornament but its very foundation. The NT is built upon authoritative texts from the Hebrew Bible. There is often a flowing transition from the allusion into citation; and citations without introduction are found alongside others which have an introductory formula. These formulae (such as Scripture says, or Moses, David, Isaiah said, wrote, prophesied, warned, called) are by and large those generally used in Judaism. Specifically Christian interpretation is shown above all in those statements which point to the fulfilment of the Scripture, i.e. as a realization of what was promised (→ Fullness, art. *plēroō*). This emphasis on the biblical text was important for the Jews as a starting point in missionary endeavour, and was then taken over by Christians too in their mission to the heathen.

(a) Proof from Scripture gained, however, special force and development in the conflict with Judaism. It is the principal tool of apologetics (cf. B. Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic*, 1961). Jewish opposition to Christian preaching led Matthew in particular to add direct quotations of Scripture to the traditional material. The passion narrative especially was linked up with old Jewish tradition, since it was here that the greatest conflict arose. Within the church, but much more in the debate with those outside, the great problem was the manner of Jesus' suffering and death; by means of evidence from Scripture discouragement and doubt could be dispelled, and at the same time hostile attacks could be repelled. What had happened here was for the Christians neither a chance event nor a catastrophe, but – as evidenced particularly by the Psalms – God's purpose from of old. The high number of citations demonstrates that questions about the origin and authority of Jesus were further focal points in the controversy within the Jewish community. In the case of Matthew, indications of the fulfilment of scripture are woven just like a leitmotiv into the whole book.

(b) This characteristic use of evidence from Scripture, with its testimony to the fulfilment of promise, emphasizes however not only the continuity, but also the break between the old era and the new. To the Essenes the history of the "Teacher of Righteousness" meant a similar cutting across of old traditions, whereas for the Pharisees who followed Hillel even the catastrophe of the destruction of the temple scarcely ruffled the continuity of their interpretation of Scripture. The coming of

Jesus gave the Scriptures a new importance for Christians, since it revealed a meaning hitherto unrealized. Matthew, Paul and John, and the other NT writers too, saw the events of Jesus' life mapped out beforehand in the OT. However conscious Jesus himself was of being the subject of such biblical prophecy, it was not merely from oral tradition that the believing community composed its life of Jesus, but also "according to the Scriptures", which were understood as having been written for his and for their own sakes.

(c) The deeper the sense of a break between the old and the new, the greater were the possibilities of evidence from Scripture being used as a polemical weapon. This made the division from the rest of the Jewish community still more acute. When for instance Paul refers in 2 Cor. 3 to Exod. there is admittedly a formal community of ideas. But the content of what he says separates him from his opponents, as is shown by the pairs of contrasted words associated with *gramma* and *pneuma* (see above 2 (c)). What belongs together is torn apart. The position of the opponent is deliberately made negative and thus demolished. In polemic similar to that of Qumran (with its contrast between light and darkness) those who believe otherwise are denied any positive value, on the basis of their own scriptures. It can even be made to look as if the common ground from which both originated, now emptied of its value, is the property of the opponents alone.

The NT presents a state of continual tension. On the one hand, it emphasizes strongly the authority of the Hebrew Bible (or the LXX). On the other, it allows this authority almost to disappear before the claims of the new gospel. From these tensions, however, which were conditioned by the historical situation and indeed necessitated by it, a synthesis was able to develop. Understanding of the unity that exists within the tension, is expressed particularly in typology. Here, as in the thought of the Essenes and the Pharisees, there is seen in the fulfilment of a promise, the promise of a still greater fulfilment. The historical value of types like → Adam, → Abraham, → Moses, → Elijah, the → temple, the → sacrifices, does not have to dissolve because these have been overshadowed by Christ. This leads to a new goal to which God leads his people along the ancient course of history. *R. Mayer*

→ Book, → Explain, → Fullness, → Proclamation, → Promise, → Revelation, → Rule, → Teach, → Truth, → Word

For the various aspects of Scripture see the fuller bibliographies given in the articles referred to in these cross-references.

(a). D. L. Baker, *Two Testaments, One Bible: A Study of Some Modern Solutions to the Theological Problem of the Relationship between the Old and New Testaments*, 1976 (with extensive bibliography); J. Barr, *Old and New in Interpretation*, 1966; *The Bible in the Modern World*, 1973; and "Scripture, Authority of", *IDB Supplementary Volume*, 1976, 794–97; E. C. Blackman, *Biblical Interpretation*, 1957; L. Berkhof, *Principles of Biblical Interpretation*, 1950; J. W. Bowker, *The Targums and Rabbinic Literature: An Introduction to Jewish Interpretations of Scripture*, 1969; J. Bright, *The Authority of the Old Testament*, 1967; C. Brown, ed., *History, Criticism and Faith: Four Exploratory Studies*, 1977; F. F. Bruce, *The Books and the Parchments*, 1950; *The English Bible: A History of Translations*, 1961; *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts*, 1960; *This is That: The New Testament Development of Some Old Testament Themes*, 1968; F. F. Bruce and E. G. Rupp, eds., *Holy Book and Holy Tradition*, 1968; F. F. Bruce, ed., *Promise and Fulfilment: Essays Presented to Professor S. H. Hooke*, 1963; J. T. Burtchaell, *Catholic Theories of Inspiration since 1810*, 1969; *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, I, ed. P. R. Ackroyd and C. F. Evans, *From the Beginnings to Jerome*, 1970; II, ed. G. W. H. Lampe, *The West from the Fathers to the Reformation*, 1969; III, ed. S. L. Greenslade, *The West from the Reformation to the Present Day*, 1963; O. Cullmann, "Scripture and Tradition", in D. J. Callahan, H. O. Ober-

mann and D. J. O'Hanlon, eds., *Christianity Divided: Protestant and Catholic Theological Issues*, 1962, 7–33 (also in *SJT* 6, 1953, 113 ff.); H. Cunliffe-Jones, *The Authority of the Biblical Revelation*, 1945; C. H. Dodd, *The Authority of the Bible*, 1935; *The Bible and the Greeks*, 1954; and *According to the Scriptures*, 1952; J. W. Doeve, *Jewish Hermeneutics in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts*, 1954; G. Ebeling, *Word and Faith*, 1963; E. E. Ellis, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament*, 1957; and "The Authority of the Bible: Critical Judgments in Biblical Perspective", *EQ* 39, 1967, 196–204; C. F. Evans, *Is 'Holy Scripture' Christian? and Other Questions*, 1971; F. W. Farrar, *History of Interpretation, Bampton Lectures*, 1886; J. A. Fitzmyer, "The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament", *NTS* 7, 1960–61, 297–333 (reprinted in *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament*, 1971, 3–58); R. T. France, *Jesus and the Old Testament: His Application of Old Testament Passages to Himself and his Mission*, 1971; H. W. Frei, *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative: A Study in Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Hermeneutics*, 1974; L. Gaussen, *Theopneustia: The Plenary Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures*, 1888; B. Gerhardsson, *Memory and Manuscript: Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity, Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis* 22, 1961; and *Tradition and Transmission in Early Christianity, Coniectanea Neotestamentica* 20, 1964; G. W. Grogan, "Scripture", *ZPEB* V 302–13; R. H. Gundry, *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel with Special Reference to the Messianic Hope, Supplements to NovT* 18, 1967; A. T. Hanson, *Jesus Christ in the Old Testament*, 1965; J. R. Harris, *Testimonies*, I–II, 1916–20; A. G. Hebert, *The Throne of David*, 1941, 240–66; C. F. H. Henry, *God, Revelation and Authority*, I–IV, 1976-; C. F. H. Henry, ed., *Revelation and the Bible*, 1958; J. P. Hyatt, ed., *The Bible in Modern Scholarship: Papers Read at the 100th Meeting of the Society for Biblical Literature*, 1966; S. Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study*, 1968; P. H. Kelsey, *The Uses of Scripture in Recent Theology*, 1975; E. G. Kraeling, *The Old Testament since the Reformation*, 1955; W. G. Kümmel, *The New Testament: The History of the Investigation of its Problems*, 1972; B. Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic*, 1961; H. Lindsell, *The Battle for the Bible*, 1976; R. N. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*, 1974; I. H. Marshall, ed., *New Testament Interpretation*, 1977; J. Michl, "Scripture", *EBT* III 816–25; K. H. Miskotte, *When the Gods are Silent*, 1967; R. Morgan, *The Nature of New Testament Theology, SBT* Second Series, 1973; S. Neill, *The Interpretation of the New Testament, 1861–1961*, 1964; D. E. Nineham, *The Use and Abuse of the Bible*, 1976; D. E. Nineham, ed., *The Church's Use of the Bible Past and Present*, 1963; W. O. E. Oesterley and G. H. Box, *A Short Survey of the Literature of Rabbinical and Mediaeval Judaism*, 1920; J. Orr, *Revelation and Inspiration*, 1909, J. I. Packer, *'Fundamentalism' and the Word of God*, 1958; D. Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutics in Palestine*, 1975; G. von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, II, 1965; B. Ramm, *Protestant Biblical Interpretation*, 1950; J. K. S. Reid, *The Authority of Scripture: A Study of the Reformation and Post-Reformation Understanding of the Bible*, 1957; A. Richardson, *The Bible in the Age of Science*, 1961; and "Scripture, Authority of", *IDB* IV 248–51; P. Ricoeur, "Biblical Hermeneutics", *Semeia* 4, 1975, 29–145; H. Schlier, *The Relevance of the New Testament*, 1967; L. A. Schökel, *The Inspired Word: Scripture in the Light of Language and Literature*, 1967; G. Schrenk, *graphō* etc., *TDNT* I 742–73; J. D. Smart, *The Interpretation of Scripture*, 1961; and *The Strange Silence of the Bible in the Church*, 1973; K. Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew and its Use of the Old Testament, Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis* 20, 1969[2]; H. B. Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, 1900; G. Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism*, 1961; W. Vischer, *The Witness of the Old Testament to Christ*, I, 1949; B. B. Warfield, *The Inspiration and Authority of the Bible*, 1948; J. C. Wenger, *God's Word Written; Essays on the Nature of Biblical Revelation and Authority*, 1966; J. W. Wenham, *Christ and the Bible*, 1972; C. Westermann, ed., *Essays on Old Testament Interpretation*, 1963; W. Wink, *The Bible in Human Transformation: Toward a New Paradigm for Biblical Study*, 1973.

(b). W. Bacher, *Die exegetische Terminologie der jüdischen Traditionsliteratur*, (1899) 1965; G. Bauer, "Schriftbeweis", *EKL* III 846 ff.; O. Betz, *Offenbarung und Schriftforschung in der Qumransekte, WUNT* 6, 1960; I. Christiansen, *Die Technik der allegorischen Auslegungswissenschaft bei Philon von Alexandrien*, 1969; L. Goppelt, *Typos. Die typologische Deutung des Alten Testaments im Neuen*, 1939; F. Hesse, "Schriftauslegung", *RGG*[3] V 1513 ff.; H.-J. Kraus, *Geschichte der historisch-kritischen Erforschung des Alten Testaments von der Reformation bis zur Gegenwart*, 1956; H.-J. Kraus and C. Maurer, "Bibelwissenschaft", *EKL* I 489 ff.; H.-J. Kraus and H. W. Surkau, "Bibelkritik", *EKL* I 454 ff.; R. Mayer, "Geschichtserfahrung und Schriftauslegung", in O. Loretz and W. Strolz, *Die hermeneutische Frage in der Theologie*, 1968, 290 ff.; O. Michel, *Paulus und seine Bibel*, 1929; M. Rese, "Die Rolle des Alten Testaments im Neuen Testament", *Verkündigung und Forschung* 2, 1967, 287 ff.;

O. Schmitz, "Das Alte Testament im Neuen Testament", in *Wort und Geist. Festgabe Karl Heim*, 1934, 49 ff.; R. Smend, *Die Mitte des Alten Testaments*, 1970; E. Stauffer, "Jesus und seine Bibel", in *Abraham unser Vater. Festschrift Otto Michel*, 1963, 440 ff.; H. J. Stoebe, E. Nestle, W. Wiesner, "Bibelkanon", *EKL* I 448 ff.

Seal

σφραγίς

σφραγίς (*sphragis*), seal, signet; σφραγίζω (*sphragizō*) and κατασφραγίζω (*katasphragizō*), to seal.

CL 1. *sphragis* is attested since the 6th cent. (Theognis) – the first attestation is probably already a metaphor – and the vb. since *c.* 500 B.C. The noun means both the tool that seals (e.g. a signet ring), the stone set in it (the gem) and the engraving on it (an image or name) as well as its imprint.

2. Seals were widely used very early (3rd millennium onwards), especially in Mesopotamia, where Hdt. observed that every man possessed not only a staff but also a seal (1, 195), and later in the whole Mediterranean area (on the different forms of seals – e.g. rolls, buttons, scaraboid – cf. *BHHW* III 1786 ff., 1812 f.). The real importance of the seal is a legal one: the owner puts his mark on his possessions, his beasts (cf. Virgil, *Georgics* 3, 157 ff.; *BGU* I, 87, 12 f.; P. Teb. 419), his slaves (cf. Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* 25, 13, 173; *BGU* I, 15, etc.) and thereby guards his property against theft. To that extent one can call it a protecting sign or a guarantee. When used with documents (wills, deeds of sale, etc.) the seal served as a signature to authorize what was written there (cf. *TDNT* VII 941). Things sealed were at the disposal of the possessor of the seal. This applied not only to private persons, but also particularly to the authorities of a city and to kings. The seal symbolized their authority.

3. Seals were also significant in religious life. For instance, a beast could be attested as ritually pure and thus suitable for a sacrificial victim (cf. Hdt. 2, 38; *BGU*, I, 250, 15 ff.; 356, 7). Men show themselves to be the possession of their deity by the imprint of their seal (Hdt., 2, 113; cf. 3 Macc. 2:29 f.; also J. Ysebaert, *Greek Baptismal Terminology*, 1962, 200 f.). More tangibly one can seal houses, etc., to guarantee that they were preserved, or documents, to keep their contents a secret. Hence, one can also say that the mouth or words are sealed (cf. Diog. Laert., 1, 58; Theognis, 1, 178; Timotheus, *Persians* 148): what one has experienced must remain secret and in safe keeping. This applied particularly to keeping the secrets of the mysteries (Ysebaert, op. cit., 221–226).

OT In the LXX the noun is a translation of *ḥōṭām*, *ḥôṭām*, and of the vb. *ḥāṭam*.

Twice the LXX translates *ḥōṭām* with *daktylios*, signet-ring, but *daktylios* usually represents the Heb. *ṭabba'aṭ*, ring (e.g. on the ark of the covenant, altars, the priests' clothing, etc.). However, it is also used of signet-rings. On the other hand, *sphragis* can also mean a signet-ring (e.g. Exod. 35:22; 1 Ki. 20[21]:8). Both the noun and the vb. are used (1) literally and (2) figuratively. In this way they approximate to non-biblical usage.

1. A seal engraved by a maker of signets (Sir. 38:27) can leave its impress in clay (Job 38:14). It has a legal use: by means of a seal a document (e.g. a marriage con-

tract, Tob. 7:14; or a deed of sale, Jer. 39[32]:10 f., 44) is made valid. All who affix their seals to a document are bound to abide by its contents (Neh. 10:1). To give one's seal to another implies the transference of authority and power (Gen. 41:42; 1 Ki. 20[21]:8; Est. 3:10; 8:8, 10). Hence, one of the means by which the dying Antiochus Epiphanes appointed his friend Philip as regent over his kingdom was to hand over his seal to him (1 Macc. 6:15).

The LXX can also speak of a seal used as a fastening (for a purse, 2 Ki. 22:4; Tob. 9:5; a treasury, Deut. 32:34; the temple, Ad. Dan. 14:14, 16 f.; a pit, Dan. 6:18; a fountain, Cant. 4:12). Thence the act of sealing comes to be equivalent to keeping something secret: that which is sealed is hidden from men (a book, Dan. 12:4; Isa. 29:11; cf. 1 Esd. 3:8). The seal is thus absolutely necessary in both private and public life. The seal of the state (Jerusalem, 2 Esd. 10:23) is carefully guarded (Tob. 1:22). Signet-rings are precious (Isa. 3:20; Sir. 35[32]:5 f.) and are regarded as valuable spoil (Num. 31:50).

2. The figurative use of the concept is found especially with the sense of concluding or shutting up. One can, e.g., ask for a seal to be set on one's lips that one may not sin in speaking (Sir. 22:27; cf. Ps. 141[140]:3). God seals the stars (Job 9:7) by shutting them up so that they can no longer shine, and he seals men and thus prevents them from working, so that they may recognize their dependence on him (Job 37:7 LXX). Several times sins are said to be sealed (in a bag, Job 14:17; Dan. [Theod.] 9:24; cf. Hos. 13:12). A revelation that is sealed remains hidden (Dan. 12:9) and one can therefore learn as little of its contents as of those of a sealed book. In Job 24:16 skulking malefactors are said to have "sealed" themselves from daylight. The end of life is sealed in that it is as unalterable as a sealed document (Wis. 2:5).

The application of sealing to a religious context plays some part in the LXX. These precise words are not used, but their meaning is. Isa. 44:5 presupposes the custom of having a seal with the words "for Yahweh", i.e. Yahweh's property, tattooed on the hand. Probably the author of Lev. 19:28 was opposing this very practice, because he regarded it as pagan. Ezek. 9:4 ff. is also relevant at this point: God gets one of his servants to mark a sign upon the foreheads of his children to protect them in the judgment. The seal is thus God's protective mark for his property (cf. Pss. Sol. 15:6 ff.: "For the mark of God is upon the righteous that they may be saved. Famine and death remain far from the righteous, for sword and pestilence [shall be] far from the righteous, for they shall flee away from the pious as men pursued in war").

3. The affixing of seals is also frequently mentioned in Rab. Judaism. Letters are sealed (Oholoth 17:5); their seals are smaller than those of sacks (Shabbath 8:5). In the temple there was a room where four kinds of seals for victims were kept (Shekalim 5:3, 4). A seal can be made of metal or coral (Kelim 13:6), and is used like a key to lock things up (Tohoroth 7:7). The Mishnah also uses the word in a metaphorical sense, e.g. Sanhedrin 4:5, "Man stamps many coins with one seal and they are all like one another; but the King of Kings, the Holy One, blessed is he, has stamped every man with the seal of the first man, yet not one is like his fellow" (Sanhedrin 4:5; → Image).

Sealing often occurs in the sense of signing, especially in the tractate Gittin (1:1, 3, *et passim*), where two witnesses are said to "seal" a bill of → divorce. → Circumcision

can be called the seal of the holy → covenant (T. J. Ber. 9:3) or the seal of → Abraham (Exod. R. 19:5), since he was the first to receive this sign (Gen. 17:11). The noun and the vb. occur only infrequently in the Qumran texts. CD 5:2 refers to the sealed book of the law, and 1QH 8:11 to the seal of the secret of the holy shoot, i.e. its secret is inscrutable.

NT The noun *sphragis* and the vbs. occur 32 times in the NT (22 times in Rev. alone). The other occurrences are divided between the Pauline writings (6), Jn. (2), Matt. (1) and 2 Tim. (1).

1. *The Literal Use of these Words.* (a) Twice *sphragizō* is used of actual physical sealing: the stone before Jesus' grave (Matt. 27:66; cf. Dan. 6:18) and the pit into which the devil is thrown (Rev. 20:3) are both sealed. In both cases this is done to prevent the one enclosed within from leading men astray (Matt. 27:63 f.; Rev. 20:3).

(b) In Rom. 15:28 Paul says that he is "sealing" the collections from Macedonia and Achaia for the Jerusalem church. Here he is either wanting to say that he has "sealed" the collections as one seals a purse (cf. Tob. 9:5; Job 14:17) so that the contents may be kept safe, or that he has finished the collections (→ Poor, art. *ptōchos* NT 4).

2. *The Figurative Use.* (a) Jn. uses *sphragizō*, to seal, in the sense of confirm, authenticate. He who receives God's witness thus affirms that God is true (Jn. 3:33). Jn. 6:27 says that God has put his seal upon the Son of man. By doing so he attests that the eternal food that the Son of man gives is the true food and not perishable; by his seal he authenticates the Son of man's work. Perhaps Jn. is here thinking of → baptism as a sealing (cf. (b)). Others think that this seal is the miracle of the feeding of the five thousand (6:1 ff.). or the testimony of Holy Scripture (5:39).

When Paul in 1 Cor. 9:2 calls the Corinthian community the seal of his apostleship, he means that the existence of this community in the world confirms the legitimacy of his apostolic authority and that they are at the same time his letters of recommendation (cf. 2 Cor. 3:1–3; → Book, art. *epistolē*).

(b) Three times Paul connects "sealing" with the Holy → Spirit. This sealing, as he sees it, is symbolized by → baptism (aor.) which he associates with the gift of the Spirit (1 Cor. 6:11; 12:13; cf. Acts 2:38; 10:47). While Eph. 1:13 relates "being sealed" with or in the Holy Spirit (cf. Eph. 4:30) to the whole baptismal event, 2 Cor. 1:21 f. looks on baptism as an anointing in Christ and associates it with the receiving of the pledge of the Spirit (→ Gift, art. *arrabōn*). As Christ was anointed with the Spirit at his baptism (cf. Lk. 3:22; 4:18; Acts 10:37 f.; → Anoint, art. *chriō*), so also are believers at theirs. The Spirit is a pledge until the day of redemption (Eph. 1:14; 2 Cor. 1:22; cf. 5:5). In sealing believers with his Spirit, God makes them his own possession (cf. above OT). On the relation of → faith to baptism → the various articles under Baptism.

It is not certain whether Paul used the word "seal" in Rom. 4:11 in connexion with → Abraham's → circumcision, because he thought of baptism as a "seal" (cf. Col. 2:11 f. which mentions a circumcision which is not performed by hand, which comes through Christ). This idea first became explicit at a later stage (e.g. 2 Clem. 7:6; 8:6; Hermas, *Sim.* 8, 6, 3). Rom. 4:11 is most readily intelligible, if it means that by the seal of circumcision God confirms that Abraham was justified even before God made his covenant with him (Gen. 17:10 ff.), a covenant whose sign is circumcision.

So circumcision would here represent God's confirmatory sign (cf. 2 (a)).

(c) That difficult passage, 2 Tim. 2:19, speaks of a firm foundation which is fixed (cf. Isa. 28:16) and bears a seal: "But God's firm foundation stands, bearing this seal: 'The Lord knows those who are his,' and, 'Let every one who names the name of the Lord depart from iniquity.' " The word "seal" here means the impress of the seal, the inscription on it (cf. Exod. 28:36). The question is what is meant by the foundation upon which this mark is stamped: is it Christ (cf. 1 Cor. 3:10 ff.), the church (cf. 1 Tim. 3:15), the apostolic witness (cf. Eph. 2:20), or the truth in contrast to that which is taught by the false teachers (vv. 15, 18)? Through his seal God guarantees the firmness of the foundation, for he knows his own and does not tolerate unrighteousness. The two inscriptions probably depend on Num. 16:5 LXX, but M. Dibelius and H. Conzelmann, think that this is a quotation from early Christian poetry influenced by the Gk. OT (*The Pastoral Epistles*, *Hermeneia*, 1972, 112).

3. *The use of these Words in Revelation.* (a) The sealing of words and its absence. In Rev. 22:10 the seer is forbidden to seal the words of the prophecy; he is not to keep them secret since the time of their fulfilment is near (cf. the opposite in Dan. 12:4).

On the other hand, Rev. 10:4 reads: "Seal up that which the seven thunders have spoken; do not write it down." This reflects the idea that that which is sealed up is hidden (cf. Isa. 29:11). The message of the thunders which ushers in the beginning of the final judgment was only for the seer's ears and should not be communicated by him to anyone else (→ Revelation; → Hide).

(b) The book with the seven seals. Rev. 5:1 tells us how Jn. saw in the right hand of him who sat on the heavenly throne a scroll written on both sides which had seven seals. No one but the → Lamb could open it (5:2–10). The contents of the scroll (and also, according to E. Lohmeyer, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes*, *HNT* 16, 1970 ³, ad loc., the events which Rev. goes on to describe) are so voluminous that they cover both sides of it (cf. Ezek. 2:9 f.). But it is still secret, even for the seer (cf. Dan. 12:4, 9). The number seven recalls the Roman custom of sealing wills with 7 seals, but it is more likely to be derived from the use of this number in Rev. itself (→ Number, art. *hepta*).

It is difficult to guess what the scroll looked like, since a part of the final cataclysm is revealed with the opening of each individual seal (Rev. 6:1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 12; 8:1), despite the fact that the contents of ancient documents were disclosed only after the opening of all the seals. But the writer is not interested in this idea itself, but in emphasizing that only the Lamb is worthy of setting the final events in motion.

(c) The sealing of believers. Finally Rev. 7:10 ff. refers to the "seal of the living God" which is imprinted on the foreheads of believers before the four angels of judgment are allowed to set to work. These are to protect them from the judgment that is coming upon the world (Rev. 9:4; cf. Ezek. 9:4; Pss. Sol. 15:6 ff.; cf. OT above). The seal is here a sign of ownership and hence also of the one that protects; God keeps his own from the judgment. The fact that 12,000 of each tribe, i.e. 12 x 12,000, receive the seal means that the whole of God's people are spared from the judgment (→ Number, art. *chilias*). The imprinting of the seal which bears God's → name (cf. Rev. 14:1; 22:4) will distinguish believers from those who bear the "mark of the beast" on their hands and foreheads (13:16 f.; 14:9, 11, etc.; → Animal, art. *thērion*). God's sign protects one from judgment; the mark of the beast brings it upon one

(9:4; 14:9 ff.). It is easy to discern here a word of consolation to a community which is living through the trials of persecution; it tells them of God's protection.

R. Schippers

(a). D. Diringer, "Seals". in D. W. Thomas, ed., *Documents from Old Testament Times*, 1969, 219–26; G. Fitzer, *sphragis* etc., *TDNT* VII 939–53; F. B. Huey, Jr., "Seals", *ZPEB* V 319–24; J. Michl, "Seal", *EBT* III 827 ff.; G. W. H. Lampe, *The Seal of the Spirit: A Study of Baptism and Confirmation in the New Testament and the Fathers*, 1967 [2]; W. M. F. Petrie, *Scarabs and Cylinders*, 1917; A. Reifenberg, *Ancient Hebrew Seals*, 1950; and "Hebrew Seals and Stamps", *Israel Exploration Journal* 4, 1954, 139–42; G. M. A. Richter, *The Engraved Gems of the Greeks and the Etruscans and the Romans*, I, 1968; O. Tufnell, "Seals and Scarabs", *IDB* IV 254–59; W. H. Ward, *The Seal Cylinders of Western Asia*, 1910; D. J. Wiseman, *Cylinder Seals of Western Asia*, 1958; Y. Yadin, ed., *Hazor I: An Account of the First Season of Excavations, 1955*, 1958; and *Hazor II: An Account of the Second Season of Excavations, 1956*, 1960; J. Ysebaert, *Greek Baptismal Terminology: Its Origins and Early Development, Graecitas Christianorum Primaeva* 1, 1962.

(b). N. Avigad, *ḥōṯām*, *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, III, 1958, 68–86; J. Diehl, *Sphragis. Eine semasiologische Nachlese*, (Dissertation, Giessen) 1938; E. Dinkler, "Die Taufterminonologie in 2 Kor. i, 21 f.", in *Neotestamentica et Patristica. Eine Freundesgabe Herrn Professor Dr. Oscar Cullmann, Supplements to NovT* 6, 1962, 173–91 (reprinted in *Signum Crucis*, 1967, 99 f.); F. Dölger, *Sphragis*, 1911; K. Galling, "Beschriftete Bildsiegel des ersten Jahrtausends v. Chr. vornehmlich aus Syrien und Palästina", *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 64, 1941, 121–202; and "Siegel", *RGG* [3] VI 27 f.; W. Heitmüller, *sphragis*, in *Neutestamentliche Studien G. Heinrici dargebracht*, 1914, 40–59; W. Michaelis, "Zeichen, Siegel, Kreuz. Ein Ausschnitt aus der Bedeutungsgeschichte biblischer Begriffe", *ThZ* 12, 1956, 505–25; S. Moscati, "I Sigilli nell' Antico Testamento", *Biblica* 30, 1949, 314–38; L. Wenger, "signum", Pauly-Wissowa Series 2, II 2361–2448; and *Die Quellen des römischen Rechts*, 1953, 45–9.

Secret, Mystery

μυστήριον

μυστήριον (*mystērion*), mystery, secret; μυέω (*myeō*), initiate, instruct.

CL 1. *mystērion*, found from the time of the Tragic Poets onwards, comes from *myō*, to shut (the mouth), and means that which must not or cannot be said. The plur. is almost exclusively a technical term for festivals such as those which took place in Eleusis from the 17th cent. B.C. and were widespread during the Hellenistic period and especially in Christian times as the mysteries associated with Isis, Attis, Mithras etc. The mystery celebration gave a ceremonial and dramatic representation of the deity suffering and overcoming death, and the initiated attained salvation (*sōtēria*; → Redemption, art. *sōzō*) and deification by sharing in the deity's fortunes through sacramental acts such as baptism, cultic feasts, and ceremonies of death and resurrection (→ Baptism, art. *baptizō* NT 7; cf. G. Wagner, *Pauline Baptism and the Pagan Mysteries*, 1967). The cultic acts and symbols were kept strictly secret.

2. *myeō* meant originally to initiate (into the mysteries), and then (as in NT Gk.) took on the meaning of to instruct, to teach.

3. As early as Plato, ideas and terms from the mystery cults were being transferred to philosophy: He describes the path of knowledge for immutable being as the path of true initiation (cf. *Theaet.* 156a; *Gorgias* 497c). In later mystic philosophy, especially in Neoplatonism, *mystērion* is that which by its very nature

cannot be put into words. Mystic speech is the very negation of speech (*TDNT* IV 809).

In gnosticism (→ Knowledge) the *mystēria* become secret revelations granted only to the "perfect" (*teleioi*) with a view to the redemption of their souls.

OT 1. (a) In the LXX *mystērion* occurs only in later writings, i.e. those belonging to the Hellenistic period; the same is true of *apokalypsis*, → revelation, in its theological sense of the revelation of a mystery. The OT is very slow to abandon the idea that God's words and deeds in history (Heb. *dāḇār*; → word) are manifest in the sense that they take place before the eyes of the whole world. Numerous passages demonstrate this. God does not speak in secret (Isa. 45:19; 48:16). Amos 3:7 f. goes so far as to contradict the later concept of "mystery" or "secret" (Heb. *sôḏ*): "Surely the Lord GOD does nothing, without revealing his secret to his servants the prophets."

(b) When it occurs later in the LXX, mystery terminology frequently refers to heathen cults (Wis. 12:5; 14:23; 3 Macc. 2:30 and passim). On the other hand, in passages such as Wis. 2:22; 6:22; 8:4 the way to divine → wisdom is described approvingly in terms of the mysteries. But even here (Wis. 6:22) the authentic OT note is still sounded in that the way of wisdom is faithfully and uncompromisingly set forth.

In writings other than Wis. and Dan., *mystērion* occurs with profane meanings such as the secret plans of a political leader (Tob. 12:7; Jud. 2:2), military secrets (2 Macc. 13:21), or secrets shared among friends (Sir. 22:22; 27:16 f., 21).

2. *mystērion* always renders the Heb. *sôḏ*, confidential speech, secret, except in Dan. where it occurs most frequently and corresponds to the Aram. *rāz*. Dan. uses the word in a very definite theological sense, that of "eschatological secret", the vision of what God has decreed shall take place in the future (Dan. 2:28). When given in the form of a → dream, it can be interpreted only by a Spirit-inspired seer (4:6, 18), for the revelation of mysteries belongs to God alone (2:28 f.).

In this way Dan. serves as a transition to the special use of the term in late Jewish apocalyptic, where the *mystēria* are used in the one sense of eschatological events: the judgment and punishment of sinners (Eth. Enoch 38:3), the reward of the righteous (Eth. Enoch 103: 2 ff.) and the cosmic upheaval at the dénouement of world history (Eth. Enoch 83:7). Future events, in so far as they belong to the divine decrees, are present realities in the heavenly sphere, and are revealed in vision to the apocalyptic seer (Heb. Enoch 71:3 f.). He knows even now about "the approach of the ages" (Syr. Bar. 81:4), and what must, of divine necessity, come to pass in the last days (*TDNT* IV 816). But what he beholds remains a secret in that he may pass it on only in symbolic, oracular language (Eth. Enoch 68:1: "signs of all secrets") and for the exclusive benefit of a given circle of initiates (2 Esd. 12:36 ff.).

3. (a) In rabbinic literature there are also references to "secrets" in connexion with the interpretation of the written and oral tradition. The secrets of the Torah seek to reveal the inner workings of the Lawgiver's mind, and, being also "the secrets of creation", to throw light on his purposes for the world (Heb. Enoch 11:1). Such secrets are part of an esoteric scheme of doctrine reminiscent of gnosticism. The esoteric interpretation of Gen. 1:1 ff. and of Ezek. 1:1 f. is a work of daring (cf. *Ḥagigah* 2, 1; J. Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus*, 1969, 237; H. Bietenhard,

Die himmlische Welt im Urchristentum und im Spätjudentum, *WUNT* 2, 1951, 86 ff.).

(b) In the true apocalyptic tradition the Qumran texts speak of the secrets which God has prepared for men (frequently in stereotyped association with *pele'*, wonder, miracle; wondrous, miraculous), no distinction in meaning being drawn between *sôḏ* and *rāz* (cf. 1QH4 27f.). The "wondrous secrets" are God's decrees, according to which, in strictly dualistic and predestinarian fashion, he has set apart one section of mankind, the sons of righteousness, for the way of light (1QS 3:20), and the other section, the sons of evil, for the way of darkness (1QS 3:21). Individuals (the Teacher of Righteousness?) are set to be "a banner and a discerning interpreter of wonderful mysteries, to try [those who practise] truth" (1QH 2:13 f.). The secrets give information about God's purposes for the world from its very beginning right through to its end: about his creation (1QH 1:9 ff; 1QS 3:15), his deeds in history (1QH 4:29), and about cultic arrangements, interpreted along the lines of Qumran observance (CD 3:14 ff.). All this is arrived at through a kind of spiritual exegesis of the written tradition, with correction and reinterpretation of existing prophecies (1QpHab 7:7 f.). In addition there are revelations regarding the time of visitation (1QS 3:21 f.) and the final conflict of the sons of light with the sons of darkness (1QM 14:14 ff.).

NT In the NT *mystērion* is comparatively rare, occurring only some 27 times. It is significant that it is found most frequently (20 times) in Paul (5 times in 1 Cor; 6 times in Eph.; 4 times in Col.; twice in Rom. and 1 Tim. and once in 2 Thess.), since it is here that the mystery cults and gnosticism are directly dealt with. The word occurs once each in Matt., Mk. and Lk. and, as one would expect, is found also in Rev. (4 times). Its complete absence from the Gospel of Jn. is striking. Perhaps the reason lies in John's christology.

1. Mk. 4:11 (par. Matt. 13:11, Lk. 8:10) with its picture of harvest, i.e. the appearing of the kingdom of God, touches on a matter close to the heart of apocalyptic. Mk., however, sees God's kingdom as having already arrived in Christ. The meaning of the parables (note the plur. in v. 11), i.e. that of Christ's teaching as a whole, has to do with his way to the → cross. Only this will usher God's → kingdom into the world. One of the ideas basic to Mk.'s Gospel (W. Wrede calls it the messianic secret) is that neither the people nor the disciples realized that this way to the cross was according to the will of God (cf. 3:35), even though the Twelve received clear teaching on the matter (4:11; 8:17; cf. on the other hand Matt. 13:51; → Parable, art. *parabolē*). The first man to confess the truth was the heathen soldier at the foot of the cross: "Truly, this man was the Son of God!" (15:39). Only the evil spirits knew from the beginning that the turning point of the ages had come (1:24). On the question of the messianic secret see the note appended to this article.

Matt. and Lk. abandon this strict adherence to the idea that Christ's way to the cross remained a mystery, and speak of the secrets which it is given to the disciples to know (Matt. 13:11; Lk. 8:10). The plur. here indicates that the decrees of God concerning Christ and his church, latent in the Scriptures of the OT but now explainable to the disciples, are at last being fulfilled (cf. the frequent references to the fulfilment of OT prophecies: Matt. 2:17, 23; 3:3 and passim; Lk. 24:26 and passim). According to Lk., Christ's way of suffering, and that of his church, are a matter of

divine → necessity (Lk. 24:26; art. *dei*) and will issue in the glory of heaven (cf. Lk. 23:43; Acts 7:55).

2. The mystery with which Paul firmly confronts his opponents in 1 Cor. is that of the → cross of Christ, revealing as it does God's redemptive decree for the world. Paul is concerned to set before men Jesus Christ only, and him crucified (1 Cor. 2:2; cf. 1:23). This is the essence of "the mystery of God" (2:1; a well-attested *v.l.*). Although the apostle uses "mystery" terminology (*teleioi*, "perfect", 2:6; *en mystēriō*, "in a mystery", 2:7; *psychikos* "physical"/*pneumatikos*, "spiritual", 2:14, 15), he interprets this "mystery" in an entirely apocalyptic manner. Before the beginning of → time God in his wisdom predestinated the cross of Christ to our glory, i.e. with a view to our glorification at the end of time (2:7; → Determine, art. *horizō*; cf. Rom. 16:25). That which has already been prepared in heaven and promised in OT prophecy, has now taken place in time and history (1 Cor. 1:19 quotes Isa. 29:14; 2:9 quotes Isa. 64:3). The rulers of this age have not known the secret of the divine decree (2:6); but he who, enlightened by the → Spirit (2:12), now acknowledges it in humble submission. He is left speechless before its unfathomable depth (1:23; 2:3). His grasp of it is sufficient to bind him irresistibly to its service for life (9:16) and to rule out all boasting of self (1:31; 3:21).

Only thus, in weakness and humility, are the → apostles, as servants of the crucified Christ, stewards of the mysteries of God (4:1; → House, art. *oikos*). They submit to the plan (*oikonomia*) of God (Eph. 3:8). Their sole ground of boasting is that, in spite of all their weakness and insufficiency, he can still use them as instruments of his grace (1 Cor. 1:26 f.; 2 Cor. 1:12).

3. Practically wherever it occurs in the NT *mystērion* is found with vbs. denoting → revelation or → proclamation, i.e. *mystērion* is that which is revealed (cf. *TDNT* IV 819). It is a present-day secret, not some isolated fact from the past which merely needs to be noted, but something dynamic and compelling.

This is vividly expressed in Col. By his office the apostle "fulfils" (Col. 1:26) "the mystery of Christ" (4:3), i.e. by bearing in his own body that which is still lacking in the afflictions of Christ (1:24), he gives practical expression to the "mystery" and carries it on towards its final consummation. The riches of the mystery (1:27) are summed up as *Christos en hymin*, "Christ in you", i.e. the world-wide church with Christ as its → head, having reconciled the whole universe and the whole of mankind through his death (1:18, 20). This was concealed from earlier generations (1:26), but now men specially set apart are entrusted with the task of proclaiming it to all (1:28), that as perfect men (*teleioi*) all may share in the power of the first-born from the dead (1:18) and be incorporated into his resurrection body (1:28).

In Eph. too the mystery of Christ is essentially the fact that through Christ the Gentiles have been given access to the Father of all creation (Eph. 3:15; cf. 2:18). They are members of the world-wide church of Jew and Gentile, described figuratively in Eph. 2:20 f. as a building whose head or corner-stone is the pivot of all creation (→ Rock). This was God's will before time began (3:9; cf. 1:9) and was all part of his great purpose (3:6). It was kept secret from men in the past, but now, since the time is fulfilled (1:10), God has made known his will to those who proclaim the gospel (3:8), that through them his purpose may come to fulfilment (1:9 f.). The gospel is spreading throughout the whole world but is meeting with much opposition on the way, so at the close of the first section of the epistle Paul has every reason for

urging his readers to exercise patience (3:13) and for recording his own intercession on their behalf (3:14 ff.).

The only other christological passage is 1 Tim. 3:9, 16, where the *mystērion tēs pisteōs* ("mystery of the faith") and the *tēs eusebeias mystērion* ("mystery of [our] religion") both refer to the confession of Christ and his redeeming work, i.e. *mystērion* here is a paraphrase for a formulated confession of faith (on this hymn 3:16; → Revelation, art. *epiphaneia* 5 (c)).

4. The same divine economy which directs the course of history towards its predestined goal also concerns itself with the destiny of → Israel. The apostle uses a strong negative (*mē genoito*, "by no means!") in Rom. 11:1 to counter the suggestion that God has cast off his people, even though their hardness of heart might lend colour to the idea. Against all the dictates of reason and experience (Rom. 11:9 f., 25a), he unfolds the secret of the final acceptance of the chosen people. Israel has been stricken with blindness only for a limited period, in order that the gospel may have free course among the Gentiles and that their → fullness (art. *plēroō*) may come in (11:25). Believing Gentiles, knowing that they are now God's elect people, are to respond not with pride or arrogance but with reverent, adoring fear (11:20). They are also to be humbled by the fact that the Jews who at present are hard of heart will one day be saved. Truly the mystery of free → grace is unfathomable and unsurpassable (11:33 ff.)!

5. (a) In 1 Cor. 14 Paul warns against too high an estimation of speaking with tongues (→ Word, art. *glōssa*). In his judgment it is subordinate to preaching, for to outsiders it is not intelligible of itself and does not serve to build up the church (14:2, 16). The mysteries uttered in ecstatic, unintelligible sounds need to be interpreted (14:13), and in any case no such ecstatic experience of divine mysteries can bear comparison with love (13:2).

1 Cor. 15:51 is written in the light of the imminence of Christ's parousia (→ Present, art. *The Parousia and Eschatology in the NT*). Paul tells the Corinthians the apocalyptic mystery the imminent day of → resurrection will dawn, when all those still living will be changed.

(b) In Eph. 5:32 *mystērion* refers to the allegorical sense of a verse of Scripture, Gen. 2:24 being interpreted as referring to the relationship between Christ and his church. The apostle's phrase *egō de legō eis* ("I take it to mean" RSV) is intended to exclude any other possible interpretations.

(c) 2 Thess. 2:7 bears an apocalyptic stamp, the context dealing with the events which are to precede the parousia. Before Christ returns, there will come a period of apostasy, in which the *anthrōpos tēs anomias* ("man of lawlessness"; → Antichrist) will gain the upper hand (2:3 f.). At present there is a power which hinders (*katechōn*) his appearing, but already the mystery of *anomia* ("lawlessness") is abroad and the day of Antichrist is dawning (2:7).

(d) In Rev. the *mystēria* similarly refer to apocalyptic events which, occurring in a time of distress, will precede the return of the Lord. The mysteries are presented in the form of OT symbols and metaphors which require interpretation. But God reveals them to his church through the mouth of the → prophets (10:7) and through the seer (17:7; cf. 1:19). The victory is his (18:2; 19:6), and this knowledge serves to comfort his church as it passes through severe affliction and persecution.

Rev. 1:20 introduces the seven letters by a reference to the "mystery" of the seven

churches and their angels. As the mystery is unfolded they are enlightened as to their true standing in the eyes of God, who sees through all pretence of virtue and goodness, and they are exhorted to repent. *G. Finkenrath*

The Messianic Secret

Jesus' injunctions to secrecy have been the subject of intense debate among students of the Gospels throughout the twentieth century. The controversy was initiated by William Wrede in his book *Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien* (1901; ET *The Messianic Secret*, 1971). Wrede argued that the picture of Jesus presented by the Gospel of Mark portrays him as one who is deeply concerned to veil his mission, and the disciples are made to appear as recipients of revelations by him which they do not understand. However, the resurrection ends Jesus' self-concealment, and the disciples are given the commission to proclaim Jesus as messiah to the world. What was novel about Wrede's thesis was the contention that this picture of Jesus was not based on the Jesus of history; it was the product of the theological reflection of the early church. For Jesus did not think of himself as the messiah in this way; it was only after the resurrection that the church thought of this. The church, therefore, had to explain why Jesus did not speak openly about his messiahship. Wrede's reply was that the church put out the story that Jesus had indeed told the disciples of his messiahship, but that he had done it secretly and at the same time had forbidden them to tell people about it. The picture of Jesus presented by Mark is, therefore, not strictly a piece of historical reporting; it is a theological interpretation, the product of the reflection of the early church on its own Easter faith.

Albert Schweitzer concluded his survey of *The Quest of the Historical Jesus* (1910) with a discussion of Wrede. He saw Wrede's position as one of "thoroughgoing scepticism" which he contrasted with his own "thorough-going eschatology" (on Schweitzer → Present, art. *The Parousia and Eschatology in the NT* 1 (a)). Subsequent discussions of this subject include the introduction to *The Messianic Secret* by J. C. G. Greig, op. cit., vii–xxi; E. Sjöberg, *Der verborgene Menschensohn in den Evangelien*, 1955; P. W. Meyer, "The Problem of the Messianic Selfconsciousness of Jesus", *NovT* 4, 1960, 122–38; N. Perrin, "The Wredestrasse becomes the Hauptstrasse", *JR* 46, 1966, 296–300; G. Minette de Tilesse, *Le Secret Méssianique dans l'Evangile de Marc*, 1968; B. G. Powley, "The Purpose of the Messianic Secret: A Brief Survey", *ExpT* 80, 1968–69, 308 ff.; D. Aune, "The Problem of the Messianic Secret", *NovT* 11, 1969, 1–31; R. N. Longenecker, "The Messianic Secret in the Light of Recent Discoveries", *EQ* 41, 1969, 207–15; J. D. G. Dunn, "The Messianic Secret in Mark", *TB* 21, 1970, 92–117 (summarized in "The Messianic Secret in Mark", *TSF Bulletin* 69, 1974, 7–14). The following note is much indebted to Dunn's researches.

A focal point in Mk.'s Gospel and also in Wrede's thesis is Peter's confession of Christ, followed by the → transfiguration and the injunction: "And as they were coming down the mountain, he charged them to tell no one what they had seen, until the Son of man should have risen from the dead" (Mk. 9:9; cf. 8:30; and Wrede, op. cit., 13 ff., 252 ff.). This, Wrede claims, is not historical but the theological invention of the early church. It is further supported by the silence enjoined by Jesus on the messianic confessions of the demons (Mk. 1:23 ff., 34; 3:11 f.; cf. 5:6 f.; 9:20) and the healings (Mk. 1:43 ff.; 5:43; 7:36; 8:26), Jesus' intention to remain hidden (Mk.

7:24; 9:30 f.), and the command of the crowd to blind Bartimaeus to remain silent (Mk. 10:47 f.). Moreover, Jesus' teaching was directed to his followers for their private illumination and not the crowds (Mk. 4:34; 7:17–23; 8:31; 9:28 f., 31; 10:32 ff.; 13:3 ff.). It also accords with Jesus' method of teaching in → parables, as he explained to the disciples: "To you has been given the secret of the kingdom of God, but for those outside everything is in parables; so that they may indeed see but not perceive, and may indeed hear but not understand, lest they should turn again and be forgiven" (Mk. 4:11 f.). Dunn notes three main strands in Wrede's argument: (a) the motif in Mk. concerning the messianic secret; (b) the argument that certain elements in this motif are unhistorical, e.g. the exorcisms, which leads to the conclusion that the whole motif is the construction of Christian theology; and (c) as the *raison d'être* the complementary argument that belief in Jesus as the messiah was the product of the church's Easter faith, and thus that the messianic secret is an attempt to read back Jesus' messiahship into the life of Jesus.

(a) In reply to the first of these three strands Dunn contends that Wrede has narrowed too much the scope of the secrecy motif. In none of Mk.'s accounts of the miracles did any spectator conclude that Jesus was the messiah (cf. the healing of the paralytic in ch. 2 and the man with the withered arm in ch. 3). The people of Nazareth saw only the carpenter (Mk. 6:1–6). Herod thought that Jesus was John the Baptist, Elijah or a prophet (Mk. 6:14 f.; cf. 8:28). The Pharisees attributed his works not to the → Spirit but to Beelzebul (Mk. 3:22; → Satan). Moreover, the only person healed by Jesus who hailed him in messianic terms was not silenced by Jesus (Mk. 10:46 ff.). Dunn suggests that Jesus' injunctions to silence were motivated by a variety of reasons, including concern for the individual being healed (Mk. 1:44; 5:40; 7:33; 8:22, 26; 9:25), a desire to discourage misleading ideas, and perhaps a strong sense that his destiny was completely in the hands of God.

Whilst the → kingdom is bound up with the status and ministry of Jesus, the purpose of the parables is wider than the messianic secret (cf. Mk. 4:11, 34). To those outside everything is taught in parables. The parable in Mk. 7:17 concerns not messiahship but inward cleanliness. Moreover, if Mk. 4:11 (which implies the illumination of the disciples) is interpreted in the light of the messianic secret, it stands in conflict with the incomprehension of the disciples of the messianic secret in Mk. 9:32. The disciples show their incomprehension about other matters, such as Jesus' teaching on marriage and divorce (Mk. 10:10). Dunn comments: "Bearing in mind this diversity in the situations which demonstrate the disciples' obtuseness, it is more plausible to recognize in the motif a historical reminiscence of the very natural and unexceptional slowness of unlettered men whose rigid and closed system of thought made it difficult for them to adjust to new teaching. It was not simply the difficulty of coping with new information, but the impossibility of trying to assimilate that new information into a system of thought and reference which had no place for such information. . . . This then is my first criticism of Wrede's thesis: that it fails to do justice to the full scope of the secrecy motif in Mark. The secrecy motif is more complicated than Wrede allowed. And since those passages which give his thesis credibility are only part of a larger whole, it suggests that there is more to Mark's picture of Jesus at this point than the hypothesis of the *Messianic* secret allows – a 'more' which puts a question mark against that hypothesis" (*TB* 21, 96, 98).

(b) Counterbalancing the *secret* motif in Mk., there is what might be called the

publicity motif. After the first exorcism "his reputation spread everywhere through all the surrounding Galilean countryside" (Mk. 1:28). Following the healing of the leper people came from all around (Mk. 1:45). Other instances may be found in Mk. 3:20; 5:19 f.; 6:2 f., 14 ff., 31; 7:24; 8:28. Although the crowd rebuked Bartimaeus, Jesus did not do so when he called him the son of David (Mk. 10:46 ff.; cf. 12:35 ff.). Although secrecy and privacy are attached to some healings (Mk. 5:37 ff.; 7:31–37; 8:22–26), Jesus healed in full view the paralytic, the man with the withered arm and Bartimaeus (Mk. 2:12; 3:3 ff.; 10:52). Despite the injunction to silence, Mk. records how the news of Jesus' actions was broadcast far and wide (Mk. 1:25–28, 43 ff.; 7:36 f.). Summing up this aspect of Mk., Dunn comments: "If the Messianic secret motif was added to explain why Jesus was not recognized as Messiah, and part of that motif is the command to demons and men not to tell of their cures, I am at a loss to understand what Mark was trying to achieve by adding or at least retaining the publicity sequel. For the whole point of these passages is that the secret commanded was *not* kept. The commands to silence failed, and the so-called attempt to keep His Messiahship secret also failed. If the Messianic secret was a Markan theory, then these publicity passages are the *reductio ad absurdum* of that theory. This publicity motif may not simply be dismissed as though it left the theory of the Messianic secret unaffected. On the contrary, it shows that at most we can speak of a Messianic *misunderstanding*, but hardly of a Messianic *secret*" (*TB* 21, 1970, 100).

In addition to the publicity which surrounded Jesus' exorcisms and healings, Mk. draws attention to the dimensions of revelation which are intrinsic to Jesus' ministry: his claim to be able to forgive sins (Mk. 2:10), to have a mission to call sinners (Mk. 2:17), to be Lord of the → sabbath (Mk. 2:28), to be the one who binds the strong man (Mk. 3:27); that loyalty to him will be the criterion in the judgment (Mk. 8:38); his teaching about the true nature of messiahship (Mk. 8:31 ff.; 9:31 f.; 10:32 ff., 45; 14:22–25); the way in which Jesus brings God's mystery to men (Mk. 4:34; 7:17–23; 8:15–21, 27–33; 9:30 ff.; 10:32 ff.; cf. 5:37; 9:2; 13:3 f.). In Mk. 12:12 the priests and lawyers recognize that Jesus' teaching about the stone which the builders rejected was directed against them (→ Rock). The centurion confesses that Jesus was a (or even the) Son of God (Mk. 15:39).

(c) Wrede maintained that Jesus did not think of himself as the messiah, and that the idea was the product of the theological reflection of the early church. But there are incidents in Mk. which cannot be explained away and which show not only that Jesus thought of himself in these terms but that others also thought of him in this way.

Commenting on the feeding of the five thousand (Mk. 6:30–44; cf. 8:1–21), J. C. O'Neill draws attention to its possible significance to contemporaries: "We may suppose that some extraordinary event will lie behind such a miraculous narrative . . . it remains true that if Jesus did preside at a communal meal in the desert places of Galilee and Judaea, this would have a peculiar significance to his contemporaries. They would perhaps remember that Moses by praying to God was able to feed the people with manna and quail in the desert; they would perhaps be reminded of the promise that the desert would again be fruitful; and they would think of the shepherd King as they were given food in the barren places (cf. Pss. of Sol. xvii. 45). The Qumran desert community placed great emphasis on communal meals, and looked forward to the time when the Messiah of Aaron would preside and the Messiah of

Israel, whom God had begotten among them, would come (IQSa ii. 11–22)" ("The Silence of Jesus", *NTS* 15, 1968–69, 163 f.). Dunn relates the hurried departure of Jesus following the feeding to Jn. 6:14 f., and interprets it as an attempt by Jesus to forestall the messianic enthusiasm of the crowd who want to make Jesus king by acclamation (op. cit., 102). He also sees Jesus' resorting to prayer (Mk. 6:46; cf. 1:35, 38; 14:35 f.) as an expression of Jesus' awareness of his messiahship and the need to fulfil it in accordance with the Father's will and not that of the people.

Peter's confession of Christ (Mk. 8:27–30) has obvious messianic implications. Clearly, advocates of Wrede's thesis need to explain it away as unhistorical, for the event implies conscious acceptance of messiahship both by Jesus himself and by Peter as the spokesman for the disciples. But there are strong indications within the account which favour its historicity (cf. Dunn, op. cit., 103–6). It is located in the region of Caesarea Philippi. None of the traditional resurrection appearances took place so far north, which suggests that it is unlikely to be a post-resurrection story which somehow got transferred to the earthly ministry of Jesus. The use of the title Christ is messianic (→ Jesus Christ, art. *Christos*). Its use by a disciple is unique. At the same time the disciple is addressed as → Satan, an event which would be highly improbable, if it had not actually happened. The insertion of the words *kai idōn tous mathētas autou* ("and seeing his disciples", v. 33) may well suggest an authentic reminiscence. In v. 31 Mk. records how Jesus "began to teach [*ērxato didaskein*]", which is not a normal Marcan Semitism but an indication of the particular point in his ministry when, for the first time, a repeated teaching is given (cf. W. Grundmann, *Das Evangelium nach Markus, Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament* 3, 1959 [2], 167).

A third incident which has the stamp of authenticity and which has clear messianic implication is Jesus' triumphal entry into Jerusalem on the first Palm Sunday (Mk. 11:1–11; cf. Zech. 9:9). This was clearly pre-Easter, and the cries of Hosanna reinforce the messianic connotation (→ Amen, art. *hōsanna*).

All four Gospels record how Jesus at his trial was found guilty of claiming to be King of the Jews (Matt. 27:37; Mk. 15:26; Lk. 23:38; Jn. 19:19). The title is repeated in Mk. 15:2, 9, 12, 26, 32. Alongside of this are Jesus' sayings about the → temple (Mk. 14:58; 15:29; Matt. 26:61; 27:40; Jn. 2:19; Acts 6:14). The building of the temple belonged to the messianic age (Eth. Enoch 90:29; 2 Esd. 9:38–10:27; cf. Ezek. 40–48; Jub. 1:17, 27 f.; 2 Sam. 7:12 ff.). The messianic implication of Jesus' sayings about the temple was seized upon by the high priest at Jesus' trial, when he asked; "Are you the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?" (Mk. 15:61). Mk. records the reply: "And Jesus said, 'I am; and you will see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of Power, and coming with the clouds of heaven' " (v. 62).

If these events are historical, and there are good grounds for thinking that they are, their messianic associations are not the product of post-resurrection theology but are intrinsic to the events themselves. The account of the feeding of the five thousand shows that in Galilee at least there was a popular, political, messianic conception. Jesus did not respond to it – not because he was not conscious of his messiahship – but because he wished to avoid the wrong kind of messiahship. Similarly, he reacted to Peter's advice at Caesarea Philippi, not because he was not the messiah but because Peter had false notions of messiahship. The entry into Jerusalem was an enacted parable concerning the nature of Jesus' messiahship. This

explains why the political overtones are absent. The prophecy of Zech. 9:9 is not directly referred to. The king comes to his capital, not as the leader of an uprising but as one who seeks peace. Similarly, there are messianic overtones at the trial of Jesus, but at the same time Jesus avoids political connotations. He replied to the question of the high priest: *sy eipas hoti egō eimi* (lit. "You say that I am"). Dunn is inclined to favour this longer version, and paraphrases it: "You could put it that way" (op. cit., 111).

Jesus firmly believed himself to be the messiah, but sought to avoid misconceptions, and this is the reason why so often he enjoined silence. "The claims He made to Messiahship and Messianic authority were of a parabolic sort whose significance was there, plain for all to see whose eyes were not blinded and whose ears were not clogged by misconceptions (8:17–21)" (J. D. G. Dunn, op. cit., 112). Dunn sees this reinforced by three further aspects of Mk. (i) The teaching on authority in Mk. (especially Mk. 2:1–3:6) is not explicitly messianic, but has messianic overtones. (ii) All Jesus' teaching had a parabolic quality, so that all who had ears to hear could hear (cf. Mk. 4:9). (iii) Jesus' choice of the term → Son of man was capable of concealing as well as revealing. On the one hand, it could be simply a circumlocution for "I". But on the other hand, it had also strong links with the Danielic Son of man (Dn. 7). "No term was more fitted both to conceal, yet at the same time to reveal to those who had ears to hear, the Son of Man's real identity" (M. Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*, 1967 ³, 329).

R. N. Longenecker has noted parallels between the Jesus of the Synoptic Gospels, the Qumran Teacher of Righteousness and Simeon ben Kosebah (Bar Kokhba). In each case there was an external exclamation, a reticence on the part of the individual concerned to speak of himself in terms used by others, and at the same time a consciousness of the ultimate validity of the titles employed (*EQ* 41, 1969, 207–15). In none of these cases is there a "messianic secret" theology. Rather, the reticence is to be attributed to the Jewish view that no man can be defined as a messiah before he has accomplished the task of the anointed. If this is so, then Jesus was indeed the messiah during his earthly life. But only with the cross, resurrection and exaltation could he enter into the fullness of his messianic office and be properly understood as messiah by men. And it is for this reason that the messianic titles and messianic claims became widespread and explicit in the post-Easter period. *C. Brown*

→ Baptism, → Gospel, → Jesus Christ, → Lord's Supper, → Parable, → Son

(a). D. Aune, "The Problem of the Messianic Secret", *NovT* 11, 1969, 1–31; G. H. Boobyer, "The Secrecy Motif in St Mark's Gospel", *NTS* 6, 1959–60, 225–35; G. Bornkamm, *mystērion, myeō*, *TDNT* IV 802–28; J. W. Bowker, "Mystery and Parables in Mark: Mark iv. 1–20", *JTS* New Series 25, 1974, 300–17; W. J. P. Boyd, "The Mystery of God and Revelation", *SJT* 13, 1960, 178–82; R. E. Brown, "The Semitic Background of the New Testament Mysterion", *Biblica* 39, 1958, 426–58; and ibid. 40, 70–87; T. A. Burkill, "The Injunctions to Silence in St. Mark's Gospel", *ThZ* 12, 1956, 585–604; and "Concerning St. Mark's Conception of Secrecy", *Hibbert Journal* 55, 1956–57, 150–58; A. W. Carr, "The Rulers of this Age – I Corinthians ii 6–8", *NTS* 23, 1976, 20–35; J. D. G. Dunn, "The Messianic Secret in Mark", TB 21, 92–117 (summarized in "The Messianic Secret in Mark", *TSF Bulletin* 69, 1974, 7–14); J. Coppens, " 'Mystery' in the Theology of Saint Paul and its Parallels at Qumran", in J. Murphy-O'Connor, ed., *Paul and Qumran: Studies in New Testament Exegesis*, 1968, 132–58; F. Gavin, *The Jewish Antecedents of the Christian Sacraments*, 1969; R. M. Grant, *Hellenistic Religions: The Age of Syncretism*, 1953; L. E. Keck, "Mark 3 7–12 and Mark's Christology", *JBL* 84, 1965, 341 ff.; J. W. Leitch, "The Injunctions to Silence in Mark's Gospel", *ExpT* 66, 1954–55, 178–82;

describes an apocalyptic exaltation of the teacher and preacher of repentance. T has many points of contact with NT motifs.

(iv) Two things must be said in conclusion. In the Similitudes the vision of the S of man of Dan. 7 is interpreted of a *messianic figure* without the phrase "Son man" becoming a messianic title. In Eth. Enoch 70 f. the Enoch tradition is uni with Dan. 7 to describe a representative of righteousness who bestows peace a salvation upon his community.

(c) The Apc. of Ezra's connexion with the vision to Daniel is fundamentally (ferent from that of the Enoch tradition: the destiny of the nation as a whole is m emphasized both in the tradition used and in the author's reflection upon it. Agai upholds a form of religion that is based more on the Torah (13:54). The real probl is posed by the discrepancy between the tradition and the motifs used: Son of m and messiah, apocalyptic vision and messianic expectation are joined in an uneq union, to the detriment of both elements. 2 Esd. 13:26 describes (in apocalyp terms) the "man from the depths of the sea" as "he whom the Most High has helc readiness for a long time and through whom he intends to redeem creation; he hi self gives a new order for those that remain" (→ Remnant). Messianic mot however, are added: mankind gathers to fight against the man who has risen from sea, but unarmed he wages war with the stream of fire that issues from his lips. descends from the mountain to gather a peaceable host out of the midst of the sc tering or the great affliction (13:1–13). It is important to note too that this "man' at the same time the "son" or the "servant" through whom the Most High reve himself (13:32, 37, 52). Till now he has been hidden but when his day comes h made manifest (13:52). This passage differs from Dan. 7 in its more fantastic i agery and the more active rôle given to the messianic man; haggadic ornamentat is on the increase.

(d) (i) It is also important to note how the "one like a son of man" and "heavenly one" assume concrete historical features: Abel, Enoch and → Melchize appear in apocalyptic as God's elect who represent his righteousness and wield authority to judge in the eschatological assize. OT exegesis reveals their particu qualifications for this, but only Melchizedek is endowed with messianic traits.

(ii) It is said of Melchizedek in 11QMelchizedek 10 ff. that "[as it written] conc ning him in the psalms of David, who says, 'The heavenly one stands in God's c gregation; in the midst of the heavenly ones he holds court'; and concerning him says, 'Return over them to the heavenly heights; God will judge the nations'. A what he says is 'How long will you judge unjustly and take side w transgressors?' " Cf. ibid. 16: "[through Isaiah the prophet who says, 'How] lov are the feet of the messenger of joy upon the mountains, who proclaims peace, a who brings the message of good, who proclaims salvation and says to Zion, Y heavenly one is king!' " Melchizedek is here thought of as a heavenly being; he m execute judgment on the godless. The inauguration of the time of salvation is conn ted with this judgment and this is portrayed in the language of Isa. This comes cl to identifying Melchizedek with the archangel Michael. The motif of the Son of m does not explicitly appear in this text, but we can see how certain decisive functi which are ascribed to the Son of man can similarly be applied to angels or heave beings.

(e) Test. Abr. 11 contains an unusual Son of man tradition of Jewish origins. A

gain as an eschatological figure, the object of the expectation of a corresponding ommunity. We must take as our starting point this eschatological community's self-nderstanding, if we are to evaluate this relatively late stratum in the Enoch iterature. The concepts expressed in Eth. Enoch 46:8; 53:6; 62:8 ("houses of his ongregation", "the house of his congregation", "the community of the elect and oly") show that we are dealing here with an independent hasidic group, comparable o that of Qumran in its apocalyptic expectation. But its messianic expectation, in articular the position of the Son of man in the Similitudes, is completely different rom that of Qumran. The Elect One, the Righteous One, is in Eth. Enoch the epresentative of God's righteousness and wisdom; he mediates this blessing to his ommunity. He is "hidden before him" and exists before the creation of the world. owever, he also takes on the messianic struggle with kings and powers and emerges ictorious. The features of this delineation (46:3 ff.; 48:2 ff.; 62:7 ff.) are gleaned rom an exegesis of the Pss. and the prophets (above all Isa. and the vision of Dan. :9 f. which is paralleled by Eth. Enoch 46).

"Man" in Eth. Enoch is not really a messianic title, but describes the appearance f this heavenly being (cf. the use of demonstrative pronouns with the expressions for Son of man"). The appearances of different phrases in the Ethiopic (e.g. 46:3 *walda ab'e*; Aram. *bar nāšā'*) suggests that particular Gk. and Aram. expressions lie ehind them and that these were not titular either. There is no end to the discussion f the question whether Christian influence has produced this distinctive Son of man adition. But caution is necessary. It can be dated somewhere between the Parthian ivasion mentioned in 56:5 (40–38 B.C.) and the destruction of Jerusalem (A.D. 70). n all this cf. Colpe, *TDNT* VIII 423–427.)

[I.H.M.] It may be necessary to date the Similitudes even later. Although frag-ents of Eth. Enoch have been discovered at Qumran, it is remarkable that none ave been found of the Similitudes. On this and other grounds J. T. Milik (*HTR* 64, 971, 333–378) has argued that the Similitudes were not part of the original book ut are a post-Christian insertion. If this argument is valid, it need not necessarily ex-lude use of the Similitudes in establishing the background of thought to the NT sage of "Son of man", since the traditions used may well be earlier than the date of riting. Nevertheless, caution in the use of Eth. Enoch is clearly called for.

(ii) The exaltation of Enoch to be Son of man and his translation to be with the ord of Spirits (70 f.) is especially important. These last two chs. of the Similitudes re remarkable for the problems that they present as to their relation both to one nother and to the book as a whole. Ch. 71 explicitly refers to the manifestation of e Ancient of Days in Dan. 7:13. Enoch is greeted as the "Son of man", who is born righteousness: righteousness abides over him (v. 14). We should not see here an in-arnation of the Son of man or a descent to earth, but rather Enoch's investiture with e eschatological function of the Son of man. This still leaves a whole mass of con-oversial questions unanswered (e.g. whether originally only a translation of Enoch as intended and not his installation as "Son of man"). But at any rate we may see ere an exegetical development of the Enoch tradition of Gen. 5:22–24 and the "Son f man" references in Dan. 7:13.

(iii) Perhaps we can assume that one particular Jewish sect joined the "Son of an" tradition with some quite definite messianic ideas, but that Eth. Enoch 70 f.

came one like a son of man [*kᵉḇar ʾᵉnāš*]." Note the allusive way in which apocalyp makes its comparisons (Heb. *kᵉ*, as). In contrast to the beasts which have be described previously there comes on to the stage one who is like a son of man (i.e member of the genus man). The wisdom tradition too loves to speak of the gen man.

(c) In Mishnaic Hebrew *ben ʾāḏām* does not occur. Here too it is possible to spe generically of men or mankind (*bᵉnê ʾāḏām*) or of creatures (*bᵉʿrî'ôṯ*), thus expressi the idea of man's common experience in life (cf. Aboth 2: 1, 3).

(d) Ps. 80: 8–15(9–16), with its picture of the vine and the vineyard, which ref to God's dealings with → Israel, is particularly important. It leads on to a prayer f the king, the "man at your right hand" (cf. Ps. 110:1) and the "son of man, whc you have reared" (vv. 17 f.). Here the son of man (*ben ʾāḏām*) is used of that speci elect man, the king.

In addition a periphrastic description of the person who is speaking often occurs Judaism. This idiom makes use of the demonstrative: this man (*hahû' gaḇrā'*) or tl woman (*hahî' gaḇrā'*). Cf. Gen. R. 68:12: "A certain man came to R. Jose b. Hala and said to him: 'It was revealed to this man [*hahû' gaḇrā'*] in a dream' " (furth material in Gen. R. 7:2; cf. Num. R. 19:3; Geniza fragments of the Pal. Tg. of Gc 4:14; cf. G. Vermes, Appendix in M. Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gosp and Acts*, 1967 [3], 320–328; C. Colpe, *TDNT* VIII 406 ff.). It may be granted that certain circumstances not only *hahû' gaḇrā'*, but also *bar nāšā'*, son of man, cou be thus used in Palestinian Galilean (Vermes, loc. cit. 327; Colpe, loc. cit. 406). Tl periphrasis had no messianic sense (→ Jesus Christ, art. *Christos* OT).

[I.H.M.] According to J. A. Fitzmyer (*NTS* 20, 1973–74, 396 f.) the form attest by Qumran evidence always has initial *Aleph*, so that the possible phrases are *b ʾᵉnāš* and *bar ʾᵉnāšā'*. The view of G. Vermes (repeated in *Jesus the Jew*, 19' 162–168) that the phrase could be used as a substitute for "I" in contexts whe humiliation or death are mentioned, or out of reserve and modesty, has be challenged by Fitzmyer and by J. Jeremias, *New Testament Theology*, I, 1971, 261 1, who hold that it means "the (or a) man, and therefore also I".

2. *The Development of the Tradition within Apocalyptic.* (a) The starting po for the apocalyptic tradition is the vision of Dan. 7:13 f.; 18:26 f. This is couched rhythmic language. While the beasts are being rendered powerless or destroyed, t one like a son of man ascends with the clouds of heaven to the Ancient of Days. A parently this vision of the one like a son of man refers to the theocracy of Isra which is conscious of being fundamentally different from other kingdoms and r tions. Dan. 7:18 mentions the "saints of the Most High" who will reign for ever (vv. 22a, 25, 27); the expression is a striking one and has been variously interpret But in its present context it refers to the imminent crisis of history and t transference of power to the hitherto humbled people of Israel; hence the traits of t one like a son of man are transferred to Israel itself. It is tempting to link this up w the convictions of the later Qumran community in 1QS 11:7 f.: "He has given them share in the inheritance of the saints and he has united their fellowship with the so of heaven". The Qumran community did not merely regard itself as the e chatological Israel, but also as a fellowship between saints on earth and powers heaven.

(b) (i) In the Similitudes of Eth. Enoch (chs. 37–71) the Son of man appe

ıriety of ways in which the NT uses this concept. Paul also uses it with a wider nse when he calls himself (Rom. 1:1), his fellow-workers (Phil. 1:1; Col. 4:12) and l Christians (1 Cor. 7:22) *douloi* of Christ.

Here too then the effects of the older biblical concept of faith as service are to be en, but now this service is concentrated especially in the relation of Christians to hrist. A fundamental distinction can be drawn between the new filial relationship ıd the old servile one (Gal. 4:1–7; Rom. 8:14 ff.). This attachment to Christ does ɔt alter this biblical perspective of faith as service, but it does lift it clear of the ser-le nature of the pre-Christian existence. ([Tr.] The Servant's task is seen to be flected in the mission of the church in Acts 15:47 [Isa. 49:6]; Rom. 10:6 [Isa. 53:1] ıd 15:21 [Isa. 52:15].)

The motif of the "servant of God" is used explicitly in the prefaces of Jas. 1:1; Tit. 1; Rev. 1:1. It is particularly prominent in Rev. and is used repeatedly (e.g. Rev. 3; 10:7; 11:18; 19:2; 22:3). The Gospel of Jn. follows the Hellenistic pattern and ʻoids applying the *doulos*-concept to Christians (cf. Jn. 15:15) and seeks other ways ' preserving the character of faith as obedience and service. *O. Michel*

ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου

ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (*ho hyios tou anthrōpou*), the Son of man.

& OT 1. *The Philological Problem in the OT and Judaism.* The antecedents of the idea *ho hyios tou anthrōpou* are found exclusively in the OT and Judaism ıd especially in apocalyptic; in the LXX the words go back to the Heb. and Aram. ɔrds for → child (art. *hyios*) and → man (art. *anthrōpos*).

(a) In biblical Hebrew *'āḏām* or *'ᵉnôš* is a collective term for man(kind); hence the dividual man is called *ben 'āḏām*, son of a man, and a number of men are called *nê 'āḏām*, sons of men, or, with the art., *bᵉnê hā'āḏām* (Koehler-Baumgartner, f.; → Adam). The use of "son of man" as an address in Ezek. is striking (*c.* 90 nes). The prophet is not addressed by his own name, but as an individual creature awn from the genus man and contrasted with God. God himself condescends to nsort with his servant (cf. also Dan. 8:17). We are dealing here with a "thoroughly ɛbraic idiom" (W. Zimmerli, *Ezechiel*, *BKAT* XIII/I, 1959, 70). There is no real ed to posit Babylonian influence (Gilgamesh 9, 2, 16; *ANET* 88). The way in ıich "son of man" (i.e. a member of the genus man) appears in elevated speech is erefore important, particularly in *parallelismus membrorum*: "God is not [like] an, that he should lie, nor a son of man [*ben 'āḏām*], that he should repent of ything" (Num. 23:19); "What is man [*'ᵉnôš*], that you are mindful of him, and the n of man [*ben 'āḏām*], that you consider him?" (Ps. 8:4[5]). The contrast between e God who offers reassurance and the people whom he addresses, who fear mortal ɛn and the sons of men, who perish like grass, is plain in Isa. 51:12 (here too is the ɛrchange of *'ᵉnôš* and *ben 'āḏām*). Jud. 8:16 seems to go back to Num. 23:19: an has not control over God's decisions, for God cannot be threatened like a man d does not vacillate like a son of man. The contrast between God and man (or in ʻrallelismus membrorum* "son of man") is a definite Heb. idiom.

(b) In biblical Aramaic we must note Dan. 7:13, which has become the fun-ımental problem in apocalyptic: "And behold, with the clouds of heaven there

even if it is not found very often in Paul when he is writing freely and not basing h self on traditional formulations. As the most obvious statement of the death and v dication of God's Servant in the OT, it is highly probable that the vague reference: Christ's death "according to the Scriptures" (1 Cor. 15:3–5) conceal allusions to 53. It is possible that the Servant figure in the old hymn, Phil. 2:6–11, has been fluenced to some extent by the same concept, although a direct influence of Isa. the hymn is difficult to prove (cf. R. P. Martin, *Carmen Christi: Philippians ii 5- in Recent Interpretation and in the Setting of Early Christian Worship, Society New Testament Studies Monograph Series* 4, 1967, 182–196). Further allusi may be present in Rom. 8:34; Heb. 7:25 and 9:28 (Isa. 53:12).

The pervasiveness of these allusions to the Servant-figure prompts the ques whether Jesus himself gave the impulse to the church to interpret his person work in this way. Whether or not *hyios* has replaced an original *pais* in Mk. 1:11, baptismal narrative certainly contains an allusion to Isa. 42:1–4 ("with thee I well pleased"; reception of the → Spirit). In Lk. 22:37 Jesus himself quotes 53:12, and there is good reason to accept the authenticity of the saying. Jesus quotes Isa. 61:1–3 with reference to himself in Lk. 4:18 f., and there is some rea to believe that the quotation was regarded as referring to the Servant (cf. the asso tion of Isa. 52:7 and 61:1 f. in 11QMelchizedek). There are two fairly clear allus to Isa. 53 in Mk. 10:45 and 14:24. These references strongly suggest that Jesus his vocation as the Son of man in terms of the suffering and humiliation of the vant of Yahweh.

The case that Jesus did not make use of the Servant concept has been impressi presented by M. D. Hooker who claims that the allusions do not refer unequivoc to Isa. 53 and that the note of vicarious suffering is absent. An alternative sourc the thought of the "ransom for many" has been sought by C. K. Barrett in I ("The Background of Mark 10:45", in A. J. B. Higgins ed., *New Testament Ess Studies in Memory of T. W. Manson*, 1959, 1–18; cf. C. K. Barrett, *New Testar Essays*, 1972, 20–26). The view that Jesus did use the concept is developed b Jeremias, *TDNT* V 712–717, and R. T. France, "The Servant of the Lord in Teaching of Jesus", *TB* 19, 1968, 26–52; for a more cautious defence of Mk. 1 and 14:24 as allusions to Isa. 53 see F. Hahn, *The Titles of Jesus in Christo* 1969, 54–63. There can be little doubt that the case against Jesus' use of the con has been overstated; while M. D. Hooker has demonstrated that a number of all allusions to the Servant concept should be dropped from consideration, t remains sufficient cogent evidence to support the view that the concept was or the means used by Jesus to express the necessity for his suffering and death follc by divine vindication.

2. (a) However the NT does not restrict the title *pais theou* to Jesus. It is us Israel in the Magnificat (Lk. 1:54), an old hymn built up of quotations, and of D in the equally old Benedictus (Lk. 1:69) and in Acts 4:25. The use of the title fo people and for David is in line with the usage that had been current since the tim the Deuteronomist and Isa. Here we are dealing with a stratum of old Palest tradition.

(b) *pais theou* is not used of Christians in the NT, but such a differentiati only significant in Gk.-speaking areas. Paul is conscious of being God's servan particularly notable way in accordance with Isa. 49:1 (Gal. 1:15); this show

5; 4:27, 30). It is noteworthy how it is used in a quotation and in the old tradi-
ons of Acts (chs. 3 f.; cf. 3:13 with Exod. 3:16; Isa. 52:13; and 4:27 with Ps. 2:2 f.).
Acts 4:27, 30 the meaning "Servant" is confirmed by 4:25, where, as in late
daism, David is called God's "servant" and not his "child". (For the interchange of
ulos and *pais* cf. Lk. 7:2 f., 7 f.) A similar sense is to be given to it in Acts 3:13, 26.
But the influence of the title *pais theou* in its application to Jesus is not to be
nited to the occurrences of this phrase. The *doulos*-concept in the logion of Mk.
):44 has certainly been moulded by Isa. 53:10; i.e. behind it stands the *'ebed* of the
rvant Songs, who was interpreted as a servant by ancient tradition and thus related
Jesus (→ Redemption, art. *lytron* NT 1). On the other hand, we must also ask
hether the *'ebed* of Isa. 42:1 does not lie behind the *hyios*, son, of Matt. 3:17 par.
k. 1:11, Lk. 3:22 (Jesus' → baptism) and Matt. 17:5 par. Mk. 9:7; Lk. 9:35 (the →
ansfiguration). Originally it would have been translated by *pais*, but then because of
e ambivalence of *pais* it could have been glossed by *hyios* in a later Hellenistic
adition and so understood as meaning "God's child". ([Tr.] But this hypothesis
ces several objections, cf. I. H. Marshall, " 'Son of God' or 'Servant of Yahweh' –
Reconsideration of Mark 1:11", *NTS* 15, 1968–69, 326–336.)
The idea of the *pais theou*, the Servant of God, as a title of Jesus is found oc-
sionally in the liturgical formulae of prayers and confessions (Did. 9 f.; 1 Clem.
:2–4; Mart. Poly. 14:1 ff.). The meaning of *pais* here is uncertain, but may be in
nsition from "servant" to "child". In Jn. the title of *pais* or *doulos* for Jesus is
olly lacking, apparently through assimilation to Hellenistic ideas, or because John
eferred other titles. *hyios tou theou* replaces it (cf. Jn. 1:34; 10:36), but in fact the
otif of the Servant is still there (cf. Jn. 13:4 ff.: the washing of feet was one of the
ost menial jobs of a slave). Finally in the Johannine literature (Jn. 1:29, 36) the Ser-
nt of Isa. 53 lies behind the form of the *amnos tou theou*, the → Lamb of God; this
nsition to *amnos* was made possible by the ambiguity of the Aram. *talyā'* (servant,
y, or lamb, but this remains uncertain; cf. I. H. Marshall, *op. cit.*, 323 n. 3).
(b) We must also consider whether the figure of the *'ebed* of Isa. 53 has influenced
y of the christological formulae. This is true of the *hyper*-formula, especially the
rase *hyper pollōn*, "for many" (Mk. 14:24; Jn. 6:51). But this would scarcely apply
Jn. 11:50 f.; 18:14 which limit the *hyper* to the people of Israel; these texts are
her to be explained in terms of the late Jewish ideas connected with the atoning
ath of the righteous (4 Macc. 1:11; 6:28 f.; 17:20 f. and rabbinic references in SB
273 ff.; → Reconciliation, art. *hilaskomai* OT 3 (c), NT 4 (b)). Here too we must con-
er the formulae *anti pollōn*, "for many" (Mk. 10:45; Matt. 20:28) and *peri pollōn*
r many" (Matt. 26:28). The title *pais* perhaps lies behind the formula *dia tou*
ou, "through Jesus" (Rom. 1:8; 2:16), if it is to be seen as a shortened form of the
ler *dia tou paidos sou Iēsou*, "through your Servant Jesus" (Acts 4:30), which was
gest preserved in the language of prayer (Mart. Poly. 14:1, 3; 1 Clem. 59:2 ff.).
e may also add the formulaic use of *paradidonai* in the pass. as a substitute for the
of the divine name (Rom. 4:25; 1 Cor. 11:23) and the formula *didonai heauton*,
give oneself (Gal. 1:4; 1 Tim. 2:6), and *tithenai tēn psychēn*, to lay down one's life
. 10:11, 15, 17 f.); all these may be variant translations of the Heb. text of Isa.
:12.
(c) [I.H.M.] It is clear from the references cited above that the Servant concept
rcised a considerable influence on the developing theology of the early church,

prominent, but in Job it can be replaced by *therapōn* and in Isa. by *pais*. Althou the "Servant" passages of Isaiah are mostly rendered with *pais* and may be colle tively interpreted, a messianic figure seems to have been discerned behind Is 52:13–53:12.

4. The phrase *pais theou* occurs only seldom in the literature of Gk.-speaking Ja Judaism since it was very much overshadowed by the concept of the *doulos* (t Israelites are *douloi* of God: 2 Macc. 7:33; Jub. 23:30; Josephus, *Ant.*, 11, 4, 4 anc (90, 101)). But where it was used it usually meant servant of God and referred Moses (Bar. 1:20; 2:28), the prophets (Bar. 2:20) or the righteous (Wis. 9:4 f.). Le often *pais* means child of God (Wis. 2:13; 12, 7; 20; 19:6). The prominence of t *doulos* motif in late Judaism reveals an increased awareness of the distance betwe God and man. Gk. thought was not very conscious of this distance before the adve of the oriental cults (K. H. Rengstorf, *TDNT* II 264 f.).

In 2 Esd. 7:28 f. (*v.l.*); 13:32, 37, 52; 14:9 and Syr. Bar. 70:9 we find an apocaly tic tradition which refers to the messiah as son, child, youth or servant. Behind the variant translations lies the older *'eḇeḏ* tradition which is transmitted through the C phrase *pais theou*. Older prophecies involving the destiny of Israel and the natio are used here, but the revelation of God's elect is the central idea. Apocalyptic acce tuates the element of transcendence in the *'eḇeḏ* tradition.

Hellenistic Judaism always took the *'eḇeḏ* passages in Isa. collectively of the pe ple of Israel (LXX Isa. 42:1) or of the righteous (Wis. 2:13 in its context). No agre ment has been reached as to whether the "Servant" passages in Isa. we messianically interpreted in Palestinian Judaism in pre-Christian times. J. Jeremi (*TDNT* V 684–700) thought that they were ([I.H.M.] on the basis of his interpre tion of the Similitudes of Eth. Enoch (37–71), the Peshitta; Aquila; Theodotion; t Targum; rabbinic material; and Justin. Cf. W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbi Judaism*, 1955², 274–284. Some of the evidence is slender, and its weaknesses ha been pointed out by M. Rese, *ZTK* 60, 1963, 21–41, but there is perhaps sufficie evidence to show that Judaism applied some of the traits of the Servant to an exp ted future figure, whether the messiah or the Son of man). The references to Isa. are not always obvious. The passages could also be derived from the concept of t atoning death of the righteous which was widespread in late Judaism (cf. SB 274–299; E. Lohse, *Märtyrer und Gottesknecht*, 1955).

Qumran continued the OT tradition in referring to the prophets as "God's s vants" (1QS 1:3; 1QpHab 2:9). It is striking how the Teacher of Righteousn adopts the title of "God's servant" in the hymns (1QH 13:18 f.; 14:25; 16:10, 18), and one can in some passages detect the influence of Isa. (cf. 1QH 7:10; 8:3 18:14 f.; cf. A. Dupont-Sommer, *The Essene Writings from Qumran*, 19 360–367). The "servant's" anonymity is here preserved intact (M. Buber).

At all events up to A.D. 200 official Judaism, as represented by the Targumi had not interpreted Isa. 53 of the suffering messiah, but, perhaps influenced by ar Christian polemic, had eradicated or drastically reinterpreted any statements th about his suffering. The idea of a suffering messiah only appears late in offic Judaism and then in connexion with Isa. and particularly ch. 52 (so San. 98ab, Joshua b. Levi [A.D. 250], the school of "Rabbi" [A.D. 200]; cf. SB II 286).

NT 1. (a) The NT uses the title *pais theou* 5 times of Jesus (Matt. 12:18; Acts 3:

ḇāḏîm, servants, is used of the whole body of Israelites (Isa. 54:17). In Isa. 56:6 roselytes too are called "servants of God".

At a very early date the "servant of God" sayings in the OT can be divided into vo traditions: on the one hand, in 2 Sam. 3:18 the especial function of the king)avid) is seen to lie in the saving of the people from all its enemies. This tradition ontinued in Ezek. 34:23 f.; 37:24 f.; and beyond that to Hag. 2:23; Zech. 3:8. On ıe other hand, there is the prophetic tradition: the prophet is the authoritative ıessenger of the word of God (1 Ki. 18:36) who imposes God's will upon the people ıd by his word sets historical processes in motion.

(b) B. Duhm (*Das Buch Jesaja*, 1892, 1922[4]) was the first to recognize in Isa. four ngs which are known as the "Servant Songs" and must be interpreted on their wn: Isa. 42:1–4 (or 9); 49:1–6 (or 11); 50:4–9; 52:13–53:12. C. R. North's survey attempts at their interpretation (*The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah*, 1950[2]; –160) shows that the Ethiopian official's question to Philip about Isa. 53:7 f. has ceived various answers: "Of whom does the prophet speak? Of himself or of ıother?" (Acts 8:34). From the LXX to the present day there have been inter- eters who tried on the basis of Isa. 49:3 to identify the Servant with the whole peo- e of Israel collectively or with a part of it (so O. Kaiser, who takes the *ʿeḇeḏ* to refer the exiles as opposed to the whole people), ([I.H.M.] or who find some kind of ovement within the Songs from a collective to an individual identification of the ervant [so, with stress on the collective aspect, M. D. Hooker, *Jesus and the ervant*, 1959, 25–52; with stress on the individual aspect, H. H. Rowley, *The Ser- ınt of the Lord*, 1965[2], and C. R. North, *The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah*,)56[2]]). Yet it may be suspected that the "Israel" of Isa. 49:3 is a very early inter- etative gloss (cf. Isa. 42:1 LXX with the Heb.), ([Tr.] although it is dangerous to nend the text simply to support a theory). An individual interpretation of the Songs supported by Isa. 49:5 f. which sets the Servant over against the people. Some sup- ɔse him to be a prophet because of his peculiarly prophetic traits (ear, 50:4 f., and outh, 49:1 f.) and have identified him with Moses, Isaiah, Deutero-Isaiah, Jeremiah ıd Ezekiel. But on the other hand, because he establishes justice (42:1, 3 f.), releases isoners (42:7; 49:9) and wields a sword (49:2), others see him as a king and think Uzziah, Hezekiah, Jehoiachin or Zerubbabel. But G. von Rad's view is to be eferred to all these attempts to identify the Servant-figure with a historical person: Such extreme language can never have been applied to a living person – or even to ıe recently dead..... This transcendence of all familiar human categories is ıaracteristic of discourse which foretells the future" (or, in M. Buber's words, "of e secret") (*Old Testament Theology*, II, 1965, 258).

3. The LXX equivalents of the 870 occurrences of *ʿeḇeḏ* in the MT are: *pais*, ser- ınt, menial, 340 times; *doulos*, → slave, 327 times; *therapōn*, servant, attendant, 46 nes; *oiketēs*, household slave, 36 times; also once each *hyios*, son, and *hypēretēs*, rvant, helper. The other occurrences have no exact equivalent. The choice of Gk. quivalents varies from book to book. In the Hexateuch *therapōn* interchanges with *ais* and *doulos*; the last is reserved almost completely for the "house of bondage in gypt" and other harsh servitude. In Jdg. – 2 Ki. *pais* is used of the free servant of e king and *doulos* for enforced bondage. *doulos* is used throughout in religious con- xts to designate oneself or others, in order to express the great difference between an and God. In the other books of the OT too the religious idea of the *doulos* is

1. (a) From earliest times right up to the revolt of A.D. 70 Hebrews h possessed Hebrew → slaves (Gen. 24; 29:15, 18; Exod. 22:2; Jer. 34:8 ff.; Joseph *War* 4, 9, 3 [508]). A Hebrew was forcibly sold as a slave by a court if he could make good the value of stolen goods (Exod. 22:2), or he sold himself because of poverty (2 Ki. 4:1). In both cases the slavery was normally limited to 6 years (but Exod. 21:5 f.; Deut. 15:16 f.). Slaves played a full part in cultic life (→ circumcisi Gen. 17:12 f.; → sabbath, Exod. 20:10; → sacrifice, Deut. 12:18; Passover, Ex 12:44; → Feast). The mark of the *'ebed*, → slave (art. *doulos*), is that he belongs another; he is mentioned as a chattel along with gold and cattle (Gen. 24:35; Ex 21:21). The Essenes had no slaves (Euseb., *Praep. Ev.* 8, 11, 4).

(b) From as early as Saul's time – in common with the world of the Ancient E (cf. J. A. Knudtzon, *Die el-Amarna Tafeln*, 1915, 60:3; 61:2; etc.) – soldiers in king's service were referred to by themselves and others, but not by the king, as *'a hammelek*, servants of the King (LXX *paides tou basileōs*) (2 Sam. 11:24; 15: However, these *'abādîm*, servants, were not in an explicitly servile relationship to king, but were employed by him (1 Sam. 8:11 f.). This usage in court circles le the frequent everyday use of *'ebed*, servant, as a humble self-designation (Gen. 3 An especially strong version of such self-abasement is the phrase "Your servant, dog" (2 Ki. 8:13; 2 Sam. 9:8). But kings too could be called *'abādîm*, if they were vassals of another ruler (2 Sam. 10:19; Jos. 9:11; Knudtzon, op. cit., 158:1 f.). vassal king had then to pay tribute, as 2 Ki. 16:7 f. shows, and had to do military vice (→ Slave, art. *doulos* OT 1, 2).

2. (a) The religious use of this idea is probably also influenced by the court p tice. As in the rest of the world of the Ancient East, but in complete contrast to cient Gk. ideas, the worshipper of God in the OT styles himself as his *'ebed*, serv He thus gives expression to his awe and his duty to serve his God and even belonging to him, with a view to placing himself under his protection. In contra other Sem. cultures, however, only rarely is the bestowal of a name used to desig this belonging to God; cf. the case of Obadiah (1 Ki. 18:3 ff.). More often the who prays calls himself "your servant", or Yahweh speaks and ascribes to som the title "My servant" or another person refers to him as "His servant".

The designation *'ebed* occurs relatively seldom in the pre-exilic period in religious sense and is almost completely absent from the pre-exilic prophets; this be because the religious idea of the *'ebed* had spread from the language of the c into that of the cult and of prayer and was therefore regarded as alien. Thus the "servant" is used of Jacob (Gen. 32:10[11]), Isaac (Gen. 24:14), Moses (N 12:7 f.), David (2 Sam. 3:18), the prophets (2 Ki. 9:7) and the remnant faithf Yahweh (2 Ki. 9:7; 10:23).

But from the time of the Deuteronomist and Deutero-Isaiah onwards, the *'ebed* became far more frequent; it was particularly used of Moses, but als Joshua (Jos. 24:29), the patriarchs (Deut. 9:27, Exod. 32:13) and David (8:24 ff.; 14:8). Even Nebuchadnezzar is called a servant of Yahweh in the trac of the kingly *'abādîm* (Jer. 25:9). Job, too, who has even less connexion with the ple of Israel, receives the title of an *'ebed* in the prologue and epilogue of the Bo Job (Job 1:8; 2:3; 42:7 f.). From Ezekiel's time onwards the sing. *'ebed* is used people of Israel (Ezek. 28:25; 37:25), and from Deutero-Isaiah onwards the

ality in God's purposes. Solomon was great David's great son, but he was not the ɔmised king and messiah; he was but his progenitor (Matt. 1:6 f.). Solomon had in-ɔd built a majestic temple in God's honour; but the whole burden of Stephen's ɔech in Acts 7 is to depreciate any temple "made with hands": Solomon's temple ɔ the second temple after it were the very centres of apostasy and unbelief. Both ts 7:50 and Matt. 6:29 turn the listener's and reader's attention from human ıievement such as Solomon's to the glories of the Creator. Finally, Matt. 12:42 ex-ɔssly states that Solomon in all his wisdom was eclipsed by Christ. This passage, ich is primarily attacking Jewish unbelief, seems to imply that Solomon is depicted a → type of Christ. The common testimony of the NT references to Solomon ɡests that the early church not infrequently compared and contrasted the literal ı of David with his eschatological successor. *D. F. Payne*

David, → Son

J. Bright, *History of Israel*, 1972², 206–24; F. F. Bruce, "Son of David", in *This is That: The New ament Development of Some Old Testament Themes*, 1968, 68–82; R. T. France, *Jesus and the Old ament: His Application of Old Testament Passages to Himself and His Mission*, 1971, 78 f.; S. mann, *History of Israel in Old Testament Times*, 1975, 174–86; E. Lohse, *Solomōn*, *TDNT* VII -65; J. M. Myers, "Solomon", *IDB* IV 399–408; R. B. Y. Scott, "Solomon and the Beginnings of dom in Israel", H. H. Rowley Festschrift, *VT Supplements* 3, 1955, 262–79.
G. Gerleman, *šlm*, *THAT* II 932; G. Salzberger, *Die Salomo-Sage in der semitischen Literatur*, /; J. J. Stamm, "Der Name des Königs Salomo", *Festgabe W. Eichrodt*, *TZ* 16, 1960, 285–97.

, Son of God, Son of Man, Servant of God, Son of David

following article was originally written for the German edition of this work by fessor Otto Michel. It has been brought up to date for this English edition by Dr. vard Marshall. whose insertions are indicated by [I.H.M.]. Dr. Marshall also ıared the bibliography for general works, Servant, Son of Man, Son of God, Son)avid.

articles that are collected here deal with the concepts that are centred on the ds *pais* and *hyios* only in so far as they relate to the person of Jesus, i.e. only with · functions as christological titles. Because *pais* not only means child, but also e, Isa. 52:13 LXX uses it to translate the term "Servant of God" (Heb. *'ebed h*) and hence the NT uses *pais theou* to designate Jesus as God's Servant. For r uses → Child. Similarly *hyios* expresses not only a physical relationship, but a spiritual. Hence, Jesus' relation to men is expressed by *ho hyios tou anthrōpou*, ɔon of man, and his close relationship with God by *hyios tou theou*, Son of God; ncestry in the Davidic line is recalled in the title *hyios Dauid*, Son of David. The ropological import of the concept "son" is dealt with in the article on Child un-*ıēpios*, *pais*, *teknon* and *hyios*.

παῖς Θεοῦ | *παῖς Θεοῦ* (*pais Theou*), Servant of God.

OT The phrase *pais theou* as such has no antecedents in Gk. and first occurs in ıe LXX. On *pais* and its associations → Child; on *theos* → God.

couraged the development of commerce, both overland and maritime (cf. 1 10:22, 25). The trade was no doubt boosted by the exploitation of Israel's resourc notably the copper mines in the Negeb.

The fortress cities were only one element in a large-scale building programr which was in part essential, and partly due to a natural desire to beautify a enhance the kingdom. The building of the temple was an act of notable piety (1 6).

In all these respects Solomon displayed vision, statesmanship and skill; the div promise of → wisdom, made at the start of his reign, was thus amply fulfilled (1 3:12). The wisdom for which his name has become a byword lay chiefly in t specific directions. Primarily it was a practical wisdom; statecraft and the ; ministration of justice were above all the areas in which it was needed a demonstrated (1 Ki. 3:9, 16–28). Secondly, it was an academic and didactic wisdo in a world already famed for its wise men, Solomon showed himself outstandi making major contributions to the collection of proverbial and related material (1 4:29–34). His name is linked with the books of Proverbs (1:1), Song of Solom (1:1), and by implication Ecclesiastes (1:1), and we may see him as the founder a patron of a great deal of literary activity in Israel. (The precise extent of his o literary work remains disputed; it is at least certain that apocryphal a pseudepigraphal works bearing his name are pseudonymous.) He may well have tablished wisdom "schools" in Israel.

His shrewdness and sagacity were not however unalloyed. Many of his ventu were excessive and proved too expensive, so that he gradually impoverished country, with the result that heavy taxation and forced service caused deep rese ments which were to break up his kingdom (cf. 1 Ki. 12:1–20). His diploma marriages were but the beginning of a vast – and expensive – harem. His perso piety also lapsed into a measure of apostasy and idolatry (1 Ki. 11:1–10). The count of Solomon's reign in Chronicles (2 Chr. 1–9) concentrates on his building the temple, and is little concerned with the defects in his character; the narrative 1 Ki. 1–11, on the other hand, depicts Solomon as a king who, though blessed w abnormal wisdom and material resources, set the kingdom on its first steps towa decline and fall; the man who built the temple was the first man to adulterate worship.

In later literature, beginning with Josephus, many legends and legendary featu became attached to the Old Testament's more realistic information. In particular, story of the Queen of Sheba's visit (1 Ki. 10:1–13), which was no doubt connec with Solomon's commercial and diplomatic enterprises, attracted many such acc tions. His wisdom, magnificence and pious attachment to the law of Moses w heightened and extolled, while his faults were glossed over. Strangely enough, weight of later Jewish criticisms of Solomon centred on something of which he v not historically guilty, namely, the development of magical practices.

NT Solomon figures little in the NT; he is neither exalted nor denigrated. In M 1:6 f. he appears in his appropriate place in the genealogy of Christ. Matt. 6 (= Lk. 12:27) mentions his "glory", and Matt. 12:42 (= Lk. 11:31) his wisdc Finally Acts 7:47 recognizes him as the builder of the temple. These widely separa references both acknowledge his achievements and also emphasize their lack

.k. 17:22 ff.). No one knows the hour. When the flood came only → Noah and his amily were prepared. So the coming of the Son of man will find people engaged in lentical activities, but some will be ready and others not. This was in fact the case /hen → judgment fell on Jerusalem in A.D. 70. For discussion of the eschatological eaching of Jesus → Present, art. *The Parousia and Eschatology in the NT* 2 (a).

C. Brown

› Rob, → Take

a). W. Foerster, *harpazō, harpagmos*, *TDNT* I 472 ff.; T. F. Glasson, "Two Notes on the Philippians Hymn (II. 6–11)", *NTS* 21, 1974–75, 133–39; L. L. Hammerich, *An Ancient Misunderstanding (Phil. :6 'robbery')*, 1966; D. Hill, *The Gospel of Matthew, New Century Bible*, 1971; R. W. Hoover, *HTR* 4, 1971, 95–119; R. P. Martin, *Carmen Christi: Philippians ii. 5–11 in Recent Interpretation and in he Setting of Early Christian Worship, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series*, 4, 967; and *Philippians, New Century Bible*, 1976; C. F. D. Moule, "Further Reflexions on Philippians :5–11", in W. W. Gasque and R. P. Martin, eds., *Apostolic History and the Gospel: Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F. F. Bruce*, 1970, 246–76; D. W. B. Robinson, "*harpagmos*: The Deliverance Jesus Refused?", *ExpT* 80, 1968–69, 253 f.; W. Schmithals, *Gnosticism in Corinth*, 1971; .. P. Trudinger, "*harpagmos* and the Christological Significance of the Ascension", *ExpT* 79, 1967–68, 79.

b). E. Peterson, *Heis Theos. Epigraphisch-formgeschichtliche und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*, 1926; A. Schlatter, *Johannes der Taufer*, ed. W. Michaelis, 1956; and *Paulus der Bote Jesu*, 962[3] ; G. Strecker, "Entrückung", *RAC* V 461 ff.

olomon

Σολομών

Σολομών (*Solomōn*), Heb. *šᵉlōmōh*, LXX *Σαλωμών* (*Salōmōn*) and variants, Solomon.

ıT Solomon was the son (by Bathsheba) and successor of David, and the last king of a united Israel. His reign (c. 961–c. 922 B.C.) was peaceful and prosperous, except for some economic difficulties and abortive revolts towards the end of it, and was without doubt the most splendid era in Israel's history. Building on the foundations laid by David, Solomon organized an efficient administration, developed industry and commerce, and established harmonious relationships with neighbouring tates. His most lasting achievement was the building of the → temple in Jerusalem.

At birth, he was named both Solomon and also Jedidiah (2 Sam. 12:24 f.). The neaning of the name Solomon is not certain; "his [i.e. Yahweh's] peace, well-being" s a possibility, but most probable is "his compensation", i.e. God's compensation to David for the death of Bathsheba's firstborn. He was by no means David's eldest on, and it was not without rivalry and intrigue that he came to the throne, first as co-regent with his father (1 Ki. 1). He quickly and ruthlessly consolidated his personal position (1 Ki. 2), and went on to take all appropriate steps to strengthen his kingdom and empire. Against external foes, Jerusalem and other strategic cities were horoughly fortified, and garrisoned with a powerful chariot force (1 Ki. 9:15–19; 0:26). The internal structures of Israel Solomon endeavoured to strengthen by breaking down the old tribal pattern and replacing it with a completely new system of administrative districts (1 Ki. 4:7–19).

Good relations were established with neighbouring states, notably Tyre and Egypt 1 Ki. 3:1; 5:12). The alliances not only provided military security but also en-

5–11 in Recent Interpretation and in the Setting of Early Christian Worsh Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 4, 1967; and *Philippia New Century Bible*, 1976, 90–102, 109–116; → Empty, art. *kenos* NT 3; → Form, a *morphē* NT 1, art. *schēma* NT 1). The majority of exegetes have taken *harpagmos* mean a thing plundered or seized (cf. RSV), and so spoil, booty or a prize of w However, C. F. D. Moule has suggested that it means the act of snatching ("Furth Reflexions on Philippians 2:5–11", in W. W. Gasque and R. P. Martin, ed *Apostolic History and the Gospel: Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F. Bruce*, 1970, 264–76). Thus Moule takes the v. to mean: "he did not regard equal with God as *consisting in* snatching" (op. cit., 266); "instead of imagining th equality with God meant *getting*, Jesus, on the contrary, *gave* – gave until he w 'empty'." Whilst granting that this accords with Paul's train of thought in v. 7, R. Martin thinks that it does not give sufficient weight to the contrast between v. 6 a v. 7. This is introduced by "but [*alla*]". V. 6b states what Christ might have done, i seized equality with God; v. 7 states what he chose to do, i.e. give himself. Mar thinks, therefore that Moule's interpretation loses the tension between the two vers and thus *harpagmos* denotes that which Christ refused to seize (*Philippians*, 96). particular, it denotes "the enjoyment and use of 'equality with God' in its char teristic expression, namely, the title of lordship as a springboard from which might, had he so decided, have aspired to be the universe's ruler. He had the opp tunity to grasp what lay within his reach – since he shared God's throne as his 'for (so T. F. Glasson, 'Two Notes on the Philippians Hymn (II. 6–11)', *NTS* (1974–75), pp. 133–9 . . .) – and by an act of self-assertiveness and pride he mig have striven to be Lord in his own right. But 'equality with God' in this way was intolerable thought, since in Jewish tradition (cf. Jn. 5:17, 18 . . .) to claim su equality is tantamount to a false independence and to setting up a rebellion agai the divine government" (op. cit., 97). He chose, therefore, to empty himself and ta the form of a servant which in turn provides the ground and pattern for Christi conduct.

3. The noun *harpagē* means robbery, plunder (of the forcible confiscation Christian property, Heb. 10:34; → Possessions, art. *chrēma* NT 2), what is plunder (Matt. 23:25). The latter passage refers to the inside of the cup and di ceremonially cleansed on the outside by the → Pharisees. The par. in Lk. 11:39 ref to the Pharisees themselves and means greediness, rapacity. The saying points to t hypocrisy of maintaining professed concern for righteousness and purity which bel self-seeking inner motivation. *harpax* means rapacious, ravenous, of wolves (Ma 7:15; cf. Gen. 49:27; → Animal), and as a noun a robber (Lk. 18:11; cf. 1 C 5:10 f.; 6:10; Tit. 1:9 *v.l.*).

4. The vb. used in the sayings about the two men in the field and the two wom grinding at the mill, and one being taken and the other left, is *paralambanō* (Ma 24:40 f.; Lk. 17:34 f.). The vb. is used generally for taking someone along (e.g. G 47:2; 2 Macc. 5:5; Matt. 2:13 f., 20 f.; 17:1 f.; Lk. 9:28), and is used of the spirit th takes seven other spirits to help him (Lk. 11:26; cf. Arndt, 624 f. for other example The sayings in Matt. and Lk. have sometimes been taken to imply a rapture believers prior to the judgment. But this teaching is not paralleled elsewhere, and appears to read too much into the vb. The point of the passage is to encourage t hearers to watch and be ready for the coming of the Son of man (cf. Matt. 24:39, 4

ıtes of the world to meet in the air the Christ acclaimed as Lord" (E. Petersen, *Heis heos*, 1926, 380). *eis apantēsin*, to meet, is the technical term for the solemn eeting of important persons. The language is that of contemporary Jewish ɔocalyptic. Rapture has a similar meaning in Gen. 5:24, where death has been iminated. For further discussion of Paul's eschatology → Present, art. *The Parousia ıd Eschatology in the NT* 2 (c).

In Rev. 12:5 the child (Jesus) is caught up to God to escape the persecution of the dragon; this is the expression in the picture language of Rev. of incidents like that corded in Matt. 2:13 ff. *E. Tiedtke*

(d) The meaning of *harpazō* in Matt. 11:12 is debatable: "From the days of John ɛ Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven has suffered violence [*biazetai*; cf. RSV ɡ. "has been coming violently"], and men of violence take it by force [*kai biastai ırpazousin autēn*]" (RSV). The par. in Lk. 16:16 omits the vb.: "The law and the ophets were until John; since then the good news of the kingdom of God is eached, and every one enters it violently [*kai pas eis autēn biazetai*]." In Lk. this mes as an isolated saying, but in Matt. it stands in the context of a discussion of ɛ significance of John the Baptist. Arndt (108) suggests that the juxtaposition with ızzetai probably means something like seize or claim for oneself. This would imply at the kingdom of God forces its way through with violence (cf. RSV mg.), if the ı. *biazetai* is taken in the middle voice. If the vb. is passive, it would mean that the ıgdom is striven after with violence. The emphasis would thus fall on the renuncia- ɔn and effort required to enter the kingdom, and the idea would be comparable with tering by the narrow → gate (Matt. 7:13 ff.). However, *biazō* generally expresses ɔlent and hostile action in a bad sense, and the parallelism in Matt. reinforces this ɛa. D. Hill suggests that the v. means "that from the Baptist's time till the present ɛ Kingdom is being violently assaulted, and violent men try to grab or rob it. The ıusion may be to the opposition of Satan and evil spirits to the Kingdom, or to the ɔlence of Herod Antipas to John; but a more likely explanation is that the reference either to Zealots who try to bring in the Kingdom by employing force against the ɔmans, or to Jewish antagonists who continued to persecute Christians" (*The ɔspel of Matthew*, *New Century Bible*, 1971, 200 f.). The context suggests that the te of John the Baptist is uppermost in Jesus' mind. But his warning would not eclude the other suggestions, the main thrust of which is to make it clear "that sus considers his ministry to be a time when the Kingdom can be attacked as being esent" (D. Hill, op. cit., 201; cf. W. G. Kümmel, *Promise and Fulfilment*, *SBT* 23, ɔ61², 121 ff.).

Hill considers the Matthean form of the saying to be the more original, and the ıcan version to be a simplification. As it stands, Lk.'s saying could mean that the thusiastic (i.e. tax collectors and sinners) are grasping the opportunity to enter the ıgdom, whereas the complacent self-righteous do not (cf. Lk. 16:14 f.). But the lusion to the opposition of the Pharisees in the preceding vv. could also mean that ey too are part of the opposition which is doing violence to the kingdom which is esent in the ministry of Jesus.

2. The noun *harpagmos* is found only in Phil. 2:6: "who, though he was in the rm of God, did not count equality with God a thing to be grasped [*harpagmon*]." ɲ the Christ-hymn in Phil. 2:5–11 see R. P. Martin, *Carmen Christi: Philippians ii.*

says that Enoch "was caught up": the word used elsewhere in the LXX anc secular Gk. (from Homer, *Od.*, on) is *metatithēmi* (Gen. 5:24; Wis. 4:10; Sir. 44: 49:14, etc.). But since the translation of Enoch (Gen. 5:24) frequently appears later Jewish literature and has left traces even in the NT (cf. 2 Cor. 12:2 f.; 1 Th 4:17), it is important to discuss what is meant by the rapture in Gen. 5:24. This n be understood as in the Gilgamesh epic, where the hero is translated directly from earthly life into the fellowship of the gods. If that is so, Enoch, because of his pleasing to God, was taken directly into God's presence without first going to Sh (→ Hell). The manner in which this happened is not mentioned (cf. Heb. 11:5, wh *metatithēmi* is used; Jude 14). Similarly, → Elijah was taken directly into Gc fellowship (2 Ki. 2:11 f.). For further discussion of the translations of Enoch and jah → Resurrection, art. *anastasis* NT 5.

NT 1. *harpazō* is found 14 times in the NT.

(a) As in secular Gk. and the LXX, it has the meaning to steal, carry off, d away (Matt. 12:29; Jn. 10:12; cf. Gen. 37:33; Pss. 7:3[2]; 50[49]:22).

(b) It also means to lead away forcibly (Jn. 6:15; 10:28, 29; Acts 23:10; Jude 2

(c) It is used of the Spirit carrying someone away – also *metatithēmi* – (Acts 8: 2 Cor. 12:2, 4; 1 Thess. 4:17; Rev. 12:5). "Rapture is a change of location whic granted men through more than human power" (G. Strecker, "Entrückung", *RA* 461). We must distinguish in the NT between a movement from one place on earth another (Acts 8:39) and being caught up into a supernatural world (e.g. 2 Cor. 1: 4).

Following the baptism of the Ethiopian eunuch "the Spirit of the Lord caught Philip; and the eunuch saw him no more" (Acts 8:39). This should be taken spati and really. It has close links with 2 Ki. 2, even in verbal details (cf. especially v. But it may also be compared with the Spirit driving Jesus into the wilderness after baptism (Matt. 4:1 par. Mk. 1:12, Lk. 4:1). 2 Cor. 12:2 ff. is based on an entirely ferent concept. Paul, with a certain reluctance, saw himself forced by his oppone to tell of an experience, which really concerned only God and himself. In the "spi the gnostic left even the prison of his body so as to immerse himself temporarily the cosmic body of Christ. Paul contrasts the rapture given him with this high degree of ecstatic experience. It was not a journey of the soul to heaven – he did know whether the rapture had been in his body or out of it – nor a physical asc sion. His description is very reserved and betrays nothing of the way in which it curred. "It is precisely the essential feature of the process that remains veiled" Schlatter, *Paulus der Bote Jesu*, 1962[3] ad loc.). The stress lies solely on the fact Paul temporarily moved from faith into sight, that he experienced for a moment w he was to be. In contrast to his opponents, Paul knew that he had not reached final perfection in his rapture, which would have made faith unnecessary. For furt discussion → Paradise, art. *paradeisos* NT 1 (b).

In 1 Thess. 4:17 Paul deals with the final rapture into the fellowship of redeemed at the last day. It was not the sufferings of the church that caused Pau make the statement, but the concern of some of its members about the fate of Ch tians who had already died. This concern is removed by the certainty of → resur tion. Those Christians who were still alive would not die but would be taken directly into the fellowship of those who had already been raised, "as they leave

aul thought of himself as the slave of Christ (Rom. 1:1 etc.) and as a prisoner of ar (Rom. 16:7; Col. 4:10; Phlm. 23), Barrett considers that Paul is here thinking of imself as one who collaborates with God and not as someone exposed to defeat and isgrace. He, therefore, suggests that Paul is seeing himself here as one of the iumphant generals. However, there is much in the letter which indicates that outardly the apostle was subject to calamity, and apparent defeat and shame (2 Cor. :7–12; 11:21–12:10). And this may underlie v. 14 and the next two vv.: "For we re the aroma [*euōdia*] of Christ to God among those who are being saved and mong those who are perishing, to the one a fragrance [*osmē*] from death to death, to ıe other a fragrance [*osmē*] from life to life. Who is sufficient for these things?" 2 Cor. 2:15 f.). The imagery thus appears to change. On the one hand, the apostle in ll his weakness, lack of acclaim and with his message of the cross, is like the stench f death to those who only see defeat and a morbid message. On the other hand, his acrificial service for the gospel of Christ's sacrifice recalls the sweet savour of the)T sacrifices (cf. Gen. 8:21; Exod. 29:18; Lev. 1:9; Num. 15:3; Ezek. 7:13; Dan. :34; Eph. 5:2; Phil. 4:18; and the "odour of wisdom" in Sir. 24:15; 39:14; Syr. Bar. 7:6). "It seems inevitable that one should fill out the picture by taking Paul's sense ɔ be that the apostles are the smoke that arises out of the sacrifice of Christ to God, iffusing as it ascends the knowledge of God that is communicated in the cross" (C. . Barrett, op. cit., 99; cf. SB III 497 for rabbinic analogies). *C. Brown*

→ Fight, → Incense, → Sacrifice

ı). H. F. Beck, "Odor", *IDB* III 589 f.; G. Delling, *osmē TDNT* V 493 ff.; A. Stumpf, *euōdia*, *TDNT* 808 ff.

ɔ). E. Lohmeyer, *Vom göttlichen Wohlgeruch, Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Vissenschaften* 10, 9, 1919; E. Nestle. "Der süsse Geruch als Erweis des Geistes", *ZNW* 4, 1903, 272; nd ibid. 7, 1906, 95 f.

ɔnatch, Take Away, Rapture

ἁρπάζω

ἁρπάζω (*harpazō*), snatch, seize; ἁρπαγμός (*harpagmos*), robbery, that of which someone is robbed, prize, booty; ἁρπαγή (*harpagē*), robbery, plunder, greediness, rapacity; ἅρπαξ (*harpax*), rapacious, avenous, a robber, swindler; μετατίθημι (*metatithēmi*), to transfer, change the posiion of, change, turn away.

ɪL *harpazō* (from Homer on) is related to Lat. *rapio*, seize, snatch, and means to snatch, seize, carry off, rob, plunder, ravish. *harpagmos* means both robbery, ape, and the thing of which a person is robbed, a prize to be grasped.

ɔT *harpazō* in the LXX represents mostly Heb. *gāzal*, take away, rob (e.g. Lev. 6:4 [MT 5:23]; 19:13; Jdg. 21:23; Isa. 10:2; and metaphorically Mic. 3:2), and *ārap̄*, tear, e.g. of beasts of prey, tear in pieces (e.g. Gen. 37:33; Pss. 22:13 [MT 2:14]; 104[103]:21; Amos 3:4; and also Hos. 5:14; Ps. 50[49]:22, where Yahweh imself, facing an apostate people, is compared to a lion rending in pieces; cf. Hos. ɔ:1).

Only once does the LXX have the meaning rapture, being caught up. Wis. 4:11

In the revelation of deity the smell proceeding from it is important as "the bearer a producer of divine life" (E. Lohmeyer, *Vom göttlichen Wohlgeruch*, 1919, 13).

OT Some passages of the OT may reflect the idea of a life-force received throu smell: the bridegroom in the Song of Solomon sings of the ravishing fragra of his beloved (e.g. Cant. 4:10; 4:16 and passim); the power of Moab is compa with that of mature wine and its "bouquet" (Jer. 48:11); and the smell of fresh h indicates to Isaac the presence of his first-born son, a strong, virile hunter (G 27:27). In particular, passages attributed to the Priestly source use the word fr Gen. to Num.: the offering is made to the Lord "for a pleasing odour" (Gen. 8: Lev. 2:12; cf. Lev. 1:9; 13, 17; Num. 28:1 f. etc.). Some scholars have seen in t idea that as the smell of the sacrifice ascends to heaven, God feeds upon it. But L 26:31 and Amos 5:21 show the limits of this materialistic concept. God is not dep dent on the bringing of offerings, nor upon their smell. In a metaphorical, spirit sense wisdom is said to diffuse fragrance (Sir. 24:15), while Sir. 39:14 calls the pra of God by his people a sweet smell. But even in this metaphorical usage materialistic background can still be seen, in that the fragrance diffused by wisd and godliness contains a life-giving power.

NT *osmē* is found only 6 times in the NT, 2 of which are in the combination *o euōdias*, which stems from the OT; *euōdia* occurs in only one other place (2 C 2:15), between two verses each containing *osmē*.

In the story of the anointing at Bethany (Jn. 12:3), the house is said to have b filled with the fragrance of the ointment. In addition to the literal sense, there doubtless symbolism here: as the fragrance of the ointment filled the house, so fragrance of the gospel will shortly fill the whole earth (cf. R. Bultmann, *The Go of John*, 1971, 415). In Eph. 5:2 *osmē euōdias* is used to describe the death of Ch as a → sacrifice which is "for a sweet-smelling fragrance to God". This figura usage is particularly apparent in Phil. 4:18, where Paul calls the financial aid sen him by the Philippians "a fragrant offering". The idea here is not simply that of sacrifice in the strict sense of the word; the Philippians' gift is "a symbol of any every gift which a man brings to God" (E. Lohmeyer, *Die Briefe an die Philip Kolosser und an Philemon*, *KEK* 9, 1964[13], ad loc.).

The concept of *osmē* as a life-giving or death-giving force re-emerges, however 2 Cor. 2:14 ff. The fragrance of the knowledge of God is being diffused by the w of the apostle; indeed, Paul himself is the bearer of the fragrance of Christ. But fragrance spread abroad through his preaching has a twofold effect: to those v obey the gospel it brings divine life, while to those who refuse the message it bri eternal death. Paul adopts this naturalistic approach in order to show vividly how gospel divides men and calls for their individual decision, but also to emphasize divine power inherent in the gospel. *O. Flender*

C. K. Barrett, on the other hand, thinks that the imagery of v. 14 is proba drawn from the use of → incense in the pagan, royal and religious triumphal pro sions: "But thanks be to God, who in Christ always leads us in triumph, and thro us spreads the fragrance [*osmēn*] of the knowledge of him everywhere" (cf. *Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, *BNTC*, 1973, 98; cf. also 1 Cor. 4:9). Altho

:usalem were from Cyrene and the other places is an open question. Libertines, in s context, have no relationship with the English word "libertine", a person un- ıibited in mores. *G. T. D. Angel*

Freedom, → Serve, → Yoke

A. El-M. Bakir, *Slavery in Pharaonic Egypt, Supplément aux Annales du Service des Antiquités de gypte* 18, 1952; R. H. Barrow, *Slavery in the Roman Empire*, 1928; S. Benko and J. O'Rourke, eds., *Catacombs and the Colosseum*, 1971; A. C. Bouquet, *Everyday Life in New Testament Times*, 3, 151–55; S. Scott Bartchy, *MALLON CHRĒSAI: First Century Slavery and the Interpretation of Corinthians 7:21*, *Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series* 11, 1973; W. W. Buckland, *The nan Law of Slavery*, 1908; J. Carcopino, *Daily Life in Ancient Rome*, 1941, 52–75; J. A. Crook, *w and Life of Rome*, 1967, 179–205; M. David, "The Manumission of Slaves under Zedekiah", *OTS* 948, 63–79; A. M. Duff, *Freedmen in the Early Roman Empire*, 1928; H. L. Ellison, "The Hebrew ve: A Study in Early Israelite History", *EQ* 45, 1973, 30–35; M. I. Finley, ed., *Slavery in Classical iquity*, 1960, with supplement 1968; "Between Slavery and Freedom", *Comparative Studies in iety and History*, 6, 1964, 233 ff.; and "Slavery", *OCD* 994 ff.; R. Flacelière, *Daily Life in Ancient ece*, 1959, 45–54; M. Grant, *The World of Rome*, 1960, 100–125; J. Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the ıe of Jesus: An Investigation into Economic and Social Conditions in the New Testament Period*, 9; G. Kittel, *aichmalōtos* etc., *TDNT* I 195 ff.; and *desmos, desmios*, *TDNT* II 43; N. P. Lemcke, ıe 'Hebrew Slave': Comments on the Slave Law, Ex. xxi. 2–11", *VT* 25, 1975, 129–44; F. Lyall, ɔman Law in the Writings of Paul: The Slave and the Freedman", *NTS* 17, 1970–71, 73–9; and ɔman Law in the Writings of Paul: Adoption" *JBL* 88, 1969, 458–66; I. Mendelsohn, "The Con- ɔnal Sale into Slavery of Free-born Daughters in Nuzi and the Law of Ex. 21:7–11", *Journal of the erican Oriental Society* 55, 1935, 190–95; "Guilds in Ancient Palestine", *BASOR* 80, 1940, 17–21; ee Artisans and Slaves in Mesopotamia", *BASOR* 89, 1943, 25–29; *Slavery in the Ancient Near t*, 1949; "On Slavery in Alalakh", *Israel Exploration Journal* 5, 1955, 65–72; and "Slavery in the ", *IDB* IV 383–91; G. R. Morrow, *Plato's Law of Slavery in its Relation to Greek Laws*, 1939; K. Rengstorf, *doulos* etc., *TDNT* II 261–80; W. G. Rollins, "Slavery in the NT", *IDB Supplementary ume*, 1976, 830 ff.; K. C. Russell, *Slavery as Reality and Metaphor in the Pauline Letters*, (Disserta- ı, Pontifical University) 1968; A. Rupprecht, "Slave, Slavery", *ZPEB* V 453–60; B. J. Siegel, *very During the Third Dynasty of Ur, Memoir Series of the American Anthropological Association* 1947; R. de Vaux, *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions*, 1961, 80–90; J. Vogt, *Ancient Slavery the Ideal of Man*, 1972; J. Weiss, *Earliest Christianity: A History of the Period A.D. 30–150*, II, 9, 458–63; W. L. Westermann, *The Slave Systems of Greek and Roman Antiquity*, 1955, H. W. lff, "Masters and Slaves", *Interpretation* 27, 1973, 259–72; W. Zimmerli, "Slavery in the OT", *IDB ıplementary Volume*, 1976, 829 f.

W. Brandt, *Dienst und Dienen im Neuen Testament*, 1931; E. Häusler, *Sklaven und Personen min- ɛn Rechts im Alten Testament*, 1956; G. Kehnscherper, *Die Stellung der Bibel und der alten stlichen Kirche zur Sklaverei*, 1957; S. Lauffer, "Die Sklaverei in der griechisch-römischen Welt", *nnasium*, 1961, 370 ff.; G. Locher, "Sklaverei", *EKL* III 975 ff.; G. von Rad, *Das Gottesvolk im ıteronomium, BWANT*, 1929; G. Sass, "Zur Bedeutung von *doulos* bei Paulus", *ZNW* 40, 1941, ff.; SB IV 698 ff.; H. Wallon, *Histoire de l'Esclavage dans l'Antiquité*, I–III, 1879; H. D. Wendland, laverei und Christentum", *RGG*[3] VI 101 ff.

ıell

ὀσμή

ὀσμή (*osmē*), smell, scent; *εὐωδία* (*euōdia*), fragrance, aroma.

osmē, Ion. *odmē*, means smell, scent. Antiquity conceived smell in such strongly material terms that the trunk of a tree was said to receive new life and vitality m the scent of water (cf. Job 14:9). Aristotle mentions the view of the thagoreans "that some living creatures live on scents" (*De Sensu* 5). Smell was refore considered to contain, quite literally, a life-giving force. This materialistic a of smell as something charged with energy also appears in the sphere of religion.

6. Hence, he who would be first in Jesus Christ's community must be its sla (Matt. 20:27). It is understandable that in the light of this dialectical concept Christian freedom as a *douleia* after the pattern of the redeemer, the sociologi question of the freedom of slaves did not appear a pressing one. Christians w aware of the indelible distinction between master and slave. However, the liberati knowledge of the common service that both had to one heavenly master (Eph. 6 was normative; through it "we experience a joyous liberation from the godless bc dage of this world to serve God's creatures in freedom and thankfulness" (*Barm Declaration*, Thesis 2). Master and servant are told to subject themselves to t Lord, because it is in their mutual treatment of one another that they join themsel to that community whose rule is love. However, it is not left to the choice of dividual members of the community (particularly the choice of masters and servan to decide whether or not thus to subject themselves and join this community. It precisely the concept of *douleuō*, in contrast to that of *diakoneō* (→ Serve), th emphasizes the obligatory character of the service for God and to one's neighbc that is the duty of the community of those who have been set free by Jesus Christ.

R. Tuente

Λιβερτῖνος — Λιβερτῖνος (*Libertinos*), Libertine, Freedman.

CL & OT *Libertinos* is a Gk. borrowing of the Lat. *libertinus*, found in secular G only on an inscription (*IG* XIV 1781). The normal Greek translation *libertinus* or *libertus* is *apeleutheros* (cf. 1 Cor. 7:22) or *exeleutheros*. The *libertin* was a freed slave, who after either buying or having been given his freedom und went manumission, a process whereby his freedom was secured publicly. But l freedom did not amount to full citizen rights, for example, he could not petition l legal action without permission nor gain high military office. However, some free men, during the Empire, as employees of the state or of wealthy patrons, amass considerable wealth and wielded political power.

NT At the sole New Testament reference, the text reads: "Some of those out of t so-called synagogue of the Libertines and of the Cyrenians and Alexandrians a of people from Asia and Cilicia opposed, debating with Stephen" (Acts 6:9). E egetes agree that the Libertines were Jewish freedmen, but they debate (a) whetl the freedmen were from Cyrene, Alexandria, Asia and Cilicia (so J. Munck, *The A of the Apostles*, *Anchor Bible*, 1967, 58), or were separate from the Cyrenians a the others, such as descendants of Jews brought to Rome by Pompey in 63 B.C. a later freed who are described in Philo, *Leg. Gai.* 155 (Schürer, II, i, 49; II, ii, 56 276), and (b) whether the one synagogue served all these ethnic groups (F. F. Bru *The Book of Acts, NLC*, 1954, 133; E. Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 19 271), two synagogues (H. Strathmann, *TDNT* IV 267 f.), or five (Schürer, *loc. ci* Large towns had more than one synagogue (Philo, *Leg. Gai.* 137 f., 156 f Jerusalem at one stage had a synagogue of Alexandrians (SB II 663 f.). Because t Libertines are a social group while the others are ethnic, Dibelius, for examp welcomes a variant reading in an Armenian version *Libyorum*, of Libyans (*Studi in the Acts of the Apostles*, 1956, 91). A natural reading of Acts 6:9 suggests o synagogue only, but whether the Jewish freedmen served by the one synagogue

he pre-existent One takes on the *morphē* of a *doulos*. The point of this expression loes not lie in a statement about the obedience of the incarnate Christ (this follows in ʾhil. 2:8b), i.e. in its picking up the OT concept of the Servant of God (Isa. 53, MT *ʿebeḏ* YHWH; LXX *pais theou*, → Son). For discussion → Form, art. *morphē*; → ɛmpty, art. *kenoō*. Hence, when Christ takes on the form of a slave, he enters into ull solidarity with mankind in its subjection to sin, law and death. As servant, he is ubject to the *nomos* (Gal. 4:4) and bears its curse (Gal. 3:13). He takes on a form 'that was like that of sinful flesh" (Rom. 8:3), and thus made himself a brother of nen "who through fear of death must serve in bondage all their lives long" (Heb. ?:15). It is the form of the servant that exactly describes Jesus Christ's incarnation as he deepest self-abasement.

4. Thus the Lord's form as a servant unmasks the nature of unredeemed man as *louleia*. This slavery is that of sin, i.e. man's obsession with the illusion that he can nake or maintain his own life and freedom with reference only to himself and in his ɔwn power. That which the Greeks regarded as the highest form of freedom (cf. CL 1) ɔecomes in the NT the source of man's most abject bondage. Man, bent in upon him- ɨelf, obstinately waves God's help aside and busies himself in running his own life in ıis own strength, trusting in his own resources, and falls into the grip of → fear (Rom. 3:15; Heb. 2:15). He trusts in the tangible and is subject to the "bondage of mor- ɑlity" (Rom. 8:21). He makes use of the law and the powers of this world to create 'his own righteousness", and is enslaved under the "curse of the law" (Gal. 3:13), ɨtanding in the service of "the gods who are not really such" (Gal. 4:8). Since every ɑttempt of man to liberate himself must thus ensnare him yet further, his *douleia* is ɔomplete and is not restricted, as in gnostic dualism, to the level of matter and the ɔody. The comprehensive and remorseless phrase, *douleia tēs hamartias*, gives the lie ɔo just this sort of idea of an inalienable residue of inner, spiritual freedom (cf. Rom. 7:23.; → *aichmalōtos*).

5. Jesus Christ alone redeems man from the slavery of sin with the price of his ɗeath. The metaphor of sacral manumission is here united with the idea of a change ɔf masters. Believers "having been set free from sin, have become slaves of ɾighteousness" (Rom. 6:18; cf. v. 22). This manumission from the bondage of a sup- ɔosed independence into *eleutheria* (→ freedom) does not lead to a new indepen- ɗence. Rather, the one manumitted is set free for the "obedience of faith" which he ɔresents to his Lord, Jesus Christ, as his servant (Rom. 12:11; 14:18; Col. 3:24; cf. 1 Thess. 1:9; Rom. 7:6). Yet this new relationship of master and servant is ɗominated, not by "the spirit of slavery [*pneuma douleias*] to fall back into fear"; ɓelievers "have received the spirit of sonship [*pneuma hyiothesias*]" (Rom. 8:15; → Child, art. *hyios* NT 2). However, the freedom of God's sons is not to become "an op- ɔortunity for the flesh". Hence, the redeemed are called upon to "serve one another in love" (Gal. 5:13). This sort of service of love to one's neighbours is rooted in Christ's love in taking the form of a servant (cf. the exhortations of Phil. 2:1–4, which are causally related to Phil. 2:5 ff.). As a *doulos*, Jesus showed his love to his disciples by washing their feet (the duty of a slave), "that you also should do what I have done to you" (Jn. 13:15). The nature of Christ's loving work thus prevents anything like the orthodox, pharisaic separation of God's service from that of one's neighbour. The freedom that is found in the obedience of faith expresses itself in lov- ing service of one's neighbour.

society into lord and servant, free and bond. Repeatedly slaves are called to l obedient to their masters in all things – even to unmerciful ones (1 Pet. 2:18; → Si art. *hamartia* NT 4 (c)); we may compare the ethical instruction of Col. 3:22; Ep 6:5; 1 Tim. 6:1; Tit. 2:9. Paul recognizes Philemon's right to Onesimus as his posse sion, even if Philemon's position shows something of the tension existing between tl *status quo* and faith in the one Lord, Jesus Christ (cf. 1 Cor. 7:20–24). It is on possible here to draw attention to two different ways of translating 1 Cor. 7:2 Many commentators render it: "If you actually [*ei kai*] have an opportunity becoming free, by all means [*mallon*] seize it." But C. K. Barrett prefers: "Were yc a slave when you were called? Let not that trouble you, but even though you may l able to become free put up rather with your present status" (*The First Epistle to t Corinthians*, *BNTC*, 1968, 170). However, for Paul the main point is freedom Christ (vv. 22 ff.). For a more detailed discussion see S. Scott Bartchy, *MALLO CHRĒSAI: First Century Slavery and the Interpretation of 1 Corinthians 7:2 Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series* 11, 1973.

(b) The sociological problems of this state of affairs which we have sketched o are mitigated by the fact that God's revelation in Jesus Christ shows that all men a in the relentless grip of a completely different sort of slavery. Man outside the sphe of Christ's rule is a *doulos tēs hamartias*, a slave of sin (Rom. 6:17). This *douleia* c consist of a miserably meticulous observance of the "letter" in the hope of salvatic (Rom. 7:6, 25; → Law, art. *nomos*), or of a slavish adoration of the mediating cosm powers (Gal. 4:3, 8 f.), or of a frenzied horror of death (Heb. 2:15), or of the servi of the belly (Rom. 16:18) and one's lusts (Tit. 3:3). This means in general th "whoever commits sin is a slave of sin" (Jn. 8:34). Similarly Paul asks: "Do you n know that if you yield to anyone as obedient slaves, you are slaves of the one who you obey, either of sin, which leads to death, or of obedience, which leads righteousness? " (Rom. 6:16). One cannot free oneself from this servitude of sin l one's own efforts nor change masters by one's own decision. Only he whom the S sets free is really free (Jn. 8:36). Christ's redemption frees one for obedient servi under the command of the *Kyrios* (Rom. 12:11; 14:18; Col. 3:24) and leads one in the service of righteousness in the new Spirit-given nature (Rom. 6:18; 7:6). Paul se himself, called to his office as an apostle, as in a special way a *doulos Christou Iēsc* "servant of Christ Jesus" (Rom. 1:1; Phil. 1:1; Gal. 1:10). This title is also used refer to the office of one of his colleagues like Epaphras (Col. 4:12). In this titul sense *doulos* is closest in sense to *diakonos*, servant, which is frequently used Paul's writings of the apostolic service of witness (Col. 4:7, *diakonos kai syndoul* "servant and fellow slave"; → Serve, art. *diakoneō*). But here, as elsewhere, the d tinctive thing about the concept of the *doulos* is the subordinate, obligatory a responsible nature of his service in his exclusive relation to his Lord. At the sar time, all who are called to freedom are set to serve one another in love (Gal. 5:1 Paul made himself a slave of all (1 Cor. 9:19); in the service of the gospel (Phil. 2:2 he is the servant of the community for Christ's sake (2 Cor. 4:5). He who would first in Christ's community must be its slave (Matt. 20:27).

3. This last evaluation of slavery is only excelled by the dignity given to it by t bestowal upon the *kyrios* of the title of *doulos*. Christ divested himself and took the form of a servant (Phil. 2:7, *morphēn doulou labōn*). Above all, the statement Phil. 2:7 shows the theological significance of this group of words. In becoming m

orship in this context (Jdg. 2:7; 2 Chr. 30:8; the Heb. noun *ʿbōḏâh* means the service of worship). Just as one humbly referred to oneself as "your servant" when addressing the king (e.g. in 2 Sam. 9:8), so does he who prays to God (frequently in the ss.: "your servant", e.g. Pss. 19:11, 13; 67[66]:17; 86[85]:2, 4, 16; 119[118], 17, 3, 38, 49, 65, 76, 84, 122, 124 f., 135, 140, 176). In calling himself the *doulos* of this *yrios* (Ps. 122[123]:2; cf. here the Gk. idea of the relation of God and man as one *ata physin*, by → nature), the Israelite was conscious of the infinite distance between im and his God and also of his complete dependence upon him. The worth of the *oulos* stood or fell with his knowledge of his *kyrios*, Lord, and so was based upon is relation to God. Yahweh encounters his people as a judging, saving Lord. Hence, lthough the concept of the *doulos* still retained the element of unconditional subjecon to another, it yet lost the character of abject baseness. As a result of God's ɔecial election, *doulos* became a title of honour (Ps. 88[89]:3). The concept of the *oulos*, thus expanded, in turn affected one's relation to one's fellow-countrymen. He ho honoured Yahweh, the God who had chosen a people for himself, knew at the ame time that he had been joined to his community to serve them.

3. In late Palestinian Judaism the OT usage lived on. Alongside the secular use of ıese words expressions like "service of worship", "serving God", "servant of God", ccur in Essene as well as in rabbinic texts. Philo, however, shows the influence of ik. thought: the use of *doulos* and its cognates for one's relation to God was found ffensive by them and was toned down or avoided completely (*Det. Pot. Ins.* 56; cf. . H. Rengstorf, *TDNT* II 269). At the same time *doulos*, etc., took on a new ignificance in the dualistic world-view of gnosticism. Man, alienated from his home ı the light, found himself in *douleia* to cosmic powers, in the "bondage of corrupon" (cf. Rom. 8:21). The dualistic system of contrasted spirit and matter represen-ɜd man as fatefully bound to matter. Man's self of sense, desire and will, bound up in ıis world, was to him something alien and a prison from which he, the prisoner, ould not free himself. For the position of slaves in the NT era, see J. Jeremias, *erusalem in the Time of Jesus*, 1969, 312–16, cf. 110 ff., 303 ff.

T 1. *doulos* and its cognates appear very frequently in the Pauline writings in comparison to the rest of the NT. Apart from that, they occur often in Matt., less in k., Acts and Rev., rarely in Mk. and Jn. and hardly at all in the Pastorals and the atholic Epistles. Out of the 124 instances of *doulos*, 30 are in Paul, 30 in Matt. and 6 in Lk. Out of the 25 instances of *douleuō*, 17 are in Paul.

2. (a) In order to appreciate the nuances of meaning in the NT we must first see hat its attitude is to the position of the slave in society. This can be found out prinipally from the parables of Jesus. Occasionally, slaves are put in a position of esponsibility and command (Matt. 24:45). But the slave owes his master exclusive nd absolute obedience (Matt. 8:9). "No one can serve as slave to two masters" Matt. 6:24; → Possessions, art. *mamōnas*). His work earned him neither profit nor ıanks; he was only doing what he owed as a bondslave (Lk. 17:7–10). The master ould use his unlimited power over his slave – for good (Matt. 18:27) or for unmeriful punishment if he were guilty of some fault (Matt. 18:34; 25:30). The NT resists ıe contemporary verdict on slaves as a contemptible lower class by, in the first lace, the use of *doulos* in the parables of Jesus to describe the relation of all men to od. Throughout its pages the NT finds nothing objectionable in the division of

24:7). The extradition of fugitive slaves was forbidden (Deut. 23:15 f.). The nea the OT comes to recognizing the sale of minors is Exod. 21:7–11 (cf. Neh. 5:1- But one could sell oneself in cases of debt and also refuse one's freedom which law provided for after the statutory period of six years, when the master was obli to offer his slave his freedom (Exod. 21:5 f.; Lev. 23:39–55; Deut. 15:16 f.). Slav could result from insolvency (Exod. 21:2 ff.; 22:2; Deut. 15:12; cf. 1 Sam. 2 2 Ki. 4:1; Neh. 5:1–5). But the practice was condemned as inhumane by prophets (Isa. 50:1; Amos 2:6). In Egypt and Babylonia slaves could be brandec tattooed. The Israelite who chose to remain a slave after the six-year period hac have his ear pierced (Exod. 21:6; Deut. 15:17), possibly in order to allow for a ta ownership.

According to the Code of Hammurabi (*§§* 146 f.), the female slave who had bo children to her mistress's husband could not be sold. Perhaps Hagar came under same category (Gen. 16). The children of slaves remained the property of the ma (Exod. 21:4). The promiscuous use of female slaves may be inferred from Job 31 The Laws of Eshnunna and the Code of Hammurabi never considered the slave an injured party. In the OT, in the case of the slave who has been gored, it is master who is compensated (Exod. 21:32). The penalty for violating a slave girl comparatively slight "since she was not free" (Lev. 19:20). Slaves could be maltr ed, but if the slave lost a limb he was to be given his freedom, and in the case of de the master was liable to punishment (Exod. 21:20–27). On the other hand, it was visaged that the slave would work alongside his master and would participate in his religious observances including the → sabbath rest (Gen. 17:1–13, 27; Ex 12:44; 20:10; 23:12; Lev. 22:11; Deut. 5:14; 12:12, 18; 16:11, 14). The prophec Joel 2:29 (3:2) extends to the slaves, implying their full participation in the outpc ing of the → Spirit. Job 31:15 questions the moral basis of slavery in its recogni that both the slave and the free man were fashioned in the womb, and thus ha common humanity.

OT legislation provided for manumission after six years' service (Exod. 21:2 Deut. 15:12) and in the jubilee year (Lev. 25:39–43, 47–55). A girl sold as a b was to be released if the master or his sons did not take her (Exod. 21:7–11). A sl permanently maimed by his master was to be freed, though without compensa (Exod. 21:26 f.). Asylum was to be granted to the fugitive (Deut. 23:15 f.). (F fuller discussion of the conditions of slavery in Israel see R. de Vaux, *Ancient Isr Its Life and Institutions*, 1961, 80–90, and the various specialist studies noted in bibliography below.)

The concept of the *doulos* in the sense of a chattel gave expression to the rela between a subject and his king under the despotic monarchies of the Near East. ruler's absolute power is in contrast to the most abject subservience and sla dependence. He who calls himself a *doulos* acknowledges that another has po over him. Even the highest official, the vizier, is a servant in his relation to the k Hence the title "servant" can be one of honour, which is borne by important fig in the OT like Moses, David or the prophets, who are called "servants of God" Jos. 14:7A; 24:29; Jdg. 2:18; 2 Ki. 17:23; Pss. 89[88]:3; 105[104]:42; Isa. 48 Dan. 3:5; cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 5:39).

2. This courtly, ceremonial language is adopted in worship to describe the rela of God and man (especially in 1–2 Ki.). *douleuō* is the most usual LXX word

K. H. Rengstorf, *TDNT* II 261). Because *douleuō* involved the abrogation of one's own autonomy and the subordination of one's will to that of another, the Greek felt only revulsion and contempt for the position of a slave. The *doulos* could take part in the domestic worship. Nor was he always treated barbarously; he could be humanely treated (Menander). He had an equal status with free men in the Eleusinian mysteries. Yet on the whole, the life of the slave was one of unrelieved compulsory labour and service in the household and in public works. The ideal of freedom was limited by Plato (*Laws* 4, 715D) to counteract the arbitrary decisions of the Sophists: he put forward the concept of the *nomos* (→ law) to guarantee the maintenance of the independent city-state. Only in the phrase *douleuein tois nomois*, "to serve the laws", is the *doulos* group of words shown in a favourable and honourable light. The idea of serving the gods appears first in the Cynic Stoics (Epictetus, *Dissertationes* 3, 22, 69; 3, 22, 82; 3, 22, 95). The concept *doulos tou theou*, "slave of God", is significantly absent in Epictetus; *douloi* for him are still a despised class. The object of the worship of the gods is in fact freedom from all internal and external ties (Epictetus, *Dissertationes* 3, 22, 49). Similarly the Stoic wise man so excused himself from all obligation to serve the community (cf. the Stoic concept of world-citizenship) that he made himself a free servant of his neighbour. It remained peculiar to Gk. thought that man found his true worth only in being conscious of himself and in the free development of his potential. Hence, *douleuein* in the sense of dependence and subordination in service is debasing and contemptible (Epictetus, *Dissertationes* 4, 1, 7 ff.).

OT 1. The *doulos* group of words, with few exceptions (e.g. Isa. 52:13, *pais*, servant [of God]; → Child; → Son), is used in the OT to translate the root *'bd* and its derivatives. The memory of Israel's experiences in their captivity in → Egypt, "the house of slaves" (*bêṯ ᵃḇàḏîm*; LXX *oikos douleias*, Exod. 13:3, 14) lingered on and was the main source of this root's essential meaning: it was distinguished from its synonyms (e.g. *diakoneō*) by its emphasis on the service being that of a slave, i.e. on a repressive or at least dependent form of service under the complete control of a superior. The recollection of their Egyptian bondage also determined (Deut. 15:12 ff.) the free Israelite's treatment of Hebrew slaves (*'eḇeḏ 'iḇrî*, Exod. 21:2). Slave laws regulated the treatment and manumission of a slave who was a Jew by birth. His master alone had the right to his work; his person remained inviolable (cf. Exod. 21:2–11; Lev. 25:35 ff.; Deut. 15:12 ff.). On the other hand, the non-Jewish, Canaanite slave (*'eḇeḏ kᵉnaʿᵃnî*, cf. Lev. 25:44 ff.) was valued like the rest of his chattels and was treated as such.

Many slaves in the ancient Near East were captives taken in war (cf. Num. 31:7 ff.; Deut. 20:10 ff.; 1 Ki. 20:39; 2 Chr. 28:8 ff.). Some were presented to the tabernacle or temple (Num. 31:32–47; Jos. 9:23–27; Ezr. 8:20; Ezek. 44:7 ff.), and others to military leaders (Deut. 20:10–14; 21:10; Jdg. 5:30). But the majority belonged to the king, and slaves played an important part in Israelite economy under the monarchy (1 Ki. 9:21, 27; 2 Chr. 8:18; 9:12). Both the OT and the Code of Hammurabi (*§§* 32, 133 ff.) sought to mitigate their lot by making certain provisions for the welfare of slaves, but they did not condemn the practice outright. Some foreign slaves appear to have been imported into Israel (cf. 1 Chr. 2:34 f.), but the kidnapping and selling of an Israelite was a capital offence (Exod. 21:16; Deut.

chains and bondage, liberation from these is part of the salvation that he awai "Saying to the prisoners, 'Come forth,' and to those who are in darkness, 'Appear (Isa. 49:9; cf. also 42:7). The hymn of praise sung by those that have been fre recalls their servitude in → Egypt: "He brought them out of darkness and gloom, a broke their bonds asunder. Let them thank the LORD for his steadfast love" (107:14; cf. 116:16).

2. As with *zygos*, → yoke, *desmos* can refer to that true relationship with God, t bond and covenant between him and man. Hosea speaks of the cords of divine lc with which Yahweh seeks to bind his people to himself (Hos. 11:4). Jeremiah co plains of the godless nation that had torn off Yahweh's cords (Jer. 2:20; 5:5; cf. 1 combination of *desmos* and *diarrhēgnymi*, tears, in Ps. 2:3; Nah. 1:13).

NT In the NT *desmos* (18 times) and *desmios* (16 times) chiefly occur in the Synoj Gospels (particularly Lk. and Acts) and in the Pauline writings. Here too the sense is more conspicuous than the spiritualized.

1. Like Samson, the Gerasene demoniac tore his fetters apart (Lk. 8:29). Pil was wont to release a prisoner at the festivals (Matt. 27:15 f.). The earthquake br the shackles of the prisoners in the gaol at Philippi (Acts 16:25 ff.). But above *desmos* is mentioned in connexion with Paul's path of suffering. In his farewell dress to the Ephesian elders he speaks of the fetters and the tribulations that aw him in → Jerusalem (Acts 20:23). Luke describes Paul's arrest in detail (A 21:18 ff.; cf. the designation *ho desmios Paulos*, the prisoner Paul, Acts 23: 25:14, 27; 28:17). But Luke also stresses that Paul was unlawfully imprisoned (A 23:29; 26:31), showing the apostle as a prototype of the suffering of the innoc martyr.

2. In his captivity epistles Paul sometimes calls himself *desmios Christou Iēs* the prisoner of Christ Jesus (Phlm. 9; cf. Eph. 3:1; 4:1; the gen. denotes possessic In Phil. he connects his imprisonment with Christ and his gospel (Phil. 1:7, 13 f., The significance that Paul here gives to it lies in the fact that it furthers the progi and spread of the gospel. On the one hand, it has got around in the prison elsewhere that he wears his fetters for Christ's sake; on the other hand, because h in prison, the rest of the brethren venture the more fearlessly to proclaim the go of Christ (Phil. 1:12 ff.).

3. Occasionally *desmos* also occurs in a figurative sense. The dumbness (I 7:35) or paralysis (Lk. 13:16) of a person can be called a fetter with which they bound. This bondage is not only physical; rather, the NT often saw its underly cause in demonic powers. Eph. 4:3 speaks of → peace, and Col. 3:14 of → love as *syndesmos*, the divine bond that binds believers together (cf. Hos. 11:4) and them free. *H.-G. Link*

δοῦλος

δοῦλος (*doulos*), slave; *δουλεία* (*douleia*), slavery; *δουλ* (*douleuō*), be subject, serve.

CL For the Attic Gk., personal freedom was his prized possession. To be indepenc of others and to manage his own life and to live as he chooses is of the essenc such freedom. The *doulos* belonged by nature not to himself, but to someone else

1. In representing deportation by the Gentiles as God's final punishment (Lk. 21:24) NT apocalyptic echoes the OT's horror at the idea of captivity. It is significant that Lk. 4:18 (quoting Isa. 61:1) explicitly includes among Jesus' saving acts the freeing of prisoners. The NT understood Jesus' freeing as both the facilitating and improving of human relations and the reconciling encounter of God with man. In two OT quotations *aichmalōsia* occurs in a modified sense. On Eph. 4:8 (= Ps. 68:18) → Heaven, art. *anabainō* NT 5). Rev. 13:10 adapts Jer. 15:2 and Matt. 26:52 (cf. G. R. Beasley-Murray, *The Book of Revelation, New Century Bible*, 1974, 214 f.). The former was a message of judgment directed to Jerusalem; but in the case of the church the Christian may be called to suffer captivity for his faith. However, he must not resort to force of arms, as Peter did in Gethsemane. The truth of the verse was appallingly illustrated in the fate of many Jews during the Jewish war. In 2 Tim. 3:6 *aichmalōtizō* now simply means capture.

2. Reflecting on his Christian experience, Paul writes: "For I delight in the law of God, in my inmost self, but I see in my members another law at war with the law of my mind and making me captive to the law of sin which dwells in my members" Rom. 7:22f.; → *doulos*; → I Am, art. *egō eimi*, NT 2 (c)). On the other hand, his concept of the new life as an exclusive union with the Lord allows him to use *aichmalōtizō* of the service of Christ: "We lead every thought into captivity to make them subject to Christ" (2 Cor. 10:5; cf. 2:11; 3:14; 4:4).

3. Paul refers to the imprisonment that he shared with them (→ *desmios*) when he calls various Christians who are particularly close to him *synaichmalōtoi*, fellow prisoners (Rom. 16:7; Col. 4:10; Phlm. 23). *H.-G. Link, R. Tuente*

δέσμιος

δεσμεύω (*desmeuō*), bind (with bonds); *δέσμη* (*desmē*), bundle; *δέσμιος* (*desmios*), prisoner; *δεσμός* (*desmos*), bond, tether, imprisonment; *δεσμωτήριον* (*desmōtērion*), prison; *δεσμώτης* (*desmōtēs*), prisoner; *δεσμοφύλαξ* (*desmophylax*), prison warder; *σύνδεσμος* (*syndesmos*), that which binds together, bond, fetter.

The root *desm-* conveys the basic meaning of bind. *desmeuō* means to bind together, chain up (Eur. onwards). *desmē* is a bundle tied together (Dem. onwards). *desmios* means one who is in chains or in prison (tragedians onwards). *desmos* at first meant chain (Homer onwards), and later imprisonment, custody. *desmōtērion* is a prison (Hdt. onwards), *desmōtēs* a prisoner (Aesch. onwards) and *desmophylax* a prison warder (Lucian).

syndesmos (Eur. onwards) can mean either the chain that holds one or the means of fastening something, the binding that holds things together. All these words are used in a physical rather than a spiritual sense.

desmos is the most frequently used of these words in the LXX; it usually translates forms of *'āsar*, to bind, and the cognate *môsēr*, bonds.

1. In the OT the lit. sense is dominant: sheafs are bound together (Gen. 37:7, *desmeuō*), a donkey is tied to a vine (Gen. 49:11, *desmeuō*), Joseph is thrown into prison by Potiphar (Gen. 39:22, *desmōtērion*) and Samson is bound with cords (Jdg. 15:13 f., *desmos*). Because man in the OT suffers from the humiliation inflicted by

or *syndesmos* can also refer to a liberating union, *douleia* to service for the cor munity, and *zygos* to the → yoke of wisdom. Thus it is possible to make use of tl *doulos* group of words to designate man's relationship to God. The *libertinos* w one who had formerly been a slave, but who was now a free man. For servant → al Child art. *pais* and for the Servant of the Lord → Son. → also Freedom, → Serve, Yoke.

αἰχμάλωτος

αἰχμάλωτος (*aichmalōtos*), captive, prisoner of wa αἰχμαλωτίζω (*aichmalōtizō*), capture, take captiv αἰχμαλωτεύω (*aichmalōteuō*), capture, put in prison; αἰχμαλωσία (*aichmalōsia*), ca tivity.

CL *aichmalōtos* means lit. one caught by the spear (from *aichmē*, spear, lance, th also war, and *haliskomai*, take prisoner). It is used to denote a prisoner of w (Aesch. onwards). The later vb. *aichmalōtizō* (Diod. Sic. onwards) means take as prisoner of war, take prisoner; *aichmalōteuō*, lead away into captivity. Another no *aichmalōsia*, captivity, also belongs to this group.

OT 1. *aichmalōtos* occurs 25 times in the LXX and usually translates various for of the root *šāḇâh*, lead off as captive (Num. 21:29; Isa. 14:2), or *gālâh*, go in exile (Amos 6:7; Isa. 5:13, etc.). The noun *aichmalōsia* is far more frequent (1 times), translating *šᵉḇî*, imprisonment, prisoners, or other derivatives of the ro *šāḇâh* or *gôlâh/gālûṯ*, leading away, banishment, exile. Usually it refers to t Babylonian exile or the exiles (e.g. Ezek. 1:1 f.; Isa. 45:13; Jer. 1:3). The same H roots were also translated by the vbs. *aichmalōteuō* (45 times) and *aichmalōtizō* (times), lead into captivity.

2. Originally Israel had no experience of prisoners of war. The holy war w waged under Yahweh's orders for the complete annihilation of the enemy (e.g. J 6:17–21; 1 Sam. 15:3). Those taken in the war met the same fate (cf. Jdg. 7:2 Gradually, however, some pity for their enemies showed itself (Jos. 6:22 f.; 1 Sa 15:8 f.) and the victors began to sell prisoners as slaves. Women were often regard as part of the booty (Gen. 34:29; Num. 31:9; Deut. 21:10 ff.). The problem prisoners first crops up in the history of Israel with the exile, i.e. when whole grou of the Israelite population were deported by Assyria and Babylon. For the Israeli the horror of captivity did not merely lie in their being given up into the hands brutal men ill-disposed to them. Rather, banishment from their own land me above all the loss of their claim to that well-being promised and given by Yahweh Israel as a pledge of his → covenant. To live in a foreign and hostile land was t tamount to being cut off from fellowship with the creator and guarantor of one's o existence (cf. Ps. 137[136]:1 ff.). Hence the tradition of the people of Israel led th to regard both captivity and banishment as a punishment inflicted by an angry G (Jer. 15:2 juxtaposes *aichmalōsia*, death or plague, sword and famine; cf. 77[78]:61 f.).

NT In contrast to a mass of OT references this group of words occurs in only passages in the NT.

9:13 *kathizō* could be used either transitively, meaning that Pilate placed Jesus on ıe judgment seat as an act of mockery, or intransitively, that he sat on it himself; ither would be grammatically possible, but God (Rev. 20:11) and Christ in glory Matt. 25:31) are described as sitting on thrones to give judgment.

4. Jesus customarily sat down to teach, whether in the open air (e.g. Matt. 5:1; 3:1–2) or in the temple court (Matt. 26:55). In the synagogues it was customary for ıe preacher to stand to read the Scriptures and to sit to expound them (Lk. :16–21). The expression "Moses' seat" (Matt. 23:2) may therefore be figurative, inicating the authority of the teacher who, like Moses, speaks in God's name (cf. our rofessorial "chair", and the "sophist's seat" mentioned in a third-century Greek inɔription). See, however, the next paragraph.

5. The worshippers in the synagogue apparently sat (Acts 13:14), and Christian ′orship followed the same pattern (Acts 2:2; 20:9; 1 Cor. 14:30). The most respec-ɔd members of the synagogue congregation sat in the front seats (Mk. 12:39), a ractice which led to unhealthy class distinction (Jas. 2:2–4). There is later evidence ɔr a special chair ("Moses' seat") for the chief elder of the synagogue, which may be ɛferred to in Matt. 23:2, though it is doubtful if the term was used in this literal sense ɔ early.

6. As in the OT, sitting on the ground was a mark of humiliation (Jas. 2:3). ſary's sitting by Jesus' feet (Lk. 10:39) was a sign of humility. Sitting in sackcloth nd ashes as a sign of penitence is still known (Lk. 10:13), and beggars sit on the round to ask for gifts (Matt. 10:46; Jn. 9:8).

7. In the NT it was common to recline at meals, particularly on more formal or ɛstive occasions; the words for "sit" are never used in this connexion. (*anaklinomai*, *napiptō*, *anakeimai* and other words for "recline" are translated "sit at table" in ıany English versions, which correctly conveys the sense, but not the cultural pat-ɛrn.) As in the synagogue, the place assigned is a mark of the guest's importance, ıe closest to the host being the most prestigious (Lk. 14:7–10; Mk. 12:39). Hence ıe significance of the "beloved disciple's" position at the last supper, "lying close to ıe breast of Jesus" (Jn. 13:23, 25; 21:20); this was the position on the right of Jesus he left elbow being used to support the body), the place of a trusted friend, and one ′hich allowed confidential conversation. *R. T. France*

. Schneider, *kathēmai* etc., *TDNT* III 440–444; W. S. McCullough, "Seat", and N. Turner, "Seat, ſoses' ", *IDB* IV, 259–260; J. Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, 1966², 48 f. (on reclining at ıeals).

lave, Servant, Captive, Prisoner, Freedman

he various groups of words dealt with in this article each express in their own way ıe dependence and forcible subjection of men: *aichmalōtos* denotes a prisoner of ′ar, *desmios* one who is in chains, and *doulos*, a slave. Naturally in their literal sense, ıese words take on a negative and depreciatory colouring (for the opposite → Lord). ut when used figuratively, they can at least in part lose the sense of compulsion and ave a more positive sense. Here paradoxically dependence can be seen, not as an ıforced loss of one's self, but also as an independent self-realization. Hence, *desmos*

quired also an intransitive sense, and became a synonym of the other verbs list
Sitting was often a mark of honour or authority in the ancient world: a king sat
receive his subjects, a court to give judgment, and a teacher to teach. The gene
practice at meals in the Graeco-Roman world was not to sit on chairs but to recl
on couches placed round three sides of the table (hence the Lat. *triclinium*, "th
couches", i.e. dining-room).

OT In the LXX *kathēmai* and *kathizō* almost always translate Heb. *yāšaḇ*, which l
a wider range of meaning than sit, including dwell and → remain.

Of the many different situations in which people sit in the OT, the following
significant. 1. The king sits on his throne (→ Might, art. *thronos*) as a mark
authority. To sit at his right hand is a mark of the highest honour (e.g. 1 Ki. 2:19;
Ps. 110[109]:1; → Hand, art. *dexia*); in 1 Sam. 2:8 to sit with princes is a picture
the highest exaltation. God, as king, also sits enthroned in → heaven (1 Ki. 22:
Pss. 2:4; 29:10; etc.). 2. The court, or judge, sits to give → judgment (Ex
18:13–14; Dan. 7:9–10, 26). 3. A respected elder sits while others stand (J
29:7–8). 4. A teacher sits among his pupils (2 Ki. 6:32; Ezek. 8:1). 5. David "
before the LORD" (2 Sam. 7:18) – a privilege apparently reserved for the king, adı
brating perhaps the privilege exercised by the royal priest of Ps. 110:1, 4 (cf. H
1:3, etc.) in contrast to the priests of Aaron's line (Heb. 10:1 ff.).

In all the above, sitting is a mark of honour and authority. It is usually clear tha
such cases a throne or seat was used. To sit on the ground, by contrast, is a mark
abasement. It is the characteristic attitude of the sufferer (Job 2:8), the mourner (
137[136]:1), the humiliated (Isa. 47:1), the penitent (Ezra 9:3–4; Jon. 3:6), and
suppliant (Jdg. 20:26; 2 Sam. 7:18).

For most of the OT period it was normal to sit at table (1 Sam. 20:5, 18, 25; 1
13:20). The custom of reclining clearly appears first in the Persian period (Est. 1
7:8), and is common during the Hellenistic period.

NT The NT also mentions people sitting in a wide variety of situations, includ
most of those listed under OT.

1. For sitting (on a throne) as the proper posture of the king see, e.g., Acts 12:
Rev. 18:7. So God, as king, is constantly described in Rev. as "the one who sits
the throne" (e.g. Rev. 4:2–10; 5:1–13; 6:16; 7:10–17; 21:5; cf. Matt. 23:22). It
mark of the glory of Christ that he has been given the seat at God's right hand (M
14:62 and many other allusions to Ps. 110[109]:1; Eph. 1:20), or even shares
very throne of God (Rev. 3:21). So, having completed his work of redemption, h
now seated in the place of supreme authority, until all opposition is finally destro
(Heb. 1:3–4; 10:11–13).

2. It is a remarkable extension of this idea that the believer, who is "in Chri
shares this exalted position. James and John asked for this place of honour as a p
sonal right (Mk. 10:37–40), and it was refused. But the Christian's union with Ch
means that God has "raised us up with him and made us sit with him in the heave
places" (Eph. 2:6). He even offers us a place on the throne which he himself sha
with the Father (Rev. 3:21; cf. Matt. 19:28).

3. The seated position of the judge or court (Acts 6:15; 23:3; 26:30) leads to
transitive use of *kathizō* as a term for the appointment of judges (1 Cor. 6:4). In

961; F. Greeves, *The Meaning of Sin*, 1956; H. W. Heidland, *oregomai, orexis*, *TDNT* V 447 f.; J. Hick, *Evil and the God of Love*, 1966; K. G. Kuhn, "New Light on Temptation, Sin and Flesh in the New Testament", in K. Stendahl, ed., *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, 1957, 94–113; S. Lyonnet nd L. Sabourin, *Sin, Redemption and Sacrifice: A Biblical and Patristic Study*, *Analecta Biblica* 48, 970; R. Mackintosh, *Christianity and Sin*, 1913; B. F. Malina, "Some Observations on the Origin of in in Judaism and St. Paul", *CBQ* 31, 1969, 18–34; W. Michaelis, *piptō*, *TDNT* V 161 ff.; G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, I, 460–96; R. S. Moxon, *The Doctrine of Sin: A Critical and Historical Investigation nto the Views of the Concept of Sin held in Early Christian, Mediaeval and Modern Times*, 1922; J. Müller, *The Christian Doctrine of Sin*, I–II, 1885; J. Murray, *The Imputation of Adam's Sin*, 1959; R. Niebuhr, *The Nature and Destiny of Man, Gifford Lectures*, I, 1943, 178–264; J. Orr, *Sin as a Problem f Today*, 1910; J. Pedersen, *Israel, Its Life and Culture*, I–II, 1926, 411–37; S. Perubčan, *Sin in the ld Testament*, 1963; G. Quell, G. Bertram, G. Stählin, and W. Grundmann, *hamartanō* etc., *TDNT* I 67–316; G. von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, I, 1962, 157–64, 262–67; J. Schneider, *parabainō* etc., *TDNT* V 736–44; G. Schrenk, *adikos* etc., *TDNT* I 149–63; C. Ryder Smith, *The Bible Doctrine of Sin nd of the Ways of God with Sinners*, 1953; W. D. Stacey, *The Pauline View of Man*, 1956; F. R. Tennant, *The Sources of the Doctrine of the Fall and Original Sin*, 1903; and *The Concept of Sin*, 1912; G. Vandervelde, *Original Sin: Two Major Trends in Contemporary Roman Catholic Reinterpretation*, 975; S. J. De Vries, "Sin, Sinners", *IDB* IV 361–76; J. G. Williams, "A Note on the 'Unforgivable Sin' ogion", *NTS* 12, 1965–66, 75 ff.; N. P. Williams, *The Ideas of the Fall and of Original Sin, Bampton ectures*, 1927; H. W. Wolff, *Anthropology of the Old Testament*, 1974.

b). E. Beaucamp, *Donnés bibliques pour une Réfléxion sur le Péché*, 1963; J. Becker, *Das Heil Gottes. Heils- und Sündenbegriff in den Qumrantexten*, 1964; F. Bennewitz, *Die Sünde im alten Israel*, 1907; Das Böse. *Studien aus dem Carl Gustav Jung Institut, Zürich*, 13, 1961; G. Braumann, "Die Schuldner nd die Sünderin. Luk. vii. 36–50", *NTS* 10, 1963–64, 487–93; H. Dee, "Vergebung der Sünden", *EvTh* 26, 1966, 540 ff. (cf. H. Gollwitzer, "Zu H. Dee, 'Vergebung der Sünden' ", *EvTh* 26, 1966, 652 f.); G. Fitzer, "Die Sünde wider den heiligen Geist", *ThZ* 13, 1957, 161 ff.; J. Freundorfer, *Erbsünde nd Erbtod beim Apostel Paulus*, 1927; G. Friedrich. "*hamartia ouk ellogeitai*, Röm. 5, 13", *TLZ* 77, 952, 523 ff.; J. Haas, *Die Stellung Jesu zu Sünde und Sünder nach den vier Evangelien*, 1953; E. Hirsch, *Schöpfung und Sünde*, 1931; W. Jetter, "Sünde", in *Theologie für Nichttheologen*, IV, 1965, 31; A. Kirchgässner, *Erlösung und Sünde im Neuen Testament*, 1950; M. A. Klopfstein, *šqr*, *THAT* II 010–19; R. Knierim, *Die Hauptbegriffe für Sünde im Alten Testament*, 1965; *ḥṭ'*, *THAT* I 541–49; *'l*, *THAT* I 920 f.; *'āwel*, *THAT* II 224–28; and *'āwôn*, *THAT* II 243–49; K. Koch, "Sühne und Sündenvergebung um die Wende von der exilischen zur nachexilischen Zeit", *EvTh* 26, 1966, 217 ff.; K. Koch, L. Goppelt and P. Jacobs, "Sünde und Schuld", *EKL* III 1217 ff.; J. Köberle, *Sünde und Gnade n religiösen Leben des Volkes Israel*, 1905; K. G. Kuhn, "*peirasmos – hamartia – sarx* im Neuen Testament und die damit zusammenhängenden Vorstellungen", *ZTK* 49, 1952, 200 ff.; E. Lövestam, *Spiritus blasphemia*. Eine Studie zu Mk. 3, 28 f. par. Mt. 12, 31 f.; Lk. 12, 10", *Scripta Minora Societatis Humaniorum Lundensis*, 1966–67, 1 ff.; S. Lyonnet, *De Peccato et Redemptione*, I, 1958; G. Mensching, T. C. Vriezen, E. Lohse, K. Stendahl, E. Kinder, W. Joest, K. E. Løgstrup, E. Engisch, and W. Rott, "Sünde und Schuld", *RGG*^{3} VI 476 ff.; R. Otto, *Sünde und Urschuld*, 1932; P. Palazzini, ed., *Il Peccato*, 1959; E. Schweizer, "Die Sünde in den Gliedern", in *Abraham, unser Vater*, Festschrift Otto Michel, 1963, 437 ff.; W. Staerk, *Sünde und Gnade nach der Vorstellung des älteren Judentums*, 1905; H. Thyen, *Studien zur Sündenvergebung im Neuen Testament und seinen alttestamentlichen und üdischen Voraussetzungen*, *FRLANT* 96, 1970; H. Vogel, "Die Sünde im biblischen Verständnis", *EvTh* 19, 1959, 439 ff.; L. van den Wijngaert, "Die Sünde in der priesterlichen Urgeschichte", *Theologie und Philosophie* 43, 1969, 35–50.

Sit

κάθημαι

κάθημαι (*kathēmaí*), sit; *καθέζομαι* (*kathezomaí*), sit; *καθίζω* (*kathizō*), sit, cause to sit; *καθέδρα* (*kathedra*), eat; *πρωτοκαθεδρία* (*prōtokathedria*) and *πρωτοκλισία* (*prōtoklisia*), best seat, place f honour.

L While *kathizō* was originally a transitive verb, to cause someone to sit, it early ac-

and deliberate sinning against God (*peša'*, rebellion, Job 36:9; Ezek. 14:11; 18:2 *ma'al*, unfaithfulness; *'āwel*, injustice, Ezek. 3:20; 18:26). There are only isolated i stances of its meaning unintentional sins committed in weakness (Ps. 19[18]:12) a negligence in official duties (Dan. 6:5). As an alternative word for sin, *paraptōr* always means the individual lapse.

NT 1. The vb. only occurs in the NT in Heb. 6:6, and its use there is probably to understood as reflecting that of the Heb. *mā'al*. The readers were seeming meant to take it as fall away, be unfaithful, similar to *aphistēmi* (→ Fall) in Heb. 3: and the expression used in Heb. 10:26. This is certainly not meant in the sense o single lapse but rather expresses their whole position, as one of the abandonment the Christian truth. This would, of course, show itself in specific behaviour in i dividual cases. The idea is one of man's self-rejection by his rejection of the gra continually offered to him (→ Fall, art. *piptō*; cf. I. H. Marshall, *Kept by the Power God: A Study of Perseverance and Falling Away*, 1969, 132–54).

2. Apart from the Pauline writings, the noun is only found in the NT in Ma 6:14 f. par. Lk. 11:25 f. As in the OT, it is used as one of several words for sin, b emphasizes strongly the deliberate act (only in Rom. 5:20 is it used of a univer fact) with its fateful consequences. Hence, figuratively it means an action throu which man falls and loses the position that God gave him. Thus trespasses comm ted by one man against another directly affect man's relation to God and in the fir judgment provide the standard by which he is judged (Matt. 6:14 f. par. Lk. 11:25 Thus a man must be helped to put any failure right (Gal. 6:1). The first sinful act the beginning (Rom. 5:15 ff.; cf. Wis. 10:1) brought in its train a mass of sin and w (Rom. 5:18, 20), and even → death (5:15, 17 f.), and that in such a way that ev before his physical death man was in the power of death (Eph. 2:1, 5; Col. 2:1 Thus Christ was given up to death (Rom. 4:25) in order that we might receive forgiveness for our sins (2 Cor. 5:19; Eph. 1:7; Col. 2:13). According to Ro 11:11 f., Israel's fall consists in its rejection of the gospel. *W. Bauder*

→ Adam, → Anger, → Conversion, → Death, → Demon, → Evil, → Faith, → Fall, Forgiveness, → Grace, → Guilt, → Hard, → Hell, → Judgment, → Law, → Lie, Reconciliation, → Redemption, → Righteousness, → Sacrifice, → Satan, → Tem

(a). C. K. Barrett, "*ho adikēsas* (2 Cor. 7, 12)", in O. Böcher and K. Haacker, eds., *Verborum Veri Festschrift für Gustav Stählin zum 70. Geburtstag*, 1970, 149–58; K. Barth, "God and Nothingne *CD* III, 3, 289–368; "The Pride and Fall of Man", *CD* IV, 1, 358–513; "The Sloth and Misery Man", *CD* IV, 2, 378–498; "The Falsehood and Condemnation of Man", *CD* IV, 3, 368–480; *Christ and Adam: Man and Humanity in Romans 5*, *SJT Occasional Papers* 5, 1956; M. Ba "Speaking of Sin (Some Interpretative Notes on Romans 1.18–3.20)", *SJT* 8, 1955, 288–96; J. Bauer, "Sin", *EBT* III 849–62; G. C. Berkouwer, *Sin*, 1971; E. J. Bicknell, *The Christian Idea of and Original Sin in the Light of Modern Knowledge*, 1923[2]; A. Büchler, *Studies in Sin and Atonen in the Rabbinic Literature of the First Century*, 1928; F. Büchsel, *thymos*, *TDNT* III 167–72; Bornkamm, "Sin, Law and Death (Romans 7)", in *Early Christian Experience*, 1969, 87–104; E. Br ner, *Man in Revolt*, 1947, 114–211; and *Dogmatics, II, The Christian Doctrine of Creation Redemption*, 1952, 89–132; R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, I, 1952, 239–53; "Adam and Christ according to Romans 5", in W. Klassen and G. F. Snyder, eds., *Current Issue New Testament Interpretation: Essays in Honor of Otto A. Piper*, 1962, 143–65; E. La B. Cherbonn *Hardness of Heart*, 1955; C. E. B. Cranfield, "On Some of the Problems in the Interpretatior Romans 5.12", *SJT* 22, 1969, 324–41; and *The Epistle to the Romans*, I, *ICC*, 1975; W. D. Dav *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*, 1955[2], 17–35; D. Daube, *Sin, Ignorance and Forgiveness in the B*

romise. Therefore *parabasis* can no longer be the main content of the concept of sin s it was for the Jews. Sin is measured by God himself and no longer by the law lone. Only in Rom. 4:14–20 is sin as a universal fact referred to as a transgression *parabasis* is used here as a synonym of → *paraptōma*). This is because → Adam is a ype of sin as the transgressing of God's commandment.

(c) Christ renders the way of the law as a way of salvation powerless. It is replaced y → the way of faith in Christ. From it comes → righteousness (Gal. 3:22 ff., etc.). hus the question arises as to what part the law now plays. Paul's answer in Gal. :19 is that the law's purpose in the history of salvation lies in its function of showing in to be sin. It stirs man up to transgress and so leads him to sin and thus, it leads im to Christ (Rom. 7:7–12).

3. (a) 1 Tim. 2:14 amplifies Rom. 5:14 in the light of the narrative of Gen. 2 f. On ıe rôle of Eve → Adam, art. *Heua*. In all these passages the original fact of human in is presented as a rebellion against God and his commandment.

(b) Heb. 2:2 and 9:15 speak of *parabasis* in the context of the OT dispensation. he allusion to the punishing of *parabasis* and *parakoē*, disobedience, in the OT erves to underline the warning in Heb. 2:2 against neglecting the salvation given in hrist. Heb. 9:15 stresses the significance of Jesus' death as redemption from the ansgressions committed under the first covenant.

4. *aparabatos* only occurs in the NT in Heb. 7:24, where it retains a clear echo of ıe lit. meaning. The OT priesthood, which according to v. 11 was tied up with the ıw and thus was liable to be violated and transgressed, is contrasted with Jesus' riesthood which is an eternal one that is not exposed to any *parabasis* (→ Priest).

W. Günther

παράπτωμα

παραπίπτω (*parapiptō*), fall beside, go astray, err, sin; παράπτωμα (*paraptōma*), transgression, trespass, false ep, sin.

L *parapiptō* (from the time of Hdt. found with *kata tychēn*, accidental) means to fall beside, fall at the side; thence, accidentally bump into something, turn up mewhere or other; and then (Polyb. onwards), to turn out amiss, miss one's way or ıe truth, fail in one's duty. Used absolutely it means make a mistake, err, meaning ı accidental and excusable oversight.

Correspondingly the noun *paraptōma* (Polyb. onwards) means oversight, error, istake (unintentional). Here the originally fig. sense was that someone deviated to ıe one side or the other.

r In the LXX both the noun and the vb. are found most frequently in Ezek. *paraptōma* translates 6 different Heb. words and is found at Job 35:15; 36:9; ss. 19(18):12; 22(21):1; Wis. 3:13; 10:2; Zech. 9:5; Ezek. 3:20; 14:11, 13; 15:8; 3:22, 24, 26; 20:27; Dan. 4:24 (Theodotion); 6:5(4), 23(22). *parapiptō* translates 3 eb. vbs. and is found at Est. 6:10; Wis. 6:9; 12:2; Ezek. 14:13; 15:8; 18:24; 20:27; 2:4; 2 Macc. 10:4. The vb. usually translates the Heb. *mā'al*, (deliberately) commit ts of unfaithfulness (used with the sub. *paraptōma* in Ezek. 14:13; 15:8; 18:24; 0:27; → Fall, art. *aphistēmi*). The noun too is used for words expressing conscious

noun *parabasis* is associated with more general concepts rather than with concr individual commandments: → way, → word and → covenant. Thence it derives basic meaning in the LXX to neglect God, to break the covenant, to fail to maint the correct (obedient) relationship to God. *parabasis* occurs only at 2 Ki. 2:24; 101(100):3; Wis. 14:31; 2 Macc. 15:10.

NT The NT's use of these concepts follows on from that of the OT. While → *adi* and *anomia* are conceived of in more general terms and refer to injustice in sense of anti-social and unlawful actions, and on the other hand *asebeia*, irrevere (→ Godliness), and *hamartia* are directly orientated towards the person of G *parabasis* is related to God's gracious ordinances, such as his → covenant (H 9:15) and → law (Rom. 2:23 ff.; 4:15; Jas. 2:9–11), his → commandment and tr tion (Matt. 15:2 f.).

Because the OT ordinances of God, particularly the → law (art. *nomos*), appea a completely new light on account of the Christ-event, → *hamartia* becomes the sential idea of sin, while *parabasis* decreases sharply in importance. *aparabatos* *hyperbainō* occur only once each in the NT (Heb. 7:24 and 1 Thess. 4:6).

1. (a) In Matt. 15:1 ff. *parabainō* is associated with *paradosis*, tradition Teach) and *entolē*, commandment (→ Command). Jesus is attacking the superfic ity of the → Pharisees' observance of the law. He turns the charge of *parabasis* b on the Pharisees and shows that, when the *basileia*, the → kingdom arrives, it is the Pharisaic law that matters but the new dispensation, e.g. as it is described in Sermon on the Mount. The OT law is not abandoned (cf. Matt. 5:17 f.); but in light of this new dispensation the *paradosis*, tradition, of the Pharisees is shown tc but a human ordinance.

(b) The original spatial meaning of these words is still recognizable in Acts 1: Judas' sin consisted in his abandoning the *topos*, the place or position of service apostleship, in order to go his own way. (*hodos*, way, would be more in keeping v the OT and Jewish way of putting it; but the metaphor still has the same spa perspective.) Judas has abandoned his discipleship.

2. Almost all the instances of the nouns *parabasis* and *parabatēs* are found in Pauline writings. Jas. 2:9 ff. is an exception, and there the influence of Jewish usag clearly present. Sin is here understood as transgression of the law. As in Matt. 15 also in Paul the → law is no longer central in the Christian faith. It has been displa from its function as a way of salvation by *pistis*, faith, which is made poss through the coming, the death and the resurrection of Jesus Christ. Hence the c cept chiefly appears in Paul where he is involved in argument with the Jev theology of the law.

(a) The Jews are shown by their transgression of the law to stand before Goc sinners like the Gentiles (Rom. 2:17–29). They are ostensibly striving to ob God's righteousness, but their actions show that they fall far short of it. Yet G claim on both Jew and Gentile is binding (Rom. 2:14 f.). God is still the judge v demands good works, even of Christians (Rom. 1:18–3:20; 2 Cor. 5:10; Judgment).

(b) Faith in Christ does not replace the law, but it provides a way to righteousr even for those who do not know the law and therefore cannot transgress it. By f they can become children of → Abraham (Rom. 4:13–16) and receive a share in

Eph. 6:9; Col. 4:1; Phlm. 16) was not due to the fact that there were no Christian masters. Slaves are given a new dignity. "The social code in 1 Peter is unique among those in the NT because it bases its instructions to slaves on the example of Christ who took the form of a slave (Phil. 2:7) and bore the punishments, reviling, beating, crucifixion of a slave" (op. cit., 117). *W. Günther*

παράβασις

παραβαίνω (*parabainō*), go aside, turn aside, transgress; παράβασις (*parabasis*), overstepping, transgression; παραβάτης (*parabatēs*), transgressor; ἀπαράβατος (*aparabatos*), unchangeable; ὑπερβαίνω (*hyperbainō*), overstep, transgress.

CL 1. The vb. *parabainō* (attested from Homer onwards) lit. means to walk beside, go beside, pass by (Homer, *Il.* 11, 522) and refers both in its spatial and fig. senses to a deviation from an original and true direction.

Besides this intrans. sense there is a trans. one: transgress, neglect. It takes as its objects those words that the Greeks used to indicate the standard and norm by which they regulated their lives: e.g. *dikē*, → righteousness; *nomos*, law; *horkos*, oath; *ethē*, morals (e.g. Plato, *Crito* 53E; Eur., *Ion* 230). From the time of Aesch. onwards *parabainō* could be used absolutely to mean sin (*Agamemnon* 59). Mostly it refers to some obligation that is not kept. It is also used in a religious context in the sense of ceasing to reverence the gods (Hdt., 6, 12, 3).

2. (a) *parabasis* is found with the same objects as the vb. (Porphyry, *On Abstinence* 2, 61); it is seldom used absolutely. It is used either spatially or fig. of deviation, trespassing, transgressing. The word is used as a technical term for a choral part found in comedies, the *parabasis*.

(b) Almost nowhere does *parabatēs* occur in a fig. sense (Pythagoras, *Ep.* 3,7). It means the bystander, comrade, companion. Thus it became a technical term for the warrior standing beside the charioteer (Homer, *Il.* 23, 132; cf. Arndt, 617). The participle of the vb. is generally used for the transgressor of some norm.

(c) *aparabatos*, a late and rare word, means that which cannot be superseded, thus unchangeable, inviolable, eternal (Epictetus, *Dissertationes* 2, 15, 1). Fate and also the stars are bound thereby.

(d) *hyperbainō* follows the many senses of its prefix. Lit. it means to step over, go over the bank (Hdt., 2, 99, 3), thence injure, transgress, err (Plato, *Rep.* 2, 366A, 373D), but also presume, pass over someone in silence (Plato, *Rep.* 7, 528D).

OT This group of words is not at all common in the LXX; the fig. sense predominates. Only in Ps. 101(100):3 does *parabasis* have a Heb. equivalent (*sēṭîm*). *parabatēs*, transgressor, evil-doer, occurs only in Symmachus' translation Ps. 17:4; 139:19). The vb. occurs c. 80 times and translates 7 different Heb. words: the most frequent are *ʿāḇar*, pass on, cross over; *sûr*, turn aside, *pārar* (hiph.), break; and *śāṭâh*, deviate. It is not often that *parabainō* is used in matters of private rights, e.g. that of → marriage (Num. 5:12, 19 f., 29). It is interesting to note the objects associated with *parabainō*: God's words (Num. 14:41; Deut. 1:43), the word of the Lord (1 Sam. 15:24), legal demands (1 Esd. 1:48(46)) and especially often the → covenant (Jos. 7:11; Hos. 6:7; 8:1; and often in Ezek. 16:59; 17:15 ff., etc.). The

of grace, and at the same time the reason for man's responsibility for his faith and tions.

3. (a) In the Johannine literature the concept of *hamartia* is set in the context the Christ-event which holds together earth and heaven. Jesus comes into the wo (*kosmos*, Jn. 1:1–14) and bears its sin as the → Lamb of God (Jn. 1:29; 1 Jn. 3: Jesus himself is without sin; but he sheds his blood for the sin of the world, i.e. man imprisoned in his alienation from God (1 Jn. 1:7; 2:2; 4:10; Rev. 1:5). That v and that power which oppose Jesus are sin. This is clear in the case of Judas Iscar (Jn. 6:70 f.; 19:11), but also in the way that the Jews react to Jesus (Jn. 8:44 f They suppose Jesus to be a sinful man, but it is they who are sinful, because th have not recognized him as the redeemer (Jn. 9:16–41). Here sin is unbelief. Jes faces men with a decision (*krisis*) for or against himself (Jn. 15:22–24). By his bel or unbelief a man decides either for life or for death (Jn. 8:24; 9:41; 16:8 f.). Thus his coming Jesus exposed sin as such (Jn. 15:22–24) and, in so far as he brought li he stripped the prince of this world of his power (Jn. 12:31; 16:11).

(b) In 1 Jn. sin is seen as the opposite of love (*agapē*) (1 Jn. 3:1–10). It is true th purification from sin has taken place through Christ (1 Jn. 1:7) and sin is an i possibility for him who is born of God (1 Jn. 3:8 f.), but no man can reckon hims sinless or dispense with forgiveness (1 Jn. 1:8). Thus 1 Jn. too preserves the tensi between Christ's redemptive act, ethics and man's actions. The test lies in one's lo of one's brother (1 Jn. 1:9; 4:7; cf. 1:4; 2:7; 3:10). Sins have been forgiven (1 J 2:12), but the Christian can always call upon Christ if he confesses his sin (1 Jn. 1: However, 1 Jn. also knows of the mortal sin; by this he probably means aposta and idolatry (5:16–21; → below 4 (a)).

4. Hebrews seeks to show that Jesus has become a man in every sense, even to t point of being tempted (Heb. 5:7 f.), and how he yet remained free from sin (He 4:15). Heb. deals with sin in the context of → sacrifice (art. *thyō* NT 3). Christ as t true high priest (Heb. 7:25–27; → Priest, art. *hiereus* NT 2 (b) and (c)), who has fered himself once and for all for our sin, replaces the continually repeated si offerings. He is the unique sacrifice which makes the offering of further sacrific superfluous (Heb. 10:4–10, 18); it is replaced by the possibility of forgivene through faith (Heb. 11). The unique sacrifice of Jesus liberates us once and for from sin. The example of Jesus helps us in our struggle against the peril of fresh sin ing (Heb. 12:1–4). But for Heb. all that awaits a falling away from the faith is etern judgment. This is the sin that excludes further repentance (Heb. 6:4 ff.; 10:26 12:16 f.; → Conversion; cf. I. H. Marshall, *Kept by the Power of God: A Study Perseverance and Falling Away*, 1969, 132–54).

5. The Epistle of James warns of lust which produces sin and death (Jas. 1:1 and of the danger of failing to act on the knowledge provided by faith (Jas. 4:17). the same time James exhorts his readers to confess their sin in the certainty of t promise of God's forgiveness (Jas. 5:15 ff.).

6. 1 Peter cites Isa. 53. The disciple stands firm in the midst of suffering by takin as his example him who once suffered for us and thereby redeemed us from our sin (1 Pet. 2:21–25; 3:18; 4:1). E. Best compares this with other NT passages dealin with → slaves (Eph. 6:5–8; Col. 3:22–5; 1 Tim. 6:1 f.; Tit. 2:9 f.; 1 Cor. 7:21 ff., *Peter, New Century Bible*, 1971, 116 ff.). Most slaves were owned by pagan master Best thinks that the reason why 1 Pet. does not deal with the duties of masters (c

ɔw → Adam is an example of this. Through his sin Adam brought death into being; ɔm then on this succession was the rule for all men (cf. Rom. 1:32; 6:16; 7:5 ff.; 13; 1 Cor. 15:56).

It is only when one comes to know Christ that the full power of sin is disclosed. he man that struggles against the Spirit of God is imprisoned in the → flesh (*sarx*), hich as God's enemy produces sin and whose end is death. Spirit and flesh fight ɡainst one another in man under the law (Rom. 7:13–25; cf. Gal. 5:16–26). Paul most always uses the word *hamartia* in the sing. Sin is almost a personal power hich acts in and through man (Rom. 5:12, 21; 6:6, 17; 7:9 ff.). The same is also ue of *sarx*, flesh (Gal. 5:19, 24), and *thanatos*, death (Rom. 6:9b). This vivid way of ıtting things contributed, along with Paul's statements on the universality of sin nce Adam (Rom. 5), to the church's doctrine of original sin.

(b) Jesus Christ, as the counterpart of Adam, has by his coming broken this rcle. He has taken upon himself the → curse of the law in place of all men (Gal. :10–14). He has endured death (Rom. 5:8; 6:3 ff.; 1 Cor. 15:3), and has dealt with n by bearing it (Rom. 8:1 ff.). He himself has become sin (2 Cor. 5:21) in order to ıtablish God's righteousness (*katallagē*; Rom. 5:11; 11:15; 2 Cor. 5:18 f.; → econciliation, art. *katallassō* NT 4). Throughout all this, however, Paul gives us no ystematic teaching on sin; he describes the victory of Jesus Christ over the powers f the law, sin and death, which are replaced by righteousness and life. The way of ıe law, which Paul himself had earlier trod, does not lead to life, but to death. Paul ıw in his persecution of Christ and the Christians *the* sin of his life (1 Cor. 15:9; cf. Tim. 1:15). It is God's → grace that has opened up a new way (Rom. 5:15; 1 Cor. 5:10 f.). And it is the way of → faith (*pistis*, Rom. 3:21 ff.). → Abraham, who ecame → righteous through faith (Rom. 4), serves as a type of it (cf. A. T. Hanson, Abraham the Justified Sinner", in *Studies in Paul's Technique and Theology*, 1974, 2–66).

Christ's reconciling death has taken place for us once for all (Rom. 3:25 f.; 5:8). eace is bestowed upon the believer (Rom. 5:1 ff.). Baptism symbolizes the taking p of the believer into the Christ-event. By dying and rising with Christ, he is torn om the dominion of death and participates in Christ's new life (Rom. 6:1–11). This ıdicative is immediately followed by an imperative telling the Christian now to free imself from the bondage of sin in order to enter the service of righteousness (Rom. :12 ff.). The freedom to put oneself at the disposal of the Spirit is realized in love Gal. 5:13 ff.; cf. Rom. 8:9–17). As a result, all self-righteousness, and also all con- dence in the self, is excluded (Rom. 10:3; 1 Cor. 1:18–31; → Boast). Thereafter all hich does not arise from faith and so from union with the living Christ is sin (Rom. 4:23).

(c) Thus we have two strands in Paul's teaching on sin. (i) On the one hand, there ı the subjection of all men to the power of sin from which they can be redeemed only ırough God's once-and-for-all act of reconciliation in Jesus Christ. (ii) On the other and, there is the call to all Christians to turn to this new righteousness in faith, to be ervants of Christ instead of servants of sin, and then to walk in the Spirit or in hrist.

It is the juxtaposition and interweaving of these two strands that is the reason for he depth and seriousness of sin as a ruling power and for the greatness of God's act

dominant idea is that of individual faults committed against the law or one's brotl The sinner, the *hamartōlos*, is, according to the traditional Jewish view, the man v does not abide by the law and the Pharisaic interpretation of it. Thus he was put the same level as the tax-collector (Matt. 9:10 par. Mk. 2:15 f.) and likened to Gentile, *ethnikos*, or the godless, *asebēs* (Matt. 26:45; Mk. 14:41; Lk. 6:32 ff.; Matt. 5:46 f.). The combination "sinful and adulterous generation" in Mk. 8:38 plies that sin separates from God. Hence repentance and forgiveness are necessa

(b) Jesus' preaching went beyond the Jewish concept of sin when, as in the S mon on the Mount, he radicalized the law and set up his coming and his person a new standard and thus brought about a new state of affairs (Matt. 7:21 ff.; 12 par. Mk. 3:28 ff.; Lk. 12:10).

This is true even though these passages do not often explicitly mention sin. T new situation is disclosed by Jesus' mixing with sinners. It is to sinners that Je comes and not to the righteous (Matt. 9:13 par. Mk. 2:17; Lk. 5:32). He pronoun the → poor blessed (Matt. 5:2 ff.) and calls the burdened to him (Matt. 11:28). It i connexion with this mission of his that Jesus is called the "friend of sinners" (M 9:10 f.; 11:19). His fellowship with sinners is particularly prominent in Luk narratives (Lk. 7:36 ff.; 15:1 ff.; 18:9 ff.; 19:1 ff.). The story of the lost son in 15:11–32 shows that the sinful son, as well as the righteous one, needs the fath possessions. Jesus' address to the → Pharisees in Matt. 23:1–36 par. Mk. 12:37– Lk. 20:45 ff., makes it particularly clear that with Jesus' coming the criterion for tinguishing righteous from sinful is completely altered, so far as Judaism is conc ned. Those who according to Jewish legal standards were reckoned righteous a religious are shown up as particularly sinful before God in view of their s righteousness and their rejection of Jesus.

(c) In the passion-narrative, especially in the account of the → Last Supper, Jes whole life and preaching is seen clearly from the perspective of the cross (M 26:28). Jesus replaces ritual means of atonement with the sacrifice of his own l Here righteous and unrighteous alike are seen to be sinners. This insight is ticipated in Peter's cry in Lk. 5:8 ("Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lor and is summed up in the evangelists' overall interpretation of Jesus' mission (M 1:21; Lk. 1:77). Thus → baptism which was interpreted by John the Baptist in ter of repentance (Mk. 1:4 par. Matt. 3:2, Lk. 3:3), takes on a new meaning. Both b tism and forgiveness of sins are grounded by the apostles in the death and resurr tion of Jesus (Jn. 20:23; Acts 2:38; 5:31; 10:43).

2. (a) Paul's main statements about sin are to be found in Rom. 1–8. But i striking that in Rom. 1:18–3:20 *hamartia* and its cognates scarcely occur. Here P is speaking about Gentiles and Jews who both alike come to grief when confron with God's righteousness. As a result of their unbelief and their resultant unrighte actions, they have fallen under the wrath of God, *orgē theou* (→ Anger). Paul m tions *asebeia*, godlessness, and *adikia*, unrighteousness (Rom. 1:18). The → l *nomos*, produces knowledge of sin (Rom. 3:20; 5:20; 7:7 ff.; Gal. 3:22). It is thereby invalidated (Rom. 3:31, etc.), but rather serves as a *paidagōgos*, "custodia to lead men to faith in Christ (Gal. 3:23 ff.; → Teach). The law watches over men a keeps them for that purpose, but is not itself the way of salvation. Go righteousness cannot be attained by the way of the law. Law – sin – death, that is fateful road that man treads without Christ and without faith. Rom. 5:12–21 shc

)avidic Messiah", in *The Servant of the Lord and Other Essays on the Old 'estament*, 1965³, 1–60, 63–93).

(b) In the cultus various → sacrifices were designed to cover sin including the great ay of atonement ritual described in Lev. 16 (→ Reconciliation, art. *hilaskomai* OT). ut → forgiveness of sins is linked with confession of → guilt (cf. Gen. 50:17; 2 Sam. 2:13; Ps. 51[50]).

4. In late Judaism the concept of sin is more strongly orientated towards the law nd becomes more superficial under the influence of speculative and casuistic think- ıg. The Gentiles do not know God's commandments and are therefore all sinners. or the religious Jew the essence of sin is above all the transgression of the laws and ommandments. Idolatry, unchastity and bloodshed were regarded as unforgivable ins. The possibility of atonement for sins committed unintentionally was provided y sacrifice, purificatory rites, good works, suffering and martyrdom. To the ques- ion as to the origin of sin Judaism found the answer in Adam and Eve or the fallen ngels (Gen. 6:1 ff.). The consequences of sin are sickness, death and eternal damna- ion (SB I 495). Sin is universal and was centred in the evil inclination in particular SB III 155 ff.). But the main stress is on the → law, on the individual's responsibility nd efforts to keep himself from transgressions (SB III 38 ff.). The religious man had is sights fixed on the possibility of sinlessness. His examples were → Abraham, → Moses, → Elijah and Enoch, and particularly the last two because death did not over- ake them (→ Resurrection, art. *anastasis* OT 5). The complete removal of sin was ex- ected in the messianic kingdom.

IT Following the prominent use of *hamartanō* and its cognates in the LXX, the NT uses them as the comprehensive expression of everything opposed to God. The hristian concept of sin finds its fullest expression and its deepest theological levelopment in Paul and John. Even the statistical evidence underlines the relative in- ignificance of the rest of the NT writings. All the other concepts and synonyms are vershadowed by *hamartia* and are to be understood in the light of this concept. *amartia* occurs 173 times of which 64 instances are in Paul (including 48 in Rom.), 5 in Heb. and 17 each in Jn. and the Johannine epistles. *hamartanō* occurs 42 times including 7 each in Rom. and 1 Cor., 10 times in the Johannine epistles and 3 times n Jn.).

hamartia is always used in the NT of man's sin which is ultimately directed gainst God. *hamartēma* occurs less frequently (5 times) and refers to the individual ct (e.g. 1 Cor. 6:18); it is used in the context of forgiveness (Mk. 3:28; Rom. 3:25) nd in Mk. 3:29 is used of the eternal, i.e. unforgivable, sin (→ Satan art. *Satanas* NT)). The adj. *anhamartētos* occurs only in Jn. 8:7 and means without actual sin. *hamartōlos*, sinful, is the usual adj. (47 times, notably 18 times in Lk.); it is oc- asionally used as a synonym with *ponēros*, depraved, evil (cf. Mk. 8:38 with Matt. 12:39, 45). When used as a noun, its nuances of meaning follow those of *hamartia*, rom those taken over from Judaism to the full Christian understanding.

1. (a) Jesus used the OT and Jewish concept of sin that was familiar in the world around him. This becomes clear from the fact that in the Synoptic Gospels the nouns *hamartia* and *hamartēma* are found almost exclusively in the context of the → forgiveness of sins. The vb. is often used absolutely, i.e. in its usual and familiar sense (cf. Matt. 18:15; Lk. 17:3 f.). The use of the nouns chiefly in the plur. shows that the

guilt of the individual, was clearly recognized as a reality separating man and nati from God.

Yahweh himself is the yardstick for right and wrong. His → covenant with the pe ple, his → commandments and → law, his → word spoken by chosen men all expre his normative will. The fate of both individual and people depended upon Yahwe Sin, guilt and punishment were frequently not separated because sin is an estrang ment from him, and thus brings harm and punishment upon itself.

2. The OT's view of sin is the negative reverse side of the idea of the → covena and hence is often expressed in legal terms. The nation's history is often depicted as history of apostasy, of punishment, and of Yahweh's gracious intervention and returning.

(a) Gen. 3–11 (seen by many scholars mainly as the work of the Yahwis provides a clear and typical example of this, depicting in masterly fashion man's i dependent and self-sufficient behaviour. Sin mounts up in a series of fresh outbreak starting with the → fall of → Adam into sin in Gen. 3 and leading on to fratricic (Gen. 4), the song of Lamech (Gen. 4:23 f.), and finally to the building of the tower Babel (Gen. 11). This is not so much a reflection about sin as a confession of it ((von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, I, 1962, 154 ff.). The tendency to depart from tl order given by God and to establish oneself in one's own position and to go one own way is seated in the → heart (Gen. 6:5; 8:21). The Priestly Code lays more stre on the theological side and on the cultic ordinances, but in Gen. 6:11 f. it comes the same conclusion: "Now the earth was corrupt in God's sight, and the earth wa filled with violence. And God saw the earth, and behold it was corrupt; for all flei had corrupted their way upon the earth."

(b) Sin is both a falling away from a relationship of faithfulness towards God ar also disobedience to the commandments and the → law. The former is described a unfaithfulness to God's covenant (Hos. 2; Jer. 3:10), the latter is a violation of God word and command (1 Sam. 15:23 ff.; Ps. 78). In both cases man shuts himself o from fellowship with God and becomes God-less (cf. Jer. 2:29).

(c) The sin of the individual cannot be separated from that of the nation. Tl earlier writings concentrate on the nation's history of recurrent apostasy and salv tion (Jdg. 2:6–3:6), but later traditions put more emphasis on the fate of the i dividual (Pss.; Job).

3. (a) Sin is universal. No man can exist in the presence of God's holiness (Is 1:4 ff.). His accusation is against the people as a whole (Hos. 12). The universality o sin is especially emphasized in Gen. 6:5; 8:21; Isa. 64:6 f. This certainly forms starting-point for a doctrine of original sin, but nowhere is it given any systemat formulation. The consequence of sin is → death (Gen. 2:17). If that does not happe at once, it is wholly due to God's sovereign grace in which he constantly delays th consequence of destruction and does not allow punishment and judgment to be h last word. Rather, he makes them the basis of renewal as in the cases of → Noa (Gen. 6–9), and the new → covenant (Jer. 31; Ezek. 37). Both the sinner and th apostate nation alike can only hope for God's mercy till at last they hear the messag of the Servant of God who, though he is himself without sin, bears the sins of other (Is. 53; for interpretation of the Servant see H. H. Rowley, "The Servant of the Lor in the Light of Three Decades of Criticism", and "The Suffering Servant and th

ἁμαρτία

ἁμαρτάνω (*hamartanō*), to sin; ἁμαρτία (*hamartia*), sin; ἁμάρτημα (*hamartēma*), a sin, transgression; ἁμαρτωλός (*hamartōlos*), adj., sinful; noun, a sinner.

hamartanō (Homer onwards) originally meant to miss, miss the mark, lose, not share in something, be mistaken. The Gk. view of a mistake is intellectually oriented. *hamartanō* is the result of some *agnoia*, ignorance. The cognate noun is *hamartia* (Aesch. onwards), mistake, failure to reach a goal (chiefly a spiritual one). The result of such action is *hamartēma*, failure, mistake, offence, committed against friends, against one's own body, etc. From these was derived (in the 5th cent. B.C.) the adj. and noun *hamartōlos*, that thing or person that fails; in Aristoph. it occurs as barbarism used with a deprecatory and ironic ring. *hamartētikos* (the better form) also uncommon and late. The root *hamart-*, with its meaning of fail, produced many popular compounds, e.g. *hamartinoos*, madman.

1. In the Gk.-speaking world the noun *hamartēma* prevailed over the vb. *amartanō*. Aristotle placed it between *adikēma*, injustice, and *atychēma*, misfortune, as an offence against the prevailing order, but one without an evil intention, i.e. without *kakia*, evil, wickedness (*Eth. Nic.* 5, 8, 1135b 18). Thus it was also used in legal language of deliberate offences. *hamartia* becomes a collective term with a relatively indefinite sense: offending against right feeling. It can mean anything from stupidity to law-breaking, anything that offends against the *orthon*, the right, that does not conform to the dominant ethic, to the respect due to social order and to the polis.

2. The Gk. view of guilt finds its deepest expression in conjunction with the fateful infatuation of man as classical tragedy depicts it (e.g. Soph., *Antigone* 1261). Guilt is no longer here just an action, but a reality that is rooted in man's innermost being. Man knows that he is in jeopardy and is encircled by the destructive powers of infatuation and fate. Guilt is the cause of suffering (as in the case of Oedipus). Guilt and fate are inextricably interwoven. Perhaps it is too strong to speak of "sin" here, since a firm godward orientation of guilt and fate is missing in the Gk. world.

3. Hellenism severed the connexion of guilt and fate in its search to escape the determinism of fate by rites and gnosis in the mystery religions. On the other hand, the concept of guilt was intellectualized in the Stoa and rationalized (cf. Epictetus, *Dissertationes* I, 26, 6). Guilt can be surmounted through better understanding and correct behaviour. Both views work from the presupposition that man is basically good.

OT In the LXX two words, *hamartia* and → *adikia*, represent between them almost the whole range of Heb. words for guilt and sin. *hamartia* and its cognates particularly represent the Heb. word *ḥaṭṭā't*, lapse, sin, and also *'āwôn*, guilt, sin as a conscious deviation from the right way, *peša'*, rebellion, etc. *adikia* above all represents *'āwôn* and 35 other Heb. words besides (cf. Hatch-Redpath, I–II, 25 ff.).

The noun *hamartēma* must be distinguished from *hamartia*. The use of the vb. corresponds to that of the nouns. *hamartōlos* usually translates *rāšā'*, evil-doer, lawless man (cf. *asebēs*; → Godliness, art. *sebomai*).

1. The OT has no main general word for sin like the NT. Its theological reflection on sin is not so fully developed as, for example, in Paul. Yet sin, over and above the

visible characteristics of that which stands under the power of sin. Hence, in t parable of the unjust steward, mention is made of unjust mammon (Lk. 16:1 ff.; Possessions, art. *mamōnas*), in Jas. 3:6 of the injustice perpetrated by the tongue (Word, art. *glōssa*), and in Lk. 18:1 ff. of the unjust judge.

3. (a) Paul never uses *hamartia* in Rom. 1:18 ff., where he is talking about t sins of the Gentiles, but only *adikia* and *asebeia*. God's wrath manifestly rests up those who as his creatures should have known him and honoured him (Rom. 1:1 21, 25; 2:8; → God, art. *theos* NT 4 (b)). In Rom. 1:29 *adikia* is used as a compreh sive term at the start of a list of vices. Correspondingly, 1 Cor. 6:1 contrasts the u righteous with the saints. This refers to Gentiles who do not yet recogn righteousness through faith and as a result have fallen victims to their *adikia* a God's wrath. They do not inherit the kingdom of God (1 Cor. 6:9).

(b) The criterion for unrighteousness is the → righteousness of God (Rom. 3:5, 9:14), which discloses man's unrighteousness (Rom. 3:5). The gulf that is opened the contrast of God's righteousness and man's unrighteousness is bridged by Ch who as the righteous One stands in our place (Rom. 3:24; 2 Cor. 5:21; cf. that v Pauline-sounding passage, 1 Pet. 3:18, which makes use of the words now un consideration). A new division of righteous and unrighteous has appeared beca the truth has been received (Rom. 1:18; 2:8).

Just as *adikia* was often used in the OT to translate *šeqer*, lie, falsehood, so Paul and John use *adikia* in contrast to *alētheia* (Jn. 7:18). The consequence of fa in Christ is not only the elimination of sin as a power, but also conversion to a life righteousness (2 Thess. 2:9–12). Within the community there is no longer any pl for litigation, and so Paul in 1 Cor. 6:1–11 warns the Corinthians to cease fron and to prefer suffering unjustly to standing on their rights. The basis of this is t Christians are controlled by → love (1 Cor. 13:6). Man's preoccupation with rights, which leads to his suing his neighbour and hating him and fighting him shattered by a love of his neighbour and his enemy. This idea, which is a contin tion of the OT command to love one's neighbour (Lev. 19:13 ff.), goes right back Jesus himself (Matt. 5:43–48). It is in keeping with this that one is prepared to su injustice, as 1 Pet. 2:19 points out.

4. (a) In later writings this fundamental vision of the Christian life again shi through. 2 Tim. 2:19 warns the community that unrighteousness is not compati with calling on God's → name. Heb. 8:12 picks up the message of Jer. 31 concern God's forgiving love in the new → covenant and gives it a christological interpre tion. Christ makes → forgiveness for unrighteousness possible (1 Jn. 1:9), but t basic principle of the possibility of forgiveness seems to have been limited later sins which do not bring death (1 Jn. 5:17; for the history of interpretation of t passage see B. F. Westcott, *The Epistles of St. John*, 1902⁴, 209–14).

(b) The apocalyptic vision of 2 Peter emphasizes the final judgment and the c demnation of the *adikoi* (2 Pet. 2:9, 13, 15).

In the apocalyptic final judgment of Revelation the ungodly world is judged. R frequently uses *adikeō* here for judicial actions performed against men and thin The vb. is found more frequently here than anywhere else in the NT (Rev. 2:11; 6 7:2 f.; 9:4, 10, 19; 11:5 [twice]; 22:11). *W. Günther*

penalty, but a saving event" (G. von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, I, 1962, 271; → Reconciliation; → Redemption; → Sacrifice).

3. In the later writings of the OT and in late Judaism *adikia* was on the one hand limited to the concrete individual act, but on the other hand was extended to apply to all men. In this context it is significant that occasionally the LXX translates *šeqer*, ie, by *adikia* (e.g. Pss. 52:3[5]; 119:29, 69, 104, 163; 144:8, 11). Philo (*Spec. Leg.* 3, 209) and Josephus (*Ant.* 8, 10, 2[251]) mention *adikos* and *asebēs* in the same breath. Just as *dikaios* is prominent in Philo's teaching on → virtue, so *adikos* is in hat on wickedness (*Abr.* 103; *Sobr.* 42; cf. *TDNT* I 150). The apocalyptic thinking of late Judaism regarded the whole period preceding the coming of the messiah as the 'world of unrighteousness" (Eth. Enoch 48:7) which the messiah will destroy (2 Esd. 4:51 ff.; Eth. Enoch 91:5 ff.; Pss. Sol. 17:29, 36). Similar views are found in the rabbinic literature (e.g. San. 97a; Midr. Ps. 92:10; cf. SB IV 977 ff.).

NT 1. (a) There are only 27 occurrences of *adikeō* in the NT, chiefly in Acts, 1–2 Cor. and Rev. It occurs 10 times in Rev., 5 times in Acts, 3 times in 2 Cor., twice each in 1 Cor. and Col. and once each in Matt., Lk., Gal., Phlm. and 2 Pet. It means to act unjustly, harm in relation to other men (e.g. Matt. 20:13; Acts 7:24, 26, 27; Gal. 4:12). In Rev. it has things as its objects (Rev. 6:6; 9:4). The pass. used with the meaning suffer injustice is always found in the context of relations between man and man (Acts 7:24; 1 Cor. 6:7 f.; 2 Cor. 7:12). The other instances are Lk. 10:19; Acts 25:10 f.; 2 Cor. 7:2; Col. 3:25; Phlm. 18; 2 Pet. 2:13; Rev. 2:11; 7:2 f.; 9:10, 19; 11:5; 22:11.

adikēma occurs 3 times. In Acts 18:14 and 24:20 the *adikēma* is a criminal act, and in Rev. 18:5 it is parallel to *hamartia* and used in relation to God.

The noun *adikia* occurs almost entirely in Lucan and Pauline texts and in 2 Pet., 1 Jn. and 2 OT quotations in Hebrews; it and the adj. *adikos* are occasionally used absolutely (Matt. 5:45; Lk. 18:11; Jn. 7:18; 2 Thess. 2:12). Their meaning in these passages follows that of general usage and means behaviour that does not conform to the moral norm. In quotations it follows the OT usage (Lk. 13:27; Acts 8:23; Heb. 1:9 = Ps. 45:7[8]; 8:12 = Jer. 31:34).

(b) These concepts become more important theologically in contexts where they are contrasted with *dikaios*, just, and *dikaiosynē*, righteousness, justice (Rom. 3:5; Acts 24:15; 1 Pet. 3:18) or with *alētheia*, → truth (e.g. Jn. 7:18; Rom. 1:18; 2:8). The gen. of the noun *adikia* can be used in the Semitic fashion as a substitute for the adj. (e.g. Lk. 13:27; 16:8 f.; 18:6). The adv. *adikōs* occurs only in 1 Pet. 2:19.

(c) The NT's use of these words shows that we are dealing with commonly accepted and used categories of injustice whose particular meaning in each case we only discover through a close examination. Hence we must seek to learn the meaning of each individual passage from its context, or from what qualifies it or is contrasted with it.

2. In the NT doctrine of sin *adikia* and → *hamartia* are the most important concepts. Of these *adikia* is, as in the LXX, the less specific and more varied in its nuances of meaning. The definition in 1 Jn. 5:17 juxtaposes the two. *hamartia* is the main idea. *adikia* probably means here unjust deeds and injustice amongst men, which are not to be regarded as mortal sins but are to be forgiven.

In comparison with *hamartia*, *adikia* describes more forcibly the outwardly

that are unseemly, unspeakable or fraudulent. What is "unjust" is here not measur by definite laws laid down in writing, as is the case with *anomos*, lawless. Rather, designates that which harms the order of the world (*kosmos*; → Earth) and the ci (→ People, art. *polis*) (cf. the *nomoi agraphoi*, unwritten laws). The *adikos* is freque tly depicted siding with *bia*, sheer force.

(b) But above all, the concept of *adikia* is rooted in legal thinking. Here it is us as a synonym of *parabasis*, etc., and can refer also to particular crimes like the fraud, incest, etc. In lists of vices *adikia* is used as a general description of a wi range of things.

(c) These words are also used in a religious context. *adikeō* can mean the negl of one's duties towards the gods (Xen., *Mem.* 1, 1, 1). The *adikos* does not match to the claims of the deity and therefore is guilty before him. He offends agai *eusebeia*, reverence for God (→ Godliness), and thus becomes an *asebēs*, godle person.

OT 1. The LXX uses these words to translate a variety of Heb. equivalents; the H vocabulary is here far more complex and varied than the Gk. The most import are these: *adikeō* translates 24 Heb. words; proportionately the most frequent (times) is the qal of *'āšaq*, act unjustly, oppress, extort, which is chiefly used in a c text of human relations or politics (e.g. Lev. 19:13; Deut. 28:29; Ps. 119:121). T adj. *adikos*, which is frequently used as a noun, and the adv. *adikōs* usually repres *šeqer*, deceit, fraud, lie, and are often combined with *laleō*, speak: lying speech, i.e. (e.g. Ps. 63[62]:11; Prov. 6:17; Jer. 5:31). At a later period *adikos* and *asebēs* sometimes used as parallels (Job 16:11 LXX). We do not often come acr *adikēma*, which means an unjust act committed against the law (Heb. *peša'*) or an fence against God (*'āwôn*) (e.g. Lev. 16:16; Jer. 16:17). By far the commonest these words in the LXX is *adikia* (c. 250 times). It represents 36 different H words; most often it translates *'āwôn*, offence, guilt, punishment (c. 80 times), but casionally also *'awlâh*, perversity, wickedness (e.g. Hos. 10:13), *ḥāmās*, violent injustice (e.g. Ps. 7:16(17)), and *šeqer*, lie (e.g. Ps. 119:104).

2. The fact that *adikia* mostly occurs in the sing. shows that it is not on the dividual act but on the whole phenomenon of transgression that attention is focus Sin was felt in ancient Israel as above all an offence against the sacral order of div justice (1 Sam. 3:13 f.). Thus it affects the community, whose existence is most timately connected with the preservation of divine justice. Hence, sin is regarded a phenomenon of theological and social import, as something that destroys the c munity. For that reason it is demanded of the covenant people that they purge from their midst (cf. Lev. 16:21 f.; 17:4, 9). It is significant that the word *'āv* means not only the conscious, responsible act, but also its consequence, punishm (Lev. 26:39). As the OT sees it, an offence that incurs guilt sets in motion a proc of destruction whose effects recoil upon the offender and his community unless fateful connexion of deed and consequence is broken (Gen. 4:13; Num. 32:23). offence is, in the first place, regarded objectively as a harmful event even when it committed in error (Gen. 20:3 ff.; 1 Sam. 14:24 ff.). These harmful effects of the deed can only be checked by the → punishment of the offender or by the vicari slaying of a beast or the offering of an atonement offering. "Expiation was thus n

)). H. Bacht, "Einfalt des Herzens", *Geist und Leben* 29, 1956, 416 ff.; C. Edlund, *Das Auge der infalt*, 1952.

in

he concept of sin embraces the gamut of human failure from the transgression of a ingle commandment to the ruin of one's whole existence. The most general word for in is *hamartia*, which with its cognates designates offences against morals, laws, ıen or gods. *adikia* and its cognates cover a more specialized area, drawn from the :gal world; as the opposite to → righteousness (*dikaiosynē*; cf. *dikē* → punishment), it enotes unrighteousness, injustice and unjust deeds. *parabasis* and its cognates hrow light on a further aspect: in particular they refer to transgression of the law.)n the other hand, *paraptōma*, which is derived from *parapiptō*, fall down beside, ɔse one's way, fail, means more generally a moral lapse and an offence for which ne is responsible. Other concepts belong to the wider context of the whole henomenon of sin: *anomia*, lawlessness (→ Law, art. *nomos*); *asebeia*, godlessness → Godliness, art. *sebomai*); *ptaiō*, stumble, come to grief; *hēttēma*, defeat; *ysterēma*, lack, fault; *planaomai*, go astray, deceive oneself; *agnoeō*, not know, not nderstand (→ Knowledge, art. *agnoia*); *opheilō*, be under obligation (→ Necessity); *arakoē*, disobedience (→ Hear, art. *akouō*); and also the concepts dealt with under ıe heading of → Guilt; *aitia*, cause, accusation; *elenchō*, convict; also *enochos*, uilty.

ἀδικία

ἀδικέω (*adikeō*), do wrong, commit injustice, deal unjustly, injure; *ἀδίκημα* (*adikēma*), unjust deed, a wrong; *δικία* (*adikia*), wrongdoing, unrighteousness, injustice; *ἄδικος* (*adikos*), unjust; *δίκως* (*adikōs*), unjustly.

ʟ 1. *adikeō* and its derivatives often occur in Gk. literature. As the very form of the words (with the alpha privative) shows, they denote the opposite of the positive ɔncepts *dikē*, *dikaiosynē* and *dikaios* (→ Righteousness). The unjust man is the opɔsite of the just. The vb. *adikeō* means to commit an injustice (Aristotle, *Rhet.* 1,), 3, 1368b 6 f.); with an obj., deal unjustly with someone, injure, harm (Dem., 21, 29); in the pass., suffer injustice (Plato, *Gorgias* 509c). The noun *adikēma* denotes ɔove all the individual unjust deed, and also the possession that was unjustly obıined (Aristotle, *Eth. Nic.* 5, 7, 1138a 24; Xen., *Mem.* 2, 2, 3). Unjust deeds can also ɜ described as *adikia*, but the noun is used particularly for injustice (Plato, *Rep.* 10,)9c; *Phaedo* 82A). *adikia* is the least clearly defined description of an activity or ɜing of man that is described in negative terms. Consequently it can take on various ıances (→ Righteousness, art. *dikaios*; → Law, art. *nomos*). *adikos* is the adj. of ɔth nouns, but it has a more general meaning. It can mean wrong, useless, not of a ght nature (Hdt., 6, 137; Xen., *Mem.* 4, 4, 13).

2. (a) The definition of the content of the concept is usually dependent on the ɔrm of justice that obtains at any particular time and to which it is related. Hence *ɨikos* covers all that offends against morals, custom or decency (*dikē*), all things

CL *haplotēs* (from Plato onwards) and *haplous* (from Pindar onwards) are compou
ded from *ha-*, together, and *pel-*, to fold. They mean (a) singleness, single; the c
posite being *diplous*, double. Beside this numerical meaning there grew up a positi
ethical connotation for the word-groups. Hence, *haplotēs* came to mean (
straightness, openness, speaking without a hidden meaning. *haplōs euchomai* mea
to ask straight out. This meaning grew with the passage of time, but the one based
intellectual outlook diminished in importance; viz. (c) *haplous* came to mean simp
silly; it is used by Isoc. (2,46) as the opposite of *nous* (→ Reason).

OT In Judaism and in the LXX we can find the basic meaning of (a) single (Josephu
War 2, 151; Wis. 16:27). *haplous* then means (b) unambiguous, clear (Josephu
Ap. 2, 190). The wise man, who accepts the commandments whole-heartedly, wal
haplōs (Prov. 10:8 f.), i.e. his walk has a clear direction, for, being bound to the la
he is freed from inner divisions. David gave God his silver and gold in singleness
heart, *en haplotēti kardias*, Heb. *bᵉyōšer lᵉḇāḇô* (1 Chr. 29:17; cf. Lev. 1:3). It al
means (c) with undivided heart; a synonym being *en kardia plērei*, with a full
whole heart (1 Chr. 29:9), Heb. *bᵉlēḇ šālēm*. When *haplotēs* is used in the context
human relationships of giving it implies (d) goodness, kindness (e.g. Josephus, *Ant.*
332). Here too it is understood as a quality of the heart (Test. Iss. 3:8), and c
casionally of (e) the soul (Prov. 11:25).

NT The word-group is not often found in the NT. The basic meaning of CL (a) and
(a) is not used, though *diplous* is found in 1 Tim. 5:17 and Rev. 18:6. *haplotēs*
the NT is to be understood as personal wholeness, undividedness, and hence unco
plicated simplicity. *haplous* is used in Jas. 1:5 for the way in which God gives (RS
NEB "generous"), to show the undividedness and honesty of God's giving contrast
with the inner division of the one who doubts. God gives without any hidden motiv
tions but the doubter is "a double-minded man [*dipsychos*]" (Jas. 1:8; cf.
Marshall, "*Dipsychos*: A local term?", *Stud Ev* VI = TU 112, 1973, 348–51; cf.
(d) (e)). Hence the doubters are called upon to purify their hearts (Jas. 4:8; cf. OT (d
Christ has taken the place of the law (cf. OT (b)). Paul, using the picture of dev
tion of the bride to one man only (2 Cor. 11:2 f.) shows the completeness of hum
surrender to Christ (*haplotēs eis Christon*). The basis of such a demand is his co
plete self-surrender for us (2 Cor. 5:14–20). Hence, a similar personal integrity is
mark of the Christian in his dealings with others.

Paul saw the collection made by one church for another as a true expression o
unity transcending the local church (→ Fellowship, art. *koinōnia*; → Poor, a
ptōchos NT 4 (a)). So *haplotēs* receives a universal connotation (2 Cor. 8:2; 9:11,
and means a oneness of heart (OT d). The whole-hearted giving within the lo
church (Rom. 12:8) is also an expression of the unity of the body of Christ (Ro
12:4).

Eph. 5:6 and Col. 2:22 demand that a slave should obey his master "in singlen
of heart". In Matt. 6:22 and Lk. 11:34 eye-service and the jealous look (*ponēros*,
Evil; cf. Matt. 20, 15) are outward signs of inner division, of only half devotion
Christ. *B. Gärtner*

→ Heart, → See

(a). O. Bauernfeind, *haplous* etc., *TDNT* I 386 f.

strikes a balance: "Paul . . . holds the ecstatic phenomena and the miracles that take place in the community to be workings of the Spirit. But in his eyes these phenomena are subject to the eschatological proviso. They are provisional/transitory (see chap. 13). They do not prove the truth of the word of the cross, but are for their own part subject to the criterion of the cross When Paul presents himself as a pneumatic, then he points to his 'weakness' (2 Cor. 12:6 ff.)" (op. cit., 55). But Paul does acknowledge, without emphasis, such phenomena in his own ministry (2 Cor. 12:12).

apodeiknymi at Acts 25:7 means simply to prove (charges), and at 2 Thess. 2:4 to proclaim or exhibit oneself as something. The man of lawlessness seeks to "proclaim" himself to be God, as Nero in A.D. 54 publicly proclaimed himself emperor (P. Oxy, 7, 1021, 5 ff.; cf. Moulton-Milligan, 60). At 1 Cor. 4:9 Paul claims that God exhibits the apostles in the rôle of condemned men. The amphitheatre is the context, implying not only that God appoints death for the apostles but that he also displays them in public in this rôle. The Stoics used this context to picture the philosopher heroically standing out in the midst of troubles, but Paul seems rather to stress the humiliation involved in suffering for others (H. Conzelmann, op. cit., 88 f.). At Acts 2:22 the vb. implies proof of worth, similar to the use of the noun at 1 Cor. 2:4. The powerful deeds demonstrate the favour of God upon Jesus of Nazareth. "Jesus is vouched for to the Jews [i.e. accredited or legitimated] by God through wonders of all kinds which God has done by him in their midst" (E. Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 1971, 180; cf. F. F. Bruce, *The Book of Acts, NLC*, 69 ff.).

G. T. D. Angel

τεκμήριον — *τεκμήριον* (*tekmērion*), proof.

CL & OT *tekmērion* is found in secular Gk. from Herodotus to the 2nd cent. A.D., almost entirely meaning strict proof. In Aristotelian logic it means a "compelling sign" (Aristot. *Rhet.* 1, 2, 16). This sense is suggested in the LXX (Wis. 5:11; 19:13; 3 Macc. 3:24), Philo and Josephus (cf. *Ant.* 5:39). (See also Moulton-Milligan, 628).

NT *tekmērion* occurs only at Acts 2:3, where the common secular use suggests that Luke intends the events following the appearance of the risen Christ to be treated as infallible evidence (cf. J. Munck, *The Acts of the Apostles, Anchor Bible*, 1967, 4), despite reservations expressed, for example, by R. Bultmann (cf. "New Testament and Mythology", in H. W. Bartsch, ed., *Kerygma and Myth*, I, 1953, 1 ff.). E. Haenchen stresses that Luke could not have intended these appearances to be thought of as visions (op. cit., 140 f.). *G. T. D. Angel*

→ Image, → Miracle, → Revelation, → Spirit

Arndt, 89, 815; Liddell-Scott, 195 f., 1768; Moulton-Milligan, 60 f.; 628; H. Schlier, *deiknymi* etc., *TDNT* II 25–33.

Simplicity, Sincerity, Uprightness

ἁπλότης — *ἁπλότης* (*haplotēs*), simplicity, sincerity, uprightness; *ἁπλοῦς* (*haplous*), single, simple, sincere.

installation, but in the NT manifestation (Lk. 1:80, of John the Baptist, "he was the wilderness till the day of his manifestation to Israel").

(b) *deigmatizō*, expose, make an example of, e.g. an adulteress (Matt. 1:19 mock, expose (Col. 2:15); cf. *deigma*, example (Jude 7); from which com *hypodeigma* and *paradeigmatizō* (→ Image).

(c) *apodeixis* is discussed separately below. *C. Brown*

ἀπόδειξις

ἀπόδειξις (*apodeixis*), proof, demonstration; ἀποδείκνυμι (*apodeiknymi*), prove, appoint, demonstrate, exhibit.

CL & OT *apodeixis* is found in secular Gk. from the pre-Socratics and Herodotus t the 2nd cent. inscriptions in a number of related senses: (a) setting out or expos tion, of an enquiry or argument; (b) proof, in rhetorical demonstration, in exhibitin a specimen or documentary evidence, in deductive argument, or in impressiv achievements. It is found in the LXX only at 3 Macc. 4:20; 4 Macc. 3:19; 13:1(*apodeixis* is also found in Aristeas 102; Josephus, *Ap.* 1, 155; *Ant.* 17, 99; Test. Jo 14:5. In Philo it occurs in the sense of "proof by means of signs and wonders" (*Vi Mos.* 1, 95). The cognate vb. *apodeiknymi* is also found chiefly in the non-canonic books: Tob. 3:8; Est. 2:9 A B (for *rā'âh*, see); 3:13; Job 33:21; Dan. Sus. 5; 2:4 (for the Aram. *šᵉlēṭ* haph., make ruler); Dan. Theodotion Sus. 5; Bel. 9 A; 1 Mac 10:34; 14:23; 2 Macc. 14:26; 3 Macc. 5:31; 4 Macc. 1:8; 16:2. In secular Gk. likewise appears from Herodotus to the 2nd cent. A.D., meaning to make known, ap point, exhibit, or prove an item as an instance of something else. It also occurs i Philo, *Aet. Mund.* 112, 116; Josephus, *Ant.* 11, 3; Test. Jos. 2:7; inscriptions and th papyri.

NT In the NT *apodeixis* appears only at 1 Cor. 2:4, and *apodeiknymi* at Acts 2:22 25:7; 1 Cor. 4:9; 2 Thess. 2:4.

The noun appears in the following contrast: "My speech and my message were no in plausible words of wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and power" (RSV) The predominant sense of "proof" suggests that Paul believed his message was prov ed by whatever "the Spirit and power" refers to. H. Conzelmann favours the notio of rhetorical proof (*First Corinthians, Hermeneia*, 1975, 55). A. Robertson and A Plummer see a logical analogy: "St Paul is not dealing with scientific certainty: bu he claims that the certitude of religious truth to the believer in the Gospel is as com plete and as 'objective' – equal in degree, though different in kind – as the certitude o scientific truth to the scientific mind" (*The First Epistle of St Paul to the Corinthians ICC*, 1911, 33). They cite Aristotle's contention that to demand rigid demonstration from a rhetorician is as unreasonable as to allow a mathematician to deal in mer plausibilities (*Eth. Nic.* 1, 3, 4; cf. Plato, *Phd.* 77c; *Theaet.* 162e; P. Teb. 2, 291, 41) Exegetes differ over the meaning of "Spirit and power". Some take it to be the con victing force of the Holy Spirit *in* the apostolic preaching (cf. C. K. Barrett, *The Firs Epistle to the Corinthians, BNTC*, 1968, 65 f.; F. F. Bruce, *1 and 2 Corinthians New Century Bible*, 1971, 39). Others see it as a reference to the signs and wonder which accompanied the preaching and could be seen in the growing Corinthia church (cf. J. Ruef, *Paul's First Letter to Corinth*, Pelican, 1971, 16 f.). Conzelman

75; J. Jeremias, *poimēn* etc., *TDNT* VI 485–502; P. W. Meyer, "A Note on John 10, 1–18", *JBL* 75, 956, 232–35; L. Morris, *The Gospel according to John*, *NLC*, 1971, 498–531; J. Quasten, "The arable of the Good Shepherd: John 10:1–21", *CBQ* 10, 1948, 1–12, 151–69; J. A. T. Robinson, "The arable of the Shepherd (John 10:1–5)", *ZNW* 46, 1955, 233–40 (reprinted in *Twelve New Testament tudies*, *SBT* 34, 1962, 67–75); J. G. S. S. Thomson, "The Shepherd-Ruler Concept in the OT and its pplication in the NT", *SJT* 8, 1955, 406–18; W. Tooley, "The Shepherd and Sheep Image in the eaching of Jesus", *NovT* 7, 1964, 15 ff.
). J. Botterweck, "Hirt und Herde im Alten Testament und im alten Orient", in *Festschrift J. Frings*, 960, 339–52; N. Castavassi, "De Munere 'pastoris' in NT", *Verbum Domini* 29, 1951, 215–27, 75–85; G. Dalman, *Arbeit und Sitte in Palästina*, VI, *BFChTh* II, 41, 1939, 146–287; V. Hamp, "Das lirtenmotiv im Alten Testament", *Episcopus. Festschrift für Kardinal Faulhaber*, 1949, 7–20; H. W. lertzberg, "Hirten- und Beduinenleben in Israel", *RGG*[3] III 365 ff.; T. Kempf, *Christus der Hirte*, 942; D. Mollat, "Le bon Pasteur (Jean 10, 1–18, 26–30)", *Bible et Vie Chrétienne* 52, 1963, 25–35;). Müller, "Der gute Hirte", *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache* 86, 1961, 127–44; M. Rehm, "Die Hir- enallegorie", *BZ* 4, 1960, 186–208; J. J. O'Rourke, "Jo. 10, 1–18: Series Parabolorum?", *Verbum Domini* 42, 22–25; R. Schnackenburg, "Episkopos und Hirtenamt", *Episcopus*, 1949, 66–88; W. chmidt, "Der gute Hirte. Biblische Besinnung über Lk. 15, 1–7", *EvTh* 24, 1964, 173 ff.; J. Schneider, Zur Komposition von Joh. 10", *Coniectanea Neotestamentica* 11, Fridrichsen Festschrift, 1947, 20–25; A. J. Simmouis, *Die Hirtenworte im Johannesevangelium*, 1967; J. A. Soggin, *rā'âh*, *THAT* II 91–94.

Show, Proof, Demonstrate

δείκνυμι — *δείκνυμι* (*deiknymi*), show, explain, prove.

L & OT *deiknymi* occurs in cl. Gk. from Homer onwards. It is also found in inscriptions and papyri. In the LXX it is found for 12 different Heb. vbs., but most frequently for *rā'âh*, see, in the hiphil, i.e. cause to see, show: e.g. Gen. 12:1, "Now the LORD said to Abram, 'Go from your country and your kindred and your father's house to that land that I will show you' " (cf. Gen. 41:28; Exod. 25:9[8], 40[39]; Num. 8:4; 13:26[28]; Deut. 1:33; 3:24; Jos. 7:14; Jdg. 1:24; Pss. 4:6; 50[49]:23; 59[58]:10; 60[59]:3; 71[70]:20; 78[77]:11; 85[84]:7; 91[90]:16; Amos 7:1, 4, 7; Isa. 9:2). Although it has a normal secular sense, it acquires a theological significance, when Yahweh is showing something.

NT 1. *deiknymi* is found in the NT in the following senses:

(a) point out, make known something or someone to someone: kingdoms in the temptations of Jesus (Matt. 4:8; Lk. 4:5; → Tempt); showing oneself to the priest (Matt. 8:4; Mk. 1:44; Lk. 5:14; cf. Lev. 13:49; → Leper); a hall (Mk. 14:15; Lk. 22:12); a pattern (Heb. 8:5; cf. Exod. 25:40; → Tent); the → hands of the risen Christ (Jn. 20:20); signs (Jn. 2:18; → Miracle); visions (Rev. 1:1; 4:1; 21:9 f.; 22:1, 6, 8; cf. Zech. 3:1); the → Father (Jn. 14:8 f.); revelation (Jn. 5:20); the parousia (1 Tim. 6:15); a way, i.e. the more excellent way of love (1 Cor. 12:31); (b) explain, prove (Jas. 2:18; cf. 3:13; → Righteousness); Jesus' way of suffering (Matt. 16:21); the vision of Peter which showed that the Gentiles were to be admitted to the church (Acts 10:28).

2. The following compounds also occur:

(a) *anadeiknymi* means to show clearly, reveal (Acts 1:24, the choice of a successor to Judas); appoint (Lk. 10:1, the Seventy). *anadeixis* means commissioning,

hand (Jn. 10:27 f.). Jesus leads them out of the *aulē* of Judaism and unites them ir great flock with those who are following him from among the Gentiles (Jn. 10:4

4. In Acts 20:28 *poimnē* and *ekklēsia* are juxtaposed. Paul, on the other har only uses the latter. In 1 Cor. 9:7 the apostle compares his claim on the church f hospitality with the shepherd's claim on the produce of his flock. 1 Pet. 2:2 however, looks back once again to the image of the shepherd and his flock; Jesus the shepherd and → bishop of souls. Christian elders were exhorted not to be se seeking masters over the community, but examples of service to it, so that they mig pass the test when Jesus, the chief shepherd (*archipoimēn*), appears (1 Pet. 5:3 f.). Heb. 12:20 Christ is the great shepherd (*poimēn megas*) who, in accordance with t theme of the letter, has, once and for all, surpassed all prototypes, including Mos himself. Rev. 7:17, on the other hand, says that the → lamb (*arnion*) will be t shepherd of his flock and that they will gladly follow him (cf. Rev. 14:4).

5. In the list of offices in Eph. 4:11 we find *poimenes kai didaskoloi*, pastors a teachers. But pastor is by no means yet an official title. For in 1 Pet. 5:1 and in A 20:17 the leaders of local Christian communities are called *presbyteroi*, and in A 20:28 *episkopoi* (→ Bishop). Their function can be deduced from 1 Pet. 5:2–4; A 20:28; Jn. 21:15–17 (care for spiritual welfare of the flock). Matt. 18:12–14 a 12:30 par. Lk. 11:23 (seeking the lost) are also relevant. In these cases the lead have to prove themselves worthy examples to the flock.

This is the background of Peter's appointment to pastoral office by the ris Christ: *poimaine ta probata mou* ("tend my sheep", Jn. 21:16). This strengthens a confirms Peter's special position as an apostle, to which the Gospels bear witness position, however, by no means absolute or capable of being handed on). Pete special responsibility is to the whole flock, to the whole church (→ Open; → Roc

6. The proclamation of Christ as the good shepherd, who laid down his life a rose again to tend his flock, the new people of God, became a living experience the NT church and was made use of pastorally. In missionary preaching, in the co text of a distinctive, ancient city culture with no OT background, the title of hono *kyrios*, naturally took the centre of the stage in place of the image of the messia shepherd. In worship and in personal piety there are also echoes of the shepherd i age. So the christological witness of the NT retains, against the background of message of the OT, the picture of the historical Jesus drawn in the Gospels, includ Jesus' witness to himself.

Just as, in the missionary preaching outside Palestine, the image of the sheph was withdrawn into the background, so it was with the image of the flock. The *kyr* and his community (his *ekklēsia*) become the increasingly prominent concepts for expression of these ideas (→ Lord; → Church). *E. Beyreuther*

→ Animal, → Feast, → I Am, → Lamb, Sheep, → Lord's Supper

(a). J. B. Bauer, "Shepherd", *EBT* III 844 ff.; J. N. Birdsall, "John x. 29", *JTS* New Series 11, 19 342–44; E. F. F. Bishop, "The Door of the Sheep – John x. 7–9", *ExpT* 71, 1959–60, 307 ff.; J Bruns, "The Discourse on the Good Shepherd and the Rite of Ordination", *American Ecclesiast Review* 149, 1963, 386–91; R. E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John, Anchor Bible*, I, 383–412 F. Bruce, "The Shepherd King", in *This is That: The New Testament Development of Some Old Te ment Themes*, 1968, 100–114; R. Bultmann, *The Gospel of John*, 1971, 358–91; J. D. M. Derrett, " Good Shepherd: St. John's Use of Jewish Halakhah and Haggadah", *StTh* 27, 1973, 25–50; Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament*, I, 1961, 59, 67 ff., 235 ff., 287, 347; II, 1967, 330, 46

he story of the shepherds as a solid part of the local tradition in Bethlehem that a tall was the birthplace of Jesus (*TDNT* VI 491).

2. According to the witness of the Synoptics in particular, Jesus is the messianic shepherd promised in the OT. There is only one reference, in the language of parable, to God the shepherd (Lk. 15:4–7 par. Matt. 18:12–14). The shepherd's joy at finding his lost sheep after an anxious search is compared to God's joy at one repentant sinner over against ninety-nine righteous. However, the Synoptics claim for Jesus the promise of the coming messianic shepherd in three ways:

(a) Jesus begins to fulfil the messianic shepherd's function by gathering the lost sheep of the house of Israel (Matt. 9:36; 10:6; 15:24; cf. Lk. 19:10 with Ezek. 34:15). This marks the dawning of the era of salvation announced by the prophets. He is the ruler of Israel, promised in Mic. 5:3(4), who gathers the shepherdless flock Matt. 2:6; 9:36; Mk. 6:34; cf. Ezek. 34:5). But this does not mean any abandonment of the gatherings of the nations, for he is also the universal shepherd (see below, 3 (b)).

(b) But Jesus must first die for his flock and rise again (cf. Matt. 26:31 f.; Mk. 14:27 f.). Here Jesus took up the words of Zech. 13:7 and claims to be the promised shepherd to which the OT looked forward, the shepherd whose representative death ushers in the time of salvation (cf. also Isa. 53).

(c) The era of salvation during which the flock, the people of God, is gathered under the Good Shepherd, reaches its climax in the day of → judgment. When all the nations are gathered around his glorious throne, Jesus will separate the sheep from the goats (or perhaps the white sheep from the black goats; cf. OT 1). He will sit in judgment. This will bring to an end the era of world mission, in which, since Jesus' death and resurrection, his flock has been called together from out of every nation *panta ta ethnē*, Matt. 25:32).

3. (a) The good shepherd of Jn. 10:1–30 is contrasted here, on the one hand, with the thief and, on the other, with the stranger. The shepherd enters through the door, his sheep know him and follow him willingly. In typically Johannine fashion the unique relationship between this shepherd and his flock is expounded. It is a relationship which is elsewhere expressed in other metaphors (cf. the vine and the branches in Jn. 15; → I Am).

This unique relationship is made possible by the shepherd's voluntary laying down of his life, something that the hireling is unable to do. He flees in the hour of danger. The hireling (*misthōtos*), like thief and stranger, is introduced for the sake of the contrast. The special contribution of Jn. 10, compared to the Synoptics, lies in this striking emphasis on the willing laying down of the shepherd's life (cf. Jn. 10:18). The links with the OT are obvious (cf. Ezek. 34 and the Synoptic witness; see above 2). Most scholars see Jesus' statements in the light of the OT background. However, R. Bultmann holds that the figure of the shepherd was drawn from gnostic tradition (*The Gospel of John*, 1971, 367–71). But these passages are mostly more recent than Jn. 10.

(b) As the shepherd stands for their → Lord (*kyrios*), so the flock (*poimnē*, Jn. 10:16), the sum total of his sheep (*probata*), stands for his people. This image replaces that of the *ekklēsia* (→ church), which is absent from Jn. The theme of the Synoptics is taken further. The risen Christ gathers his flock like a good shepherd. They know their shepherd as he knows them, and no one can snatch them out of his

10:21; 22:22; 23:1–5; 25:34; 50:6; 50:6; Ezek. 34:2–10; Isa. 56:11; Zech. 10:3 11:5 f.; 16 f.). In Isa. 44:28 God called Cyrus, king of Persia, "my shepherd". Like good shepherd, in accordance with God's will, he was concerned for the well-being c the returning exiles and the rebuilding of Jerusalem and of the → temple. In a totall different manner Jer. 25:34 ff. threatened the shepherds, the rulers, of the foreign na tions with judgment and destruction (cf. Nah. 3:18).

3. The messiah was also spoken of as a shepherd sent from God. At the tim when disaster was breaking loose, the title of shepherd suddenly appeared as designation of the future Davidic messiah. At first the references were t "shepherds", in the plur. Nevertheless, these prophecies pointed to the figure of single shepherd (Jer. 3:15; 23:4; Ezek. 34:23; 37:22, 24). One-sided expectation of political salvation was avoided, particularly in the case of Ezek. This figure of future messianic ruler remained mysterious. The shepherd, described as messiah c David, was particularly emphasized in post-exilic times in Zech. 13:7. The majorit of commentaries link this passage, which announces a representative death as th preliminary to a dawning time of salvation, with Zech. 12:10. "Thus at the end of th OT shepherd sayings there stands an intimation of the shepherd who suffers deat according to God's will and who thereby brings about the decisive turn" (J. Jeremia *TDNT* VI 488).

4. Late Judaism drew distinctions between shepherds. After the exile the Pharisa rabbis brought about a striking devaluation of the occupation of shepherd in Palest nian Judaism. In a time of poor pay, shepherds were suspected, perhaps often rightl of dishonesty. The pious were forbidden to buy wool, milk or meat from shepherd Civic privileges (the functions of judge and witness) were withdrawn from them a from the tax collectors. "No position in the world is as despised as that of th shepherd" (Midrash on Ps. 23). In legalistic Judaism → Moses and → David wer praised as true shepherds (as leaders and teachers of the law). Philo and Hellenist Judaism do not add anything which would cause this general picture to be altered. I the Qumran sect it was demanded of the Mebaqqer, the Guardian of the Camp, tha he receive the members of the community as a shepherd his sheep (CD 13:9; cf. A R. C. Leaney, *The Rule of Qumran and its Meaning*, 1966, 72 ff., 189, 228 ff.). It clear from Ps. Sol. 17:45 that late Judaism was capable of transferring the metaphc of the shepherd to the messiah, but, out of opposition to Christianity, made no use c it.

NT *poimēn* occurs 9 times in the Synoptic Gospels; 6 in Jn.; once each in Heb., 1 Pe and Eph. *poimnē* or *poimnion* occur 3 times in the Synoptics; once in Jn.; twic each in Acts, 1 Cor. and 1 Pet. *poimainō* occurs twice in the Synoptics; once each i Jn., Acts, 1 Cor., 1 Pet., Jude, and 4 times in Rev.

1. It is striking that the contemporary negative view of shepherds was not take over into the NT. On the contrary, the shepherd's devotion to duty is painted i glowing colours (cf. Jn. 10:3 f.; Lk. 15:4 f.; cf. Matt. 18:12 ff.). His contemporarie despised the shepherd, but this was the metaphor which Jesus used to glorify God' love for sinners and to reveal his opposition to Pharisaic condemnation of them (c Lk. 15:4–6). It is, of course, only in Lk. 2:8 f. that shepherds play an active rôle i the NT; elsewhere they appear only in parables and figures of speech. Jeremias see

4:1 ff.). Devotion to duty was proved in the nightly guarding of the flock against vild animals and thieves. In this respect hired shepherds frequently disappointed heir employers.

By *poimnion* the LXX means a herd of small cattle, especially a flock of sheep (cf. Gen. 29:2 ff.; 30:30). In NT times such a herd would consist of from 20 to 500 animals (Lk. 15:4 refers to 100 sheep). Sheep and goats were grazed together but separated in the evening, for the goats spent the night in the centre of the pen or of he walled enclosure (*aulē*), where it was warmer (this practice is referred to in Matt. 25:32).

Even after the occupation of Canaan the raising of cattle played a dominant rôle, alongside cultivation, as a means of earning a living. The memory of the classical nomadic days of ancient Israel before the occupation, when the people lived as aliens n tents, must have remained constantly alive, because God's activities in salvation history were bound up with it. For this reason the → Levites did not receive any arable land at the occupation, but remained herdsmen (Jos. 21). The Rechabites who formed a radical sect held fast in prophetic times to the pastoral way of life as an example (Jer. 35). Even the NT contains echoes of the memory of Israel's pastoral period (Heb. 11:9, 13).

2. Yahweh is the only shepherd of his people, Israel. This title is used disinterestedly only in Gen. 48:15; 49:24. Elsewhere in the historical books of the OT we feel a definite reticence, evidently the result of an aversion to the formal, stiff eastern titles of divinities (cf. J. Jeremias, *TDNT* VI 487 f.). At all events, the passages are very irregularly distributed over the OT. But in the Psalter and in the exilic prophets of comfort, the idea of the shepherd comes into greater prominence (Pss. 23; 28:9; 58:8 f.; 74:1; 77:20; 78:52 f.; 79:13; 80:1; 95:7; 110:3; 121:4; Jer. 23:2; 31:10; 50:19; Ezek. 34:11 f.; Isa. 40:10 f.; 49:9; Mic. 4:6 f.; 7:14). The acknowledgment that Yahweh was the shepherd of Israel grew out of the living religious experience of the people and is thus to be distinguished from the cold courtly style of the ancient East. In invocation, in praise, in prayer for forgiveness, but also in temptation and despair (Ps. 73), the worshippers know that they are still safe in the care of God the faithful shepherd (the most beautiful expression of this is Ps. 23). At the same time is the thought of God's unlimited sovereignty over his flock is not absent. In these contexts it co-exists in creative tension with the overwhelming consciousness of God's spontaneous love.

The people is Yahweh's flock (cf. Jer. 13:17; Isa. 40:11; Ezek. 34:31; Mic. 7:14; Zech. 10:3; Pss. 79:13; 95:7; 100:3). As the chosen people of God, Israel applied the metaphor of Yahweh's flock only to himself. Sir. 18:13 is the sole instance of the metaphor being applied universally to all men, who at the end of time will be gathered together into one flock.

This made it impossible to employ the official title of shepherd for the reigning monarchs of Israel as an expression of honour, even though they exercised the functions of the shepherd. Rather, in the light of God's faithfulness, their failure as shepherds was felt to be fundamental. David certainly shepherded the people. They were his flock, but the kingly title, shepherd, was avoided (cf. 2 Sam. 5:2; 1 Chr. 11:2; Ps. 78:71 f.; 2 Sam. 24:17; 1 Chr. 21:17). The prophets in their denunciations spoke of the political and military shepherds in unquestionably negative terms; these had all failed because of their arrogance and disobedience to God (Jer. 2:8; 3:15;

2. With *aischynomai* and *kataischynō*, the meaning to put or be put to shan predominates; with *epaischynomai*, to be ashamed. *aischynē* in the NT means shan suffered or self-inflicted (Jude 13; 2 Cor. 4:2). Phil. 3:19 and Rev. 3:18 use *aischy* in a sexual sense. *aischros*, disgraceful, is found in the NT chiefly in the phra *aischron estin*, it is a disgrace (1 Cor. 11:6; 14:35; Eph. 5:12). *aischrologia*, foul ta (Col. 3:8), and *aischrokerdēs*, greedy for base gain (1 Tim. 3:8; Tit. 1:7), are fou listed in catalogues of sins. *H.-G. Link*

(a). C. K. Barrett, "I am not ashamed of the gospel", *Foi et Salut selon S. Paul* = *AnBib* 42, 19 19–50; R. Bultmann, *aidōs*, *TDNT* I 169 ff.; and *aischynō* etc., *TDNT* I 189 ff.
(b). K. E. Løgstrup, "Scham", *RGG*[3] V 1383 ff.; R. Schultz, *AIDOS*, (Dissertation, Rostock), 191C

Shepherd

ποιμήν

ποιμήν (*poimēn*), shepherd; *ποίμνη* (*poimnē*), floc *ποίμνιον* (*poimnion*), flock; *ποιμαίνω* (*poimainō*), to he tend; *ἀρχιποίμην* (*archipoimēn*), chief shepherd, over-shepherd.

CL *poimēn*, herdsman, shepherd, is an Indo-European word (cf. Lithuanian *piem* which is frequently used in metaphorical senses: leader, ruler, commanc (Homer, Plato). It is also used as an alternative for *nomeus*, law-giver. *poimai* means to be a shepherd, tend (act. and mid.); metaphorically, care for. *poimnē poimnion* is the herd, particularly the flock of sheep.

1. Plato reminds us of the religious use of the word when he compares the rul of the city-state to shepherds, who care for their flock (*hōsper poimenōn poleōs*, *R* 4, 440d). For the human shepherd is a copy of the divine shepherd and law-gi (*schēma tou theiou nomeus*, *Politics* 271e).

2. In the ancient East, shepherd at an early date became a title of honour appl to divinities and rulers alike. This usage is found in a stereotyped form in t Sumerian king-lists, in Babylonian courtly style and in the pyramid texts (the boc of the dead). The custom was followed throughout antiquity. So far characteris parallels are lacking for pagan Canaan. Another aspect of the use of the image the shepherd appears in poetry, as typified by Theocritus' *Idylls* (3rd cent. B.C Pastoral terminology was very much in vogue throughout the Hellenistic worl

OT The Heb. equivalent of *poimēn* and *poimainō* is *rā'âh*; that of *poimn* predominantly *ṣō'n*. *poimnē* occurs only at Gen. 32:17(16) and Zech. 13:7 (b times for *'ēḏer*).

1. Before Israel settled in Canaan, the individual tribes depended on const wandering with their herds and flocks. The patriarchs (cf. also Job), who owr sheep and goats along with their cattle, were nomads. The shepherd's task was u dertaken preferably by members of the family; by the daughters only in the i mediate vicinity of the dwelling (Exod. 2:16). It was expected that the shepherds, a the servants who worked with them, would show caution, patient care and hones In the dry summer on poor soil it was not easy to find new pasture at the right ti as the flocks passed through lonely regions, or to balance properly grazing, wateri rest and travel. The shepherd had to care tirelessly for the helpless beasts (cf. Ez

19 f.). Yahweh's acts of judgment will force his enemies to be ashamed (Pss. 40:14; 83:16–18). That an objective sense is intended is corroborated by the use, parallel to *aischynō*, of vbs. like *tarachthēnai*, to be struck with terror (Pss. 6:10; 83:17); *entrapēnai*, to be confounded (Pss. 35:26; 70:2; 71:24); *katagelaō*, to mock (Ps. 25:2).

2. In the sexual sense *aischynō* is found frequently in Ezek. (16:36 f.; 23:10, 18, etc.), and in the normative statement of Gen. 2:25, "They were naked and were not ashamed." Here shame in the body is the most primitive expression of the feeling of guilt, the sign of a lesion going through man's bodily nature and casting doubt upon the unity of body and spirit. This disturbance results from an act of disobedience against Yahweh, and man reacts to the objective loss of innocence, and the innermost disturbance of his relationship with God, by the feeling of shame (Gen. 3:7; cf. G. von Rad, *Genesis*, 1961, 88, 95–9).

NT In the NT the group of words is found much less often than in the LXX: the noun and vb. together only 11 times, *aischros* 4 times, compound forms 11 times (*ep-*), and 13 times (*kat-*). In the Gospels they occur only in Lk. and Mk. Of relative importance is the Pauline use of *kataischynō*. Usage is closer to that of the LXX than that of cl. Gk.

1. (a) Mk. 8:38 par. Lk. 9:26 use *epaischynomai* in the sense of to be ashamed. The point of reference is not, however, a virtue or vice, but → confession of Christ. Being ashamed, i.e. fear of human ridicule, is rejected, as conduct denying the eschatological and universal authority of the → Son of man (cf. 1 Pet. 4:16; 2 Tim. 1:8, 16).

(b) In a similar way to the prophets (cf. Jer. 8:9), Paul speaks in 1 Cor. 1:27 of God as actively putting to shame, i.e. to nought, the wise and the powerful, while he chooses what is foolish and weak in the world, i.e. gives it standing and worth. Through the cross of Christ glory and shame have undergone an exchange of values. Similarly in Rom. 5:5, Paul makes the affirmation: "Hope does not put to shame", i.e. it does not rest on something that does not exist, but on God's future plans (cf. Rom. 8:24 f.). At Rom. 1:16 *epaischynomai* is used as part of a primitive Christian confession. The negative phrase, "I am not ashamed", means positively, "I confess . ." (cf. P. Stuhlmacher, *Gerechtigkeit Gottes bei Paulus, FRLANT* 87, 1966 [2]; and *Das paulinische Evangelium, I, Vorgeschichte, FRLANT* 95, 1968). The statement is not psychological in character, but rather forensic: With the gospel I shall not be put to shame. Paul takes up the same thought in a pass. form at Rom. 9:33, a quotation from Isa. 28:16: the believer will not be put to shame, i.e. his existence is secured (cf. also 1 Pet. 2:6). It is the apostle's continual concern that he should not be put to shame in his missionary work (2 Cor. 7:14; 9:4), i.e. that he should not work in vain (cf. the parallel phrase *mē eis kenon*, "not in vain", Gal. 2:2; Phil. 2:16; 1 Thess. 3:5). As in the OT, so in Paul's use of *kataischynō* the primary meaning is objective, to be put to shame; human feelings of shame are only the other, subjective side of the coin.

(c) The author of Heb. uses *epaischynomai* with reference to God's saving activity: Christ is not ashamed to call men his brothers (Heb. 2:11), and God is not ashamed to be called their God (11:16); Christ even takes the public shame (*aischynē*) of death on the cross upon himself (12:2).

dress that is stressed here, as the "good works" which are reckoned to be the tr adornment of a woman (cf. M. Dibelius and H. Greeven, *The Pastoral Epistl Hermeneia*, 1972, 45 ff.).

aidōs and *sōphrosynē* do not play a significant rôle in the NT. This is due in part their independent character as Stoic → virtues, calling for respect and restraint relation to one's fellow men. "The essence of the believer, however, is not relationship to himself, a *hexis* or *aretē*, but a being before God and towards h neighbour" (R. Bultmann, *TDNT* I 171). Christian behaviour is not determined l individual standards of virtue, but by the need of others. The Gk. *aidōs* has be replaced in the NT by *agapē* (→ Love). *H.-G. Link, E. Tiedtke*

αἰσχύνη

αἰσχύνω (*aischynō*), be ashamed, be put to shame, be d graced, be confounded; ἐπαισχύνομαι (*epaischynomai*), ashamed; καταισχύνω (*kataischynō*), to dishonour, disgrace, put to shame; pass. be dishonoured, be disappointed; αἰσχύνη (*aischynē*), modesty, shame, disgra ignominy; αἰσχρός (*aischros*), ugly, shameful, base, disgraceful; αἰσχρότ (*aischrotēs*), ugliness, wickedness.

CL 1. The root *aisch-* refers originally to that which is ugly and disgraceful. *aischy* (Homer onwards) thus meant originally to disfigure, make ugly. It is found in C literature almost exclusively in the mid. or pass. with the meaning to feel shame, ashamed, or to be confounded, be disconcerted. *epaischynomai* (Aesch. onwards) a strengthened form of the mid., and *kataischynō* (Homer onwards) of the act. a pass. meanings of *aischynō*. The noun *aischynē* (Aesch.) is derived fr *aischynesthai*, and originally carried the meaning of *to aischynesthai*, the fact of b ing ashamed, or of being confounded. *aischynē* has the subjective sense of modes understood as fear of what is *aischron*, ugly (Aristoxenos, *Fragment* 42a); and t objective sense of shame, that which results from an *aischron*, shameful deed (Di Sic. 2, 23, 2). In contrast to → *aidōs* with its religious reference to the gods, *aischy* is primarily a sociological concept: shame exposes one to the ridicule of socie which one tries to escape by being ashamed.

2. *aischros* (Homer onwards) is used lit. and fig. in the sense of base (e.g. b gain, cf. Polyb., 6, 46, 3). *aischrotēs* means ugliness (Plato, *Gorgias* 525a).

OT 1. The LXX uses *aischynō* in by far the majority of cases for the Heb. *bôš*, to p to shame (65 times), and *aischynē* for the nouns *bôš*, *bûšâh* or *bōšeṯ*, shame (times). Only in 8 cases does *aischynē* render *'erwâh*, pudenda. The mid. meaning be ashamed, or modesty, is found only rarely in comparison with the Gk. usage. T group of words is found most frequently in Isa., Jer., and Pss.; and the emphasis not on the sociological, but on the theological, aspect of *aischynō*. Commo Yahweh is the implied or stated subject of *aischynō*, as may be seen from the pa construction (generally the future second pass.) used as a circumlocution for God (Isa. 1:29; 20:5; Jer. 2:26). The psalmists pray for (cf. Pss. 6:10; 35:26; 40:15) a the prophets foretell (Isa. 1:29; 41:11; Jer. 2:26) Yahweh's → judgment, which w put their enemies and the ungodly to shame. Thus in the OT *aischynō* refe primarily to the objective ruin of the evildoer, or of the whole nation (cf. Ps. 69:4–

ıakes use of the same dramatic symbolism when the Jews stir up opposition to his reaching in Pisidian Antioch (Acts 13:51) and when he makes his final break from ıe synagogue in Corinth (Acts 18:6).

The verb *apotinassō* is used in its literal sense to describe Paul's action in shaking ff the snake from his hand after the shipwreck on Malta (Acts 28:5). *N. Hillyer*

i. Bertram, *saleuō, salos*, *TDNT* VII 65–70; G. Bornkamm, *seiō, seismos*, *TDNT* VII 196–200.

hame, Respect

αἰδώς

αἰδώς (*aidōs*), modesty, reverence, respect; αἰδέομαι (*aideomai*), have respect for, have regard for.

L *aideomai* (Homer onwards), to have respect for, stand in awe of, have regard for, remains a common word in Gk. language; but the related noun *aidōs* (likewise rom Homer), (a) awe, reverence (Pindar, Plato), (b) modesty (Hdt. 1, 8), is seldom sed. Originally the terms refer to awe in face of the *deinon*, signifying for the Greeks power which commands respect, in the shape of gods, fate, justice, or laws (Hesiod, *Vorks* 197 ff.). In contrast to *hybris*, → pride, which is a wanton transgression of the ıeal of the golden mean (*metron*), *aidōs* signifies a respect for the established sacred ıstitutions (e.g. home, marriage, laws of hospitality), or for the privileges of certain ıeople (e.g. king, priest, orator, etc.), in the sense of piety, *eusebeia* (→ Godliness; 'lato, *Prt.* 322 ff.). It also connotes anxious avoidance, in the sense of *phobos*, → fear ıf any damage or change to existing circumstances (Aristotle, *Eth. Nic.* IV 15p 128b 10 ff.).

At a later period *aidōs*, originally a foundation concept for the self-understanding ıf the Greeks, was freed from the ties that bound it and became an independent con-ept in individual ethics, signifying the Greeks' sense of self-esteem, honour or shame Stoics, Epictetus etc.). *aidōs* in this sense can be associated with *sōphrosynē*, ırudence, → discipline, and *eleutheria*, → freedom, as the "attitude of the worthy ıan" (R. Bultmann, *TDNT* I 170). Connected with this is the fact that the word, un-ke → *aischynē*, is limited in use to the language of the élite, and the ethics of the ristocracy, in a society divided by a class-system.

ıT Heb. possesses no equivalent for *aidōs*. Significantly the word is found in the LXX only at 3 Macc. 1:19 in the sense of modesty (cf. Lat. *pudor*), and 3 Macc. :5 for reverence for age. At Ezek. 23:20 the Heb. *zirmâh*, the semen of a stallion, is endered by *aidoion*. *aideomai* occurs occasionally in Macc. with the meaning, to tand in awe (2 Macc. 4:34), or regard, show respect (4 Macc. 5:6).

IT In the NT *aideomai* does not occur at all, and *aidōs* only in some textual variants to Heb. 12:28, and in 1 Tim. 2:9. The Koine variants of Heb. 12:28 use *aidōs* in :s original sense of awe of God, parallel to *eulabeia*, fear of God: "Through ratitude we serve God acceptably with reverence and awe." 1 Tim. 2:9 describes the ıroper conduct of women as being *meta aidous kai sōphrosynēs*, with marked eserve and sober modesty. The background of Greek and Stoic ethics is un-ıistakable, and the context (v. 10) makes it clear that it is not so much moderation in

melt or rot away. The disruption of nature involves "a tumult of the elements, reason of which the most important parts of the universe lose their equilibrium, a their mechanism seems to become unhinged. That is the immediate introduction the reappearance of the Son of man" (T. Zahn, *Das Evangelium des Lucas*, 1913

The noun *salos* occurs only at Lk. 21:25, where the rolling swell of the sea is o of the eschatological signs distressing the nations (Hag. 2:6). This item is omitt from the parallel passages in Matt. 24 and Mk. 13. The image of the roaring wav often symbolizes turbulent conditions in the life of the nations (Ps. 65:7).

Luke tells how, when the crew of Paul's storm-tossed ship ran the vessel asho the bow stuck fast in the mud and remained immovable, *asaleutos* (Acts 27:41). T only other occurrence of *asaleutos* is in Heb. 12:28, where the divine kingdom described as unshakable and therefore eternal, in contrast to the fate of the mater creation, however solid that has appeared in the past (Heb. 12:26, quoting Hag. 2:

N. Hillyer

ἐκτινάσσω

ἐκτινάσσω (*ektinassō*), shake out, shake off; *ἀποτινάσσ* (*apotinassō*), shake off.

CL *ektinassō*, shake out, as in cleaning clothes; search thoroughly, make a distu bance, kick out (of animals). The derived noun *ektinaktron* means a winnowin shovel. *apotinassō*, shake off (Eur.)

OT *ektinassō* occurs 21 times in the LXX, usually to render *nā'ar*, though six oth Heb. words are once or twice each translated by the same verb. The Lord sho off (*nā'ar*) the Egyptians in the midst of the sea, i.e., out of their chariots as they tu ned to flee (Exod. 14:27; Ps. 135:15). Nehemiah sealed an oath taken by the pries by shaking out (*nā'ar*) his lap, symbolizing that anyone breaking the promise wou be cursed by a life of homeless wandering, emptied of all his possessions, an outca (Ps. 126:4 LXX). Metaph. *nā'ar* is used to express weakness: shaken off as easily a locust (Ps. 109:23). Captive Jerusalem is bidden to stand up and shake herself fr from the dust of despair in captivity and from the Gentiles (Isa. 52:2). In 1 Sam 10 *apotinassō* once translates *nāṭaš* (leave, forsake), when Saul's father is said to ha ceased to be concerned (*apotetinaktai*) about the lost asses. In Lam. 2:7 *apotinas* is used for the piel of *nā'ar*, abhor, reject: the Lord has disowned, cast off, h sanctuary.

NT In commissioning the Twelve, Jesus tells them that where their message is not a cepted, they are to shake off (*ektinassō*, Matt. 10:14; Mk. 6:11; *apotinassō*, L 9:5) the dust from their feet, a gesture of total abandonment. No trace of associatic with the house or city is to remain. Mark and Luke add, "for a testimony again them", i.e., branding the inhabitants as no better than the heathen outside the cov nant. Jewish travellers shook off the dust of Gentile territory from their sandals ar clothes before re-entering the Holy Land (SB I 571). Once the apostles have di charged their responsibilities to preach, those rejecting the gospel will suffer jud ment, heavier even than that inflicted upon Sodom and Gomorrah. The fate of tho cities is often an OT type of fearful retribution for aggravated sin (Deut. 29:23; Is 13:19; Jer. 49:18; 50:40; Amos 4:11; Zeph. 2:9). Paul follows Jesus' advice an

ɔssing motion, earthquake, rolling swell of the sea; perplexity, restlessness (political r personal).

T In the LXX *saleuō* appears 77 times and translates no less than 12 different Heb. words, the commonest of which is *mûṭ*, to totter, shake, slide; frequently in the salms for the man of God not being moved, i.e. weak, in the face of enemies. *salos* ccurs 8 times and renders *mûṭ*, and several other Heb. terms: the tumult (*nāśā'*, lit. fting up) of the waves (Ps. 88:9); the raging (*zā'ap̄*, to be angry) of the sea (Jon. :15); the tumult (*s'ārâh*, storm) of threatening (Zech. 9:14). For Philo, the laws of ıe nations are variable, but the law of Moses, like nature itself and the cosmic order, ; unshakable, *asaleutos*. In the LXX *asaleutos* occurs in Exod. 13:16; Deut. 6:8; 1:18 for *ṭôṭāp̄ôṭ*, in reference to the immovability of the signs which were to be worn n hands and forehead as a reminder of the Exodus deliverance. It is from these erses that the Jewish practice of wearing phylacteries (Matt. 23:5) arose, i.e. binding mall rolls of parchment, endorsed with sentences from the law, upon the forehead nd left arm when the *Shema'* was recited (J. A. Thompson, *Deuteronomy*, 1974, 23).

IT *saleuō* is used of the action of the wind and storm, to shake, disturb violently, as in the parable of the two men whose houses, built on sand and rock respectively, aced the violence of a storm with dramatically different consequences (Lk. 6:48). \fter the release of Peter and John from prison, the house where the Christians in erusalem had met to pray was shaken as in an earthquake (*esaleuthē*) as a sign of livine approval (Acts 4:31; cf. Acts 2:2; Exod. 19:18; Isa. 6:4; 2 Esd. 6:15, 29). At 'hilippi, the foundations of the prison were shaken by a literal earthquake (Acts 6:26). No doubt, as known in modern times, the swaying building not only unatched doors but momentarily opened up the rough mortar between the stones, thus ;ausing the staples holding the prisoners' chains to fall out.

After answering the messengers from John the Baptist, Jesus took occasion to peak about John's character and mission. A reed shaken (*saleuomenon*) by the wind Matt. 11:7; Lk. 7:24) may be a collective singular, referring to the cane-grass growng on the banks of the Jordan. If so, there is no suggestion of frailty or instability. 'eople went to the wilderness, not to gaze at the beauty of the cane-grass being wayed about in the wind, but to look for a man with a message (D. Hill, *The Gospel of Matthew*, 1972, 199). *saleuō* is also used metaph. (a) to express abundant giving, ıs full volume is obtained by shaking together the contents of a grain measure (Lk. 5:38); (b) to be thoroughly unsettled in mind (2 Thess. 2:2); (c) to incite a mob (Acts 17:13); (d) to shake out of a sense of security and happiness (Acts 2:25, quoting Ps. 16:8 LXX).

After the tribulation, the return of the Son of man will be accompanied by unnistakable cosmic portents. These are described by the Synoptists in the traditional erminology of Jewish apocalyptic, commonly used to symbolize political upheaval ınd the end of the world (Isa. 13:10; 34:4; Ezek. 32:7; Amos 8:9; 4 Esd. 13:30 ff.; 1QH 3:29–39). According to Matt. 24:29; Mk. 13:25; Lk. 21:26, the powers of the ıeavens – either the heavenly bodies or the forces which control them – will be shaken, *saleuthēsetai*. The wording alludes to Isa. 34:4, but the LXX has the much ess violent verb *takēsontai*, from *tēkō*, dissolve, and MT *nāmaqqû*, from *māqaq*,

God's praises in prison (Acts 16:26). Earthquakes are one of the eschatological si (Matt. 24:7; Mk. 13:8; Lk. 21:11; Rev. 6:12; 8:5; 11:13, 19; 16:18).

The passage Matt. 27:51–54 includes a piece of primitive christology. T resurrection of the righteous was expected as one of the great events of the end, wh as a result of the Mt. of Olives splitting in two (Zech. 14:4) the dead were to app (Dan. 12:2). The earthquake at Jesus' death relates to the first part of this sequen while the second (the appearance of some of the saints) takes place after Jes resurrection. This witness to the significance of Christ's death and resurrection not survive in the main stream of tradition (only Matthew includes the incide since it did not fit comfortably into what became the accepted christology that Ch was the first fruits of those who had fallen asleep (1 Cor. 15:20), with all the oth waiting for the general resurrection (1 Thess. 4:16). The six instances of resurrect mentioned in Scripture as preceding that of Jesus are only restorations to the pres earthly life: the widow of Sarepta's son, 1 Ki. 17; the Shunammite's son, 2 Ki. 4; effect of Elisha's bones, 2 Ki. 13; Jairus' daughter, Matt. 9; the widow of Nain's s Lk. 7; Lazarus, Jn. 11. Enoch and Elijah were translated without going throu death (Gen. 5:24; 2 Ki. 2; → Resurrection, art. *anastasis* OT 5). Matt. 27:52– signals that with Christ the general resurrection has begun (K. Stendahl, "Matthe in *Peake's Commentary on the Bible*, ed. M. Black and H. H. Rowley, 1962, 79 The earthquake symbolizes Christ's shattering of the power of death. He burst grave in entering it. The local tremor at Calvary and the subsequent resurrection some saints in the holy city foreshadowed the eschatological earthquakes, the gene resurrection, and the new Jerusalem, the destruction of the present earth and the f mation of the new (Rev. 21:1).

anaseiō occurs only at Mk. 15:11 and Lk. 23:5, where Pilate observes that chief priests have incited (*aneseisan*) the crowd. *diaseiō* appears in Lk. 3:14, wh John the Baptist tells the soldiers who responded to his preaching not to use th position to intimidate anyone (*mēdena diaseisēte*), i.e. not to extort money. Th were probably not Roman soldiers but a Jewish paramilitary force used to supp tax-collectors. John exhorts them to behave fairly, but says nothing about leavi their jobs. *kataseiō* is used four times in Acts, of Peter (12:17), Paul (13:16; 21:4 and Alexander (19:33) motioning with their hands to gain people's silent attenti before speaking to them. *episeiō* is only in the expanded D text of Acts 14:19, wh the Jews incited (*episeisantes*) the mob at Lystra (B. M. Metzger, *A Textual Co mentary on the Greek New Testament*, 1971, 424 f.). *N. Hillyer*

σαλεύω

σαλεύω (*saleuō*), shake, cause to waver or totter, unsett drive away; σάλος (*salos*), rolling or tossing motic ἀσάλευτος (*asaleutos*), unshakable, firm, enduring.

CL From Aesch., *saleuō* means to rock, vibrate (sea, ground), loosen (tooth, na shake in measuring, so as to give good weight; roll, toss, of ships in stormy se metaph. to be in distress, be unstable, roll in walking; shake, due to sickness or a (Plato). Hence, life in the world beyond is *asaleutos*, not subject to trouble or dist bance. *asaleutos* also refers to the calmness of the sea, or metaph. of the mind. *sal*

articularly when God comes in judgment, the anticipation of which causes a shak-ıg, a trembling, among the peoples (Ezek. 38:19 f.). When Judah is threatened, the round is said to shake, i.e. with fear, in anticipation of the thundering horses of the ıvader (Jer. 8:16). In its day, the terror of Babylon caused other nations to tremble Isa. 14:16). Paradoxically, her end produces a similar effect (Jer. 50:46, LXX 7:46), for if so mighty and self-sufficient a power can be overthrown, what may appen to lesser nations? Nebuchadnezzar's heavy chariots and wagons driving into he city (Ezek. 26:10) will cause the walls of Tyre to shake, literally with the vibra-ion, and metaphorically because the strength of a city, symbolized by its wall, has ıeen destroyed, and who knows what the enemy will now do to a defenceless people? n Prov. 24:5 f. (MT 30:21) upstarts are said to cause the earth to tremble (*rāgaz*, uiver violently), i.e. they are liable to upset the smooth running of affairs, whether lomestic or national.

seismos occurs 15 times in the LXX, and usually translates *ra'aš*. In Job 1:20(21), the crocodile laughs at being threatened with a waving (*seismos*) irebrand. *seismos* means an earthquake, lit. or fig., in Amos 1:1; Isa. 29:6; Jer. 0:22; 23:19; Ezek. 3:12 f.; 38:19; Zech. 14:5; the rumbling of wheels, Nah. 3:2; the attling of chariots, Jer. 29:3 (MT 47:3); trembling for fear, Isa. 15:5; the rattling of lry bones in the valley as they come together, Ezek. 37:7. *diaseiō* is used of intimida-ion, especially to extort money (3 Macc. 7:21). In Job 4:14 it translates *pāḥaḏ*, trem-ıle, and describes a great shaking of bones caused by a fearful nightmare. In the LXX *kataseiō* occurs twice. Daniel's servants sprinkled (*kataseiō*) ashes over the loor of Bel's temple to betray the footprints of the nightly intruders (Ad. Dan. Bel 14). In 1 Macc. 6:38 *kataseiō* is the verb used of horsemen being placed in position ɔn either wing of an army, as though spread or sprinkled over an area. *episeiō* tran-slates *sût*, persuade, excite. Achsah urges (*episeiō*) Othniel to ask her father for a favour (Jdg. 1:14). In 1 Sam. 26:19 *episeiō* means to stir up feelings against someone, and in 2 Sam 24:1 and 1 Chr. 21:1 the verb is used for the inciting of David to number the people.

NT *seiō* is a powerful term to describe the effect on the people when Jesus entered Jerusalem seated on an ass: all the city was stirred, *eseisthē* (Matt. 21:10), shaken to its foundations. His deliberate fulfilling of the prophecy of messiah's entry (Zech. 9:9) was unmistakable. At the resurrection the guards at the tomb trembled (*eseisthēsan*), shook violently, at the sight of the angel (Matt. 28:4).

Heb. 12:26 refers to the giving of the law on Sinai (Exod. 19:12 f.), when the divine voice shook (*saleuō*) the earth. The earthquake at the time (Exod. 19:18) was an event which was never forgotten by Israel (Ps. 68:17 f.). At the end of the present world-order God would shake (*seiō*, as in Hag. 2:16, quoted here) not only earth but heaven too. The opening of the sixth seal leads to cataclysmic events of cosmic proportions, including stars falling to the earth, like so many figs being shaken off the tree by a gale (Rev. 6:13; cf. Isa. 34:4).

In Matt. 8:24 *seismos* is used to describe the violence of the sudden storm which threatened to engulf Jesus and the disciples on the lake. The other eleven occurrences of *seismos* in the NT all refer to earthquakes, and always as divine interventions: at the moment of Jesus' death (Matt. 27:54); at the resurrection, where it is linked with the rolling back of the stone (Matt. 28:2); and at Philippi, as Paul and Silas sing

like Philo, the author of Heb. understands this contrast christologically: in co parison with the high-priestly work of Jesus Christ, who is "in the heavens", earthly worship, as conducted in the tabernacle, takes on secondary importan Thus the Mosaic law may not be regarded as absolute in its validity, for it belongs the "shadow of heavenly things" (Heb. 10:1; cf. 8:5). Col. 2:17 asserts that questic of food and drink, festival, new moon and → sabbath "are only a shadow [*skia*] what is to come; but the substance [*sōma*] belongs to Christ." The person w belongs to Christ, the bearer of true reality (note that as in Philo *sōma* [lit. "body" seen as the contrary to *skia*), does not have to submit to the judgment of others such matters. It is not that the ordinance has been suspended. Rather, it is made cl that the direct relation of faith in Christ, in the dimension of eschatological hope, h priority, since the latter links man with genuine reality, with God in Christ. Bef this God all that is earthly, even certain religious and cultic formalities, cannot b appear transient. Earthly things are marked by the characteristics of the shado change and darkening. With God, on the other hand, the Father of lights, there is " variation or shadow [*aposkiasma*] due to change" (Jas. 1:17), i.e. "processes change and of darkening, such as are known among the constellations, are exclud in the case of God" (F. Hauck, *Das Neue Testament Deutsch* 10, 11).

H.-C. Hahn

→ Darkness, → Light

P. W. van Horst, "Peter's Shadow: The Religio-Historical Background of Acts V 15", *NTS* 1976–77, 204–12; H. Schultz, *skia* etc., *TDNT* VII 394–400; J. H. Paterson, "Shade, Shadow", *ZP* IV 368 f.; J. A. Wharton, "Shadow", *IDB* IV 302.

Shake

σείω

σείω (*seiō*), shake, cause to quake, agitate; σεισμ (*seismos*), shaking, commotion, earthquake; ἀνασε (*anaseiō*), stir up, incite, excite; διασείω (*diaseiō*), shake violently, intimidat κατασείω (*kataseiō*), shake down, motion, shake or wave the hand as a sign ἐπισείω (*episeiō*), incite.

CL *seiō* (poetical *siō*) means to shake, move to and fro (Homer), e.g. a poised spear, door; the head, as a sign of discontent; the ground (earthquakes were attribut to Poseidon); metaph. to agitate, disturb, upset; accuse falsely, spitefully; extc (shake out) hush-money, blackmail; *seismos*, shaking, shock, earthquake, blackma *anaseiō*, shake back (hair from head), swing to and fro, brandish, threaten, stir u *diaseiō*, shake violently, wag (tail), shake off (people), throw into confusion, i timidate; *kataseiō*, shake down, throw down; metaph. listen carefully, by throwi back the ears; be dead drunk (thrown on the floor); beckon, signal with the han shake the head in contempt; *episeiō*, shake at or against, with a view to scaring; ur on.

OT *seiō* occurs 37 times in the LXX and usually translates *rā'aš*, to shake, move and fro. In the Song of Deborah the earth is said to have been shaken, *eseist* (Jdg. 5:4), and this expression of the divine presence occurs frequently in the O

:3; Pss. 23:4; 44:19; 88:6 [LXX only]; 107:10, 14; Isa. 9:2). In these places *skia* used of the realm of darkness, threatening to life. It is therefore understandable at the metaphor of shadow is a favourite one for describing the short and transitory ture of human life. For "man is like a breath, his days are like a passing shadow" s. 144:4; cf. 1 Chr. 29:15, *kai ouk estin hypomonē*, there is no abiding; Job 14:2).

4. In apocryphal literature also the term "shadow" is used chiefly to demonstrate e nothingness of human life (cf. Wis. 2:5; 5:9) and effort (cf. Sir. 34:2, "As one no catches at a shadow . . . is he who gives heed to dreams"). But the lit. meaning is so found (cf. Wis. 19:7, cloud; Bar. 5:8, plant); and the term can also refer to an arthly) empire (cf. Bar. 1:12).

In the NT the group of words is comparatively rare: *skia* is found 7 times; the vb. *episkiazō* 5 times; and *aposkiasma* once. The words are totally absent from the uline and Johannine writings.

1. At Mk. 4:32 we find the lit. meaning: → birds will be able to nest in the shadow the mustard when it has grown into a tree. The shadow of the shrub affording elter to the birds (cf. J. Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, 1963², 147) thus indicates place of security such as is offered by nature.

2. The sphere of God's rule is characterized in the Synoptic Gospels (Matt. 17:5 r. Mk. 9:5; Lk. 9:34) by use of the OT image of the bright cloud which ershadows Jesus and his disciples on the Mount of Transfiguration (→ ansfiguration). Here the cloud's shadow symbolizes the gracious presence of God. t Lk. 1:35 the concrete image of the cloud throwing its shadow is lacking. Instead ere is a more abstract and yet more direct reference to the divine subject of *iskiazō*, overshadowing, when Mary is told: "The Holy Spirit will come upon you, d the power of the Most High will overshadow you." The vb. recalls the Shekinah esence of Yahweh (cf. also D. Daube, *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*, 956, 32–6, who compares it with the words of Ruth, "spread therefore thy wing er thy handmaid" [Ruth 3:9], in the light of rabbinic teaching). The passage which lls of the sick who were carried out on to the street, "that as Peter came by at least s shadow might fall on some of them" (Acts 5:15), is intended to point to the heal- g power of God, whose sphere of operation is in this case identified with Peter. hus in all 5 instances of *episkiazō*, God is ultimately the cause of the overshadow- g, which serves to demonstrate his power and glory.

3. As in the OT, *skia* can also refer in the NT to the sphere of darkness in which en find themselves before they come to the light. For by nature man lives in the nd and the shadow of death, i.e. his existence is determined by death (cf. the cita- on of Isa. 9:1 in Matt. 4:16, and the words about John the Baptist at Lk. 1:79). ere death and darkness are intensified to mean the darkness of separation from od, so that "the expression 'shadow of death' . . . denotes the sphere of perdition hich characterises the Gentiles who are separated from the Messiah and Son of od" (S. Schulz, *TDNT* VII 397).

4. It is not only the transitoriness of human life, however, with its threatened ter- ination by death, that is expressed by *skia*. As in Philo, the word plays an impor- nt part in the distinction drawn between real and unreal existence in Col. and Heb. ere *skia* stands with *hypodeigma*, copy (Heb. 8:5), and *parabolē*, likeness (Heb. :9), in stark contrast to *typos*, pattern (Heb. 8:5), and *eikōn*, form (Heb. 10:1). Un-

Homer of *skiazō*, to shade (cf. also *skiaō*, to overshadow, make shady).

Another NT word belonging to this group is the noun *aposkiasma*, found only Jas. 1:17, and nowhere in pre-Christian literature, signifying a darkening caused the movements of constellations.

2. *skia* has in cl. Gk. both a proper and a transferred meaning. On the one hanc means a shadow, thrown by an object (e.g. a tree or a rock) or a person. On the ot hand, it can assume the meaning of *skotos* and indicate the sphere of → darkness particularly important example of this is in the expression *skia thanatou*, shadow death. *skia* here underlines the suggestion of threat already contained in the conc of → death. But apart from this combination, *skia* can also be used to signify vanity (→ Empty, art. *mataios*) of human actions (e.g. Lucian, *Hermotimus* 79, pursue a shadow, a fiction) and of man in general (e.g. Pindar, *Pyth.* 8, 95 f., mar the dream of a shadow). Occasionally *skia* may be translated → image, reflection. Plato it is used alongside *eikōn* almost as a synonym for that term, which like *s* describes a mere likeness of the true and eternal realities (cf. *Rep.* 6, 510e; 7, 517d

3. The Platonic distinction between shadowy image and real → form, which is timately equivalent to that between appearance and reality, plays an important p in the religious philosophy of Philo of Alexandria. In seeking to enable man to dr conclusions from the visible world about the invisible God, he describes God's wor of creation as *skia* (*Leg. All.* 3, 99 f.). The Logos, which has in addition a mediati function, can also be called *eikōn* and *skia*, that is in relation to God. For to man is archetype and paradigm, i.e. the pattern of real being. It is interesting that Ph makes a conscious distinction between the exceptional, mediatorial rôle of → Mos and that of the → prophets, attributing to Moses a knowledge of God *en eidei*, form, while the prophets know him only *en skia* (*Leg. All.* 3, 103 f.). The meaning *eidos* here is on a level with that of *archētypos*, original, substance. The same is tr of Philo's use of *sōma*, → body, which is likewise contrasted with *skia*.

OT 1. In the OT the term shadow has various meanings. The LXX constantly us *skia* to translate the Heb. *ṣēl*, and its derivative *ṣalmāweṯ* is sometimes render by *skia thanatou*, shadow of death. Most frequently it is found in a concrete sens the shadow of mountains (Jdg. 9:36), plants (Ezek. 17:23; 31:6; Jon. 4:6), a boo (Jon. 4:5), and a sundial (2 Ki. 20:9 ff., where the details of the text are obscure, ar Isa. 38:8 which is dependent on 2 Ki. [→ Miracle, art. *sēmeion* OT 2 (c)]). Tl difficult reference in Isa. 25:5 to the shadow of a cloud does not appear in the LX

2. There is, perhaps coincidentally, no mention of a human shadow; but tl thought is in the background of Isa. 51:16, with its mention of the shadow of God → hand (cf. Isa. 49:2 LXX, *skepē*), and in the places where the "shadow of tl Almighty" is mentioned (Ps. 91:1; cf. Pss. 57:1; 17:8). Similar to the references God's wings are those which speak of the cloud whose shadow is a demonstration God's authority (Exod. 40:34 f.). Paradoxically, words of this group assume positive meaning akin to that of *phōs*, → light, in passages where they refer to tl sphere of God's protection and shelter. This is surprising in view of the fact that *sk* would seem at first sight to have its place among metaphors of → darkness. But Glory, art. *doxa*.

3. The negative sense is retained in all those places where, in poetic literature, *sk* is mentioned in conjunction with *thanatos*, death (cf. Job 3:5; 12:22; 16:16; 24:1'

or the loving service in the collection for Jerusalem (→ Poor, art. *ptōchos* NT 4 (a)). f that is so, the point would be that it was a religious service of God. Others interpret : in terms of the original secular Gk. usage. Then the stress would be on the official nd public aid to the Jerusalem community. However, we can no longer be certain whether Paul really implied anything beyond general service in his use of these words. Both in Rom. 15 and 2 Cor. 8 and 9 this word-group and the *diakoneō* word-;roup stand parallel.

4. Clearly there is no cultic use in Phil. 2:25, 30. Epaphroditus had become a *eitourgos* (2:25), helper, when he served Paul in his hour of need. Thus he rendered Paul the service (*leitourgia*), which the church, owing to circumstances, was not able o render (2:30). Similarly in Rom. 13:6, where *diakonos* could stand equally well for *eitourgos*, no priestly functions are ascribed to the state. In Heb. 1:7 the term *eitourgos* also lacks specific cultic connotation. In the latter passage, citing Ps. 104:4, the angels are merely called servants. They are contrasted with the immutability of Christ (1:8 f.), for their form and function are controlled by God. They are what they are in virtue of their service (Heb. 1:14). *K. Hess*

→ Apostle, → Bishop, → Child, Boy, Servant, → Fellowship, → Lord's Supper, → Love, → Mercy, → Poor, → Possessions, → Prayer, → Priest, → Sacrifice, → Slave, → Temple, → Tent

a). H. W. Beyer, *diakoneō* etc., *TDNT* II 81–93; C. Brown, "Ministry in the New Testament", in J. C. Porthouse, ed., *Ministry in the Seventies*, 1970, 10–22; O. Cullmann, *Early Christian Worship*, 1953; G. Delling, *Worship in the New Testament*, 1962; E. Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 1971, 258–69; H. Strathmann, *latreuō* etc., *TDNT* IV 58–65; H. Strathmann and R. Meyer, *leitourgeō* etc., *TDNT* IV 215–25.

b). P. Abbing, "Grundlinien zu einer theologischen Lehre vom Diakonat", *MPTh* 50, 1961, 348 ff.; E. Barnikol, *Das Diakonenamt*, 1941; and "Die ersten Diakonen, die Zwölf nach Apg. 1.25", *Theologisches Jahrbuch*, 1941, 88 f.; S. Bihel, "De septem diaconis (Acta 6.1–7)", *Antonianum* 3, 1928, 129–50; W. Brandt, *Dienst und Dienen im Neuen Testament*, 1931; O. Cassel, "*leitourgia – munus*", *Oriens Christianus* 3, 1932, 289–302; P. Gaechter, "Die Sieben", *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 74, 1952, 129–66; W. Hahn, *Gottesdienst und Opfer Christi*, 1951; E. Käsemann, "Liturgie", *RGG* [3]IV 402 ff.; and "Gottesdient im Alltag der Welt", in *Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche. Festschrift J. Jeremias*, 1960, 165 ff., H. Krimm, *Das diakonische Amt der Kirche*, 1953; E. Lohmeyer, *Kultus und Evangelium*, 1942; G. Noske, *Heutige Diakonie in einer veränderten Welt*, 1958; K. Rahner and H. Vorgrimler, *Diakonia in Christo, Quaestiones Disputatae* 15/16, 1962; E. Schering, *Erneuerung der Diakonie in einer veränderten Welt*, 1958; G. Uhlhorn, *Die christliche Liebestätigkeit*, 1895 [2]; H. Wagner, "Diakonie", *RGG*[3] II 162 ff.; K. Weiss, "Paulus, Priester der christlichen Kultgemeinde", *TLZ* 79, 1954, 355–64; H. Wenschkewitz, *Die Spiritualisierung der Kultusbegriffe, Angelos Beihefte* 4, 1932.

Shadow

σκιά

σκιά (*skia*), shade, shadow, overshadowing; *ἐπισκιάζω* (*episkiazō*), overshadow, cover; *ἀποσκίασμα* (*aposkiasma*), shadow, darkness.

CL 1. The noun *skia* (Ionic *skiē*) is found in cl. Gk. from the time of Homer (*Od.* 10, 495; 11, 206), meaning both a shade (of one dead) and the shade (e.g. of trees). The only verbal form of this root to be found in the NT is the Hellenistic *episkiazō*, to overshadow, cover (Hdt., 1, 209), which is an intensive form, found already in

leitourgia *ʿāḇôḏâh*, where these are used cultically. These terms were specially sui for expressing the cultic service, because the priestly cultus was public, fixed a regulated by law, and the welfare of the people of God depended on it. It is, howev surprising that the LXX should use these terms without hesitation also for t heathen cultus (e.g. Ezek. 44:12).

In late Judaism, especially as it was developed in the synagogue, and in t diaspora, we find a gradual spiritualizing of this concept of service, especially in t interpretation of prayer as "sacrifice" (cf. Wis. 18:21).

We may summarize by saying that the use of this word-group in the LXX dc not entirely coincide with that in contemporary secular Gk. The terms were adop specially to express the relationship of the people to God. The only connexion w their original use seems to be the relationship of the service to the people. This w transferred to the relationship of his people to God and given a new form.

NT The concepts are only seldom found in the NT; *leitourgeō* 3 times; *leitourgi* times; *leitourgos* 5 times; and *leitourgikos* only once.

1. In Hebrews and in some Pauline and Lucan passages, the word-group is us strictly in its cultic-sacred sense. We need not wonder at this in Heb., which mo entirely in the world of OT concepts. According to Heb. 8:2, Christ, as *leitourgik* exercises the service of the high priest in the true, heavenly sanctuary. There, he is t one, true high priest, who has obtained a "better ministry" (8:6, *leitourgia*). He h accomplished through his sufferings and death the one eternally valid → sacrifice (10:10), and by so doing he has shown that, through the daily sacrificial serv (10:11, *leitourgia*) of the priest, no sins can be taken away. Heb. seeks to make cl the unique meaning of the → cross and exaltation by using the cultic concepts of t OT. In this OT context we find *leitourgia* again in Heb. 9:21 in reference to the (cultic vessels.

Rom. 15:16 also presupposes cultic usage. Paul justifies what he has written pointing to the fact that, by the grace of God, he had become Christ's *leitourgos*, i priest, to the Gentiles (the RSV and NEB do not bring out the force) and so throu his activity in "the priestly service [*hierourgounta*]" of the gospel the converted G tiles are brought as a sacrifice to God (→ Sacrifice, art. *thyō* NT 2). By this Paul presses not only his complete dedication and dependence upon God; he a redefines the nature of sacrifice and priestly service in terms of the gospel, its serv and fruit. We should also add Phil. 2:17 here, where Paul uses cultic terms to expr his apostolic ministry. He sees himself as the messenger of Christ performing the s vice (*leitourgia*) of offering up the obedient faith of the Philippians to God. His o self-giving in martyrdom is seen as a libation on the sacrificial offering of their fa (→ Sacrifice, art. *thyō* NT 2).

The last NT passage with cultic meaning to be mentioned is Lk. 1:23, where term is used for Zechariah's priestly service. Apart from this passage, the NT sho a strong spiritualizing of the concept, e.g. Paul as priest, the believers as sacrifi

2. The use of *leitourgeō* in Acts 13:2, compared with the LXX usage, something completely new, but it is derived from it. Here the cultic meaning is cc pletely spiritualized and applied to Christian worship in prayer.

3. There is no unanimity as to how Rom. 15:27 and 2 Cor. 9:12 are to be derstood. Many commentators see the cultic use here also, where the terms are u

ose "who worship God in spirit" or "by the Spirit of God". Both passages give ear expression to Jesus' statement that true and genuine worship as God wills it ust be in Spirit and through the Spirit, for God himself is Spirit (Jn. 4:23 f.; → ayer, art. *proskyneō* NT 4). Such worship is freed from all the restrictions of cultic les, circumcision and the struggle to attain righteousness through works. The man ho has been reconciled and renewed carries out his worship of God through the irit by presenting his whole being. Since the Spirit of God takes control of a man's irit for service in the gospel (Rom. 1:9), it leads to the surrender of the whole life, hich is spiritual worship (Rom. 12:1; NEB "the worship offered by mind and art"). The expression "in the gospel" (Rom. 1:9) includes for Paul everything, ayerful mention (v. 9b), witness and proclamation, which are inseparably linked ith prayer and pastoral care.

2. *latreia*, apart from Rom. 12:1 (see above, 2), is found another 4 times in the T. In Rom. 9:4, Heb. 9:1, 6 it refers to the OT cultus; in Jn. 16:2 it expresses the rvice which those who hate the gospel think they bring God, when they persecute id kill Christ's witnesses.

3. There is little difference between *latreia* and *thrēskeia*, which means worship of od (Jas. 1:26 f.; RSV, NEB 'religion'), worship of angels (Col. 2:18) and religion in neral (Acts 26:5). Correspondingly the adj. *thrēskos* (Jas. 1:26) can be rendered ous (RSV, NEB "religious"). *K. Hess*

λειτουργέω

λειτουργέω (*leitourgeō*), serve; *λειτουργία* (*leitourgia*), service; *λειτουργός* (*leitourgos*), servant; *λειτουργικός* *itourgikos*), serving.

leitourgeō (older Att. form *lētourgeō*) is compounded from *laos* (Ionic *lēos*), people, and *ergon*, work, and is found from Xen. and Lysias on. It means do iblic work at one's own expense. It is a political, almost legal, concept. The noun milarly means service for the people. In the later classical period it was as common term as "taxes" today (O. Cassel, *Oriens Christianus* 3, 7, 1932, 289). We seldom id *leitourgos* in secular Gk.; where it is found it is rarely used in a religious sense, it normally means an artisan. *leitourgikos* is found only a few times in the papyri.

In Hellenistic Gk. *leitourgeō* covers all kinds of service to the community (H. rathmann, *TDNT* IV 217) which a person was under obligation to do because of e size of his income, but which could also be carried out voluntarily. The concept adually expanded, especially in Egypt, to cover every conceivable compulsory ser- ce for the state, with regulations laid down for every detail. Then it became widened cover any sort of service. Beside this legal meaning in public life, there developed entirely new, religious and cultic use of the words. The only connexion seems to that the cultus had a public importance for the community. There are, however, important deductions to be drawn from this.

In the LXX *leitourgeō* (about 100 times) and *leitourgia* (about 40 times) acquired a clearly defined meaning. They are used almost exclusively for the service → priests and → Levites in the temple. This explains the striking fact that both ords are used above all in the sections describing priestly functions and ritual (cf. xod. 28–39; Num.; Chron.; Ezek. 40–46). *leitourgeō* renders *šērēṯ* (piel) and

Almost everywhere it translates *'ābaḏ*, serve, which is rendered in the LXX *douleuō* (→ Slave) as well as *latreuō*, the latter being used mostly where *'ābaḏ* h religious reference (*TDNT* IV 60). Thus in Exod. 4:23; 8:1 (MT 7:26); 8:20 (8:16); 9:1, → Moses asks Pharaoh to let the people go, that they may serve God other words, it is a question of worship, which, as in the case of other ancient p ples, was carried out through the cultus. See also Exod. 3:12; 7:16, 26; 10:3, 7 f., 26; 20:5; 23:24 f.; Deut. 4:19, 28; 5:9; 6:13; 7:4, 16; Jos. 22:27; 24:14–24,

It is, however, characteristic of the OT that it is not the meticulously perfor cultus which is the true worship of God, but obedience to the voice of the L which grows out of gratitude for God's acts of salvation in history, although s obedience included the outward ritual of worship. "And now, Israel, what d Yahweh your God require of you, but to fear Yahweh your God, to walk in all ways, to love him, to serve Yahweh your God with all your heart and with all y soul and to keep the commandments and statutes of Yahweh?" (Deut. 10:12

Hence, in the LXX *latreuō* is very close to → *leitourgeō* in meaning, but the la is used exclusively for the service of the priests, while the former means the servic God by the whole people and by the individual, both outwardly in the cultus and wardly in the heart. The noun *latreia* is found only 9 times in the LXX; with the ception of 2 Macc. 4:14 (where it means forced labour) it is used in the same wa the vb. In Exod. 12:25 f.; 13:5 it refers to the sacred custom of the Passover. See a Jos. 22:27; 1 Chr. 28:13; 1 Macc. 1:43; 2:19, 22.

2. In late Judaism, just as in the OT, the relationship of man to God was pressed as service. Man is the servant or slave of God. So *'ābaḏ* and its derivati can have a specifically cultic meaning, in which case it means worship of the t God or of false gods. The meaning of worship has been perpetuated in the s agogue. But it is used also of the inner worship of the heart. So with reference Deut. 11:13 and Dan. 6:11, 16, it is said that to serve him means prayer (SB III

NT 1. All 21 cases of *latreuō* in the NT are used in a religious sense, which inclu the worship of strange gods (Rom. 1:25; Acts 7:42). Its use throughout, and merely in the 3 quotations (Matt. 4:10 par. Lk. 4:8 = Deut. 6:13; Acts 7:7 = Ex 3:12), is fixed by the OT. This is true of passages like Lk. 1:74; 2:37 and those wh the God of the fathers is mentioned, whom Paul (Acts 24:14) or the twelve tri (Acts 26:6, 7) worship. It is just in passages like this that we see that *latreuō* h largely lost its cultic connotation in favour of that of the inner worship of the he by faith (cf. Acts 24:14b), and → prayer (see above, OT 2).

Hebrews shows the closest links with the OT. Of the 6 uses, 4 refer to the → tem (tabernacle) cultus (Heb. 8:5; 9:9; 10:2; 13:10; → Tent). There is no need, howe to restrict these passages to the priest's vicarious acts for the people in the sacrifi worship; they can refer to the old worship in the tent, including that of the people general, which was temporary, and not final and perfect. For as Heb. 9:14; 12 show, only the conscience which has been cleansed and brought to life by Chr only the one who has been received into the true and eternal community of G (Heb. 12:22 ff.) can worship God acceptably "with reverence and awe".

When Paul wishes to describe the Christian's → walk, he also uses the OT cu term (*latreia*, Rom. 12:1; → Prayer, art. *entynchanō*) and says of himself that serves God with his spirit in the gospel (Rom. 1:9). Similarly in Phil. 3:3, he writes

The NT knows also the work of the female deacon, but her rôle is left undefined (Rom. 16:1; perhaps also 1 Tim. 3:11). The position is still recognized in some churches today. It was closely connected with that of the widow (→ Woman, art. *hierā*).

In Gal. 2:17 Paul rebuts the implied objection of the Judaizers that his doctrine of justification by faith makes Christ "an abettor of sin" (NEB), because it contains the corollary that no one can be justified by the → law (cf. Gal. 2:15 f.) and thus does away with the law. "But if, in our endeavour to be justified in Christ, we ourselves were found to be sinners, is Christ then an agent of sin [*hamartias diakonos*]? Certainly not" (Gal. 2:17). The thought takes up the contrast in v. 15 between "Jews by birth" who live by the law (v. 16) and "Gentile sinners" who do not. But the believer is not justified by the law (v. 16), and to the Jew this would mean that Christ is an agent of sin by doing away with the law of God. Paul replies that the real transgression would be to bring back the law (i.e. by practising → circumcision, and so endeavouring to put oneself right with God by keeping the commandments of the law, cf. Gal. 2:1–14). For, on the one hand, keeping of the law never enabled a man to become righteous before God. And on the other hand, God has provided a way of righteousness in Christ which both satisfies the law and supersedes it. "But if I build up again those things which I tore down, then I prove myself a transgressor. For I through the law died to the law, that I might live to God. I have been crucified with Christ; it is no longer I that live, but Christ who lives in me; and the life I now live in the flesh I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me. I do not nullify the grace of God; for if justification were through the law, then Christ died to no purpose" (Gal. 2:18–21).

In Rom. 13 Paul urges obedience to the secular ruler, even though he is not a believer, "for he is God's servant [*theou gar diakonos*] for your good. But if you do wrong, be afraid, for he does not bear the sword in vain; he is the servant of God to execute his wrath on the wrongdoer" (Rom. 13:4; cf. 1 Pet. 2:13–17; Matt. 22:15–22 par. Mk. 12:13–17; Lk. 20:20–26; Isa. 10:5; → Might, art. *exousia* NT; → Caesar). *K. Hess*

λατρεύω

λατρεύω (*latreuō*), serve; λατρεία (*latreia*), service or worship (of God); θρησκός (*thrēskos*), pious; θρησκεία *thrēskeia*), service of God, religion.

CL *latreuō* is derived from *latron*, wages, and means in secular Gk. work for wages, and then to serve without wages. It is not found very frequently. It was originally used predominantly of physical work, but was then used more generally and could include cultic service. *latreia* has the same meaning, i.e. work for wages, work, care, service. Finally at a later stage it had a cultic use, honouring of the gods, worship (cf. H. Strathmann, *TDNT* IV 59).

OT 1. *latreuō* is found much more frequently in the LXX than in secular Gk. Like *leitourgeō* the concept is taken up and developed, and given a specific meaning. It is found about 90 times, especially in Exod., Deut., Jos., Jdg., but, with the exception of Ezek. 20:32, it is not found in the prophets.

(Rom. 11:13; 2 Cor. 4:1; cf. 2 Tim. 4:5). Even more, the whole church become body for service in the world (Eph. 4:1–16); it is composed of members, the "s vants", and functions in preparation for the Lord's return.

4. The difference between it and *doulos* (→ Slave), is important for our derstanding of *diakonos*. *doulos* stresses almost exclusively the Christian's comp subjection to the Lord; *diakonos* is concerned with his service for the church, brothers and fellow-men, for the fellowship, whether this is done by serving at ta with the word, or in some other way. The *diakonos* is always one who serves Christ's behalf and continues Christ's service for the outer and inner man; he is c cerned with the salvation of men. Hence, Paul can see himself as a servant of gospel (Eph. 3:7; Col. 1:23), a servant through whom the Christians in Corinth l come to faith (1 Cor. 3:5), a servant of the new → covenant (2 Cor. 3:6), a servan Christ (2 Cor. 11:23), a servant of God (2 Cor. 6:4), a servant of the church (C 1:25). This concern with God's salvation includes body and spirit. Hence, Paul w as concerned with the collection (2 Cor. 8:4; 9:1, 12 f.; in each case *diakonia* Poor, art. *ptōchos* NT 4 (a)) as with the gospel. Proclamation and help through tions complement one another.

Paul's various companions and helpers, who stood with him in the work proclamation, are also called *diakonoi* by him (Eph. 6:21; Col. 1:7; 4:7; 1 Th 3:2) and more frequently *synergoi*, fellow-workers (Rom. 16:3, 9, 21; 2 Cor. 8: Phil. 2:25; 4:3; Col. 4:11; → Work, art. *ergon*).

Acts 6:1–6 belongs in this context, although only *diakoneō* and *diakonia* are us Luke avoids *diakonos*. The Seven, who are here placed alongside the apostles, t over the care of the poor in the church because the Hellenists complained that th widows were neglected in the daily distribution. But they doubtless had spiri functions as well; at least these emerged when this particular ministry was termina (cf. Stephen in Acts 6:8 ff. and Philip "the evangelist" Acts 21:8; cf. 2 Tim. 4:5; Acts 6 see E. Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 1971, 258–69; F. F. Bruce, *Acts of the Apostles*, 1952², 150–54).

The work of a deacon finally developed into a special office, whose beginnings be traced already in the NT (Phil. 1:1; 1 Tim. 3:8–13). In the course of the chur history the office developed a standardized form, though its precise form is not c from the NT. Nor was it evidently universal in the church. Originally all the manif functions exercised in the church could be called "services" or ministries (1 C 12:5). Hence, the various office-bearers (→ apostle, → prophet etc., cf. Eph. 4:1 were "servants", *diakonoi*, of the church (cf. 1 Cor. 3:5; Col. 1:25). But in the m specialized sense the concept was narrowed down to the material care of the chu which was closely linked with the office of the bishop (e.g. 1 Tim. 3:1–7, 8– 1 Clem. 42:1 f.; Ignatius, *Mag.* 2:1; 6:1; *Trall.* 2:1). This means that for the " vant" there was always a task for spirit and body expressed by his rôle in pu worship, care of the poor and administration. The service of God and of the p were, after all, a unity, as the agape, the common meal implied. Originally it was vious that all the "servants" stood in a brotherhood of service, but the concept w increasingly eroded by the growth of a hierarchy with its different grades. In Orthodox Church the *diakonos* was retained, but in the Roman Catholic Episcopalian Churches the diaconate became merely a transitional stage on the w to the priestly office.

neone in authority, an officer of a court of law, etc. (e.g. Jn. 18:3, 12, 18, 22; Matt. :5 see below, 4; 26:58). The vb. *hypēreteō*, serve, render service, be helpful, occurs Acts 13:36 (of David serving the counsel of God); 20:34 (of Paul tending to his n needs); and 24:23 (of Paul's friends being allowed to tend to his necessities).

2. The NT meaning of *diakoneō* is derived from the person of Jesus and his gospel att. 20:28 par. Mk. 10:45; cf. above 1 (a)). It becomes a term denoting loving ac- n for brother and neighbour, which in turn is derived from divine love, and also scribes the outworking of *koinōnia*, → fellowship.

When Jesus served his disciples and men in general, it was a demonstration of love of God, and of humanity as God willed it. "I am among you as one who ser- s" (Lk. 22:27; cf. Jn. 13:1–15), and "The Son of man came not to be served but to ve" (Matt. 20:28). Jesus washed his disciples' feet as an example (Jn. 13:15) to allenge the disciples; the leader among them was to be as one who serves (Lk. :26; cf. Matt. 20:26 par. Mk. 10:43; Matt. 23:11). Everyone should serve with the gift God has given him (1 Pet. 4:10). Anyone giving food to the hungry, shelter to homeless, clothing the naked, or visiting the sick and imprisoned (Matt. 25:35 f.) serving Christ himself. "As you did it to one of the least of these my brethren, you l it to me" (Matt. 25:40). The service done to Jesus on earth, especially by → men (cf. Lk. 7:44 ff.), will not be forgotten (Mk. 14:9). Various women served us also "out of their means" (Lk. 8:3).

This summons to service becomes binding because behind it stands the sacrifice of us, who came "not to be served but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for ny" (Mk. 10:45 par.). 1 Jn. 3:16 draws from this sacrifice the conclusion that "we ght to lay down our lives for the brethren."

3. The fellowship of the common meal, which involved serving at table (Acts 6:1), nains basic for the understanding of *diakonia* in the NT. We have to think of "the aking of bread" in private homes, of the agapes in which the rich cared also for poor (cf. 1 Cor. 11:17–34), and the house-churches like that in the house of phanas which had devoted itself to *diakonia* (1 Cor. 16:15). This service, in which ength and possessions were used for others, can be seen as the principal and main- ning element of fellowship (2 Cor. 9:13; cf. Acts 5:4; 2 Cor. 9:7). This service also ended from the local church to churches elsewhere that needed help (Acts 11:29; :25; 2 Cor. 8:3 f.; 9:1–5). The spiritual and physical *diakonia* of giving and receiv- takes place in acknowledgment of the sacrifice of Christ (2 Cor. 8:9; 9:12–15). This service, comprehending body and life (2 Cor. 8:5) as well as money and ssessions, becomes a means of edification of the whole body of Christ (Eph. 4:12). at is why Paul calls the charismatic gifts services *diakoniai* (1 Cor. 12:5), parts of organic whole. *diakonia* can also be used for each particular spiritual → gift om. 12:7), just as the deacon is one among all the others who serve (see below, 4).

Paul expanded the concept of *diakonia* even further. He saw the whole of salva- n, God's *diakonia* in Christ for and among men, expressed in the *diakonia* of the ostles. Already in the OT there was a divine *diakonia*, but expressed in the law and refore in death and condemnation (2 Cor. 3:7, 9, RSV "dispensation"). In Christ, wever, the service of the → Spirit, of → righteousness, of → reconciliation has gun (2 Cor. 3:8 f.), and this service has been entrusted to the → apostle, who as rist's ambassador proclaims, "Be reconciled to God" (2 Cor. 5:18 ff.). Hence the m *diakonia* can be used as a technical term for the work of proclaiming the gospel

NT 1. Both in the Synoptics and Paul *diakoneō* is found relatively frequently, with the exception of Lk. 10:40 *diakonia* is not found in the Gospels, though not uncommon in Acts, and is very frequent in Paul. *diakonos* is also a predomin tly Pauline concept.

(a) *diakoneō*, serve, is found with the meaning of serving at table in, e.g., M 8:15 par. Mk. 1:31, Lk. 4:39; 10:40, cf. Jn. 12:2; Lk. 17:8; Acts 6:2. It is foun the sense of take care of in Matt. 27:55 par. Mk. 15:41, Lk. 8:3; Matt. 4:11; 25 (in the context of service to individuals), and in 2 Tim. 1:18; Heb. 6:10; 1 Pet. 4:1 (in that of the church). It is used specifically of the work of deacons in 1 Tim. 3: 13; in connexion with the offering for the saints in Jerusalem in Rom. 15:25; 2 C 8:19 (→ Poor, art. *ptōchos* NT 4 (a)); as an expression for the proclamation of gospel in 2 Cor. 3:3; 1 Pet. 1:12; of Jesus himself as an expression of his humiliat and giving up of himself for others through suffering and death in Matt. 20:28 Mk. 10:45; cf. Lk. 18:26 f. (→ Redemption art. *lytron*), and in this connexion for the voluntary self-humiliation of the disciple in Lk. 22:26 f., and his follow Christ in Jn. 12:26. So used, the concept extends beyond the limits of its for sphere of meaning. Already the eschatological saying in Lk. 12:37 points to a radi change in the previously held values. This is also true of Lk. 22:27, linked with previous v. in which Jesus' humility becomes the norm for the life of the disciples (below, 2).

(b) *diakonia* is found 34 times in the NT. It means service at table in Lk. 10: Acts 6:1, etc. It is used in a general sense for loving service in 1 Cor. 16:15 and R 2:19; for loving service through the making of a collection in Acts 11:29; 12 (RSV "mission"); Rom. 15:31; 2 Cor. 8:4; 9:1, 12 f. (where the grace of Chris clearly seen as the motive); for the → proclamation of the word and the Christ mission in 2 Tim. 4:11; Acts 6:4; 20:24; 21:13; 2 Cor. 11:8, etc.; for all service the Christian community in Eph. 4:12; for service by → angels in Heb. 1:14; charismatic office in Acts 1:17; Rom. 11:13; 2 Cor. 3:7 f.; 4:1; 5:18; 6:3; Col. 4: 2 Tim. 4:5. Every service and every office, however, finds its meaning in the orga unity of the → body of Christ (1 Cor. 12:5; Rom. 12:7). The glory of the *diakonia* develops from this (2 Cor. 3:8 f.; see below, 3).

(c) *diakonos* is found 29 times in the NT. Its primary meaning is the one w serves at table (Matt. 22:13, where there is an eschatological note; Jn. 2:5, 9) means a servant in a wider sense in Matt. 20:26 par. Mk. 10:43; cf. Lk. 18:26; M 23:11, and a helper in Eph. 6:21; Col. 4:7. Especially in Paul, the word receive specifically Christian sense; e.g. a servant of the new → covenant (2 Cor. 3:6), a s vant of → righteousness (2 Cor. 11:15), a servant of Christ (2 Cor. 11:23; Col. 1 1 Tim. 4:6), a servant of God (2 Cor. 6:4), a servant of the → gospel (Eph. 3:7; C 1:23; cf. 1 Cor. 3:5), a servant of the → church (Col. 1:25). Christ himself is calle *diakonos* in Rom. 15:8 (of Israel) and Gal. 2:17 (of sin, used paradoxically). In Rc 13:4 the secular ruler is called a servant of God.

In Phil. 1:1 and 1 Tim. 3:8–13 *diakonos* is used of a man holding the office deacon in the church; the same title is applied to a woman, Phoebe, in Rom. 16 this office may be intended by 1 Tim. 3:11. Sometimes *diakonos* is replaced *hypēretēs*; e.g. Lk. 1:2 (servant of the word); Acts 26:16; 1 Cor. 4:1 (servants Christ). The word originally meant a rower, hence a servant, helper, attendant (H 3, 65; 5, 111). Elsewhere in the NT it normally means the (armed) servant

diakoneō, serve, is cognate with Lat. *conari*, give oneself trouble. It is not linked with *konis*, dust, and therefore does not mean go through the dust.

Basic in secular Gk. are: (a) to wait at table; this is expanded to (b) care for household needs, and from this to the general meaning (c) to serve generally. The first meaning involves personal subjection which was considered unworthy and dishonouring for a free man. When used in the third sense it can be service for a cause, e.g. for the good of the community (in Plato in connexion with the *polis*), or for a god. As such it is an honourable task and a fitting occupation for a free man. In general the voluntary giving of oneself in the service of one's fellow man is alien to Gk. thought. The highest goal before a man was the development of his own personality.

The derivative noun *diakonia* expresses the occupations implied by the vb., and means service, office. The second derived noun *diakonos* denotes the person carrying out the task. Hence, the primary meaning in secular Gk. was a waiter at table, and it is so used later in reference to cultic meals.

1. Even though the OT has the concept of service and contains the commandment to love one's neighbour (Lev. 19:8), and Israel knew charitable acts as did the ancient Near East generally, *diakoneō* is not found in the LXX. The seven instances of *diakonos* are used exclusively for court servants (Est. 1:10; 2:2; 6:1, 3, 5 *l.*), and torturers (e.g. 4 Macc. 9:17). The other instance is Prov. 10:4. *diakonia* is used only in two unimportant cases (Est. 6:3, 5 *v.l.*; 1 Macc. 11:58). Instead of them, we find the word-groups *douleuō* (→ Slave) → *latreuō* and → *leitourgeō* in cultic contexts.

2. (a) In late Judaism *diakoneō* is found both in Philo and Josephus, the latter using it particularly in connexion with the Essenes (see below, 3). Though Judaism in the time of Jesus knew and practised its social responsibilities, e.g. to the poor, this was done mainly by alms, not by service (cf. Lk. 10:30–35). Lowly service, e.g. waiting at table, was beneath the dignity of a free man (cf. Lk. 7:44 ff.). Sometimes the greater would wait at table, but this was unusual (cf. SB I 838; II 257 f.).

(b) There was, however, organized care for the → poor. Every Friday those who lived in the locality received enough money from the poor basket (*quppâh*) for fourteen meals; strangers received food every day from the poor bowl (*tamḥûy*). This food had been collected earlier from house to house by the officers of the poor (SB II 43 ff.; cf. J. Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus*, 1969, 131 ff.). In addition there were common meals and alms. In the diaspora, synagogues often set up a committee of seven for its service. The title *parnāsîm*, from *parnēs*, feed, points to service at table and in general (cf. also → Poor art. *ptōchos*).

3. Josephus says that the Essenes "neither marry wives, nor are desirous to keep servants ... but minister one to another" (*Ant.* 18, 21). CD 14:12 ff. mentions regular contributions for the needy, poor and aged. The sick were also well looked after according to Philo (*Omn. Prob. Lib.* 12, 87). Service to the poor and common meals, possibly with eschatological connotations (1QSa 2:17 ff.), belonged to the fulfilling of righteousness and the expectation of the kingdom. On the question of poverty and community of goods at Qumran → Poor, art. *ptōchos* NT 4 (b); → Possessions, art. *ploutos* OT 3. The community's holding its goods in common had a temporary counterpart in the Jerusalem church (Acts 2:44).

(*eschisthē*): one case involved the people of Iconium (Acts 14:4); the other, t Sanhedrin (Acts 23:7).

(f) About A.D. 55 there was evident in the Corinthian church not only squabbl (*erides*, 1 Cor. 1:11) but also a tendency to form cliques (*schismata*, 1 Cor. 1: 11:18), probably on the basis of sociological groupings or personal preferences one church leader over another (see 1 Cor. 1:12; 3:4; 11:17–22, 33–34), not d trinal differences. Such divisions, Paul insisted, constituted a denial of their allegia to one Lord (1 Cor. 1:10, 13) and their membership of one body (1 Cor. 12:12– where discord (*schisma*) had no place (1 Cor. 12:25). *M. J. Harris*
→ Discipline, → Divorce, → Marriage, → Redemption, Loose, art. *lyō*

(a). R. H. Charles, *The Teaching of the New Testament on Divorce*, 1921; L. M. Epstein, *Marr Laws in the Bible and Talmud*, 1942; J. A. Fitzmyer, "The Matthean Divorce Texts and Some N Palestinian Evidence", *Theological Studies* 37, 1976, 197–226; A. Isaksson, *Marriage and Ministr the New Temple: A Study with Special Reference to Mt. 19:3–12 and 1 Cor. 11:3–16*, 1965; H. M tefiore, "Jesus on Divorce and Remarriage", in *Marriage, Divorce and the Church: The Report Commission appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury to prepare a statement on the Christian I trine of Marriage*, (1971) 1975[5], 79–95, 169 f.; C. Maurer, *schizō*, *TDNT* VII 959 ff.; J. Munck, J *and the Salvation of Mankind*, 1959, 135 ff.; J. Murray, *Divorce*, 1953; J. R. W. Stott, "The Bib Teaching on Divorce", *The Churchman* 85, 1971, 165–74 (reprinted separately 1972). For fur literature see the bibliographies attached to the articles given in the cross-references.
(b). H. Baltensweiler, *Die Ehe im Neuen Testament. Exegetische Untersuchungen Über Ehelosigkeit und Ehescheidung*, 1967; K. Haacker, "Ehescheidung und Wiederverheiratung im Ne Testament", *TQ* 151, 1971, 28–38; A. Myre, "Dix ans d'exégèse sur le divorce dans le Nou Testament", *Le Divorce. L'Église Catholique ne Devrait-elle pas Modifier son Attitude Seculai l'Égard de l'Indissolubilité du Mariage?*, 1973, 139–63.

Serve, Deacon, Worship

When we speak of serving we imply work done for another either voluntarily or cc pulsorily (→ Slave), the benefit of which will accrue to the one for whom it has b done. Service does not exclude → reward. The activity of serving stands in contras ruling (→ Lord; → Strength). Faithful service presupposes → humility in the one w serves as the inferior, in contrast to → pride. He who serves is in a position of dep dence and his → freedom is limited. The Bible, however, makes it clear that a m who has been freed from the dominion of → sin and the → law finds true freedom the service of God (→ Hear, art. *akouō*), which implies service for his fellow-men well. The varieties of such service are expressed by three Gk. word-groups. *leitour* originally expressed voluntary service for the political community, and then pric service in the cultus. *latreuō* primarily stresses details of the cultus, but is then u for the inner attitude of worship. *diakoneō* and its derivatives, as their etymol suggests, are used mainly for personal help to others.

διακονέω

διακονέω (*diakoneō*), serve, support, serve as a deac διακονία (*diakonia*), service, office, aid, support, distri tion (of alms etc.), office of a deacon; διάκονος (*diakonos*), servant, deac ὑπηρέτης (*hypēretēs*), servant, helper, assistant; ὑπηρετέω (*hypēreteō*), serve, ren service, be helpful.

nust be put: Do you believe in your hearts that in your new marriage you can love God, each other and those around you more fully than if you were to remain as you ıre? *C. Brown*

σχίζω

σχίζω (*schizō*), split, tear, divide, separate; σχίσμα (*schisma*), split, tear, division.

:L In secular Gk. *schizō* (cf. Lat. *scindo*, split) is generally used literally of dividing into parts or breaking into pieces and only rarely in the figurative sense of the livision of opinion. The noun *schisma*, which is rare and generally plural, denotes a lit or cleft or a clique.

)T While *schisma* is not found in the LXX, in the papyri it is used of "ploughing" (rending the ground) (Moulton-Milligan, 619) although *hyposchismos* is the more egular word for this. *schizō* occurs 11 times in the LXX in reference to such "renling" as the cleaving of wood (Gen. 22:3), rock (Isa. 48:21) or mountain (Zech. 4:4), or the dividing of water (Exod. 14:21).

)T (a) Rent heavens (*schizomenous tous ouranous*) marked the → baptism of Jesus (Mk. 1:10), a sign of divine disclosure at a nodal point of history (cf. Jn. 1:51; Acts 7:56; 10:11; Apoc. Bar. 22:1). To heighten the allusion to Isa. 64:1 ("O that hou wouldst rend the heavens and come down"), Mk. renders the Heb. vb. *qr'* "rend") by *schizō*, departing from the more general LXX rendering (where *anoigō*, 'open" is used) that is reflected in Matt. 3:16 and Lk. 3:21.

(b) In each of the Synoptic Gospels (Matt. 9:16; Mk. 2:21; Lk. 5:36) the conflictory about the failure of Jesus' disciples to → fast is followed by a "parable" (so Lk.) ıbout patching clothing. No one ever sews a piece of newly-woven, unshrunk cloth nto an old garment because the added patch would tear away some of the garment ınd make a rend (*schisma*) worse than ever. Lk's. form of the saying (using the verbal forms *schisas* and *schisei*, Lk. 3:36) further emphasizes the same point of the incompatibility of Christianity and Judaism. Any attempt to mix the new with the old vill spoil both.

(c) Jesus' death was marked by the rending (*eschisthē*) "in two, from top to bottom" of the inner curtain of the → temple (Mk. 15:38 par. Matt. 27:51; Lk. 23:45) hat separated the Holy Place from the Holy of Holies (Exod. 26:31–35; 40:21). This symbolized the opening up of direct access into God's presence that was ecured by Christ's sacrifice (Heb. 6:19–20; 9:8; 10:19–20). In the parallel passage n Matt. (27:51), mention is also made of an earthquake which split open *eschisthēsan*) the rocks (cf. Isa. 48:21).

(d) In the decision of the soldiers not to tear (*mē schisōmen*) the tunic of Jesus but o cast lots for it, Jn. sees a fulfilment of Scripture (Jn. 19: 24, citing Ps. 22:18). Behind the observation that even the 153 fishes did not cause the tearing (*eschisthē*) of the net (Jn. 21:11) lies a contrast with Lk. 5:6 where Simon Peter was also directly nvolved. And on three occasions John observes that there was a division of opinion *schisma*) regarding Jesus: the points at issue were his identity (Jn. 7:43), his niraculous cure of the man born blind (Jn. 9:16), and his teaching (Jn. 10:19).

(e) Paul's preaching is twice said to have prompted a cleavage of opinion

There is a division of opinion as to what "this precept" (v. 11) is. D. Hill takes it t mean that "Jesus is commending the unmarried state to those whose 'call' demanc it, and who are fitted for it" (*The Gospel of Matthew*, *New Century Bible*, 1972, 281 cf. W. D. Davies, *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount*, 1964, 393 ff.). But th question may be asked whether it is appropriate to call the disciples' statement of v 10 a "precept [*logon*]". This term might seem more appropriate to Jesus' "word" c v. 9 which rounds off Jesus' answer to the Pharisees. In this case Jesus would be giv ing recognition to the fact that, human nature being what it is, we must expect a wid variety of causes for marital breakdown and remarriage. Jesus would then be takin people as they are, recognizing their failures, and dealing with them, as always, as ir dividuals at their point of need. To keep "this precept" is itself a gift of God. But a with the pronouncement in v. 6, Jesus' last word on the subject is formulated, not a a statement, but as a challenge: "He who is able to receive this, let him receive it" (v 12).

Remarriage is therefore sanctioned in certain clear-cut cases. But there are man cases in modern society, where marriage has broken down through incompatibility drink, cruelty and sundry other causes on which there are no explicit pronounce ments of Scripture. There are also many cases in society of divorcees marrying an subsequently being converted. Is the church to deny the right of marriage to the for mer group and to tell the latter to unscramble their marriages? This would be th logical consequence of the rigorist interpretation of Jesus' teaching. But this woul not seem to represent the mind of Jesus. The foundation of his teaching – "Wha God joined together let man not put asunder" – is a formula for avoiding th breakdown of marriage, and not an iron law putting into equal bondage the callous the innocent and the penitent. In cases where a believing partner desires to remarr we should follow the example of Jesus and examine the situation in the light of God' purposes in creation and the two great commandments. In creating man and woma it was God's intention that man should not dwell alone (Gen. 2:18), and, as we hav seen from Paul's argument in 1 Cor. 7:1–9, the saving knowledge of God was not in tended as a substitute for normal human relationships. Just as the sabbath was mad for man, and not man for the sabbath, so marriage was made for man. We do no cease to have the need of physical and person-affirming relationships, when marriag breaks down. At the same time, the two great commandments also apply: We are t love God with all our heart, mind and soul, and our neighbours as ourselves (Matt 22:37 f. par. Mk. 12:30 f.; cf. Lk. 10:25–28; Deut. 6:5; Lev. 19:18).

As a matter of fact, Paul introduces the second great commandment in his discus sion of relationships between husband and wife: "Even so husbands should love thei wives as their own bodies. He who loves his wife loves himself" (Eph. 2:28). In con text, this applies to the care that the man should have for his wife. It certainly precludes entering a relationship with someone else outside a marriage that is intact But it also has an application for those who find themselves divorced but desiring t enter into the person-affirming relationship that God intended marriage to be. T those who would preclude the possibility of remarriage on the grounds that marriag is indissoluble the question must be put: By what right do you, who enjoy th security and warmth of a happy marriage, deny the possibility to others who finc that their former marriage has broken down irretrievably and that there is nothing that they can now do to restore it? To those who would seek remarriage the questior

Christ, as stated in Mark, at the time they were uttered, and so long as the law relating to the infliction of death on the adulteress and her paramour was not abrogated. But, as we know, this law was abrogated a few years later. The natural result was that to our Lord's words, which had one meaning before the abrogation of this law, a different meaning was attached after its abrogation, and they came to be regarded as forbidding divorce under all circumstances, though really and originally they referred only to divorces on inadequate grounds – that is, grounds not involving adultery" (op. cit., 22). "By the insertion of these clauses Matthew preserves the meaning of our Lord's statements on this subject for all subsequent generations that had lost touch with the circumstances and limitations under which they were originally made" (op. cit., 24).

If Charles is right, the "exceptive clauses" are comparable with the kind of insertion which a modern editor would make in a quotation which today would be printed in square brackets within the quotation, thus showing that it was not part of the original words but it nevertheless explains their meaning and intention. If the background is that of Herod Antipas and Herodias, it is understandable why the "exceptive clauses" should be omitted as they would be inapplicable to their case. Indeed, this liaison would be one of *porneia*, both in the sense of adultery and that of a "marriage" within the forbidden degrees of Lev. 18. On the other hand, the inclusion of the "exceptive clauses" would make divorce on the permitted grounds consonant with the teaching of the OT with regard to *porneia*. Whether or not this is so, it must again be pointed out that the question that Jesus was discussing concerned marriages which were *still intact*, but which could be put asunder by a partner contracting a relationship with someone else. Where adultery had already taken place, the OT law did not prescribe divorce but the infliction of capital punishment on both offending parties, and this was the law which still obtained for Jesus (cf. Matt. 5:17 f.). It must therefore be presupposed not only in reading Matt., but also Mk. and Lk. However, the onus of Jesus' teaching falls not on the penalty for breaking the law but on preventing such a break from coming about (cf. Jn. 8:1–11). But where the relationship has already been put asunder, the privileges of the believer are no less under the new covenant than under the old, as the teaching given by Matt. makes explicit.

Finally, in this connexion attention may be drawn to the parallel between the teaching of Matt. 19:10 ff. and Paul's teaching on gifts in relation to marriage and celibacy (1 Cor. 7:1–9, 36 ff.). The response of the disciples is similar to that of the spiritual party at Corinth, implying that the best course for the follower of Jesus is to refrain from sexual relations altogether including marriage: "The disciples said to him, 'If such is the case of a man with his wife, it is not expedient to marry' " (Matt. 19:10). The implication is that the only safe course is to try to live as if one were a → eunuch, i.e. to have no sexual relations. Jesus' reply crystallizes their thought by putting this explicitly, deliberately using the word eunuch. But he distinguishes between those who are such by nature and those who are capable of living as such for the sake of the kingdom (v. 12). Just as Paul said that both marriage and celibacy are gifts, so Jesus declares that "Not all men can receive this precept, but only those to whom it is given" (v. 11). Deliberately to avoid marriage for fear of not being able to keep to marriage is a completely unrealistic solution. It all depends on the gifts that one has been given: "He who is able to receive this, let him receive it" (v. 12).

ble for the marriage relationship to be put asunder. But the burden of the pronounc ment falls on the responsibility of anyone who brings this about. It is thus not a la or piece of halachah – either for the Pharisees or the church – but a challenge. It addressed not to those whose marriages are already put asunder, but to those who marriages are still intact.

In the explanations which follow, all three evangelists record the point that tl man who divorces his wife and marries another commits adultery (Matt. 19:9; M 10:11; Lk. 16:18a); cf. also the case of Herod Antipas who divorced his own wi and married Herodias, the wife of his half-brother, Philip (Matt. 14:3; Mk. 6:18; L 3:19; cf. Lev. 18:16; 20:21). It is not beyond the bounds of possibility that tl Pharisees' question was prompted by the case of Herod and Herodias, which ha been denounced by John the Baptist, and which ultimately led to the Baptist's deat For if Jesus condoned the liaison, he would have implicitly condemned the Bapti and contradicted the law. But if he had denounced it, he would have exposed himse to the same fate as John. The question would have added point as Jesus had now e tered the territory of Antipas "beyond the Jordan" (Matt. 19:1; Mk. 10:1). M 10:12 denounces as adultery the case of the woman who divorces her husband in o der to marry another. (This too would fit the case of Herodias, and the fact that Jesu gave this teaching to the disciples in private might be an indication that Jesus wa avoiding open conflict on this subject as his hour had not yet come.) Lk. 16:18b a plies the teaching to the man who marries a woman so divorced. In each case tl crucial act in God's sight is not the formalities of the divorce proceedings, but the a tion which constitutes the break-up of the marriage relationship. In each case tl starting-point is the marriage that already exists intact. What is condemned a adulterous is the action which causes the break-up of a marriage for the sake of co tracting a new liaison.

Taken out of context, it might appear that Mk. and Lk. forbid remarriage und any circumstances. This would appear to conflict not only with the teaching of Pa (1 Cor. 7:27 f.; cf. v. 15) but also with the teaching given in Matt. The Sermon on tl Mount contains the statement: "But I say to you that every one who divorces h wife, except on the ground of unchastity [*parektos logou porneias*], makes her a adulteress; and whoever marries a divorced woman commits adultery" (Matt. 5:32 In the discussion with the Pharisees Matt. gives Jesus' reply as: "And I say to yo whoever divorces his wife, except for unchastity [*mē epi porneia*], and marri another, commits adultery" (Matt. 19:9).

Many scholars regard the "exceptive clauses" in Matt. as additions by tl evangelist which soften the rigorous teaching of Jesus (cf. D. R. Catchpole, *The Sy optic Divorce Material as a Traditio-Historical Problem*, 1974, reprinted from *BJR* 57, 1974, 92–127). Others, like John Murray (*Divorce*, 1953) and J. R. W. Sto (*Divorce*, 1972, reprinted from "The Biblical Teaching on Divorce", *The Churchma* 85, 1971, 165–74) see them as the faithful representation of Jesus' actual wor which were abbreviated by Mk. and Lk. Clearly abbreviation has taken place in tl case of Lk. who gives only the pronouncement without any background or prior di cussion. R. H. Charles, on the other hand, concedes the probability that the "exce tive clauses" represent a Matthaean addition. But he sees them as the editori clarification by the evangelist expressing the mind of Jesus in the light of tl historical situation. "Now, it was impossible to misinterpret the plain words

joined to his wife, and the two shall become one.' So they are no longer two but one. What therefore God has joined together [*synezeuxen*], let not man put asunder [*anthrōpos mē chōrizetō*]" (Mk. 10:6–9 RSV; cf. par. Matt. 19:5 ff.; cf. Gen. 1:27; 5:2; 2:24; for discussion of the variant readings see Metzger, 104 f.).

The culminating pronouncement is double-edged. The Pharisees had tried to manoeuvre Jesus into making a statement on a controversial issue which would force him to take sides and possibly even to contradict the law (Matt. 19:3; Mk. 10:2; see further below; and cf. J. D. M. Derrett, "The Teaching of Jesus on Marriage and Divorce", in *Law in the New Testament*, 1970, 363–88). In point of fact the law covered only the limited cases described in Deut. 24:1–4. Jesus' reply might be best translated: "What therefore God joined together let man not separate." It is, as Derrett points out, "a veritable judgement of Portia" (op. cit., 383). For the separating or putting asunder applies not only to the husband who sends his wife away with a certificate of divorce in her hand; it touches the action of either partner or third party that causes the break up of the marriage.

It thus includes any action which contributes to the breakdown of the relationship which God had intended, i.e. the mutual help and companionship (Gen. 2:18) and the ongoing physical relationship which constitutes the "one flesh" relationship (Gen. 2:24). Where there is a lack of mutual love, respect and caring, the relationship already falls short of what God intended marriage to be (Eph. 5:21–33; Col. 3:18 f.). Where a partner refuses conjugal rights, as Paul describes them in 1 Cor. 7:2–7, a step has already been taken to putting the marriage asunder. But the adulterous look is also such a step (Matt. 5:27 ff.; cf. Jn. 8:7 ff.), and either partner who actually commits adultery is *de facto* putting the marriage asunder.

There is a significant juxtaposition of the two vbs. *synezeuxen* ("joined together") and *chōrizetō* ("put asunder") in Jesus' pronouncement. What God has joined together is the "one flesh" relationship of man and woman, when the two leave their parents to be united. The sexual relationship between a man and his wife establishes the marriage. It is this relationship which constitutes the essence of marriage in Scripture and distinguishes it from all other relationships. In neither the OT nor the NT is there any form of marriage contract or prescribed vows (→ Marriage, art. *gameō* OT 6). It is rather the physical union which makes the marriage; and it is the contracting of a physical union outside marriage which breaks the marriage. The physical relationship does not exist merely on the human plane. The physical act of taking a wife establishes a relationship which God himself joins together. But the physical act of one of the marriage partners with someone outside the marriage has the effect of putting asunder the relationship established by God.

However, Jesus does not put the point in the form of a bare, factual statement. As elsewhere in his teaching, instead of giving a factual answer which would resolve an intellectual puzzle, Jesus issued a challenge designed to compel his hearers to examine their own lives. For example, the parable of the Good Samaritan (Lk. 10:25–37) is given in answer to the question, "And who is my neighbour?" Not only does it contain a reply to the question posed; it forces the questioner to come to terms with the question of the kind of neighbour *he* ought to be, and concludes with the pronouncement, "Go and do likewise." Similarly, the prouncement, "What therefore God joined together let man not put asunder", puts the onus on the questioners to examine their own attitudes and practice. It recognizes that it is possi-

and gifts (vv. 2–9, 36 ff.; on these latter verses → Marriage, art. *hyperakmos*). I Paul's opinion this second factor is the decisive one, for if we have not the gift (celibacy, the unmarried state can be more of a hindrance than a help (vv. 2 ff., 5, ! 36 ff.). It can mean *less* devoted service, and even expose one to great moral dange

(b) The Teaching of Jesus. Paul's teaching is not in conflict with that of Jesus. Th question that the Pharisees raised with him concerned the interpretation of Deu 24:1–4 in the light of *existing* marriages (Matt. 19:1–12 par. Mk. 10:1–12; cf. Lk 16:18; → Divorce). The so-called "exceptive clauses" in Matt. 5:32 and 19:9 perm divorce and remarriage on the grounds of *porneia*, a term which includes adulter and any kind of illegitimate sexual intercourse (→ Discipline, art. *porneuō*; · Marriage, art. *moicheuō*). It is rendered by the RSV as "unchastity". *porneia* ma well have been used instead of *moicheia* to cover all the sexual offences listed in Le 18 (cf. Acts 15:20, 29). J. A. Fitzmyer thinks that it alludes to Gentile marriages cor tracted within the forbidden degrees and cites 11QTemple 57:17–19, Cl 4:12b–5:14a from Qumran in support ("The Matthaean Divorce Texts and Som New Palestinian Evidence", *Theological Studies* 37, 1976 197–226). But it would b arbitrary and hypocritical to allow divorce for this kind of *porneia* only and not fc the forms mentioned in Lev. 18. In each case the guilty party was to be cut off fro the people (Lev. 18:29).

The OT law provided for divorce by the husband on the grounds of existing ur chastity discovered after the marriage had taken place (Deut. 24:1–4). All he had t do was to give his wife a bill of divorce and send her away. She was then free t marry, but not to return to him as his wife after being married to someone else even the second husband were to die. The question raised by the Pharisees arose out of th way in which this ground for divorce had been extended and trivialized. The stricte school of Shammai prescribed divorce in cases of adultery, whereas the more lenier school of Hillel extended it to incompatibility on various grounds. The OT law pe mitted divorce in cases of unchastity or indecency discovered in the wife by the hu band after he had taken her, but in the case of adultery *after* marriage the penalt was not divorce but the execution of the offending parties (Lev. 20:10; Deut. 22:2 cf. Gen. 38:24; Ezek. 16:38 ff.) which would thus leave the wronged party free t remarry. The practice of stoning the offenders was still an issue in Jesus' lifetim although it was by no means always carried out and it was stopped under Roma rule shortly afterwards (Jn. 8:1–11; cf. R. H. Charles, *The Teaching of the Ne Testament on Divorce*, 1921, 5–10, who draws attention to the Babylonian Talmu Sanhedrin 41a and T. J. Sanhedrin 18a, 24b; A. N. Sherwin-White, *Roman Socie and Roman Law in the New Testament*, 1965², 40 ff.). Under the Romans adulter was a penal and even capital offence prior to Augustus (F. Hauck, *TDNT* IV 733)

Jesus' teaching went behind the Mosaic permission to the creation ordinance c Gen. 2:24: "Therefore a man leaves his father and mother and cleaves to his wif and they become one flesh." In so doing, he was basing his reply not on the provisio made by the law for what a man might do, if he found "some indecency" (Deu 24:1) in the wife that he had married. Jesus ascribes such action to "your hardness c heart" (Matt. 19:8; Mk. 10:5). Instead, he bases his answer on the "one flesh relationship which constitutes the essence of marriage and distinguishes tha relationship from all others. "But from the beginning of creation, 'God made ther male and female.' 'For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother and b

ncludes those who have never been married and those who have been married and are now unmarried. This can be seen from Paul's use of *agamos* in v. 11, where "unmarried" is used of the wife who has separated from her husband. What Paul proceeds to say applies equally to the single, widowers and widows and the divorced. But the particular argument is drawn from the case of the divorced, and applies *a fortiori* to the others. He begins by saying that his observations are not based upon a specific command of the Lord. He concludes by saying that it is not a sin for anyone in their position to marry. "But concerning the unmarried, I have no command of the Lord, but I give my opinion as one who by the Lord's mercy is trustworthy. I think that in view of the impending distress it is well for a person to remain as he is. Are you bound [*dedesai*] to a wife? Do not seek to be free [*lysin*]. Are you free [*lelysai*] from a wife? Do not seek marriage. But if you do marry, you do not sin, and if a girl marries she does not sin. Yet those who marry will have worldly troubles, and I would spare you that" (vv. 25–28). Here the key term is not *chōrizō* (separate) but *lyō* (loose, set free) which covers all *de facto* termination of existing marriage relationships (→ Redemption,Loose etc., art. *lyō* NT 6 (f)). It is the opposite of *deō* (→ bind) which occurs in the assertion that "A wife is bound to her husband as long as he lives" (v. 39) and in the statement "Thus a married woman is bound by the law to her husband as long as he lives; but if her husband dies she is discharged from the law concerning her husband. Accordingly, she will be called an adulteress if she lives with another man while her husband is alive. But if her husband dies she is free from that law, and if she marries another man she is not an adulteress" (Rom. 7:2 f.).

In the two latter passages Paul is describing the situation laid down by the law. The law lays down the following points: (1) marriage is intended by God to be lifelong; (2) but the relationship is not such that remarriage after the death of a partner is precluded; (3) sexual relations outside the marriage constitute adultery and are thus forbidden; (4) in such cases the law did not prescribe divorce but the execution of the offenders, leaving the innocent party free to remarry; (5) whereas the act of adultery was sinful, the remarriage was not. It is this last point which resolves the apparent contradiction between the divinely intended lifelong purpose for marriage in Rom. 7:2 f. and 1 Cor. 7:39 and the declaration in 1 Cor. 7:27 f. that remarriage is not a sin. On the one hand, any breach of the marriage through adultery is a sin. On the other hand, the early church was not in a position to exact the penalty prescribed by the law in such cases. Nor indeed, did it seek to inflict capital punishment. Expulsion from the fellowship of the church is the maximum penalty that the church can inflict (→ Destroy, art. *olethros*). In 1 Cor. 7 Paul does not even insist that divorce *must* follow an act of adultery (v. 27). As we have noted already, grace and reconciliation are available in Christ for those who seek them (1 Cor. 6:9 ff.). But there can be circumstances where divorce is the most humane solution, and such considerations weighed with Paul (cf. v. 15).

For those who find their marriages broken beyond repair and for whom the formal proceedings of the divorce court are merely the legal recognition of an existing state of affairs, remarriage is not a sin (1 Cor. 7:27 f.). The question whether they should actually remarry has, according to Paul, to be decided with two factors in mind. On the one hand, there are the times in which we live, coupled with the fact that marriage necessarily brings with it a division of loyalties (vv. 26–35). But on the other hand, there is the question of the kind of people that we are, with our basic human needs

which constituted a breach of the Seventh Commandment (Lev. 20:10; Deut. 22:2 cf. Exod. 20:14; Lev. 18:20; Deut. 5:18; Jn. 8:1–11, on the latter see J. D. M Derrett, "The Woman Taken in Adultery", in *Law in the New Testament*, 197 156–88). But in the NT excommunication takes the place of execution. Just as ce tain acts affected the community in the OT and had to be purged, Paul urges that c fenders have to be removed from the NT community. The immoral and adultere have no place in the kingdom of God (1 Cor. 5:9 ff.; 6:9 ff.). However, the additic of 1 Cor. 6:11 shows that such sins were not beyond the grace of Christ and that tl truly penitent could take their full place in the fellowship of the church: "And suc were some of you. But you were washed, you were sanctified, you were justified the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and in the Spirit of our God" (cf. also Jn. 8:11

It is against this background that Paul writes on separation and divorce in 1 Cc 7. The foundation of his teaching is a frank recognition of human needs and the fa that marriage is God's appointed way of avoiding those sins which he has just be dealing with. "But because of the temptation to immorality, each man should ha his own wife and each woman her own husband" (1 Cor. 7:2). Moreover, th should give each other their conjugal rights, for each rules over the other's body (v 3 f.). They are to refrain from normal married life in which intercourse plays a pa only to devote themselves to prayer – and that only temporarily – lest Satan tem them through the lack of self-control which might issue from disregarding the natural needs and inclinations (v. 5). Some have the gift of celibacy. In such cases tl believer may devote him- or herself to the things of the Lord and be spared the tro bles that beset the married, especially in view of the times (vv. 1, 7, 26, 29 ff., 32 ff "But each has his own special gift from God, one of one kind and one of another" (7b). For those who have not the gift of celibacy it is better to marry than to burn (9). Here burning is generally understood as being "aflame with passion" (cf. RSV But it is also just possible that it may reflect the rabbinic teaching that the lustful w burn in Gehenna (on this see F. F. Bruce, *1 and 2 Corinthians*, *New Century Bib* 1974, 68, who cites Pirke Aboth 1:5 and Kiddushin 81a). Whichever of these inte pretations is adopted, Paul sees normal married life as the divine provision for mar natural needs. R. N. Longenecker comments: "1. Continence must be considered gift, not an obligation, else we enslave men to our ideal and do not allow them stand in the liberty to which Christ has set them free. 2. Abstinence from sexual e pression in marriage can be justified only in light of our Christian purpose, the pr sent circumstances, and/or our expectation of Christ's imminent return, but never (the ground that sexual relations within marriage are evil *per se*. 3. The obligation permanent abstinence, without the gift of continence, can set one 'aflame wi passion' and be a 'temptation to immorality', thus causing havoc within the Christi community and displaying, by the ascetics' insistence upon it as an obligation for a a failure on their part to condition their own Christian liberty by love" (*Paul, Apos of Liberty*, [1964] 1976, 239).

It is this recognition of basic human needs, gifts and the provision that God hir self has made which Paul wants the Corinthians to bear in mind as they consid such questions as mixed marriages (vv. 12–16) and separation (vv. 10 f.). With v. Paul turns to the "unmarried". In the first instance, these are *parthenoi*, "virgin (vv. 25, 28, 34, 36 ff.; → Woman, art. *parthenos*). But Paul also uses the ter *agamos* (vv. 8, 11, 32) meaning the "unmarried", as distinct from widows (v. 8). Th

Paul appeals in vv. 10–11 to Christ's prohibition of divorce (Matt. 19:6; cf. 5:32; 19:9); he had no need to express his own opinion (cf. vv. 12, 25). A wife should not separate (*mē chōristhēnai*) from her husband nor should he divorce (*mē aphienai*) her (vv. 10b, 11b). Parenthetically the apostle adds (v. 11a) – probably in answer to a specific Corinthian question – that "if a separation does take place [*ean ... kai chōristhē*]" on the wife's initiative (owing either to her husband's adultery or to his ascetic tendencies), she should remain unmarried or else seek reconciliation. Her option might possibly imply his guilt.

However, with regard to mixed marriages Paul knows of no relevant *verbum Christi* (v. 12a). His judgment is that separation is permissible (*chōrizesthō*) only if the unbelieving partner initiates it (probably on the ground of religious incompatibility) (v. 15a). In such circumstances, where the unbeliever was unwilling for cohabitation, the believing partner did not need to feel bound to persist in seeking reconciliation since God's calling was to peace, not discord (v. 15b) and there was no assurance that the unbelieving wife or husband would come to faith (v. 16).

M. J. Harris

4. *Divorce, Separation and Remarriage.* (a) The Teaching of Paul. In principle Paul regards the marriage bond as life-long (1 Cor. 7:10 f., 39; cf. Rom. 7:1–3; → Woman), particularly so far as the wife is concerned. For the law in Deut. 24:1–4 made provision only for the husband to effect a divorce. But in either case the act of sexual intercourse outside marriage is adulterous. Elsewhere Paul pictures the marriage union as an image of Christ and the church (Eph. 5:21–33). It is grounded in the creation ordinance of Gen. 2:24: "For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and the two shall become one" (Eph. 5:31). However, the "one flesh" relationship is not confined to marriage. The act of sexual intercourse with anyone establishes a relationship for good or ill. This question is not dealt with in 1 Cor. 7:1–24, where Paul is addressing himself to the questions raised by the Corinthian church concerning celibacy, celibacy within marriage, mutual obligations within marriage, and whether Christians should continue in existing mixed marriages. There he argues that separation may be the right course for the Christian (see above 3 (b)). It is in the previous two chapters that Paul discusses the breach of marriage through gross sexual offences, and in these cases the issue is much deeper than that of separation. It involves questions of fellowship and discipline which affect the whole church.

In 1 Cor. 5 Paul deals with the case of a man living with his father's wife; in such a case excommunication is imperative (1 Cor. 5:5, 13; → Destroy, art. *olethros* NT 5). Paul then turns to the question of adultery, pointing out that the "one flesh" relationship also applies to relations with prostitutes. "Do you not know that your bodies are members of Christ? Shall I therefore take the members of Christ and make them the members of a prostitute? Never! Do you not know that he who joins himself to a prostitute becomes one body with her? For, as it is written, 'The two shall be one flesh.' But he who is united with the Lord becomes one spirit with him" (1 Cor. 6:25 ff. RSV mg.). It is because sexual acts establish relationships through the body that Paul distinguishes sexual immorality from all other sins (v. 18).

In the OT the prescription of the law in the case of incest was the execution of the offending parties (Lev. 20:11 f.). The same punishment was laid down for adultery

Separate, Divide

χωρίζω

χωρίζω (*chōrizō*), divide, separate; (pass.) depart, b separated, separate (oneself).

CL Secular Greek authors use *chōrizō* in a literal sense to denote such separation a the freeing of the soul from the body at death (Plato) or the dividing of opposin military forces. Metaphorically the vb. often indicates a separation in thought, i.e logical distinctions or observable differences.

OT In LXX Greek the term denotes spatial separation of persons (Lev. 13:46; Jdg 4:11) or things (1 Esd. 4:44, 57), departure (Jdg. 6:18; 2 Macc. 10:19; 12:12) exclusion from office (1 Esd. 5:39), or separation from evil (Ezr. 9:1; Neh. 9:2 1 Esd. 7:13; 9:9). In the passive *chōrizō* was often used in the papyri as a technica term in connexion with divorce: "to separate the one from the other" (Moulton Milligan, 696; R. H. Charles cites P. Ryl. 2, 154, 24 ff. dated A.D. 66, and *BGU* IV 7 ff. dated 13 B.C.; *diachōrizesthai* means to desert in Josephus, *Ant.* 15, 259, cf. 1 Cor. 7:10; *chōrizō* means to divorce in Polyb., 32, 12, 6; R. H. Charles, *Th Teaching of the New Testament on Divorce*, 1921, 114 f.).

NT 1. *Spatial Separation.* The vb. may signify a physical separation of person (Phlm. 15, "he was parted from you") or a departure from a city or locality (Acts 1:4; 18:1, 2).

2. *Figurative Separation.* (a) So convinced was Paul of the constancy of divine love that he could actually list – and then dismiss as impotent – all potentia obstacles to the continued flow of God's love in Christ (Rom. 8:35–39). To his ques tion "Who shall separate [*chōrisei*] us from the love of Christ?" (v. 35a) comes the answer "Nothing will be able to separate [*chōrisai*] us" (v. 39). Neither adverse cir cumstance (vv. 35–36) nor created form or phase of being (vv. 38–39) could sever that love.

(b) If the phrase "separated [*kechōrismenos*] from sinful men" in Heb. 7:26 is construed with what precedes ("holy, blameless, unstained"), it refers to Christ's sinlessness. If it is taken with what follows ("exalted above the heavens"), it refers to his withdrawal from the world of evil. Perhaps the author intends us to understand Christ's separation as both moral and spatial.

3. *Divorce.* (a) Matt. 19:3–9 (cf. Mk. 10:2–9; Lk. 16:18) records an incident in which the Pharisees were trying to inveigle Jesus into taking sides in the contem porary dispute between the schools of Shammai and Hillel concerning the permissi ble grounds of → divorce (cf. Deut. 24:1–4). "Is it lawful for a man to divorce [*apolysai*] his wife on any given ground?" (v. 3). In reply Jesus appealed to the divine ordinance that predated any Mosaic legislation (cf. Deut. 24:1–4 with Gen. 2:24). In the divinely ordained nuptial bond the two partners become "one flesh". Man must not undo God's work by trying to separate (*mē chōrizetō*) what God has joined together (v. 6).

(b) In 1 Cor. 7 Paul is addressing an aberrant situation at Corinth in which a group of proto-gnostic ascetics seemed to be enjoining on the Corinthians either celibacy (cf. vv. 1–2, 8–9) or celibacy within marriage (cf. vv. 3–7) or even the dis solution of marriages, whether Christian (cf. vv. 10–11) or mixed (cf. vv. 12–16)

out, examine, search out, search, e.g. in connexion with a house search, a judicial hearing, and especially a scientific, philosophical and religious investigation (this particularly in Plato and Philo). *anexereunētos* means unsearchable, unfathomable (once in Heraclitus). Hellenistic forms without change of sense include *eraunaō*, *exeraunaō*, etc.

OT 1. In the LXX, while rendering other Heb. terms, the word (including the composite form) sometimes translates *ḥāpaś* (mostly piel), meaning seek, search thoroughly, and expresses, for instance, Laban's angry search for his missing household gods (Gen. 31:35), the plundering search of houses (1 Ki. 20:6), but also the quest for wisdom and discernment (Prov. 2:4) and the contrite examination of one's way of life (Lam. 3:40). God and his thoughts cannot be searched out (Jud. 8:14).

2. Philo says that man can penetrate the innermost being of God (*Fug.* 165; *Leg. All.* 3, 84). He also uses the word to describe learned investigation of the thought and exegesis of the OT (*Det. Pot. Ins.* 13:57; *Cherubin* 14). The Qumran sect regarded searching the Scriptures as its main task in order in this way to fathom the will of God (cf. A. R. C. Leaney, *The Rule of Qumran and its Meaning*, 1966, 63–77; G. Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism*, 1961).

NT The NT use of *eraunaō* (6 times) and *exeraunaō* (once) resembles that of secular Gk.

1. In Jn. 5:39 and 7:52 *eraunaō* refers to the penetrating examination of Scripture to obtain its meaning, the searching by the Jews – here presumably in the Law (note the accusation of infringing the law, v. 16; cf. also v. 45). *eraunate* in Jn. 5:39 is to be understood as indicative ("you search"), not imperative ("search!"); the Jews search the Scriptures, but they are preoccupied with words and think that by a mere fulfilment of the letter they can ensure themselves eternal life. This very searching, however, blinds them to the pointers to the true life proclaimed by the OT Scriptures. A preconceived attitude and approach to the study of the law led to the rejection of Jesus (7:52), in whom alone is life.

2. In 1 Pet. 1:10, 11 *exeraunaō* and *eraunaō* refer to the prophets' eager searching and reflection over the information revealed to them by the Spirit; it must be sharply distinguished from *prophēteuō* (prophesy).

3. An OT concept appears in Rom. 8:27 and Rev. 2:23. God searches the hearts of men (cf. 1 Sam. 16:7; 1 Ki. 8:39; Ps. 7:10). While God searches the depths of men's hearts, his judgments on them are unfathomable (Rom. 11:33, *anexeraunētos*). Only the → Spirit of God working in a man is able to search for knowledge of that which is still hidden in the depths of God (1 Cor. 2:10; cf. Matt. 11:25; 13:11; 16:17; Eph. 3:3, 5). 1 Cor. 2:9 takes up Isa. 64:4; 65:17. Where the Spirit searches, the barrier to all autonomous human search falls. *M. Seitz*

→ Prayer, → Spirit

G. Delling, *anexereunētos*, *TDNT* I 357; and *ereunaō*, *exereunaō*, *TDNT* II 655 ff.; H. Greeven, *zēteō* etc., *TDNT* II 892–96; H. Preisker, *heuriskō*, *TDNT* II 769 f.

an intensive sense (Lk. 11:50 f., which is based on OT usage, is significant: to d mand satisfaction for the blood of the prophets; cf. also Acts 15:17 = Amos 9:1 Rom. 3:11 = Ps. 14:2; Heb. 11:6; 12:17; 1 Pet. 1:10). *ekzētēsis*, useless speculatio occurs only at 1 Tim. 1:4. *epizēteō* is not much more frequent (12 times) and has similar intensive force (Matt. 6:32; 12:39; 16:4; Lk. 4:32; 12:30; Acts 12:19; 13: 19:39; Rom. 11:7; Phil. 4:17; Heb. 11:14; 13:14).

1. The secular use of the word is instructive. When the → parables tell of merchant looking for beautiful pearls (Matt. 13:45), or a housewife hunting throug her home to find a drachma (Lk. 15:8), or when the Passion-narratives tell of Juda seeking for an opportunity to betray Jesus (Matt. 26:16 par. Mk. 14:11, Lk. 22:6 the use of *zēteō* implies an act of the will rather than reflection of the intellect.

2. Like the prophets, Jesus' preaching called upon its hearers to seek God, i.e. t put their whole life at the disposal of God's will and rule: "But seek first [*zēteit* God's kingdom and his righteousness, and all these things [i.e. about which yc worry] shall be yours as well" (Matt. 6:33; cf. 7:7 f.; Lk. 11:9 f., 12:31; → Praye art. *krouō*). According to John's Gospel, the Jews opposed this call by seeking Jesu life (Jn. 5:18; 7:1, 19; 8:37) and by seeking to establish their own glory (Jn. 7:1 5:44; contrasted with Jesus in 5:30 and 8:50).

3. Paul gives the clearest statement of the contrast between man's self-assertio and his seeking of God when he rebukes Israel for wanting to establish its ow righteousness (Rom. 10:3), and sets over against it the way of faith which seeks to a tain to righteousness in Christ (Gal. 2:17). Similarly he censures his opponents wh "sought their own interests" (Phil. 2:21), while he ventures to assert of himself th he does not seek his own advantage (1 Cor. 10:33; cf. 1 Cor. 13:5: love does n seek its own interests). In both cases *zēteō* describes, not just one aspect of life, b the decisive direction of the human will.

4. It is in keeping with Gk. ways of thinking and speaking that Acts 17:27 speak of the nations seeking God, and 1 Cor. 1:22 refers to Gk. questioning and striving a ter → wisdom. The Gk. concept of *zētēsis*, which was unknown to the LXX, com in the NT to mean an argument, battle of words, dispute (Jn. 3:25; Acts 15: 25:20). It is not an important concept in the NT and, in the view of the author of th Pastoral Epistles, it advances neither faith nor the building up of the community, a is made plain by the association of argument with words like quarrelling, envy, strif slander (1 Tim. 6:4; cf. 2 Tim. 2:33, Tit. 3:9).

5. Finally God's *zētein* must be mentioned. It includes both God's claim to th fruits of obedience (Lk. 13:6, the fig-tree; → Fruit, art. *sykē*), to true worship (J 4:23) and to faithful stewardship (1 Cor. 4:2), and also the dedicated pursuit of th Son of man whose mission it is to seek that which is lost and rescue it (Lk. 19:10

H.-G. Link

ἐραυνάω

ἐραυνάω (*eraunaō*), search; *ἐξεραυνάω* (*exeraunaō* search out; *ἀνεξεραύνητος* (*anexeraunētos*), unsearchabl

CL *ereunaō* (related to *ereō*, ask, inquire), as well as the almost synonymou *exereunaō*, signified originally: (a) tracking by animals; sniff out, track dow (Homer, *Od.* 19, 436; Empedocles, *Frag.* 101); then (b) in the human sphere to trac

seek, aspire, demand, ask; the less frequent compounds *ek-* and *epizēteō* chiefly represent the qal of *dāraš*, enquire about, investigate, search for, question.

1. First of all, *zēteō* can in the LXX refer to non-religious processes: Joseph sought his brothers (Gen. 37:16); Saul looked for the runaway she-asses (1 Sam. 10:2, 14); Pharaoh sought to kill → Moses (Exod. 2:15; cf. 4:19). The phrase *zētein tēn psychēn*, "to seek the life", is regularly used of the intent to kill (1 Sam. 24:10; 25:29; 26:20; 2 Sam. 4:8; 1 Ki. 19:10, 14; Jer. 11:21; Ps. 35:4, etc.). It is significant that already this secular OT seeking entails no mere intellectual process but an activity which involves the whole person. The men of the ancient East conceived of seeking as having an emotional element. Seeking in the OT included the will and the aspirations of man. It is an existential act and not an intellectual one.

2. (a) When they are applied figuratively to man's relationship to God, *zēteō* and its compounds denote the conscious turning of the Israelites to their God with all their being, or that of Yahweh to his people. In the prophets' message of judgment, the reproach constantly recurs, that Israel has not sought its God (Isa. 9:13; 31:1; Jer. 10:21). At the same time they warn the rebellious people to seek their God, i.e. to be obedient to him (Jer. 29:13 f.; Deut. 4:29; Isa. 55:6). In the Pss. particularly (24:6; 27:8; 83:16; 105:3 f.) and 2 Chr. (7:14; 11:16; 15:12; 18:4, 7) there occurs the formula *zētein ton kyrion, theon, to prosōpon kyriou*, to seek the Lord, God, the face of the Lord, which has become fixed as a technical term. These expressions are, on the one hand, a summary of what willing obedience to Yahweh means; and, on the other hand, they also contain an allusion to cultic occasions like worship and prayers. To seek God thus acquires the meaning to seek after God, where he is to be found, in the → temple and cult. Seeking finds its fulfilment in oracles, instructions and adoration.

(b) The passages that speak of God's seeking are essentially fewer but are all the more important. Like a → shepherd, God will seek again his people who have wandered away, and he will gather them (Ezek. 34:12–16). Hence, the theological use of *zēteō* in the LXX serves to express the reciprocal → covenant relationship between Yahweh and Israel.

3. (a) In Philo, philosophical thinking and questions of the intellect are connected with the seeking of the heart to form a unique synthesis (*Abr.* 87; *Spec. Leg.* 1, 345).

(b) *dāraš* also occurs frequently in the Qumran texts. To seek God is a basic claim laid upon the Essenes (1QS 1:1). That means seeking and asking about God's will. Their zealous study of the Torah served this end. The sect expected the appearance of a figure in the end-time who was called "the Teacher of the Torah" (4Qflor 1:11; CD 7:18).

NT In the NT *zēteō* is a word primarily used by the evangelists (Matt. 14 times; Mk. 10; Lk. 34: Jn. 10) and in the Pauline writings (20 times). It occurs less often in Acts (10 times) and the Catholic Epistles (1 Pet. 3:11 = Ps. 34:14; 1 Pet. 5:8); it occurs once in Heb. (8:7) and Rev. (9:6). Its range of meaning embraces the Gk. and Heb. elements in the concept. Thus, *zēteō* in the NT refers, on the one hand, to following and seeking something (Lk. 15:8), and to probing ideas and reflections (Mk. 11:18; 14:1, 11), as well as judicial enquiry (Jn. 8:50b). On the other hand, it means anything from deliberate striving and desiring (Matt. 6:33; 1 Cor. 10:33) to an assertion of one's claims (Mk. 8:12). *ekzēteō* occurs only 7 times in the NT with

heuriskō in these two ways as *invenire* and *reperire* is something that the NT has i common with the rest of Gk. It puts the stress less on the manner and way in which is possible to find than on its object (e.g. Jn. 1:41: "We have found the messiah!' which is to be found or can be missed and so not found. It is presupposed that man i one who seeks (Matt. 7:7 par.; Lk. 11:9). Man is so care-worn, burdened and longin for rest, that he seeks (Matt. 11:29). If he is not found, he is lost (cf. Lk. 15:4 f.; th opposite here is *apollymi*). What he strives for and finds is by nature a → gift (Heb 4:16); otherwise the word is meaningless. It is also presupposed that by his way c life he will show himself to be a follower of Jesus Christ (cf. Phil. 2:8 with 3:9).

3. *The Subject and Object of Finding.* The natural man primarily seeks to hold o to his natural → life in the sense of his instinct for self-preservation. Man is able t find his life, but only through death "for my sake", as in the logion of Matt. 16:25 (c par. Mk. 8:35; Lk. 9:24; Jn. 12:25 f.). The real thing that is to be found is the kingdom of God (Matt. 13:44 ff.; cf. also 6:33, where *heuriskō* is not explicitly men tioned). Other phrases mean basically the same thing: one must find → "the way t life" (Matt. 7:14), → "rest" (Matt. 11:29; cf. Jer. 6:16; Isa. 28:12) which the unclea spirit cannot find (Matt. 12:43 par. Lk. 11:24), and → "grace [or favour] with God (Lk. 1:30; cf. Acts 7:46; Heb. 4:16). Even where it is not explicitly mentioned as th object, the affairs of the kingdom of God, however they are described, are implied

Jesus is depicted as he who finds faith or does not find it, and that as both the On on earth (Matt. 8:10; used in a parable, Matt. 18:13 par. Lk. 15:5) and also as th coming Son of man (Lk. 18:8; cf. Matt. 24:46; → Son, art. *ho hyios tou anthrōpou*) Jesus Christ who wants to find faith in himself and his message and the man wh wants to find the "way to life" are inseparably connected. Where Jesus finds faith th man also finds the "way to life" and thus to a new way of life (Phil. 2:5 ff.). Wher man finds the "way to life" Jesus also finds faith. *B. Gärtner*

ζητέω

ζητέω (*zēteō*), seek; ἐκζητέω (*ekzēteō*), seek, search for ἐπιζητέω (*epizēteō*), seek after, strive for, search for, want ζήτησις (*zētēsis*), investigation, argument, discussion, debate.

CL *zēteō*, attested from Homer onwards (cf. *dizēmai*, strive after something, als from Homer onwards), has the general meaning of to seek. In cl. Gk. the wor became a technical term for striving after knowledge, and especially for philosophica investigation (Xen., *Cyr.* 8, 5, 13; Epictetus, *Dissertationes* 1, 28, 20; 4, 1, 51). Oc casionally *zēteō* was also used as a legal term for a judicial investigation (Dinarchus 1 8; *P. Oxy.* 237, 6, 41; 726, 16). The compounds *ekzēteō* 1st cent. B.C. onwards and *epizēteō* (Hdt. onwards) emphasize the basic meaning: seek, investigate, striv (e.g. Aristotle, *Eth. Nic.* 9, 9, 1169b, 13). Apart from that, *ekzēteō* can refer to scien tific investigation (*BGU.* IV 1141, 41) and *epizēteō* to legal searching or claim (Josephus, *Ant.* 17, 10, 10[295]). The noun *zētēsis* (Soph., Hdt. onwards, not in th LXX) corresponds to the basic meaning of *zēteō*, and is used as a technical term fo philosophical investigation (Plato, *Cratylus* 406A; Epictetus, *Dissertationes* 1, 22 17; 2, 11, 13; 3, 14, 10).

OT The LXX uses *zēteō* some 400 times, principally to translate the piel of *bāqaš*

nessiah!" (cf. Jn. 1:45). This human finding is matched by God's free giving (Jn. 5:39; 17:12, 22; 18:9).

Logically this is close to the idea of predestination. But significantly *heuriskō* does not occur in the *locus classicus* for predestination, Rom. 8:28–30. It would be too weak. The emphasis of *heuriskō* is not on the logical alternatives (some find their salvation through God's grace, others do not), but on the element of → joy over those who have been found (Lk. 15:7, 10, 23). Hence, the alternatives implied by the vb. at most are that some have found their salvation through God's grace and others have not yet done so. Such a distinction is, however, always only provisional, corresponding to the biblical God of the future and of hope (Jer. 29:11).

The God who meets us in Jesus Christ seeks and finds the lost (Lk. 15:6, 8–10). He acts like a conscientious → shepherd (Lk. 15:1–6; Jn. 10:9) and like a forgiving → father (Lk. 15:20, 22–24, 32). Such a being lost and being found can be represented by the ideas of death and coming to life (Lk. 15:24, 32; cf. Paul's idea of the man who was dead but is now in Jesus Christ as a new creature, 2 Cor. 5:17; → Creation). This divine finding which is a creative act is matched by returning on man's part (→ Conversion) and by repentance (Lk. 15:7, 10, 21) and by so living out his life to the full. Thus man is shown to be like the Christ who issued an invitation to him (Matt. 11:29) and was obedient (Phil. 2:8; cf. also Phil. 2:5 ff.; 1 Thess. 1:6; Matt. 22:9; and Ignatius, *Eph.* 10:3).

(c) Hence, it is understandable that the use of the passive construction is particularly frequent, not so much with the meaning of find oneself, be found (Lk. 17:18; Acts 8:40), as with that of being found out (to be), show oneself. The follower of Christ no more wants to be found a sinner (Gal. 2:17) or a false witness (1 Cor. 15:15) than the pious Jew means to show himself to be fighting against God (Acts 5:39). The former is concerned rather to show himself to be a faithful steward (1 Cor. 4:2), to be in Christ (Phil. 3:9), to be worthy (Rev. 5:4), blameless (2 Pet. 3:14) and established in the → faith (1 Pet. 1:7). For what matters is the manner of life that the returning Lord finds in his servants (responsibility for one's neighbour, Matt. 24:46; faith, Lk. 18:8; watchfulness, Matt. 25:1–13; wise stewardship, Matt. 25:14–30).

In accordance with sense CL (b), it is possible to speak of seeking and finding, or not finding, fault. The latter is the case with the question of Jesus' guilt during his trial (Lk. 23:4, 14, 22; Jn. 18:38; 19:4, 6; Acts 13:28; cf. also 1 Pet. 2:22, where Isa. 53:9 is quoted with a christological interpretation). But it also applies to the trials in which his disciples, Peter and John (Acts 4:21), and later Paul (Acts 23:9; 24:20), were involved. Paul can "discover" a certain state of affairs in the law (Rom. 7:21), and the church at Ephesus can "discover" liars in their ranks (Rev. 2:2), and so on. The meaning of acquire, procure, is found seldom: What has Abraham gained? (Rom. 4:1); Christ has gained for himself an eternal redemption, so that it might benefit us (Heb. 9:12).

2. *The Way to Find. heuriskō* frequently appears in the NT with → *zēteō* (used literally: Matt. 12:43; Jn. 7:34; 2 Tim. 1:17; used metaphorically: Matt. 7:7 f., → Prayer, art. *krouō*; Acts 17:27; Rev. 9:6; used in a parabolic sense: Matt. 13:45). Even where *zēteō* does not explicitly occur it mostly implies some sort of preliminary to finding. It shows that the act of finding is in no way purely fortuitous (e.g. Matt. 10:39; 11:29; Lk. 23:4). On the other hand, passages like Matt. 13:44 which clearly refer to an accidental finding are in the minority. The fact that it is possible to use

for both ideas. It is used both literally and figuratively: (a) find by chance, come u
(e.g. Homer, *Il.* 1 498; *Od.* 24 462); mid. incur (e.g. misfortune, Homer *Od.* 21, 3
pass. find oneself, be found (e.g. Soph. *Philoctetes* 452), show oneself (e.g. to be
just, Eur., *Hecuba* 270); (b) find after seeking, discover (e.g. a way out, Homer,
4, 374; a device for rescue, Aesch., *Sept.* 209; a law of nature, Vitruvius,
Architecture 9, Preface 9–12: the famous *heurēka* ["I have found [it]"]
Archimedes); (c) fetch, obtain (a price for goods by a sale or auction, Xen., *Hell*
4, 24); (d) acquire, procure for some one (e.g. *sōtērian*, rescue, Plato, *Protago*
321C), mostly, however, mid. obtain (e.g. advantage, Thuc. 1, 31, 2).

OT In the LXX and late Judaism *heuriskō* was also used in a literal and a figura
sense. All the senses except that of CL (c) are found: e.g., come upon (e.g. G
18:26, 28 f.); find oneself (e.g. Deut. 20:11; 2 Ki. 14:14); be found (Dan. 1:19;
also Josephus, *War* 3, 6, 1[114], etc.). The vb. chiefly serves in the LXX to transl
the Heb. *māṣā'*. The objects of this finding can be either things (*t'rāpîm*, Gen. 31:
or persons (e.g. Saul, 1 Sam. 10:21). In theological contexts its objects are → C
(e.g. Isa. 55:6), → grace (Gen. 18:3; Exod. 33:13; Num. 11:11; Heb. *ḥēn*) and
mercy (Gen. 19:19; Jdg. 6:17, also *ḥēn*). Occasionally we find references to findin
life (Prov. 21:21) and rest (Sir. 11:19). It is never possible to be so sure whet
heuriskō corresponds to *reperire* or *invenire*, when it appears in conjunction w
zēteō, seek. Although it is occasionally said of men that they have looked and h
either found or not found (1 Sam. 20:21), most passages in which the combinatio
seeking and finding occurs make the point that God can or should be sought
found (Isa. 55:6; 65:1; cf. Rom. 10:20; Jer. 29[36]:13; Prov. 8:17, Wis. 13:6
Wisdom, too, as the knowledge of God, can be found (Prov. 14:6), although t
notion was contested by Job, who had become sceptical concerning his old ideas
God because of his inexplicable suffering (Job 28:12 f.; → Doubt).
Seeking and finding God happens in → prayer (Isa. 55:6) and hearing (Jer. 29:1
in calling and answering; prayer leads in its turn to the return of the godless (I
55:7), who alters his way of life (Isa. 55:7), and through God's → forgiveness (I
55:7) is led to recognize that God's ideas and ways (Isa. 55:8) are not the same
his. Nevertheless, God's ideas are ideas of well-being (*šālôm*, → Peace) and not
evil. As such they open up a whole future and give him grounds for → hope (J
29:11). Much as it is expected that man should speak (pray) and act (return)
zēteō), we must remember that, when God is found, he discloses himself to man a
lets himself be found (Isa. 55:6; Jer. 29:14; → Revelation): "Here am I, here am
(Isa. 65:1). God is only found through God himself.

NT 1. *Occurrence and Use in the NT.* (a) The range of meaning of *heuriskō* in
NT writings is the same as in the LXX, i.e. the meaning CL (c) does not occ
One can (as in CL (a)) hit upon things (a treasure, Matt. 13:44; leaves, Matt. 21:1
and meet men (particular ones, Jn. 1:41, 45; or unspecified, Matt. 22:9). The apos
can find "children" who "walk in the truth" (2 Jn. 4). There can be men who will se
→ death as an escape in the final affliction, but will not find it (Rev. 9:6). What
decisive is whether a man is found in the "book of life" (Rev. 20:15).
(b) *heuriskō* has a theological significance in Jn. 1:41: "We have found t

ngdom, i.e. the preservation of the righteous and the punishment of evildoers. Us-
g the figure of winnowing grain the Baptist affirms of Jesus: "His winnowing fork
tyon] is in his hand, and he will clear his threshing floor [*halōn*] and gather his
heat [*sitos*] into the granary, but the chaff he will burn with unquenchable fire"
Matt. 3:12).

(d) Jesus' parabolic teaching employed the harvest imagery to emphasize the es-
natological aspects of the divine judgment. In the parable of the seed growing
ecretly (Mk. 4:29) the decisive event in the life of the kingdom is the reaping of a
piritual harvest with sharpened sickle (*drepanon*). *therismos* as a symbol of the final
idgment of separation between righteous and wicked is developed by Jesus in the
arable of the tares (Matt. 13:24 ff.) where wheat and tares grow together in the
'orld until the end-time harvest, when angel reapers root out the weeds (the un-
ghteous) for burning and gather the wheat (the righteous) into the granary (the
'ather's eternal kingdom). The vision of the Son of man (cf. Rev. 1:13; Mk. 13:26,
7) reaping earth's ripened harvest in judgment with his angels (Rev. 14:15, 16),
ecapitulates the teaching of the OT and Jesus on the subject. *B. A. Demarest*

). R. B. Coote, "Hos. 14:8: They Who are Filled with Grain Shall Live", *JBL* 93, 1974, 161–73; J.
. Crossan, "The Seed Parables of Jesus", *JBL* 92, 1973, 244–66; N. A. Dahl, "The Parables of
rowth", *StudTheol.* 5, 1951, 132–66; D. Daube, "The Interpretation of a Generic Singular", in *The
'ew Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*, 1956, 438–44; C. H. Dodd, *The Parables of the Kingdom*,
936[3]; B. Gerhardsson, "The Seven Parables in Matthew xiii", *NTS* 19, 1972–73, 16–37; and "The
arable of the Sower and its Interpretation", *NTS* 14, 1967–68, 165–93; F. Hauck, *therizō, therismos*,
DNT III 132–33; A. M. Hunter, *Interpreting the Parables*, 1964[2]; and *The Parables Then and Now*,
971; J. Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, 1963[2]; E. Linnemann, *Parables of Jesus* (London, 1966); W.
eil, "Expounding the Parables: II The Sower", *ExpT* 77, 1965–6, 74–77; W. Pesch, "Harvest" *EBT* I
49 ff.; G. Quell and Z. Schulz, *sperma, speirō, spora*, *TDNT* VII 536–47; H. Ridderbos, *The Coming
f the Kingdom*, 1962; V. K. Robbins, "The Parable of the Sower and its Interpretation", *JBL* 92, 1973,
65–93; D. Wenham, "The Interpretation of the Parable of the Sower", *NTS* 20, 1973–74, 299–319;
. White, "The Parable of the Sower", *JTS* New Series 15, 1964, 300–7.

). J. Jeremias, "Zur Deutung des Gleichnisses vom Unkraut unter dem Weizen (Mt. xiii 36–43)", in
*eotestamentica et Patristica. Eine Freundesgabe Herrn Professor Dr. Oscar Cullmann zu seinem 60.
eburtstag überreicht, Supplements to NovT* 6, 1962, 59–63.

eek, Find

eek, *zēteō*, and find, *heuriskō*, are two concepts that belong together both logically
nd in practice. They can also refer both to concrete objects and to spiritual matters
nd – at least in the case of *zēteō* – to existential ways of behaviour. In the biblical
vritings they are particularly used to indicate man's relationship to God; here *zēteō*
ays its main emphasis on the anthropological side of it and *heuriskō* on the
heological and christological. Also included in this article is *eraunaō*, to search.

εὑρίσκω

εὑρίσκω (*heuriskō*), find, discover.

L *heuriskō*, which is attested from Homer onwards, means to find, discover. Its origin is obscure. While Lat. distinguishes between *reperire*, which implies finding hat is preceded by seeking, and *invenire*, a chance discovery, Gk. has only one word

either good (Hos. 10:12) or evil (Job 4:8; Hos. 8:7), or of gaining a certain rev through persistent effort (Ps. 126:5).

qāṣîr is symbolically used in the OT of a time of divine appointment in ger (Jer. 8:20) and of temporal → judgments in particular: e.g. upon Ethiopia (Isa. 1 5), Babylon (Jer. 51:33), Judah (Hos. 6:11) and the house of Israel (Isa. 17:5). richly descriptive harvest imagery portrays the judgmental acts of God in justice vengeance. A people ripened by sin are likened to a harvest prepared for the sick divine retribution. First cut down, then bound in bundles, threshed and winno the grain is gathered in the store house, whilst the chaff is consumed by fire

A few OT prophets looked beyond the temporal horizon of divine judgment tc general harvest which would consummate this present age. Joel (3:13) foresees ingathering of the end-time harvest of the nations. Isaiah (27:12) expands the agery with the prophecy that the divine threshing process will effect the separatio Israel (grain) from the nations (chaff).

The figure of the world as a ripened field ready for harvest was taken up in Jewish apocalyptic literature. The end of this present evil age, which is to be sumated in a holocaust of judgment, is likened to a harvest (*qāṣîr*) in which good evil fruit is reaped (Syr. Bar. 70:2).

The ethical maxims of Philo make frequent use of the "sowing-reaping" n (*Conf. Ling.*, 152; *Mut. Nom.* 269; *Leg. Gai.* 293). The Alexandrian also deve the harvesting process into a moral and psychological allegory in which the ma understanding distinguishes virtue from vice, consumes all that is defiled in his n and enshrines the good (*Som.* 2, 23).

NT 1. *Primary Meaning. therismos*, which occurs 13 times in the NT, has a primary meaning the process or time of gathering ripened crops, particul grain (Matt. 13:30; Mk. 4:29; Jn. 4:35). *therizō* is found 21 times in the NT (M 6:26; Jas. 5:4), literally in the sense of reaping a cultivated crop and, in the cas grain, of threshing, winnowing and storing the produce. *theristēs*, which denotes agent who harvests a crop, is used by Matthew (13:30, 39) alone.

2. *Extended Meaning.* The commonplace motif of the ingathering of a ripe crop provided Jesus and the NT writers with a powerful imagery for the explica of various facets of the divine economy.

(a) The *therismos* group occurs in the Synoptic Gospels in the sense of the crease of one's labour generally. In the parable of the talents (Matt. 25:24, 26) the parable of the pounds (Lk. 19:21, 22) the master and the nobleman, respectiv are slighted with the accusation of unjustly appropriating the → fruit (*karpos*) others' work.

(b) Jesus developed the basic harvest imagery into the notion of the potential f of the Christian mission. Predisposed by God for reception of the gospel, men likened to a crop of fully ripened grain ready for harvest (Matt. 9:37, 38; Lk. 10 With a note of urgency Jesus, "the Lord of the harvest", enjoins his followers, reapers, to gather the ripened harvest before it perish in the field. The Fourth Go acknowledges that in the work of the kingdom the spiritual harvester reaps labours of faithful sowers who went before (Jn. 4:36–38). Both sower and rea may anticipate due rewards for faithful performance of their appointed tasks.

(c) The harvest imagery admirably depicts the judgmental aspects of

(f) Paul employs *speirō* (and its correlate *phyteuō*, to plant) in the context of the ıaterial maintenance of the gospel preacher. Like the servant who plants a vineyard l Cor. 9:7), he who sows the seed of spiritual fruit is entitled to reap the reward of a ving (1 Cor. 9:11). Underscoring the church's responsibility for the financial sup-ort of the evangel, Paul in 2 Cor. 9:6 (and its near parallel Gal. 6:7) asserts that the berality with which one sows determines the spiritual and material benefits one :aps (→ Poor, art. *ptōchos* NT 4 (a)).

(g) In Gal. 6:7 f. this theme is developed into an ethical sowing-reaping proverb ımiliar to secular antiquity and the OT: "Do not be deceived: God is not mocked, or whatever a man sows, that he will also reap. For he who sows to his own flesh ⁄ill from the flesh reap corruption; but he who sows to the Spirit will from the Spirit eap eternal life" (cf. Job 4:8; Cicero, *De Or.* 2, 65; Aristotle, *Rhet.* 3, 3; Plato, *Phdr.* 60 c; and Prov. 11:30; 13:2; Amos 6:12 for the metaphor of the → fruit of ighteousness). Here, however, Paul focuses attention upon old and new natures as he two spheres in which ethical action is sown: a sowing in the flesh yields a certain ıarvest (→ *therismos*) of moral corruption, whereas a sowing to the Spirit brings orth eternal life. James adds that the divine standard of ethical conduct is achieved ınly by those possessors of heavenly wisdom who sow in gentleness, humility and ıeace (Jas. 3:18).

(h) The hapax legomenon *spermologos* means lit. "picking up seeds". It is used in :l. Gk. of the rook, but also non-literally of people in the sense of gossip, chatterer, ıabbler, one who makes his living by picking up scraps, a rag-picker (cf. Arndt, 769). t is applied to Paul by the Athenians: "Some also of the Epicurean and Stoic ıhilosophers met him. And some said, 'What would this babbler say?' Others said, He seems to be a preacher of foreign divinities' – because he preached Jesus and the esurrection." Paul's preaching technique is studied by M. A. Robinson in 'SPERMOLOGOS: Did Paul preach from Jesus' Parables?", *Biblica* 56, 1975, 231–40.

B. A. Demarest

θερισμός

θερισμός (*therismos*), harvest; *θερίζω* (*therizō*), reap, harvest; *θεριστής* (*theristēs*), reaper, harvester.

CL The noun *therismos* is rare in cl. Gk. The word group as a whole (from *theros*, summer) is commonly used in the literal sense of reaping or gathering food crops (Herodotus, Aristophanes, Xenophon). It is also used metaphorically, frequently in proverbs which highlight the inevitable moral consequences of prior actions (i.e. Aristotle, *Rhet.* 3, 3, 4: "You have sown shame and reaped misfortune"). *therizō* also occurs in the extended sense of cutting off or destroying human adversaries (Euripides, Sophocles; Plutarch, *Mor.* 182A: "Alexander . . . reaped Asia, and I am picking up the straws").

OT In the LXX *therismos* stands primarily for *qāṣîr* (the vb. *therizō* for *qāṣar*), which in the OT commonly means either the process of harvesting a crop (Gen. 45:6; Exod. 34:21; Ruth 2:21) or the produce reaped (Isa. 16:9; 17:11; Joel 1:11). *qāṣar* is commonly employed in the extended sense of reaping the → fruit of a prior deed

Abraham was not confined to a single individual but extended to his posterity general. In reply J. B. Lightfoot points out that the sing. collective implied by Heb. *zarᵉkā* ("your seed") and the Gk. *sperma* makes Paul's point by involving idea of unity (*Saint Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*, 1890 [10], 142). The argumer not a grammatical one but a theological one. In the first instance, the seed refer the people of Israel, the posterity of → Abraham. Although the children of Ishn were descended from Abraham, there was only one → covenant people descen from him, the line through Isaac. R. N. Longenecker draws attention to the fact t the Targums consistently employ the plur. "and to your sons" here, although t presume a corporate understanding (*Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*, 19 123). In drawing attention to the sing. "seed", Paul may be hitting out at targumic plur., especially in view of the fact that for him physical descent was guarantee of spiritual relationship (Rom. 9:6 f.; cf. F. Pereira, "The Galatian C troversy in the Light of the Targums", *The Indian Journal of Theology*, 20, 19 27). This latter thought is reflected in v. 29: "And if you are Christ's, then you Abraham's offspring, heirs according to promise." Here the sing. is clearly a coll tive. Although he is aware of the strained applications of rabbinic exegesis (cf. Daube, *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*, 1956, 440–44), Longenec does not think that Paul is adopting such an exegesis here. "Rather, he is invokin corporate solidarity understanding of the promise to Abraham wherein the Messi as the true descendant of Abraham and the true representative of his people, and Messiah's elect ones, as sharers in his experiences and his benefits, are seen as legitimate inheritors of God's promises [cf. C. A. A. Scott, *Christianity According St. Paul*, 1927, 154 f.]. The Judaizers at Galatia may have been proclaiming that promises were made to Abraham and to his 'seed' the nation (a generic singular), possibly, as Daube suggests, to Abraham and to his 'seed' Isaac (a specific singul [Daube, op. cit., 440]; and some of Paul's converts may have been taken in by th exposition. But whatever the precise form of the heresy afflicting Christians Galatia, Paul 'deliberately furnishes them with a deeper application' of the promi of God made to Abraham and to his 'seed' [Daube, op. cit., 441]" (Longenecker, cit., 124). *C. Brown*

(d) The Philonic concept of the "divine seed" is given a Christian interpretation 1 Jn. 3:9, where *sperma* signifies the divine principle of life (the Spirit?) in t believer, which renders continuance in sin incongruous. As the physical *sperma* w the generator of life in the physical order (Gen. 1:11 ff.), so the divine *sperr* becomes the fount and origin of life in the new order of recreated humanity.

(e) The figure of seed sown in the earth (cf. Jn. 12:24) is used by Paul to illustra the interment and → resurrection of the bodies of deceased believers (1 Cor. 15:36 f As the bare grain of wheat (*sitos*) sown in the soil unfolds into a full grown ear, the germ of spiritual life deposited in the ground will be raised into a glorious n body animated by the Spirit. "The *kernel* that is sown is different from the plant th springs up, for all the continuity of life; whatever variety of *seed* be sown, G provides it with its appropriate *body*, in which the full-grown plant is 'clothed'. A that is necessary for the analogy is the combination of identity with difference; th the seed does not 'die' as the mortal body does is neither here nor there" (F. F. Bruc *1 and 2 Corinthians*, *New Century Bible*, 1971, 151).

uraging persistence in preaching. The parable's teaching on the side of human sponsibility should be held in tension with that teaching of Jesus which stresses vine sovereignty. Thus, "Every plant [*phyteia*] which my heavenly Father has not anted will be rooted up" (Matt. 15:13).

In the parable of the seed growing secretly (Mk. 4:26–29), the seed (*sporos*) posited in the earth develops successively into the blade (*chortos*), the ear (*stachys*) d finally the full head of grain (*sitos*), symbolizing the growth of the life of the → pirit in the believer promoted by the secret power of God. Lacking the life of the ngdom, man is like the flower (*anthos*) of the grass (*chortos*) which fades and mes to naught (Jas. 1:10, 11). The parable of the wheat and tares (Matt. 3:24–30), in which the Son of man sows the seed of wheat (*sitos*) and the devil the ed of darnel (*zizanion*), affirms the simultaneous growth of good and evil during e present age. In the parable of the mustard seed (Matt. 13:31 f., par. Mk. 4:30 ff.; k. 13:18 f.) the growth of the minuscule mustard seed (*sinapi*) into a magnificent rub highlights the contrast between the insignificant beginnings of the kingdom and s final manifestation in majesty and power.

2. *Extended Meaning.* (a) The NT frequently employs *sperma* in the sense of offspring" or "posterity". The word often occurs in citations of OT promise texts hich foretell the future blessing of the descendants of → Abraham (Lk. 1:55; cf. en. 17:7; 18:18; 22:17; Mic. 7:20; Acts 7:5 f.; cf. Gen. 12:7; 17:8; Deut. 2:5), saac (Rom. 9:7; cf. Gen. 21:12; Heb. 11:18; cf. Gen. 21:12) and → David (Acts 3:23).

(b) In Paul *sperma* occasionally transcends the basic physical relation to include ie spiritual descendants of OT believers. The common NT expression "seed of braham" thus is not restricted to the generic house of Israel, but includes all who ossess the same kind of faith as the patriarch. NT believers are represented as the ue seed of Abraham (Gal. 3:29). The OT promise to the patriarchs therefore anscended the material prosperity of the nation to include the ultimate spiritual lessing of all who believe, whether Jew or Gentile (Rom. 4:16 ff.). The seed of the oman in Rev. 12:17 represents the NT community which towards the end of the ge becomes the focus of Satan's attack.

(c) Paul ultimately interprets the OT promise of a seed in terms of Christ, the aramount offspring of Abraham (Gal. 3:16–19; cf. Gen. 12:7): "Now the promises vere made to Abraham and to his offspring. It does not say, 'And to offsprings,' eferring to many; but, referring to one, 'And to your offspring,' which is Christ. This s what I mean: the law, which came four hundred and thirty years afterward, does ot annul a covenant previously ratified by God, so as to make the promise void. For f the inheritance is by the law, it is no longer by promise; but God gave it to Abraham by a promise. Why then the law? It was added because of transgressions, ill the offspring should come to whom the promise had been made; and it was or- lained by angels through an intermediary." As head of the corporate community Gal. 3:29), Christ is identified as the ultimate fulfilment of the divine promises to the patriarchs and later to David (Acts 13:23, 33 ff.). *B. A. Demarest*

Paul's exegesis here has sometimes been criticized for its artificiality. The plur. of the Heb. *zera'.* is generally used for grain or crops (e.g. 1 Sam. 8:15), and therefore the original Heb. of Gen. 12:7 would have to be sing., even though the promise to

Isa. 55:10; Amos 9:13) and to the flow of male semen (Lev. 15:16; 22:4; Jer. 31:

zera' is used figuratively of offspring or posterity, either individually (Gen. 4 21:13) or collectively (e.g. seed of → Noah, Gen. 9:9; seed of → David, Ps. 8 seed of the patriarchs, Deut. 1:8), thereby highlighting the cohesion of the elect c munity. *zera'* in Gen. 3:15 includes the two preceding ideas: collectively the foreshadows the spiritually renewed posterity of → Adam who strive with → Sa ultimately it refers to Christ the paramount seed who seals Satan's doom. In Genesis promise texts *zera'* denotes Abraham's spiritual offspring (Gen. 15:5; 1 8; 22:18) who adhere to the → covenant of Yahweh. Ps. 22:30 refers to the seed spiritual progeny) of the messiah.

zāra' is used figuratively of Yahweh sowing Israel in the land (Hos. 2:23) or dispersion (Zech. 10:9) and of fructifying the chosen nation (Jer. 31:27; Ezek. 3€ The imagery of sowing seed is employed in injunctions to ethical action (Hos. 10 Jer. 4:3) and in warnings against evil practices (Job 4:8; Prov. 22:8).

Late Judaism employed the ethical idea of seed-sowing and harvest (→ *therisn* in an apocalyptic context. The present evil world is likened to a field sown v corrupt seed which can only bear → fruit (*karpos*) after its kind (2 Esd. 9:17). Un the produce of the corrupt seed is gathered in, the beneficent age-to-come canno inaugurated (2 Esd. 4:28 ff.). The seed-sowing imagery was also used of the impl tation of the law in the children of Israel (2 Esd. 9:31).

In Philo *sperma* is interpreted as the starting point of the universe (*Plant.* 48) of all that exists (*Leg. All.* 3, 185). Man's body originates from human seed, but soul from divine seed (*Vit. Mos.* 1, 279). God sows every chaste virtue in the s (*Cherubin* 52) and wisdom, the daughter of God, sows knowledge and discernm But man possesses the capacity of sowing both good (*Leg. All.* 1, 80) and evil (*Cc Ling.* 152) seed.

Rabbinic tradition interpreted certain OT seed texts (e.g. Gen. 4:25; Isa. 53:10 terms of the messiah. Thus Gen. R. 23:5 (on 4:25): "Eve saw the offspring wh origin is elsewhere. Who was this? The King Messiah."

NT 1. *Primary Meaning. sperma* occurs 44 times and *speirō* 53 times in the NT, f quently in the → parables of Jesus, where the familiar imagery of seed sown ir field conveys profound teaching about the kingdom of God. In the parable of t sower (Matt. 13:1–9, par. Mk. 4:1–9; Lk. 8:4–8) emphasis rests upon the act of se sowing which, on the basis of Jesus' identification of the *sperma* with the "Word God", is symbolic of the proclamation of the arrival of the kingdom. Jesus' int pretation of the parable (Matt. 13:8–23, par. Mk. 4:13–20; Lk. 8:11–15) emphasiz the four kinds of soils upon which the word was sown, thus illustrating the divers of response to the message. The seed sown "along the path" symbolizes the stu born, secular man who is incapable of comprehending the message. That sown "rocky ground" characterizes the shallow hearer who for want of spiritual e nestness falls away at the first occasion of opposition. The seed sown "amo thorns" depicts the selfish recipient in whom the implanted word is choked by carr concerns. Lastly the seed cast upon "good soil" represents the saved man who embracing the proclaimed word participates in the eternal increase of the kingdo Although much of the soil is unresponsive to the seed, the parable nevertheless e tends the promise of a great overflow of a spiritual harvest (→ *therismos*), thus e

iterary and archaeological evidence of theatres in a number of other cities, used for eligious, dramatic and civic events.

NT The theatre was a natural place for the citizens of Ephesus to take Paul's companions, Gaius and Aristarchus, during the riot over Paul's preaching (Acts 19:29). ts capacity was around 24,000–25,000. The use of such a place for public assemblies is documented in Moulton-Milligan, 285. While the gathering is properly called n "assembly" (*ekklēsia*) in Acts 19:32, 41, it was an impromptu assembly, and any udicial action would need to be taken *en tē ennomō ekklēsia* ("in a legal assembly," 19:39).

The word for "theatre" also served to designate the play or spectacle itself. Thus Paul employs *theatron* in 1 Cor. 4:9 to describe the apostles as those who are "on stage", as in a theatre. In this imagery the theatre is the whole universe. Similarly the metaphor of an arena is employed in the first part of the verse. Heb. 10:33 uses the verb *theatrizomai* to convey a similar idea. Believers are exposed to public ridicule and shame. *W. L. Liefeld*

→ Blind, → Dream, → Face, → Knowledge, → Revelation

(a). K. E. Kirk, *The Vision of God: The Christian Doctrine of the Summum Bonum*, Bampton Lectures for 1928, 1932[2]; W. Michaelis, *horaō* etc., *TDNT* V 315–82; W. E. Moore, " 'Sir, we would see Jesus' – Was this an Occasion of Temptation?", *SJT* 20, 1967, 75–93; E. J. Pryke, "IDE and IDOU", *NTS* 14, 1967–68, 418–24; V. K. Robbins, "The Healing of Blind Bartimaeus (10:46–52) in the Marcan Theology", *JBL* 92, 1973, 224–43; R. Schnackenburg, "Vision of God", *EBT* III 947–52.
(b). F. Amiot, "Deum nemo vidit unquam (Jn. 1:18)", *Mélanges A. Robert*, 1957, 470–77; M. Barth, *Der Augenzeuge*, 1946; W. W. Graf Baudissin, " 'Gott schauen' in der alttestamentlichen Religion", *ARW* 18, 1915, 173–239; O. Becker, *Plotin und das Problem der geistigen Aneignung*, 1940; A. Brunner, "Gott schauen", *ZKT* 73, 1951, 214–222; J. Botterweck, *"Gott erkennen" im Sprachgebrauch des Alten Testaments*, 1951; R. Bultmann, "Untersuchungen zum Johannes-Evangelium B. *theon oudeis heōraken pōpote*", *ZNW* 29, 1930, 169–92; E. von Dobschütz, "Die fünf Sinne im Neuen Testament", *JBL* 48, 1929, 1930; E. Fascher, "Deus invisibilis", *Marburger Theologische Studien* 1, 1931, 41–77; J. Hänel, *Das Erkennen Gottes bei den Schriftpropheten*, *BWANT* 2. Folge 4, 1933; N. Hugedé, *La Métaphore du Miroir dans les Épîtres de S. Paul aux Corinthiens*, 1937; G. Kittel, *Die Religionsgeschichte und das Urchristentum*, 1932, 95–106; W. Michaelis, *Die Erscheinungen der Auferstandenen*, 1944; F. Nötscher, *Das Angesicht Gottes schauen nach biblischer und babylonischer Auffassung*, 1924; G. Rudberg, "Hellenisches Schauen", *Classica et Mediaevalia* 5, 1942, 159–86; R. Schnackenburg, *Die Johannesbriefe*, 1963[3].

Seed, Plant, Grass, Flower, Harvest

σπέρμα

σπέρμα (*sperma*), seed; *σπείρω* (*speirō*), sow; *σπόρος* (*sporos*), seed.

CL In secular Gk. the *sperma* group is commonly used in the literal sense of sowing plant seeds (Homer, Xenophon) and figuratively of begetting offspring (Euripides, Sophocles, Plato). Reference is also made to the pure (because divine) seed of the god (Pindar). *speirō* had wide currency in ethical "sowing-reaping" maxims highlighting the inevitable consequences of wilful deeds (Gorgias, Plato).

OT *sperma* and *speirō* occur 217 and 52 times in the LXX, chiefly for *zera'* and *zāra'*, respectively, which literally refer to agronomic seed-sowing (Gen. 47:23;

(*emblepō*) after his exposure to the light on the road to Damascus (Acts 22:11). ' account in 9:8 and a minor variant of Acts 22:11 use the simple *blepō*. Also *blepontes* of Acts 1:11 became *emblepontes* in some MSS, the apparent terchangeability showing that the prefix should probably not be given much stres is uncertain whether the usage in either Jn. 1:36 or 42 implies some sort of specia sight or perception. Since John sometimes varies his vocabulary without spe meaning (and conversely may employ one word with two levels of meaning), necessary to use care when attributing a deep or "spiritual" meaning to a word this case (and R. E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John, Anchor Bible*, 196 74, 76, thinks especially so in v. 42) the significance of the recognition may jus understanding a similar significance in *emblepō*. Finally, the use in Matt. 6:26 ma figurative in the sense of Isa. 51:1, 2, 6 (LXX), "consider" or "look to."

W. L. Liefel

ἀτενίζω

ἀτενίζω (*atenizō*), look at a person or thing intently, g on, observe.

CL There is little in the cl. use of the word which goes beyond the normal use in senses listed above. In the later Hellenistic period it came to be used in conne with magical activity (→ Magic; and see further below).

NT In each NT use (all but two of which occur in the Lucan writings) *atenizō* se to emphasize the intensity of the look. When Jesus read from Isa. 61 in his h town synagogue, all eyes were "fastened on him" (Lk. 4:20 NIV). Peter was tryin avoid identification with Jesus after his arrest, but found himself scrutinized by a vant girl (Lk. 22:56; Mk. 14:67 has *emblepō*). In Acts 1:10 the disciples gaze at t ascending Lord. Similar uses are found in Acts 3:12; 6:15; 7:55; 10:4; 11:6; 23:1 2 Cor. 3:7, 13 *atenizō* describes the way the Israelites would have stared at Mo radiant face, had it not been hidden by the veil.

Three times *atenizō* is used in connexion with a → miracle (Acts 3:4; 13:9; 14 Although eye contact came to be a feature in some secular and rabbinic storie both healing and cursing (SB II 713 ff.), that may not be of significance here. P looked "straight at" (Acts 3:4 NIV) the crippled man and called for his attent (There is a Western MS reading, in D, which reverses the verbs, ascribing the m intensive *atenizō* to the man instead of to Peter.) The actual healing in the succee vv. 6–8 does not include any reference to eye contact. In Acts 14:9 Paul looks crippled man intently, but apparently only to determine if he has faith (Acts 14 Only in Acts 13:9 is the look directly incorporated in a context of cursing. It is stated or implied, however, that anything like an evil eye is employed in the curse.

W. L. Liefel

θέατρον

θέατρον (*theatron*), theatre, place of assembly, a specta

CL Theatres are known to have existed in the ancient world from the sixth cent B.C. on. That at Epidaurus, built in the fourth cent. B.C. is still in use. Ther

mind the prosperity of the city of Laodicea, and the white clothing, which contrasts with the famous black wool of that area. The three items mentioned represent a spiritual value which the church failed to realize was missing (v. 17). Apparently this was a worldly prosperous church whose members mistook both the nature and source of true well being. (On the church at Laodicea → Cold, Hot, Lukewarm NT.)

W. L. Liefeld

ἀναβλέπω

ἀναβλέπω (*anablepō*), look up (at), see again.

OT & OT The two uses of the word go far back into cl. times, recovery of sight being also described as early as Herodotus (2, 111). In the LXX it almost always means simply to look up, but Is. 42:18 has the other sense, "Look [*anablepsate*], you blind, that you may see [*idein*]." Moulton-Milligan cite two occurrences in an inscription from the temple of Asclepius (p. 30).

NT The simple meaning, look up, is found in several passages (e.g. Mk. 16:4; Lk. 19:5; 21:1). Jesus looked up to → heaven when giving → thanks for the → bread to be multiplied for the crowd (Matt. 14:19; Mk. 6:41; Lk. 9:16) and when healing the → deaf man in Mk. 7:34. The man whose vision was restored by a double touch by Jesus looked up after the first touch (Mk. 8:24). *anablepō* means to see again in Jesus' message to John the Baptist about his messianic works (Matt. 11:5; Lk. 7:22; cf. also Mk. 10:51, 52; Lk. 18:41). In Acts 9:12, 17, 18 it refers to the restoration of Paul of Tarsus' vision. The later report of this in Acts 22:13 uses the same word, but its meaning in the following verse seems to be altered from see to look up by the additional words *eis auton* ("at him"). Ancient copyists sensed the problem and in order to allow retention of the meaning "see again" omitted *eis auton*. Jn. 9:11, 15, 18 describes the healing of the man born blind by using *anablepō*, although obviously the prefix *ana-* cannot mean "again" here, as the man had never seen. John also describes the miracle as the "opening" of his eyes (vv. 10, 14, 17, 21, 26, 30, 32).

W. L. Liefeld

ἐμβλέπω

ἐμβλέπω (*emblepō*), look, look at, look in the face, consider.

The NT occurrences of *emblepō* are generally straightforward. The word usually signifies a look of interest, love or concern. Jesus "looked" at the rich young man and loved him (Mk. 10:21). He later "looked" at the disciples, as he discussed the issues involved (Mk. 10:27; Matt. 19:26). A servant girl who thought Peter might have been associated with Jesus, who has just been arrested, "looked closely" at him. The Lucan parallel has → *atenizō*, a word indicating an intense look (Lk. 22:56). When Jesus applied the parable of the vineyard he "looked directly" at his audience (Lk. 20:17). In the poignant passage about Peter's meeting with Jesus after the denial, Jesus "looked straight at" him (Lk. 22:61 NIV, as also in the other examples).

Once *emblepō* describes the perception of the formerly → blind man after a second healing touch by Jesus (Mk. 8:25). Conversely, Saul of Tarsus was not able to see

4. For the NT God is utterly invisible (Jn. 6:46; 1 Tim. 1:17; 6:16; Col. 1 "God does not become visible; He is revealed" (W. Michaelis, *TDNT* V 369), ye → resurrection narratives especially stress that the risen Christ is visible. There encountered as a person. The Gospels use a rich vocabulary to describe these counters with him in the body (Matt. 28:17; Lk. 24:31, 36 f.; Jn. 20:14–29). "In opinion there is only one thing guaranteed by the copious use of this group of w in the resurrection narratives and that is that the decisive experience was prim one of seeing and being seen" (H. Grass, *Ostergeschehen und Osterberichte*, 1 188). The risen Christ is recognized by his actions (Matt. 28; Lk. 24). The resu tion narratives describe this by means of vbs. of seeing and of perception with eyes. What is novel is the experience of the person of the risen Christ and the pro his reality. Above all, it is Jesus who appears to the disciples and whom recognize. That the risen Christ is seen is an event of revelation. "In all the pearances the presence of the risen Lord is a presence in transfigured corporeal (W. Michaelis, *TDNT* V 359). In Jn. 20:25 the disciples come to believe through ing the risen Christ ("We have seen the Lord"). These encounters lead to faith commitment, to witness and to sending. For faith one needs to behold both crucified and the risen Lord.

Paul attests that the risen Christ was seen or appeared with the aor. pass. *ōphē* (1 Cor. 15:5 ff.). The appearances are never only visual, but are always bound with hearing the word of the risen Christ; yet hearing should not be stressed at expense of seeing. The Easter message is summed up in Jn. 19:35: "He who has s it has testified to it, so that you may believe."

5. The vbs. of seeing are also used in the NT with respect to the future. promise for the future contains three essential elements: (a) the vision of God's g (Jn. 17:24); (b) seeing God's kingly rule (King → Kingdom) (Jn. 3:3); and supremely, seeing God (Matt. 5:8) and living in fellowship with him (Rev. 21:3). angels already see God's face (Matt. 18:10). In the time of fulfilment that is to c God is to restore that fellowship with men that has been broken by sin. He does put himself at man's disposal, and he does not give himself up to man's clutches, he does open the way to fellowship with himself. Now we still wait in faith, yet watching community knows that "Blessed are they who are pure of heart, for t shall see God" (Matt. 5:8).

K. Dah

κολλούριον — *κολλούριον* (*kollourion*), eye-salve.

CL The substance after which our modern English word for an eye-wash or sa collyrium, is derived was common in ancient times. It was used for various p poses, but especially for application to the eyes. References to it are numerous, fo in Gk., Lat., and rab. literature.

NT The sole use of *kollourion* in the NT is Rev. 3:18. Since the context is the lette the church at Laodicea, it is assumed that the writer had especially in min preparation made from powdered Phrygian stone used at the medical school th Its significance must be understood together with that of the gold, which would

ıe revelation of God in Jesus Christ. It also discerns Jesus Christ's *doxa* in the signs :11). The non-believer does not discern it. Spiritual blindness is shown up by Jesus' gns and men must answer for it. Faith's seeing is illustrated in Jn. 6:40. The believer ɛrceives in the Son the → Father who sent him (12:45; 14:9). He who sees the Son lso sees the Father.

(b) Although the seer is only occasionally important in the NT (cf. Jn. on Patmos, .ev. 1:9), there is a stronger emphasis in the Johannine literature on the eyewitness *ıeōrakōs*, Jn. 19:35). His testimony is valid (1 Jn. 1:11).

(c) Jesus' own seeing is important in the event of revelation (Jn. 12:45; 14:9). He ɛes the Father (1:18). This is characteristic of Jesus' special relationship to him and ; the basis of his message. He sees what is in man and discloses it. He sees Jathanael under the → fig-tree (1:48) and the thoughts and inner nature of man 2:25).

(d) Hearing and seeing can be used interchangeably in relation to → faith (cf. Jn. :24; 8:45; with 5:39; 6:40), and the concept of *zōē aiōnios*, eternal → life, is .ssociated with seeing. Seeing as well as hearing again and again provide the impetus o faith (2:11; 20:8), lead to knowledge (14:9), and minister to inner perception ("I ee that you are a prophet", 4:19). Faith recognizes the coming messiah. Here we ıave a situation involving decision. Seeing is thus as a whole an existential encounter vith Jesus. But faith based on seeing has no advantage. Jesus expects faith without ɛeeing (20:29).

3. *The Theological Meaning of these Words in the Rest of the NT.* (a) "The sen- ıual organs (ears) are not just symbols for the organs of spiritual perception; in them here actually takes place true hearing of God's summons" (J. Horst, *TDNT* V 557). What is there applied only to the ear also applies to spiritual seeing in the NT.

(b) Spiritual perception as a function of seeing comes to mean make the acquain- ɛance of (Lk. 23:8), meet (Acts 20:25), watch or look out for (Mk. 13:33; Phil. 3:2). Spiritual seeing is at the same time an experience (Lk. 2:26; Jn. 8:51) or the conceiv- ing of or experiencing of God's love (1 Jn. 3:1).

(c) The idea of → foreknowledge is not very important in the language of the NT and above all is not there given a eudaemonistic interpretation.

(d) As mentioned above, God's eye is only rarely mentioned and then fig. Yet the OT idea is still found, e.g. with the vb. *blepō*: God sees what is hidden (Matt. 6:4) and knows what we need (Matt. 6:33).

(e) Here too seeing acquires a new perspective with reference to faith. In the Synoptics it is used to express obtaining a share in salvation (Lk. 2:26). Hence, seeing takes on the character of a decision (Matt. 21:32; Mk. 8:18); the unbeliever does not perceive (Matt. 13:13 f.; Mk. 4:12).

(f) Theophanies are not found in the NT. On the other hand, appearances of angels are mentioned in connexion with Jesus' coming (Lk. 2:13), the → temptation (Matt. 4:11), the passion (Lk. 22:43) and the → resurrection (Matt. 28:2, 5). Revelatory → dreams are mentioned only in the prefaces (Matt. 1:20; 2:13, 19). The NT knows nothing about any experiences of the risen Christ in dreams, but there are repeated accounts of visions (*horama* and *optasia*). These are given by God, who causes them to be seen (2 Cor. 12:1; Acts 9:10, 12; 10:3). Here too we find an interest both in the character of these as events and in their effect on those seeing them (cf. OT 1; NT 1 (d)).

(f) *theaomai* means in its various contexts to visit (Rom. 15:24), to look at (M 22:11), and to notice something (Lk. 23:55).

theōreō, look at, behold, but also experience (Matt. 27:55; Lk. 14:29), is found of intellectual seeing (Jn. 4:19; Acts 4:13). In the pass. it means become ble.

The pres. part. of *optanomai*, a *hapax legomenon* in the NT, refers in Acts 1: the appearances of the risen Christ.

(g) *ophthalmos*, eye (cf. CL 2), is used some 100 times in the NT, whereas the is mentioned only 36 times. Besides the usage mentioned in CL, which is continue the NT, it is also now used more often with moral concepts, especially in the Syr tic Gospels (38 times; Acts 6 times): to look enviously (Matt. 20:15; Mk. 7:22) o genuously or evilly (Matt. 6:22 f.). It can be the occasion of taking offence or inci to sin (Matt. 5:29; 2 Pet. 2:14; Jn. 2:16;).

It is also the organ of understanding and knowing. Eph. 1:18 speaks of the ey the heart. Very rarely, however, does the NT refer to God's eyes (1 Pet. 3:12; H 4:13; cf. 1 Clem. 22:6).

(h) The use, especially in the Synoptic Gospels, of *idou* or *kai idou*, "see!", " see!" (adapted from the OT and not found in secular Gk.), is also noteworthy. used to attract attention at the beginning of a conversation (Mk. 3:32; 10:28) generally draw attention to something. Matt. and Mk. also use it with a predicate advertise something surprising or new (Matt. 12:2; Mk. 2:24). The formulation occurs in the context of the proclamation of salvation (Lk. 2:34; Jn. 1:29, "See, th is the Lamb of God"). At other times it draws attention to the fulfilment of th promise (Matt. 12:41; Mk. 14:41 f.; Jn. 4:35), and gives assurance of the fulfilm of that which has been announced (Mk. 10:33; Jn. 16:32). The varied usage sh that *idou* and *kai idou* are not only demonstrative or stylistic additions. They ser kerygmatic purpose, addressing the hearer, before whose eyes (*kat' ophthalmous*) message is proclaimed (cf. P. Fiedler, *Die Formel "und siehe" im Neuen Testam* 1969).

2. *The Johannine Concept of Seeing.* In Jn. the vbs. of seeing take on a spe significance. He loves to use *horaō* for that which the pre-existent Son saw when was with his Father (Jn. 3:11, 32; 6:46; 8:38). *theaomai* is used of seeing Jes *doxa*, → glory (Jn. 1:14) and the → Spirit descending (1:32).

(a) Jn. uses the vbs. of seeing in a threefold sense (R. Bultmann, *The Gospe John*, 1971, 69, n. 2).

(i) They are used in connexion with the "perception of earthly things and happ ings accessible to all men" (Jn. 1:38, 47; 9:8 of things, people, etc.).

(ii) They denote the "perception of supernatural things and events" which o certain men enjoy. Hence, John the Baptist sees the Spirit descending in the form c dove (Jn. 1:32 ff.); this is nevertheless still a physical seeing.

(iii) Jn. also thinks of seeing as the perception of an event of → revelation. Yet t is no mystical inner vision, still less a Platonic vision of the forms, but a spiritual of seeing, the sight of faith (so Bultmann, ibid., n. 4). The disciples see the Son's gl (1:14), which is also revealed to them in his signs (2:11; → Miracle, art. *sēmeio*

The real nature of the Son, his *doxa*, is disclosed to faith. That which in the was proclaimed and only appeared symbolically now becomes historical reality the incarnate → word. Faith, discerning it through hearing and seeing, responds

:28 f.; Isa. 11:6 f.; 57:19). The goal is to see God face to face (Ps. 42:2[3]), rhaps in the future life. However, this last point is not unambiguously attested in : OT (cf. Ps. 17:15; → Resurrection OT). The promise of Matt. 5:8 and the confi- nt assertion of 1 Jn. 3:2 have no direct OT parallels.

3. In late Judaism seeing gave way to hearing. In Philo this group of words took a spiritualized meaning (cf. *TDNT* V 334–38). Seeing is frequently separated)m the grasping of sense-perceptions (*Leg. All.* 3, 100–103). Besides the general :aning of to know, *horaō* and its derivatives can mean to obtain knowledge, and)o occasionally to see God. Philo held that the world (creation) should lead to a owledge of God (*Spec. Leg.* 1 20, 32–35; cf. Rom. 1:20, *kathoraō*; → Revelation, t. *Revelation in Contemporary Theology* 2 (a)).

1. *Survey of the Terms.* This group of words occurs frequently in the NT: *horaō* and the fut. *opsomai* occur c. 110 times, the aor. *eidon* 336 times, *blepō* 132 nes. Generally they are used in the same sense as in secular Gk. and the OT. Their es that fall into these categories (see above CL and OT) will be only summarily dis- ssed here.

(a) *horaō*, *opsomai* and *eidon* generally mean see, perceive (Matt. 28:27; Mk.):7; Jn. 16:16 f.). These vbs. can be used figuratively for perceiving, recalling, ascer- ining, realizing (e.g. Matt. 13:14) and for a vision of the spirit or intellect (Lk. 2:30, eing salvation; cf. 1 Cor. 2:9; seeing visions or appearances, Acts 2:17; 26:16).

(b) *blepō* in general simply refers to the capacity to see, of sense-perception (Matt.):22; Lk. 7:21). Otherwise it can mean to watch, look at, look into (Matt. 5:28; ev. 5:3 f.). It also represents intellectual functions like attending, paying attention to Mk. 13:33; 1 Cor. 1:26), heeding something (2 Cor. 10:7), or being careful. iguratively it can mean to perceive or observe (Rom. 7:23, Heb. 2:9). The NT does ot use *blepō* to say that God is seen (*TDNT* V 343 f.).

(c) The verbal adjs. *horatos* and *ahoratos* mean visible and invisible respectively. hey are used to emphasize God's invisibility (Col. 1:15 f.; Rom. 1:20; 1 Tim. 1:17).

(d) The nouns *horasis*, *horama* and *optasia* are used in the same sense as in the)T.

horasis means appearance (Rev. 4:3) or vision (Acts 2:17; Rev. 9:17) and *horama* ie thing seen, the vision (Matt. 17:9; Acts 18:9) and also the vision seen in a → ream (Acts 16:9). Continuing in line with the OT, the NT represents its effects on ie visionary as pardoning, encouraging, commissioning (Acts 10:3; 9:10, 12; cf. Hermas, *Vis.* 3, 10, 6).

optasia, the appearance of the vision, that which God lets man see, is found in Lk. :22; 24:23 of the appearances of → angels, and in 2 Cor. 12:1 probably of ecstatic xperiences (cf. W. Michaelis, *TDNT* V 353, 357, 373).

(e) Compounds include the following. (i) *prohoraō* can mean to foresee, referring o the future (Acts 2:31; Gal. 3:8), but it can also mean to see something previously Acts 21:29). (ii) *kathoraō* means to perceive, and in Rom. 1:20 it refers to the invisi-)le, which is perceived in the external and visible ("His [God's] invisible nature is)erceived with the eye of reason in the things that have been made", Arndt, 392; but → God, art. *theos* NT 4 (b); → Revelation, art. *Revelation in Contemporary Theology* ! (a)). (iii) *epopteuō*, to look at, is used in 1 Pet. 2:12; 3:2 with reference to the Christian's manner of life which the Gentiles notice.

pact: God lets it be known what he wants or what he is going to do and "shows" someone whom he has chosen for this purpose.

(d) It is simply assumed in the OT that God sees and watches man. He see justice (Lam. 3:34 ff.), the death of his prophet (2 Chr. 24:22), the distress of his (Exod. 3:7). He looks for faithfulness (Ps. 101[100]:6) and for trust (Jer. 5:3). also has his eyes on the sinful kingdom (Amos 9:8). Man cannot hide 139[138]:3, 7, 16). God sees into his innermost being (1 Sam. 16:7).

2. (a) Even though the OT speaks of God's becoming visible in visions, yet must be clear that there is no sign in it of inquisitive speculation into God's form. statements on the theophanies of the OT are not unanimous in this respect. God pears to Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and Moses (Num. 12:8) face to → face an human form. "As a matter of fact Jahweh was always thought of as having hu form, like that of a man" (G. von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, I, 1962, 219 145). Several passages extend this bodily imagery (Gen. 3:8; Exod. 33:23; A 9:11 ff.; Isa. 6:1 ff.). These anthropomorphic modes of manifestation show how used to recognize and understand God's nature, and how he conceived of it. "In place of a cosmic-mythical occurrence in the Babylonian epiphanies there is in OT a historical one. Yahweh appears in order to help his people and to destroy foes" (C. Westermann, *The Praise of God in the Psalms*, 1966, 96). Fire, g clouds, etc., are mentioned as important elements in these manifestations.

(b) In the theophany God's *kāḇôḏ*, weight, splendour, → glory (which is transl in the Gk. by *doxa*, authority, glory) was revealed and seen by men (Ezek. 1 Exod. 33:18; Num. 14:22). Heaven opens (Ezek. 1:1), the transcendent bre through and is visible. Supernatural brightness (Hab. 3:4; Pss. 18:12[13]; 50:2), likeness of sunrise (Hos. 6:3), storm and tempest (Job 38:1; Nah. 1:3) are mentio as concomitant phenomena for God's presence.

(c) *prosōpon*, → face, means in the context of the theophanies the very perso God and not just that side of him that is turned towards men. It reveals somethin God's nature (Gen. 32:30 f.). The parts of God's form that are mentioned (the ear and hand) illustrate his faithfulness and care. It is significant that qualities those attributed to the Gk. gods (like sexuality) are not ascribed to God in the Rather the OT seeks to disclose God's nature, but not to provide any concrete vi images of him.

(d) On the other hand, God's holiness and majesty prevent man from seeing face. Man's consciousness of guilt leads to a consciousness of distance (Isa. 6 God's glory would slay man (cf. Exod. 33:20; and Gideon's lament, "I have seen angel of the LORD face to face", Jdg. 6:22).

(e) The OT epiphanies express God's partnership. Biblical man sees himself God's creature and at the same time knows himself to be called as a partner. The God is one who meets us and consorts with us and is known as such. "The conten the knowledge which Scripture imparts to us is therefore moulded by God's deali with men" (H. M. Kuitert, *Gott in Menschengestalt*, 1967, 237). G. von Rad arg from this that in the biblical view God is not anthropomorphic, but mar theomorphic (cf. op. cit., 145).

(f) Eschatological vision. In the OT's message the future constantly reappears the prophetic vision discussed above under 1 (c)). In view are the coming redempti the conquest of enemies and the establishment of God's kingdom (1 Chr. 29:11;

5. (a) The vbs. of seeing or beholding in Gk. have religious and philosophical gnificance, for Gk. religion, like that of antiquity in general, was a religion of seeing. ı contrast to Judaism, the rôle of hearing is subordinate to that of seeing. "The ireeks were 'a people of the eye' " (W. Michaelis, *TDNT* V 319). Seeing was an in-:gral part of their religion.

(b) Insight into the cosmic order and the rationale of this world was understood eligiously. That applied both to the world on the grand scale, in the sense of the ıacrocosm, and to the world on a small scale, in the sense of the microcosm. The eye of the soul" is particularly significant here.

(c) The actions of men were governed by this insight into the cosmos. In Plato ɔod is more an object than a subject and being seen is predicated of him. Plato rrives at the concept of the vision of the ideas (cf., e.g., *Meno*; *Rep.*; → Form, art. *idos* CL). The word *idea*, appearance, image, derived from *idein* (Pindar onwards), akes on a philosophical sense and means the knowledge of supernatural things chieved by the spirit: pattern, idea, essence (so in Plato, Aristot., Plut.).

(d) In general deity is regarded as invisible (cf. Hellenistic Gnosticism). Yet from Homer onwards we find the notion that the gods are visible. This happens in human orm (anthropomorphism). The gods often go around in bodily form. They "appear" n human disguise, and have human qualities and propensities. But in general their in-'isibility is still emphasized. The "vision of god" serves as the way to be like the im-nortals, to become assimilated to the gods.

ɔT *horaō* with its 2nd aor. *eidon* occurs some 1450 times in the LXX. The most im-portant Heb. equivalents are *rā'âh* and *ḥāzâh*, which have a rather wider mean-ng than *horaō*. *horaō* can even mean to select (Deut. 12:13), yet *horaō* corresponds o them fairly closely (cf. learn, find, as in Gen. 18:21; 22:8).

1. (a) Generally *horaō* means see with one's own eye, become aware (Gen. 27:1).

(b) Figuratively it comes to be used of intellectual or spiritual perception: notice, ɔecome conscious (Ps. 34[33]:8[9]); or of what man experiences or suffers (seeing leath, Ps. 89[88]:48[49]). It also means to regard (misfortune, Ps. 106[105]:44), at-end to, know or have experienced (Deut. 11:2), or be concerned about something Gen. 37:14; Isa. 5:12). Seeing in the Gk. and Heb. OT can refer also to perception ɔy means of other senses, e.g. hearing (Jer. 33:24) or understanding (1 Sam. 12:17; 1 Ki. 20[21]:7). In the pass. it is used for letting oneself be seen, having something shown to one or experiencing it. Here the idea is of true perception in contrast to fig-ments of the imagination (*phantasma*). God let himself be seen, disclosed, showed or revealed in visions (*horama*). Through this action the one who sees as well as the nearer is encouraged or commissioned (Gen. 15:1; 46:2; where God speaks through visions).

(c) Furthermore, seeing can refer to prophetic perception. Prophetic seeing, which sometimes assumes the character of a vision, is frequently attested in the OT. Hence the → prophet can also be designated a seer (Heb. *ḥōzeh*; LXX *horōn*; 1 Chr. 21:9; 2 Chr. 9:29). The seer's visions generally have a twofold reference. On the one hand, they refer to the thing seen, the vision (*horama*) or the appearance of the vision (Exod. 3:3; Dan. 7:1). On the other hand, they show the effect on the seer. He is en-couraged, chosen, shocked, pardoned (Gen. 15:1; Dan. 7:13). This prophetic vision involves primarily a → revelation of God and his word, and only then a visual im-

(c) From the pass. used with an intrans. sense it came to mean to appear, becor visible (cf. the aor. pass. *ōphthēn*). In Soph. it means roughly "you will surely se i.e. be shown. The pass. use is absent in Homer.

(d) The verbal adj. *horatos* (Hippocrates onwards) and the later negative fo *ahoratos* (by the time of Polyb. and Isoc.) mean visible and invisible respectively (t invisible world, the invisible God, etc.).

(e) Three important nouns are formed from *horaō*. (i) *horasis* (Aristot. onward synonymous with *opsis*, designates on the one hand the capacity to see, the organ sight, also the whole face (Plut., *Mor.* 88D), and on the other hand that which is se the view, spectacle. It is also used with reference to the supernatural. (ii) *hora* (Xen. and Aristot. onwards) means that which is seen, view, sight, vision, and so t the effect on the viewer; that which is seen can assure and empower. (iii) *optas* derived from the stem *op-*, is close to *horama* in meaning.

(f) Compound vbs. include: (i) *prohoraō* (Hdt. onwards) has the sense of fore the future, see something which one has seen before, or (mid.) which one sees in fr of oneself; (ii) *kathoraō* and *epopteuō* (Homer onwards) both mean to look regard, observe (for demonstrative and imperative forms derived from the roots and *id-* see NT 1 (h)).

2. The noun *ophthalmos*, eye, is derived from the root *op-*, and has been us abundantly from Homer onwards. It is not simply synonymous with *omma*, whi also means eye, but has a more specialized use (in Homer, Aesch., Pindar, etc., fa in Pindar, Plato, etc., in the poetic sense of the eye of heaven, the sun and the mo as also expressing the ideas of light, well-being and that which brings comfort

(a) In general the *ophthalmos*, eye, is the highest means of contact with the wo around. It is the organ of perception. Gk. sagas (cf. Lucian) continually menti many-eyed beings, e.g. Argus with his 100 eyes.

(b) Figuratively it means that which is dearest and most loved (cf. the apple of eye).

(c) At the same time the eye is generally associated with man's relation to G his fellow men and the world around. In Gk. the "eye of the soul" gains insight i the cosmos (see further below). Moral concepts are associated with the eye (so Soph., to look covetously, to cast jealous glances). In Aesch. and Soph. it is used the sense of being awake or guarding oneself. Sometimes the eyes were associa with tasks and qualities.

3. *blepō*, see (Pindar onwards), possesses some tenses not attested for *horaō*. A rule it is near to *horaō* in meaning, but gradually it replaced it. Where it can be d tinguished from *horaō*, it relates to that which strikes the eye, that which faces viewer, the front. Originally it applied only to the function of the eyes, seeing, lo ing, watching (with the acc. of the thing seen). Thence it came to mean to look view, look into, and also give heed to, pay attention to something. Figuratively it c mean observe, notice.

4. *theaomai* (Homer onwards) is derived from *thea*, seeing (cf. *theatēs*, view and → *theatron*, cf. Eng. "theatre"; found in Thuc. and Plato), and means vi behold, watch. *theōreō* (Aesch. onwards), also watch, look at something, is used solutely or with the acc. (Aesch. *Prometheus Bound* 304) and has the fig. meani of reflect on, notice, understand, comprehend, and in the pass. means become visi or be looked at.

.. N. Longenecker, "The Messianic Secret in the Light of Recent Discoveries", *EQ* 41, 1969, 207–15; '. W. Manson, "Realized Eschatology and the Messianic Secret", in D. E. Nineham, ed., *Studies in the ospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot*, 1955, 209–22; B. M. Metzger, *Index to the Periodical iterature on Christ and the Gospels, New Testament Tools and Studies* 6, 1966, 139 f. (for journal arcles prior to 1966 on the messianic secret); P. W. Meyer, "The Problem of the Messianic elfconsciousness of Jesus", *NovT* 4, 1960, 122–38; "Messianic Secret and Messianic Didache in lark's Gospel", *Oikonomia*, 1966, 57 ff.; N. Perrin, "The Wredestrasse becomes the Hauptstrasse", *R* 46, 1966, 296–300; B. G. Powley, "The Purpose of the Messianic Secret: A Brief Survey", *ExpT* 80, 968–69, 308 ff.; K. Prümm, "Mystery", *EBT* II 598–611; H. Rahner, *Greek Myths and Christian lystery*, 1963; M. Smith, *The Secret Gospel*, 1974 (on this see F. F. Bruce, *The Secret Gospel of Mark*, 974; *ExpT* 86, 1974–75, 130 ff.; and Q. Quesnell, "The Mar Saba Clementine: A Question of Evience", *CBQ* 37, 1975, 48–67); A. Schweitzer, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus: A Critical Study of s Progress from Reimarus to Wrede*, (1910) 1954[3], 328–95; V. Taylor, "The Messianic Secret in lark: A Rejoinder to the Rev. Dr. T. A. Burkill", *Hibbert Journal* 55, 1956–57, 241–48; G. Vagner, *Pauline Baptism and the Pagan Mysteries: The Problem of the Doctrine of Pauline Baptism n Romans VI. 1–11, in the Light of its Religio-Historical "Parallels"*, 1967 (see pp. 299–316 for terature relevant to Christian origins and the mystery religions).
). L.-M. Dewailly, "Mystère et Silence dans Rom. xvi. 25", *NTS* 14, 1967–68, 111–18; E. Fuchs, *Das Sakrament im Lichte der neueren Exegese, Schriftenreihe der Kirchlich-Theologischen Sozietät in Württemberg* 1, no date; R. Follet, "Mystères", *Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplément* VI, 1958, 1–225; . Gnilka, "Mysterium", *LTK* VII 727 ff.; G. Haufe, "Die Mysterien", in J. Leipoldt and W. Grundmann, eds., *Umwelt des Urchristentums*, I, 1965, 101 ff.; N. Johanssen, *to mystērion tēs basileias ou theou, Svensk teologisk Kvartalskrift* 16, 1940, 3–38; E. Jüngel, "Das Sakrament – Was ist das?", *vTh* 26, 1966, 320 ff.; K. Koch, "Die Apokalyptik und ihre Zukunftserwartungen", *Kontexte*, III, 966, 51 ff.; H. Krämer, "Zur Wortbedeutung 'Mysteria' ", *WuD* Neue Folge 6, 1959, 121 ff.; J. eipoldt, "Mysterien", *RGG*[3] IV 1255 ff.; W. Luz, "Das Geheimnismotiv und die markanische hristologie", *ZNW* 56, 1965, 9–30; M. P. Nilsson, *Die Religion der Griechen*, 1927; R. Reitzenstein, *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen*, 1927[2]; B. Rigaux, "Révélation des Mystères et Perfection à umrân et dans le Nouveau Testament", *NTS* 4, 1958, 237–62; J. Schneider, " 'Mysterion' im Neuen estament", *ThStKr* 104, 1932, 255 ff.; G. Strecker, "Zur Messiasgeheimnis im Marcus", *StudEv*, III, 961, 87 ff.; E. Schweizer, "Zur Frage des Messiasgeheimnis bei Markus", *ZNW* 56, 1965, 1 ff.; E. jöberg, *Der verborgene Menschensohn in den Evangelien*, 1955; G. Minette de Tilesse, *Le Secret Méssianique dans l'Évangile de Marc*, 1968; N. Turchi, *Fontes Historiae Mysteriorum Aevi Hellenistici, Collezione Graphe* 3, 1923; E. Vogt, " 'Mysteria' in Textibus Qumran", *Biblica* 37, 1956, 47 ff.

ee, Vision, Eye

ὁράω

ὁράω (*horaō*), see; *ὁρατός* (*horatos*), visible; *ἀόρατος* (*ahoratos*), invisible; *ὅραμα* (*horama*), sight, vision; *ὀπτασία* (*optasia*), vision; *ἐποπτεύω* (*epopteuō*), observe; *καθοράω* (*kathoraō*), look at; *προοράω* (*prohoraō*), foresee; *βλέπω* (*blepō*), see; *θεάομαι* (*theaomai*), behold; *θεωρέω* (*theōreō*), watch; *ὀφθαλμός* (*ophthalmos*), eye.

L 1. (a) The vb. *horaō*, see, is only found in this form in the pres. and perf. act. The fut. act. *opsomai* and the aor. pass. *ōphthēn* are derived from the stem *op-*, and he aor. act. *eidon* from the stem *id-*. The vb. is common from Homer onwards and n the act. means to see, look, perceive, observe (Homer, *Od.* 4, 540). But it is found nore often (with the prep. *eis*) meaning to look towards something or (with the acc.) ee something. Aesch. also uses it in the mid.

(b) Already by Homer's time it had the meaning of to conceive or experience, and ven be present at or participate. In a fig. sense it means to understand, recognize, consider, attend to (Thuc., 5, 27).

who at the first gave witness appears as judge and Enoch as the scribe of righteousness. A clear distinction is made between the questions as to who pronounces sentence and who records the sins. Here we can see a significant development: if attention has passed from the transference of the kingdom to the saints to the eschatological judgment which exposes and punishes sins, then it follows that every man will be judged by a man. Hence Abel takes on the rôle of the eschatological judge because he is the "son of the first man" (longer text of Test. Abr. 13). The shorter text of Test. Abr. 12, which is perhaps the superior text, is also important because it there criticizes Abraham's relation to sinners. In any case we must distinguish the original Jewish tradition here and a Christian editing of it (longer text).

(f) [I.H.M.] Attempts to shed light on the meaning of the Son of man concept by study of its origins have not so far produced any generally accepted conclusions. Three main contributions may be mentioned: (1) C. Colpe (*TDNT* VIII 406–430) surveys the possibilities of a background for Dan. 7 in the OT itself and then in a series of non-biblical figures – Gayomart in the Avestas, Adapa in Babylonian literature, the sun god in Egyptian mythology, Adam in rabbinic speculation and the primal man in gnosticism. Each of these possibilities is rejected, and Colpe himself suggests a background in Canaanite mythology, where the young god Baal rides on the clouds and the supreme god, El, the father of years, is replaced as ruler by him. Colpe admits that there are difficulties about regarding this myth as the basis of Dan. 7, but claims that it stands closest of all the claimants to kinship with Dan. 7. (2). F. H. Borsch claims to have unearthed a widespread myth about the First Man, the king and Primordial Man, which is reflected in various legends attested in ancient myth and ritual. (3). M. D. Hooker argues that the background of the concept is to be found in the OT. The Son of man is to be understood collectively of Israel as the heir of Adam. Although destined to rule, the Son of man undergoes loss of dominion and suffering, but will finally be vindicated by God.

One difficulty with the views of Colpe and Borsch is that each of them must presuppose the existence of bearers of Son of man traditions in the period between Dan. and Jesus, but there is little evidence for these. The problem of transmission is solved by N. Perrin (*A Modern Pilgrimage in New Testament Christology*, 1974, 23–40) who argues that all that we have is a series of independent exegetical uses of Dan. 7 by the authors of 2 Esd. and Eth. Enoch rather than a continuing "Son of man" tradition. Perrin has at least demonstrated the influence of Dan. 7 on subsequent writings; it is not so clear that he has got rid of a continuing "Son of man" concept.

NT 1. *The Designation of Jesus as the Son of Man and the Oldest Tradition.* In Jesus' message there confront us statements in which he speaks of himself as the Son of man and as thereby possessing a certain authority (→ Might, art. *exousia* NT 2) or having to tread a path of suffering that is appointed for him. But we also find statements about the coming Son of man and these obviously reflect an apocalyptic tradition (→ Come; → Goal; → Present). The Gk. words *ho hyios tou anthrōpou* are a lit., though misleading, translation of the Aram. *bar nāšā'*. The Heb. equivalent would be *ben 'āḏām* (cf. the statement directed against Christians in T. J. Ta'an. 2:65b:50; SB I 486). It is striking that this use of the definite article is usually

retained (until we come to Jn. 5:27); this shows that the evangelists attached a messianic significance to the Gk. translation. So that we can better understand this significance, let us consider a selection of the views of NT scholars.

(a) R. Bultmann (*Theology of the New Testament*, 1952, § 5, 33–37) holds that the earliest community regarded Jesus as teacher and prophet. But that was not all; they also saw in him the messiah and they proclaimed him as such. He was proclaimed "*as the coming Messiah*, in other words as *Son of Man*" (op. cit., 33); that is, they did not look for "his *return* as Messiah, but his *coming*" (as Son of man). "His then past activity on earth was not yet considered Messianic by the earliest Church" (ibid.). They carried on this proclamation of Jesus as the future Messiah or as the Son of man "*quite within the frame of Jewish eschatological expectation*" (op. cit., 34). Hence the late Jewish myth of the Son of man was transferred to a real man.

Bultmann holds that the different groups of Son of man sayings exist independently of one another. At any rate the oldest tradition is that of the sayings about the coming Son of man; these include Mk. 8:38 or Lk. 12:8 f.; 17:23 f. ("These sayings could come from Jesus", *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*, 1963², 152), Matt. 24:37–39, 43 f. ("yet these sayings could also have been taken from Jewish tradition", ibid.). The Hellenistic community was the first to project the title "Son of man" back into Jesus' earthly life.

(b) O. Cullmann (*The Christology of the New Testament*, 1963², II 2:2: "Jesus and the Son of Man") renounces all critical analysis, but, in accordance with the overall structure of his work, he makes a distinction between a future work of Jesus as judge (an apocalyptic idea) and a present one as a man among men. Hence, statements about Jesus' exaltation run parallel to ones about his humiliation. The *'ebed* (servant) of God recurs in both sets of statements: Jesus is the *'ebed* both in his authority to forgive sins and in his readiness to submit to suffering. The *'ebed* tradition is thus correlated with the statements about the Son of man. "This is the unheard-of new act of Jesus, that he united these two apparently contradictory tasks in his self-consciousness, and that he expressed that union in his life and teaching" (op. cit., 161).

(c) E. Schweizer ("Der Menschensohn – zur eschatologischen Erwartung Jesu", *ZNW* 50, 1959, 185–209; *cf. JBL* 79, 160, 119–129; *NTS* 9, 1962–63, 256–261) raises the question whether the motif of the Son of man – if it must be separated from that of the kingdom of God (P. Vielhauer) – had any other place of origin than the preaching of Jesus. He maintains that an analysis of the futuristic sayings shows that there is no good evidence in the sources for the expectation of an imminent Parousia. References to the coming humiliation of the Son of man cannot simply be discarded, but can after all be traced back to Jesus himself, at least as regards basic ingredients. But statements about Jesus' earthly work as the Son of man are the surest.

Schweizer holds that this picture fits into the concept of the servant of God as it is found in Wis. 2–5: the righteous man is rejected by men but exalted by God. The motif of the Son of man has points of contact with Dan. 7, Eth. Enoch 70 f. and Ezek. 1. The new element in Jesus' message is that Jesus, like Ezek., takes up the concept of the Son of man in a new way and reapplies it to the righteous One here on earth. This idea points to Jesus' having been sent without making it explicit. Hence, the two sets of statements about the kingdom of God and about the Son of man cer-

tainly appear to be separate, yet both have their basis in the preaching of Jesus himself.

(d) Like Schweizer, R. Leivestad (*ASTI* 6, 1967–8, 49–105; cf. *NTS* 18, 1971–72, 243–267) declines to make general use of the title or Jewish apocalyptic his starting point for showing the origins of the Synoptic idea of the Son of man. He states that (1) there is no such title in Jewish literature; (2) we know of no Christian confessional formula in which "Son of man" is used as a messianic predicate; (3) in Jesus' lifetime the expression is found only on Jesus' own lips; and (4) in many cases the phrase "Son of man" can be construed as only a self-designation. In those cases where another interpretation is formally possible the evangelists have taken no pains at all to avoid such a misunderstanding. Moreover, this formal ambiguity is found in late, secondary formulations. It occurred to no one that "the Son of man" could be anything other than a self-designation of Jesus. (5) None of the "Son of man" sayings are intelligible only on the basis of a pre-Christian use of the phrase as a title. (6) There are a number of sayings which are intelligible only if no messianic ideas are attached to the phrase. (7) This phrase is irrelevant for the question of the messiah. No one ever suggested that Jesus' naming of himself as the "Son of man" was an answer to the question as to who he was. The "messianic secret" has not been influenced by the use of the name "Son of man". (8) The apocalyptic figure to which we ascribe the title of "Son of man" is a heavenly supernatural being. Many of the NT sayings speak of the earthly life, sufferings and death of the Son of man. The point is never made that in thus speaking they were saying something paradoxical or alien to the traditional concept of the Son of man (op. cit., 96 f.). Attempts have been made to regard the Aram. equivalent *bar nāšā'* as a mere periphrasis without any particular significance; that is implausible. Implausible too is the suggestion that the Aram. phrase had a demonstrative pronoun attached to it. Rather, Jesus saw himself as in a particular way the representative of mankind; he wanted to be, not the messiah *ben Dawīḏ*, but the messiah *ben 'āḏām*.

(e) P. Vielhauer's essay "Gottesreich und Menschensohn in der Verkündigung Jesu", 1957, also in *Gesammelte Aufsätze zum Neuen Testament*, 1965, 55–91; cf. 92–140) resumes the analysis of the "Son of man" sayings. He starts with the apocalyptic texts of Dan., Eth. Enoch and the Apc. of Ezra. "When the Son of man is an individual figure and plays an active rôle there is no mention of the kingdom of God. The Son of man is not an integral part of the expectation of the eschatological kingdom of God" (op. cit. 86). "Originally the kingdom of God and the Son of man had nothing to do with one another and were not connected in late Jewish eschatology. To combine them was not something ... which would suggest itself to Jesus from his religio-historical background" (op. cit., 87). Since the message about the kingdom of God is the central point in the tradition about Jesus, and since Jesus himself is inseparably connected with the kingdom of God, it is impossible that Jesus expected a coming Son of man or identified himself with him (op. cit., 88). The apocalyptic idea of the Son of man was introduced by the Christian community, who thereby transformed the message of the kingdom into an expectation of the apocalyptic Son of man.

(f) E. Käsemann ("The Problem of the Historical Jesus", in *Essays on New Testament Themes*, *SBT* 41, 1964, 43 f.) lends his weight to Vielhauer's radical position. He starts by describing the historical problem as a whole, but then he also analyses

the evidence of the Synoptic material. On form-critical grounds, he regards Mk. 8:38 as a formation of the community, since it preserves the peculiar character of the utterances of Palestinian prophets who proclaimed a holy law for the community and prescribed earthly terms for the promise of heaven or the curse of God. We may conclude from this that Jesus did not look for a Son of man distinct from himself. How could such a person be fitted into his scheme of things, if the Baptist had already ushered in the change of the ages? The problem of the Son of man belongs to the christology and apocalyptic theology of Near Eastern Christianity and it is from there that it has spread into the already-formed tradition about Jesus. Unfortunately, Käsemann here seems to err in presupposing the identity of the Son of Man and the messiah.

(g) All these studies have distinguished between logia about the Son of man who is to come and about him who is present and about him who suffers; they all begin with the final stage of the Synoptic tradition. But now J. Jeremias attempts, by analysing the sources (*ZNW* 58, 1967, 159–172; *New Testament Theology* I, 1973, 257–276), to penetrate a step further back into the tradition. He notes that a large number of "Son of man" sayings have parallels in the tradition which lack this title. Hence, the idea of the Son of man is in many cases secondary and this points to a revising of an older tradition. There is no sign of the suppression of this idea; rather, given a foothold, it establishes itself. To the oldest parts of the tradition belong Matt. 8:20; 10:23; 24:27; 37; 25:31; Mk. 13:26; 14:62; Lk. 17:22, 30; 18:8; 21:36; Jn. 1:51.

(h) C. Colpe (*TDNT* VIII 400–477) carries on in his own way the analysis mapped out by Jeremias. The prophecies of Jesus in which he brings the eschatological future into the present, depict the dawning end-time in three traditionally distinct and conceptually unintegrated schemes. We thus find sayings about his own perfecting, then proclamation of the kingdom of God, and finally the announcing of the Son of man. These three views of the last time cannot be identified with one another, but they do not mutually exclude one another. We have here parallel symbols. The kingdom of God and Son of man ideas have a common origin, as Dan. 7 shows.

(i) Summary and evaluation of the current position. (i) The Fathers, from Ignatius to Augustine, saw in the phrase the Son of man (*ho hyios tou anthrōpou*) a reference to the human aspect of Jesus' origins. In this the Greeks thought of someone whose will it is to be the son of a man (G. Dalman, *The Words of Jesus*, I, 1902, 238 ff.). But if one goes back to the Heb. or Aram. equivalents of the Synoptic phrase, one can see the prominence and the distinctiveness of "this man" as opposed to all others (Colpe, *TDNT* VIII 433: "but a man such as I"), but perhaps also his eschatological position: "the eschatological Man" (Leivestad, loc. cit., 102: "the representative of humanity"). It is advisable neither to discard completely any connexion with apocalyptic (Colpe, *TDNT* VIII 439–441: eschatological patterns) nor to concentrate exclusively on Dan. 7 or the Enoch tradition as its religio-historical provenance. Jesus seems to have left behind his own historical contribution. It refers neither to human descent nor to human nature, but to a unique historical course leading from humiliation to exaltation. Undoubtedly the idea contains both the present lowliness of his being man and his striving after his vindication and authorization by God.

(ii) At any rate one should never separate the series of "kingdom of God" sayings (including their messianic potential) from that of the "Son of man" sayings (Colpe, *TDNT* VIII 440). Neither set of sayings excludes the other; they stand together and

no attempt is made to harmonize them. Nor should we confuse the messianic motif with the idea of the Son of man. *Messianic elements concern Israel, as the OT shows, but the idea of the Son of man concerns the fulfilment of mankind's goal.* It is no coincidence that the concept of the Son of man is not only associated with a particular, historical vocation, but also at times involves a separation from other men and indeed an apologia and a polemic. It is possible that the messianic context is the earlier one and the Son of man sayings are later. The statements about the Son of man presuppose an insuperable resistance on Israel's part. The christological scheme of Mk.'s Gospel has a definite purpose: in Mk. 1:11 and 9:7 the voice from heaven (Son, Elect One) heralds the christological struggle around the messiah and the Son of man: the Son bears messianic features and takes his stand in the struggle and sufferings as the Son of man. Only as the Son can Jesus live out the content of the Son of man sayings.

(iii) It is not a sound historical method to deny Jesus the use of the expression "the Son of man" and to relegate this problem to later stages of the Christian community (so Dalman, op. cit., 239). In the Synoptic tradition the expression is used solely of Jesus by himself; it is neither a mode of address to him nor a confession of him. We must also say that it was neither a name nor a title, but the mark of a particular eschatological rôle. Hence, it is advisable not to start, as has long been the practice, with the explicitly apocalyptic prophecies of Jesus, but with those concerning the present (Schweizer, Leivestad). However, it becomes clear that the connexion between the present and the future sayings is still a slender one, yet it is there (Mk. 8:38; Lk. 12:8 par. Matt. 10:32; see below 4 (a)). It is important to note that Jesus' path through suffering to exaltation has its religio-historical parallels in the apocalyptic tradition: Abel's authority to judge (Test. Abr. 11; 13), the exaltation of Enoch, and the translation of Elijah and of the Servant of God in Isa. 53 all provide abundant fuel for the hope of being exalted by God on one's way through suffering (Lk. 22:69). The Melchizedek fragment points to the same connexion of ideas. It is important to see that Jesus thus follows the path of the Son of man up to the Ancient of Days (Dan. 7:13), and does not come down from heaven to earth.

(iv) The concept "the Son of man" occurs outside the Gospels only in Acts 7:56 (Stephen), the Gospel of the Hebrews (Henn.-Schn., I, 165: Christ's appearance to James), and the Jewish Christian tradition about James in Hegesippus; here the title "messiah" is not used. In Eusebius' account (*Hist. Eccl.* 2, 23, 8–18). James replies to the scribes' question: "What do you want to know about the Son of man? He sits in heaven at the right hand of the great Power and will come on the clouds of heaven." Jesus' great-nephews, James and Zoker, Judas' grandsons, are arrested as descendants of David and Christians, brought before the emperor Domitian and are asked where and when Christ and his kingdom will appear. They reply that his kingdom is not worldly or earthly, but heavenly and angelic, and that it will be established at the end of time when he, i.e. the Christ, comes in his glory to judge the living and the dead and to requite each one according to his deeds (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 3, 20, 4).

This shows contacts with the Melchizedek fragment and other early Christian traditions which describe a partnership with angels or a close connexion between Christ, the Son of man and an angelic figure. It is of course possible that in Ebionite circles the exalted Christ was worshipped as an angelic being (Epiph. *Haer*, 30, 16, 4,

hōs hena tōn archangelōn, "like one of the archangels"), but this feature does not at all demand a gnostic explanation.

Jewish polemics also recall Jesus' "Son of man" sayings. R. Abbahu (*c.* A.D. 286) warns: "If any one should say to you, 'I am God', then he is lying; or 'I am the Son of man', then he will eventually regret it; or 'I am going to heaven', then he may say it, but he will not manage it" (T. J. Ta'an. 2:65b:59). "Son of man" here represents the Heb. *ben 'āḏām*, which recalls Num. 23:19. R. Abbahu is certainly contending against the tradition about Jesus when he likens it to the wanton pride of the king of Babylon (Isa. 14:13 f.). However, his statements may be aimed at an old tradition about Jesus which describes the *ben 'āḏām* in similar terms to those used in John's Gospel (Jn. 3:13; 10:34–38).

(j) [I.H.M.] The flow of discussion on the Son of man in the Gospels since 1971 has shown little sign of abating. (1) The view of Vielhauer and Käsemann, that none of the Son of man sayings can be traced back to Jesus, has been supported by N. Perrin who finds the beginning of the process in Mk. 13:26 as an expression of the early church's hope of the return of Jesus; thereafter the title was applied to other aspects of Jesus' work. (2) Cullmann's view, that at least some of the sayings referring to Jesus' present ministry, his suffering and the apocalyptic hope of his future activity are authentic, is upheld by the author of the present article (O. Michel) and has been defended by M. D. Hooker, F. H. Borsch and L. Goppelt (*Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, I, 1975, 226–253). (3) The view of Bultmann, that the sayings about the coming Son of man could have come from Jesus, has been taken up by numerous writers who claim, on the basis of Lk. 12:8 f., that Jesus was referring to a figure other than himself. H. E. Tödt argues that Jesus implicitly asserted his own authority by his insistence that the decisions of men for or against him would be ratified by the heavenly Son of man. Essentially the same position is taken by F. Hahn, A. J. B. Higgins and R. H. Fuller. Working from different premises, J. Jeremias and C. Colpe have come to roughly similar conclusions (see above), although the former (clearly) and the latter (somewhat obscurely) allow that Jesus identified himself in his future rôle with the Son of man. (4) G. Vermes (*Jesus the Jew*, 1973, 177–186) holds that Jesus used the Aramaic phrase as a circumlocution for "I", and accepts the authenticity of sayings which show no trace of the influence of Dan. 7, i.e. sayings about the present ministry and suffering of Jesus. He thus reaches a position not too dissimilar from that of E. Schweizer.

The continuing fluidity of opinion is apparent from these and other contributions to the debate. Nevertheless, the view espoused in this article has continued to attract strong support from various quarters and offers the least difficulties. See further C. F. D. Moule, "Neglected Features in the Problem of 'The Son of Man' ", in J. Gnilka, ed., *Neues Testament und Kirche*, 1974, 413–428.

2. *Present Statements in the Synoptic Gospels.* (a) In Mk. 2:10 Jesus makes the claim that as "the Son of man" he has power to forgive sins on earth (→ Forgiveness). He emphasizes that it is of himself that he speaks, and not of men in general. He can act with a unique authority in this eschatological hour. The phrase "the Son of man" not only points to him, but it serves to bring the conflict with the hostile scribes to a head. According to Matt. 9:8, Jesus grants a share in this power to "men", i.e. to his community. Hence this material also has a place in the discus-

sions between the Christian community and Judaism; it raises the issue whether Jesus approaches too close to the divine prerogatives.

(b) In Matt. 11:18 f. Jesus contrasts the coming of the Baptist with the coming of the "Son of man"; these two eschatological witnesses appear in very different ways. The Q tradition dwells more on the appearance of the "Son of man" (Aram. *bar nāšā'*) while the context speaks of the man who eats bread and drinks wine (Matt. 11:19; Lk. 7:33). Here too *bar nāšā'* is not just any man who eats and drinks (R. Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*, 1968², 155), but that eschatological Man who is sent from God; hence there can be no substitute for the phrase "the Son of man" as a polemic designation of him. *bar nāšā'* here was neither title nor periphrasis but a reference to the hidden eschatological activity of God which evolves in conflict with the present generation.

(c) The position is rather complicated in Matt. 8:20, a saying that also belongs to the Q tradition. Some want to interpret it in terms of Jewish wisdom (man's destiny over against the beasts), but it is more likely that the homeless "Son of man" means Jesus himself as he steels his disciples for → discipleship and homelessness. This also reflects a polemical context. It is a question here, not of man's existence, but of the eschatological fate that characterizes the existence of the "Son of man".

Apparently the original "Son of man" sayings belong above all to Jesus' later activity in the period when the hopelessness of his course had become all too clear. On the authenticity of these texts see I. H. Marshall, *NTS* 12, 1965–66, 339–343.

(d) We find ourselves on an unusual path if we trace Mk. 2:27 f. back to a Heb. *ben 'āḏām* tradition. For then this text is understood as a reference to the creation story: "The sabbath was made for Adam and not Adam for the sabbath, hence the Son of Adam [*ben 'āḏām*] is Lord even over the sabbath." If so, we would have before us a rabbinic argument apparently directed against the Essenes (cf. Jub. 2:18: the → sabbath was first established in heaven). Such an interpretation would presuppose that the evangelist no longer understood this apparently oral tradition (cf. R. Leivestad, op. cit., 76 f.). Usually this saying is set in the context of later discussions about the sabbath in the early community. ([Tr.] C. E. B. Cranfield, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, 1963², 118, and W. L. Lane, *The Gospel of Mark*, *NLC*, 1974, 120, regard the saying as a comment by Mk. addressed to the reader. More probably Jesus here expresses his own authority as the leader of God's people to whom the sabbath has been given (cf. Mek. Exod. 31:14[1096])).

(e) Matt. 16:13 gives a striking rendering of the simpler question of Jesus recorded by Mk.: "Who do men say that the Son of man is?" This passage has often been discussed in the course of scholarship; the explanation partly depends on a reference to the general theology of the evangelist (on this whole passage → Open, art. NT 3; → Rock, art. *petra* NT 3). This presupposes that Matt. could not be careless. It is possible that the phrase "the Son of Man" is here a pure self-designation and has lost its eschatological reference. At any rate, it comes remarkably close to being a periphrasis for "I" (cf. R. Leivestad, op. cit., 67–70).

3. *Announcements of the "Son of man's" Path of Suffering.* It is striking how firmly rooted the idea of "the Son of man" is in the general predictions of suffering (Mk. 8:31; 9:31; 10:33) and in the apocalyptic sayings of Mk. 9:12 and Lk. 17:25. The firm roots of the concept of "the Son of man" here must owe something to exegetical motifs in Isa. (the "ransom for Israel", Isa. 43:3 ff.; the "life given as a

sacrifice for sin", Isa. 53:10). It must be presupposed that "the Son of man" must contend with the opposition of his people. It cannot be a coincidence that this tradition is attached to the designation *bar nāšā'* (on the development of the "I" – sayings cf. Colpe, *TDNT* VIII 444, n. 309).

We have to distinguish shorter two-fold forms and longer four-fold ones. The problems as to whether these passages betray the community's reflection as it recollected the passion story and sought to impart that reflection and whether it read the apocalyptic-sounding title "Son of man" into an original "I"-saying can only be determined by a literary analysis of each individual instance. However, Jesus' suffering also presents especial problems: did it come as a surprise when Jesus found himself caught up without warning in conflict and suffering in Jerusalem? Or did he deliberately enter upon a course of suffering laid upon him by his Father himself? If the second is the case, then the conflict that awaited him and the suffering enjoined upon him must be exegetically substantiated and must find their place in their own eschatological pattern. If one chooses this second path, then one is involved in questions about the pre-literary tradition and the rabbinic or apocalyptic tradition.

([I.H.M.] This second path is fully justified exegetically. For the case that Jesus anticipated his own death see J. Jeremias, *TDNT* V 713 f.; *New Testament Theology* I, 1973, 278–280; H. Schürmann, "Wie hat Jesus seinen Tod bestanden und verstanden?", in P. Hoffman, ed., *Orientierung an Jesus*, 1973, 325–363. It would then not be surprising if Jesus had spoken of this to his disciples. Against the wholesale dismissal of the passion predictions by R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, I, 1952, 29–31, see the defence of at least the kernel of the predictions as coming from Jesus in M. D. Hooker, *The Son of Man in Mark*, 1967, 103–116; and H. Patsch, *Abendmahl und historischer Jesus*, 1972, 185–197.)

(a) Mk. 9:31 betrays an Aram. or Heb. play on words ("Son of man ... men") which can certainly be traced back to Jesus himself. The old tradition is that God himself consigned him (*bar nāšā'*) into the hands of men (cf. the version of the same logion in Lk. 9:44). It is true that the short text which only mentions his being given up to men (without his being killed) is a very remarkable one, but it is more probable that we have to do with a twofold utterance: God gave him up – men put him to death.

(b) Mk. 8:31; 9:12 and Lk. 17:25 record another "Son of man" saying which, on the one hand, speaks of the divine decree (*dei*, must, Mk. 8:31; Lk. 17:25; Mk. 9:11) and, on the other, emphasizes the combination of "undergo many punishments and be rejected" (here alluding to the "builders" of Ps. 118:22). Lk.'s shorter version is remarkable (17:25, "suffer much and be rejected by this generation"). A parallel to this "be rejected" is the "set at naught", which goes back to an older tradition (Mk. 9:12). This logion in all its different forms has been expanded by a later tradition which enumerates Jesus' opponents.

The OT conceived of the life of the "righteous" (→ Righteousness OT 2) or of the "Servant of God" (Isɔ. 53:8, 10; Wis. 2:17, 20; Acts 3:13, 26) as terminating not in sufferings but in an eschatological answer from God. The righteous will be raised up (*anastēnai*, Deut. 18:15) or exalted (*hypsōthēnai*, Isa. 52:13). In order to understand Jesus we must, as far as possible, look for the Heb. or Aram. equivalents. The texts in their present form have passed through further stages of interpretation.

(c) Lk. 22:21–23 and 48 stand out amongst the prophetic announcements of suf-

fering. Behind both passages we must assume an old Aram. or Heb. version which emphasized the betrayal by the table-companion or the "friend". The periphrasis "the Son of man" gives these words a solemn and emphatic ring; yet it is possible that an original "I" has been replaced here (but cf. the play on words: "the Son of man" – men). These remarkable words point to the most abject humiliation possible in the area of human trust and friendship.

(d) In interpreting the isolated saying of Mk. 10:45, we must bear in mind its close relationship to Lk. 22:27; Bultmann (*The History of the Synoptic Tradition*, 144) considers Mk. 10:45 secondary ("... from the redemption theories of Hellenistic Christianity"). The service of Jesus (→ Serve, art. *diakoneō* NT 2) is at any rate emphasized and it should be normative for discipleship. Mk.'s addition of the idea of the surrender of a righteous life to redeem a life that is gripped by guilt may well come from an early Palestinian tradition and refer back to the "Son of man's" way of suffering, while the combination of the two elements of service and the surrender of one's life would come from the tradition concerning discipleship (cf. Colpe, *TDNT* VIII 455). God is the pattern, for he himself serves his people instead of making them serve him (Isa. 43:22–24); we must not discount the reference here to the Servant of God who surrendered up his life in death (Isa. 53:12).

(e) It is generally assumed that the idea of the "Son of man" is a secondary addition to Jesus' announcements of his sufferings; in that case the idea of the messianic significance of suffering would be a later interpolation into the earlier material about Jesus (so too Colpe, *TDNT* VIII 444). Yet it is an open question whether the word-play "Son of man – men" does not go back to an original Aram. tradition (Colpe, *TDNT* VIII 444, n. 309). If Jesus' announcements of his suffering can have had a specifically eschatological character then we cannot rule out the possibility that in them Jesus also alluded to the "Son of man".

4. *The Resumption of the Apocalyptic "Son of Man" Tradition.* (a) In some ways it could be said that the distinction between the self-authenticating "I" and the corresponding apocalyptic "Son of man" in Lk. 12:8 f., Matt. 10:32 f. (Q) and Mk. 8:38 spans the present and future statements. This presupposes the creation of a community which is subject to the prophetic law of discipleship. The earthly event is determinative for the eschatological future of those who confess and those who deny. The "Son of man" is a future entity which is taken for granted as an object of confession. If one grants the authenticity of this logion, then the disciples are faced with eschatological afflictions which call for uncompromising resolution. Jesus himself takes part in this affliction and faces each individual disciple with a decision. It could be argued that this saying was not authentic because it reflected the community's post-Easter position. E. Käsemann sees here a "sentence of holy law" which could have been formulated by early Christian prophets in connexion with the establishment of the eschatological *ius talionis* (*New Testament Questions of Today*, 1969, 66–81).

The structure as well as the style of the Q-logion (its antithetical parallelism) points to an Aram. or Heb. original. Jeremias's and Colpe's analyses show that Matt. 10:32 f. omits the reference to the confessing by the "Son of man"; this is surprising because Matt. does not usually omit the "Son of man" title but tends rather to add it. So an old tradition is suggested here which reads: "Every one who confesses me before men will himself be confessed .... But whoever denies me before men will himself likewise be denied." We can no longer ascertain the term originally used for

the divine assize (Colpe, *TDNT* VIII 442, n. 299). The fact that, apart from Matt.'s text, the tradition makes so sharp a distinction between Jesus and the "Son of man" without offering an explanation rather tells against Jeremias's and Colpe's attempts at a solution here. The text certainly means that, when the eschatological crisis takes place, Jesus himself will be transformed into the Son of man. In the Q-version, Jesus appears as the eschatological guarantor and witness (not so in Mk.'s version). It may be that the future "Son of man" is the eschatological guarantor and witness and not the judge. Bultmann's attempt to distinguish between Jesus and the future "Son of man" as another eschatological figure is doomed to failure (op. cit., 112). A decisive question posed by the attempts to interpret Matt. 10:32 f. and Lk. 12:8 f. is whether literary-critical analysis (so Jeremias, Colpe) is appropriate in all cases. R. Leivestad considers Lk. 12:8 f. nearest to the original (op. cit., 83).

(b) A logion of Jesus contained in the material peculiar to Matt. is also disputed: "If they throw you out of one city then flee to another; for in truth, I tell you, you will not be done with the cities of Israel before the Son of man comes" (Matt. 10:23).

This logion, which goes closely with Matt. 10:5 f., concerns a persecution of Jesus' followers within Palestine. Here is a situation, no longer of hospitable welcome and joy in the message, but of slander and persecution. Nevertheless, the mission must be confined to the cities of Israel and no mission to Hellenistic settlements is anticipated. J. Jeremias (*Jesus' Promise to the Nations, SBT* 24, 1958, 20) stresses the early features of this remarkable saying: an old amen-saying, its contrast to Matt.'s own universalism, its unfulfilled promise. The saying anticipates that the proclamation in Israel will not have been completed before the parousia (→ Present). On the other hand, P. Vielhauer attributes the saying to early Christian prophets who spoke in the name of the exalted Jesus; it offers consolation in a time of eschatological persecution (op. cit., 64 f.).

(c) The logion Lk. 18:8 (pre-Lucan material) forms the conclusion to a parable and asks the question: "But will the Son of man find faithfulness on earth when he comes?" This speaks of the coming of the "Son of man" and asks whether the covenant that he has made with his own will be preserved in faithfulness, harmony and humility (cf. 1QS 5:3). We may perhaps recall that, according to one tradition, Abraham sees the sins on earth and has power to execute judgment; however he cannot exercise it, lest he destroy the creation (cf. Test. Abr. 12). So it seems that, according to one Jewish view, each generation had one "righteous one" to whose lot it fell to decide about their fate.

This may also be compared with Gen. R. 44:5 on Gen. 15:1: "Then God spoke to him: I raised up no righteous protectors from Noah, but I will raise up such ones from you. And not only that; even if your children fall into sin and evil deeds, yet will I single out a righteous one from them, to give a verdict on them, for he will say to strictest righteousness: 'Enough!' I am taking him out of the world and he will make atonement for them [by his death]!" Hence, there was a tradition that there was a particular righteous man assigned to pass judicial verdicts. He limits the rigours of righteousness. God takes him from the world and so by his death he makes atonement for men.

We should note perhaps how close this is to the parable of Lk. 12:36: if the master comes and knocks, he wants to find his servants keeping watch. It is a fact that in Lk.'s futuristic sayings the "Son of man" has certain distinct features. R. Leivestad

(loc. cit., 89) states that "the problem in Lk. 18:8b is, however, not the use of the name of the 'Son of Man' but the peculiar pessimism, which seems hard to reconcile with either Jesus' message or Lk.'s own view point. It is perhaps the most puzzling saying in the whole tradition" (op. cit., 89).

(d) The paraenetic warning of Lk. 21:36 reveals an old Sem. tradition behind it: "But be watchful at all times and pray that you may have strength to escape and come into the presence of the Son of man." In this exhortation, the "Son of man" is an eschatological figure possessing full authority to judge. To be sure, the material of Lk. 18:8 and 21:36 could derive from Jesus, but the texts stand in a tradition of the community that is also like that of Enoch in form.

In Lk. 21:36 *katischysēte*, "that you may *obtain the power*", is nearer to Sem. ways of thinking than the well-attested but secondary reading *kataxiōthēte*, "that you may *be found worthy*". *katischyein*, to have power, has a long tradition in the process of translation from the Heb. (unlike *kataxioun*, to hold worthy or of value; cf. Hatch-Redpath, II–III, 740, 751).

(e) Jesus' saying during his trial ("From now on the Son of man will be seated on the right hand of power", Lk. 22:69) belongs to this older "Son of man" tradition preserved by Lk. which has no recourse to Dan. Here once again the old *bar nāšā'* usage of Jesus could have a pregnant sense: "this man" who is placed in an apocalyptic context is, like the righteous of the old covenant (Abel, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Melchizedek), exalted to be with God. He is the righteous One of the end-time and ends the series of witnesses (cf. Gen. R. 44; Test. Abr.). It is significant that the allusion to Dan. (Mk. 14:62, quoting Dan. 7:13) is lacking. Here Lk. preserves the more original text.

The movement in Mk. (the seating and coming of the "Son of man") should be noted. Lk. 22:69, on the other hand, emphasizes that he is seated as a result of his coming and being brought to the Ancient of Days. Colpe rightly concludes that "the genuineness of Lk. 22:69 can only be doubted by calling in question the historicity of the whole trial-scene" (op. cit., 436).

(f) The argument concerning the historical setting of the material peculiar to Lk. has not yet been settled (Jeremias, Vielhauer). Two things are, however, clear in the light of the Synoptic material: (a) we must not interpret the idea of the "Son of man" in too narrow a christological sense; rather it serves to establish the eschatological righteousness (cf. the Jewish parallels in Gen. R. 44 and Test. Abr.). (2) Early Christian teachers and prophets have worked out various patterns in which the "Son of man" plays a rôle. Hence, Dan. 7 is by no means the only decisive factor; the material peculiar to Lk. has another context too.

(g) [I.H.M.] There remain a considerable number of occurrences of the phrase "Son of man" in the Synoptic Gospels. In a few cases the usage is probably due to the work of the evangelists. Matt. 13:37–43 is generally thought to be Matthew's own interpretation of the parable of the tares (cf. I. H. Marshall, *Eschatology and the Parables*, 1973², 10). In Matt. 16:28 the evangelist has evidently given us a rephrasing of the difficult saying Mk. 9:1 in order to clarify it for his readers. Matt. 26:2 looks like a literary reminiscence of the earlier predictions of the passion. In Lk. 6:22, where Jesus speaks of the possibility of persecution "for the sake of the Son of man", the Matthean parallel has "for my sake" (Matt. 5:11); it is not clear which evangelist has made the alteration, but there are some grounds for thinking that Luke has

retained the original form of a statement in which Jesus referred to himself as a figure of rejection and called his disciples to be ready to face the same fate (cf. Lk. 9:58; I. H. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 1978, ad loc.).

The saying about blasphemy and the Son of man (Matt. 12:31 f.; Lk. 12:10) is particularly difficult to understand (→ Satan, art. *diabolos* NT 9). Matthew's form runs together the saying as it is found in Lk. and another saying, found in Mk. 3:28 f., which speaks of blasphemy committed by the sons of men. The Marcan and Lucan sayings could represent different understandings of a common Aramaic original. In its Marcan form, the saying is to the effect that men ("sons of men" in the collective sense of "mankind") can be forgiven every sin except blasphemy against the Spirit whose power is displayed in the gracious acts of Jesus. In the Lucan form, the saying states that blasphemy against the Son of man (i.e. Jesus) is excusable, but not deliberate blasphemy against the manifest activity of the Spirit. The Son of man is here the lowly, rejected figure of Lk. 7:34; 9:58. In its present situation in Lk. the saying stands in tension with Lk. 12:8 f., where the Son of man is a glorious figure who could hardly be blasphemed with impunity; probably the sayings were spoken on different occasions. Attempts to account for the saying as a church creation contrasting sin before and after the resurrection of Jesus or before and after conversion are not convincing (cf. I. H. Marshall, op. cit., ad loc.).

Lk. 19:10 adds to the picture of the present authority of the Son of man by assigning to him the task of a → shepherd who seeks out and rescues the lost sheep (J. Jeremias, *TDNT* VI 492). The saying appealed to scribes, variants of it being found in the textual tradition of Matt. 18:11 and Lk. 9:56.

Other sayings refer to the activity of the Son of man in the future (i.e. from the temporal standpoint of Jesus). The saying comparing the Son of man with → Jonah (Matt. 12:39 f.; Lk. 11:29 f.) should probably be taken as a comparison between Jonah's miraculous deliverance from death and God's vindication of Jesus by raising him from the dead (as Matt. makes explicit); a reference to the parousia, favoured by many scholars, is much less probable, since such a sign comes too late to confirm belief in the message of Jesus. The whole saying is sufficiently enigmatic to be authentic, although many scholars deny the authenticity of most or all of the saying in Lk. 11:29b–30 (see C. Colpe, *TDNT* VIII, 449 f.; R. A. Edwards, *The Sign of Jonah in the Theology of the Evangelists and Q*, *SBT* Second Series 18, 1971; R. T. France, *Jesus and the Old Testament*, 1971, 43–45, 80–82).

In Matt. 24:37–44 and Lk. 17:22–37 we have a series of references to the days, day or coming of the Son of man. Here the future coming of the Son of man is compared to the flood and the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah which came unawares upon men who failed to prepare themselves for what lay ahead. Yet the disciples of Jesus should not be unprepared. They will be longing for the consummation (Lk. 17:22), and it should be clearly recognizable when it comes. Nevertheless, there is the danger of being misled by false prophets or of growing weary in waiting, and therefore the disciples must be vigilant and not be diverted by worldly concerns from being ready for the Son of man. These sayings fall into a group whose authenticity is not usually denied (*pace* P. Vielhauer, op. cit., 75, 108–110), although some scholars consider that Jesus was thinking of a figure other than himself.

The expectation of the coming of the Son of man, presupposed in these sayings, finds expression in the apocalyptic tradition, particularly in Dan. 7:13. Clear

references to this text are to be found in Mk. 13:26 and 14:62. In the latter text we have a combination of Ps. 110:1 and Dan. 7:13 used to depict the vindication of the Son of man by God and his coming to judgment. There may also be some influence from Zech. 12:10 (cf. Rev. 1:7; N. Perrin, op. cit., 10–22). Opinion is divided as to whether Luke's form of the saying at the trial, with its omission of any reference to the "coming" of the Son of man, represents a more primitive form (see above 4 (e)) or is due to Lucan editing of Mk. 14:62 to stress more the present exaltation of Jesus. In any case Luke retains the citation from Dan 7:13 in Lk. 21:27 and the reference to the Son of man in Lk. 22:69 can be derived only from Dan. 7:13. One possibility is that the original form of the saying at the trial was very much the same as in Lk. 22:69, and that the reference to the "coming" of the Son of man in Mk. 14:62 is a reminiscence of Mk. 13:26. In any case, Dan. 7:13 underlies Jesus' use of the title. In Mk. 14:62 the point of the saying is to show how Jesus re-interprets messiahship in terms of the Son of man of Dan. 7:13 (cf. Mk. 8:29–31). In Mk. 13:26 the coming of the Son of man is associated with the gathering of God's people and their deliverance from earthly tribulation.

The reference to the Son of man sitting on his glorious throne in Matt. 19:38 is missing from the similar saying in Lk. 22:30, and may be an addition by Matt. (cf. the wording in Matt. 25:31) to explain the meaning of the difficult term *palingenesia.* It is clear from the Lucan form of the saying that Jesus looked forward to heavenly rule accompanied by his disciples. Many scholars, however, regard Matthew's wording as more primitive.

5. *The Johannine Tradition (Fourth Gospel).* (a) The later period is characterized by the fact that the new patterns created by teachers and prophets have as their point of departure the obvious assumptions that Jesus is the "Son of man" referred to in the old tradition (Rev. 1:13: the one like a "son of man"; cf. Dan. 7:13; 10:5 f.) and that it is justifiable to give Jesus' statements about himself a new interpretation on the basis of this conviction (as in the Gospel of Jn.). This development should not only be regarded as the expression of an ideology but is also the result of the church's serious internal and external struggles. Hence, it remains an open question, whether Jewish-Christian circles have preserved the tradition better than, say, Gentile-Christian ones or those where Jewish-Christian material was given a Gentile-Christian interpretation. This question is posed above all by the Fourth Gospel, which presents the old Jewish-Christian material in a *kērygma* comprehensible in the Hellenistic world. Its point of departure is the One who is "sent" and comes from heaven, and who represents God both as the "Son" and as the "Son of man".

As far as tradition is concerned, Jn. 13:16, 20 uses Jewish and Synoptic material (Matt. 10:24, 40). It speaks of the execution of a commission that comes from God. Even the predicate granted to Jesus, "Son of God", is guarded from blasphemous claims by the reference to the OT tradition about such commissions (Ps. 82:1 ff.: "Execute justice for the lowly and the orphans, help vindicate the afflicted and poor"; v. 6: "Indeed I spoke: 'Gods you are and sons of the Most High, all of you, but you must die like ordinary men' "; cf. also 11QMelchizedek and Jn. 10:33–36).

(b) The concept of the "Son of man" contains apocalyptic elements, but it itself is given a kerygmatic revaluation. God's commission determines his "descent" and "ascent" (Jn. 3:13, 31; 6:62). This sending determines his "way" and forms the destiny of him who, at the commission of the One who sent him, goes along this way

and takes other men with him along it. The apocalyptists speak of a journey to heaven and the gnostics of an ascent into the heavenly world; for John, however, the decisive question is who gives the true testimony, who is really authorized to bring his message, who has the right to be exalted to be with God (→ Height, art. *hypsoō* NT). Certain questions that are posed recall the world of apocalyptic and gnosticism (→ Knowledge, art. *ginōskō* CL), yet the Johannine *kērygma* steers its own course. The "ascent" corresponds to being exalted, the "descent" to the incarnation (cf. Jn. 3:13 with 3:14 and 1:14). These patterns have different origins. The statement of Jn. 3:14 is older: in Isa. 52:13 the Servant of God is brought out of a condition of humiliation into one of exaltation. That Jesus is incarnate, that he has come into the flesh (1 Jn. 4:1–3, 2 Jn. 7), these are anti-gnostic confession statements, which emphasize the unique nature of Jesus' sending.

The Johannine concept of the "Son of man" is thus seen to be a theological testimony of Jesus to himself. This is the language and the way of thinking of myth as we find it in apocalyptic and gnosticism, but now the language embraces the cosmic significance of the confession, i.e. the cosmological and soteriological aspects of the confession are what matter now (cf. R. Bultmann, *The Gospel of John*, 1971, 25).

The promise of Jn. 1:51 has an early Jewish-Christian sound; it recalls the story of Jacob (Gen. 28:10–17). Rabbinic tradition took the words "the angels of God ascend and descend upon it" to refer either to the ladder or to Jacob himself. Now the "Son of man" replaces the ladder of Jacob. Gen. R. 68:12 mentions the connexion between earthly Jacob-Israel and his heavenly archetype. We can therefore surmise that here John sees the "Son of man" as replacing Jacob: either Jacob becomes an eschatological symbol for the "Son of man" or the "Son of man" is identified with the true Israel. Apparently, in the history of salvation, the "Son of man" embraces the earthly Israel and now represents it (cf. on this question Bultmann, *The Gospel of John*, 105 f.). Gnostic motifs like that of communication with a heavenly archetype are far from the intention of this pre-Johannine material.

(c) Jn. 5:27 tells us that the Father gave the Son authority to execute judgment because he is "man" or "Son of man" (*bar nāšā'*) (*hyios anthrōpou*, here without the article). It is an open question whether this passage refers to the unique human existence of Jesus or to the rank referred to in Dan. 7:10, 14.

Probably Test. Abr. (Recension A, ch. 13) is connected with this material. Here it is explicitly denied that God himself judges, on the grounds that man should be judged by man. This is to be understood in the light of the idea that certain righteous men are chosen to judge men (here Abel).

We must reject both the suggestion that this passage originally spoke of the "Son" and the reverse, that Test. Abr. has been influenced by Jn. 5 (so Bultmann, op. cit., 261 n. 5.). The tradition concerning the "Son" which is part of the message of salvation is manifestly hard to reconcile with Jn. 5:27. No gnostic motifs appear here. Certainly the longer Recension A of Test. Abr. is of Jewish-Christian origin, yet it contains older material than Jn.

(d) The heavenly messenger of Jn. does not come from gnosticism, although gnosticism knows of a messenger-figure, but from the confession of Jesus as the eschatological counterpart of Moses (Num. 16:28, Jn. 17:3; cf. Bultmann, op. cit., 50, n. 2, 494 f.). The Gospel is interested primarily in his commission and the idea of his

authority and not in the idea of revelation (*pace* Bultmann, op. cit., 494 f.). As the One who comes from heaven, he surpasses Moses (Jn. 1:17; 5:45). It was → Moses who ascended and descended when he came from Sinai (Exod. 24:12: "Come up"; Exod. 34:29: "When Moses came down from the mountain. . ."). Jesus ascended and descended in another way, and so bore another glory than that of Moses. The antithesis of Moses and Jesus contains a polemic against the rab. concept of salvation.

This is particularly clear in the passage on the bread from heaven in Jn. 6. This contains three "Son of man" sayings, which reveal the structural division of the passage (vv. 27, 53, 62); on the other hand, the authority of the "Son of man" is made explicit in v. 27b. The dualistic predicates, "heavenly-earthly" or "imperishable-destined to perish", mould the figure of the messenger and his gifts. Bultmann (op. cit., 182) holds that the Johannine dualism derives from gnosticism: only that which divine revelation bestows possesses the character of reality, genuineness and truth. At this point there is a radical change in the eschatological way of thinking: the temporal contrast of Moses and Christ takes on a new aspect, and the idea of the "Son of man" is also introduced here: he imparts the abiding food which brings eternal life. Probably Jn. regards that food as abiding and leading to life which is in accordance with Jesus' commission. That which corresponds to his message is true. Here too we are dealing outwardly with a Hellenistic tradition that reflects Jewish ideas. That remains true whose nature and content is trustworthiness and faithfulness.

(e) With the words → "I am", the heavenly messenger announces himself according to the manner of the OT God (cf. Isa. 43:25: "I, I am he, who blots out your transgressions for my own sake and who will not hold your sins in remembrance any longer"). As God's representative, the Son of man assumes the attributes of *'elōhîm* (→ God OT). His path is a unique part of the course of salvation history: gradually we will recognize the truth (Jn. 3:14; 8:28; 12:23; 13:31). This process, which is rooted in history yet moulds history anew, depends on the idea of the "Son of man". As far as unbelief is concerned, a continuing claim to messianic status and the raising up of the Son of man seem to be mutually exclusive (12:34). The original Aram. of *hypsōthēnai*, to be lifted up, *'istallaq*, includes the idea of progress in the being lifted up (C. C. Torrey, *JBL* 51, 1932, 320 ff.; Bultmann, op. cit., 354 f.). Jn., however, knows that that which "abides" and the process of salvation history are not mutually exclusive, but rather presuppose each other.

(f) [I.H.M.] The Son of man sayings in Jn. pose various problems when they are considered in relation to the synoptic tradition. At several points the title is used in the same way as in the other Gospels with reference to the death and exaltation of Jesus (Jn. 3:14; 8:28; 12:23, 34; 13:31 f.) and to his activity as judge (Jn. 5:27; cf. 9:35–39). But the vocabulary with which these statements are expressed differs somewhat from that used in the other Gospels. Jesus is to be "lifted up" on the cross, a word which refers both to his being physically lifted up to die and to his being "exalted" by God in his death itself and not simply by means of the resurrection: Jesus glorifies God and is glorified by him precisely in his death on the cross. As the Son of man who died on the cross, Jesus is the source of eternal life (Jn. 6:27, 53).

In other places, however, there is an emphasis on the fact that the Son of man came down from heaven (Jn. 3:13; 6:62); this thought of pre-existence is absent from the synoptic sayings, and raises the question whether Johannine thought has been in-

fluenced from other directions. Several writers accordingly have related the Johannine Son of Man to the Primal or First Man found in oriental and gnostic speculation (R. Bultmann; C. H. Dodd). Jesus is thus to be seen as the heavenly Man who is in continual communion with God during his earthly life and thus is the mediator between God and man (cf. Jn. 1:51). It is difficult to come to a clear verdict on this type of theory. Certainly R. Schnackenburg has shown convincingly that the Son of man in Jn. has nothing to do with the figure of the Son of man in gnosticism (*The Gospel of John*, I, 1968, 529–542), but this does not exclude the possibility of a pre-gnostic type of outlook influencing Jn. It is more important to note, however, that the materials for the Johannine picture of the Son of man can largely be found in the OT and Christian tradition: (1) "Son of man" is a title of majesty in Dan. 7 and the Synoptic Gospels; (2) The descent of the Son of man is probably implicit in Dan. 7 and behind Dan. in Ezek.; (3) John's description of the exaltation of the Son of man is presented in terms of the Servant of Yahweh (Is. 52:13) and in the light of the resurrection; (4) John characteristically emphasizes the present anticipatory fulfilment of eschatological expectations. These four elements largely account for the distinctive Johannine use of the title which combines motifs from the tradition of the sayings of Jesus and elements of Johannine interpretation which bring out the significance of Jesus' teaching in the light of his resurrection and exaltation (S. S. Smalley, *NTS*, 15, 1968–69, 278–301; B. Lindars, in B. Lindars and S. S. Smalley, eds., *Christ and Spirit in the New Testament. In Honour of Charles Francis Digby Moule*, 1973, 43–60).

6. *The Concept of the "Son of Man" in the Rest of the NT.* (a) In the Pauline tradition we find the concept of the "heavenly man" standing as the express antitype of the "earthly" (1 Cor. 15:47 f.) or, exegetically, that of the "last Adam" as opposed to the "first man" (1 Cor. 15:45). Perhaps here too, as was the case with the "Son of man", an originally apocalyptic and temporal concept has been adapted to the form of a doctrine of salvation based on the figure of the *Anthrōpos*. We can detect traces of the older apocalyptic "Son of man" tradition in the use of Ps. 8:7(6) in 1 Cor. 15:27. Yet we should note how Paul avoids this apocalyptic idea amidst his Hellenistic surroundings. He is concerned rather to set the new mankind in their setting within the saving event rather than under sin and death (cf. also Rom. 5:12–21). His view of history here takes on metaphysical and ontic features.

(b) Hebrews 2:6 ff. uses Ps. 8:5–7(4–6) to prove that "man" and "son of man" must undergo a process in the history of salvation before they can reign over the world to come. The connexion of "man" and "son of man" is a necessary presupposition for the exegesis of this passage; it points to the various stages of Jesus' life and thus emphasizes that his final goal has not yet been reached (v. 8). "Son of man" here, as in Jn. 1:51, embraces the community of believers. The contrast with the angelic powers may be directed against an Ebionite Jewish Christianity, in which a doctrine about angels played an important part (cf. 1 (i) (iv)).

Heb. provides the first evidence of the dissolution of the connexion between Jesus Christ and the angelic powers, which had been developed earlier in apocalyptic; the "Son of man" and mankind are, in salvation history, on a different level to the angels. Heb. 2:5 ff. is of great importance for a study of the development of this problem. But new light is also shed on Ps. 8:6–8(5–7). A statement in the OT which delimited the dignity of creaturely man by reference to God's creative power is here made to

refer to the glory that is paradoxically ascribed to the One who is humiliated (Colpe, *TDNT* VIII 464).

(c) Although the "Son of man" is firmly entrenched in Lk.'s Gospel in sayings about judgment and the parousia, yet the same is not true of the corresponding sayings in Acts (Leivestad, op. cit. 88). Hence, Stephen's testimony in Acts 7:56, that the "Son of man" stands (not sits) at God's right hand is all the more notable. It reveals a pre-Lucan tradition and clearly shows that in Hellenistic circles the idea of the "Son of man" was also interpreted in apocalyptic terms.

There are four possible ways of interpreting Acts 7:56: (1) Jesus stood to receive Stephen into heavenly glory ([Tr.] possibly an anticipation of the parousia for the individual Christian: C. K. Barrett, "Stephen and the Son of Man", in W. Eltester, ed., *Apophoreta*, 1964, 32–38); (2) Jesus stood up as Stephen's advocate or witness in the heavenly court in the spirit of Lk. 12:8 (cf. C. F. D. Moule, "From Defendant to Judge – and Deliverer", *Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas Bulletin* 3, 1952, 46 f. = *The Phenomenon of the New Testament*, 1967, 90 f.); (3) Jesus stood up to take possession of his messianic inheritance; (4) Jesus was originally thought of as standing (just like the angels) before God; or (5) Jesus stood up, as God stands up, to face his enemies (Isa. 14:22, Pss. 3:8[7]; 7:7[6]). In the last case, this would be a further clear sign of the old polemical tradition (on this whole passage cf. Colpe, *TDNT* VIII 461–463 ff.; he also refers to the → Samaritan predicate of God as "standing"; on the Samaritan liturgy cf. M. Heidenheim, *Die samaritanische Liturgie, Bibliotheca Samaritana* II, 1888, XXXVII: 7, and A. E. Cowley, *The Samaritan Liturgy* I, 1909, 54:15). As long as the Samaritan influence on the NT is not defined we cannot speak of a further possible way to interpret Acts 7:56 (on this question cf. E. Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 1971, 292).

(d) The linguistic usage of Revelation 1:13 and 14:14 reveals affinities to Dan. 7:13. Both passages speak of "one like a son of man" as walking ("amidst the lampstands") or "sitting" on the clouds of heaven. Note too how Rev. differs from the Gospels in leaving out the article; this is apparently an imitation of the text of Dan. 7:13: the apocalyptic "Son of man" is the figure found already in Dan. 7:13, but now as a glorified ruler and judge. He is in all respects like an angel (Dan. 10:5; cf. Rev. 1:13; 14:15 – "another angel" besides that of 14:14). Perhaps we may detect here an old Aram. or Heb. tradition which the seer retains. The essential christology of Rev. is rather built around the figure of the → "Lamb" or the → "Word of God"; yet this is a different, later stratum of tradition.

E. Lohmeyer (*Die Offenbarung des Johannes*, *HNT* 16², 1953, 127) thinks otherwise: "This description [Son of man] is therefore unsuited to the ultimate and innermost nature of its bearer." This underestimates the significance of this idea for Rev.

7. The formulae, "the days of the Son of man" (Lk. 17:22) and "the sign of the Son of man" (Matt. 24:30), are *apocalyptic features*.

(a) The phrase "the days of the Son of man" occurs in Lk. 17:22 (and the sing. in 17:24). This refers to the time of salvation, which ushers in the eschatological redeemed community (Lk. 21:28; cf. Eth. Enoch. 51:2). The time of salvation, however, introduces the day of judgment for the nations, corresponding to the catastrophe of "the days of Noah" and the "days of Lot" (Lk. 17:26 ff.). The Son of man stands on the side of the righteous and as messiah brings deliverance to the

redeemed community. This old text has a parallel in Gos. Thom., logion 38: "Many times you desire to hear these words which I say to you and you have no one else from whom you may hear them. There will come days when you seek me and will not find me." R. Leivestad sees here a shift of sense: "Can one not conceive of Jesus' having compared his own lifetime with the days before the Flood? The days of the Son of Man were the days when Jesus called on men to repent before the last judgment, but with little success. It is really a mistake that the days of the Son of Man have been identified with his day" (op. cit., 87).

(b) In Matt. 24:30 the shining of light symbolizes or heralds proleptically the coming of the Son of man: "And then the sign of the Son of man will appear in heaven." The apocalyptic shining of lights was originally connected with the prophecy of Isa. 60:1; this was interpreted in Pes. R. 36:2(162a) of the King Messiah who would stand on the roof of the sanctuary. Correspondingly, Matt. 24:30 interprets the sign of the Son of man as an event in the heavenly sanctuary. Traces of the same tradition may be detected in Josephus, *War* 6, 5, 3(290). We can even try to pin down the development of this tradition: Matt. 24:30 is alluded to in Did. 16:6 ("sign of the spreading out in heaven") and Gos. Pet. 10:39 (cf. SB I 954). The idea in the Heb. original was probably that of God's Shekinah, which according to Isa. 60:1 prepared for the Messiah's appearance. Several stages of development must have intervened between this original and our text of Matt. (for a different exegesis cf. Colpe, op. cit., 460, n. 412: "Coming before v. 30b the saying about the sign of the Son of Man is designed to bring out Christ's judicial office, which was not clearly enough implied for the Chr. reader by the coming in glory"). *O. Michel*

υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ — *υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ* (*hyios tou theou*), Son of God.

CL 1. In cl. Gk. *hyios* from the first means son, like *pais*, in the sense of an heir and descendant; *pais*, child, is the wider concept, but it can also come to mean slave (→ *pais theou*). It can be used with the gen. (as early as Homer, *Il.* 5, 683; *Od.* 11, 568) in references to "sons of Zeus" and of other gods. Sometimes too those belonging to a particular nation (Achaeans or Trojans) are designated by a similar genitival phrase (*Il.* 1, 162). Ancient Gk. mythology portrayed the world of the gods as one great family. Zeus is the "father of men and gods" (*Il.* 1, 544). It was thought obvious that gods should cohabit with mortal women and beget children. Heracles' fate was especially influential since he had to bear the labours of men before he could, as a son of Zeus, be accepted into the world of the gods. Later, Epictetus reflected on this peculiar father-son relationship between Zeus and Heracles; not only did Heracles consider Zeus his father whom he addressed as such and whom he imitated in his actions, but he was also aware that he was the father of men (*Dissertationes* 2, 16, 44; 3, 24, 14 ff.).

2. In Hellenism, the Egyptian ruler-cult which so influenced Alexander the Great is of outstanding importance. Alexander was hailed in the Libyan desert as "Son of Ammon", or, in Gk. terms, "son of Zeus" (Callisthenes, *Frag.* 14a in F. Jacoby, *Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, 1923 ff., IIB 645). Hence, the year 331 B.C. was critical in the development of the remarkable character of Alexander's dominion. His successors remained mindful of Alexander's deification. The Ptolemies in par-

ticular adopted the Gk. version of the ruler's title (cf. the Rosetta Stone in *OGI* I 90: a decree of the priests in honour of Ptolemy Epiphanes). Under the Roman Empire, the idea of the son of God spread all over the world of that day, but it now had its foundation in Roman political theory. After Caesar had been murdered in 44 B.C. and had been declared to be divine, Octavian let it be known that, on the basis of his adoption in 45 B.C., he was *divi filius*, son of the divine. This nomenclature slowly established itself and became that part of the name which indicated the genealogical succession. That remained true of all the emperors; e.g. it was the official name of Septimius Severus in A.D. 195, when the phrase *divi filius* occurs 6 times (cf. Pauly-Wissowa II, 1923², 1943). The Gk. world translated *divi filius* with the formula *theou hyios*. However, the Hellenistic formula which expressed a mythical descent from the deity did not make the Roman emperors divine – since this formula was based on Roman ideas. Rather, it merely made them intelligible and acceptable to the Gk. East. The acceptance of this Roman ideology must thus obviously be part of the NT world (A. Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East*, 1927², 346).

3. Particular guilds boasted of their attachment to "their god" and could thus call themselves *hyioi*, sons, or *paides tou theou*, children of the god (e.g. doctors as "sons of the god", Asclepius: *SIG*⁴ III 1169, 12). It was particularly easy for the Stoa to think of men as children of gods, in the sense of the kinship existing between gods and men, because they upheld the ultimate unity of God and man or the unity of the human race. The centre of the Stoic religion lay not only in the symbol of the Father but also in the motif of providence, caring and help. "Not only the whole race of men, but also the individual members of it, are constantly cared for and guided by the immortal gods" (Cicero, *On the Nature of the Gods* 2, 65, 164). Epictetus gives this its classical expression: "We all come directly from God and God is the father of gods and men" (*Dissertationes* 1, 3, 1). A characteristic expression of Stoic thinking is the possibility of realizing the freedom and bliss offered by Zeus. Man has to hold fast that which is "his own" (Epictetus, *Dissertationes* 3, 24, 2 f.). It spoke of a world-order and its destruction; the Christian message spoke of the woe that had come upon man and the world, and of redemption from it.

4. A separate problem is the use of *theios* or *theos* to describe men whose acts or endowment surpass those of normal men. This is especially true of poets or seers, but also of commanders like Lysander, whose divine charisma or divine qualities were celebrated. Empedocles was regarded as a god (*Frag.* 112 in Diels-Kranz I 354, 17). Legends thus came to surround the births of famous men (Pythagoras, Plato). These legends took a particularly firm hold in Neopythagorean and Neoplatonic circles. Apollonius of Tyana in particular was furnished with all the characteristics of a divine endowment, and divine sonship also seems to have been part of this endowment (Philostratus, *Life of Apollonius* 1, 6; 4, 31; 5, 24). The prophets whom Celsus saw in Palestine and Syria and who claimed to be sons of God (Origen, *Contra Celsum* 7, 9) present a particular problem. Origen also associates with these the Samaritan sons of God, Simon Magus and Dositheus, whose claims as revealers he himself did not recognize (*Contra Celsum* 1, 57).

[I.H.M.] The significance of the Gk. and Hellenistic material for the usage of the NT should not be over-estimated. The influential "history of religions" school attempted to account for much of the development of christology in terms of Hellenization (W. Bousset; R. Bultmann). It is now clear that this explanation was a complete

misrepresentation of what actually happened. Naturally early Christian thinkers could not help being influenced by their Hellenistic environment, but it was primarily their OT and Jewish environment which provided them with the concepts and vocabulary with which to develop their understanding of the person of Jesus. See especially M. Hengel, *The Son of God*, 1976, for a powerful statement of this point of view; but in fact his thesis is simply a restatement, with additional evidence, of what has long been believed by scholars who were not captivated by the "history of religions" school.

In particular, the use of *theios* with reference to men endowed with superhuman qualities appears to have no essential relationship to the concept of Son of God (W. von Martitz, *TDNT* VIII 339 f.). Even the concept of the *theios anēr* (a modern rather than an ancient title) should be used in discussions of the superhuman qualities of Jesus only with considerable caution (O. Betz, "The Concept of the so-called 'Divine Man' in Mark's Christology", in D. E. Aune, ed., *Studies in New Testament and Early Christian Literature*, 1972, 229–240; see, on the other side, H. D. Betz, "Jesus as Divine Man", in F. T. Trotter, ed., *Jesus and the Historian*, 1968, 114–133).

OT 1. *Israel and Sonship.* It is a fundamental part of the OT tradition that Israel has been chosen (→ Elect, art. *eklegomai* OT) and so is in a position of sonship. On the one hand, this gives expression to the subordination of the son and the legal claim of God as → Father (art. *patēr*) (Mal. 1:6), and on the other to the care and → love extended to Israel as the "first-born son" (Exod. 4:22 f.; Jer. 31:9). Only in this context do the prophets' message of judgment and the recognition of God's chastisements become intelligible. Israel provides a historical pattern for election and for a concept of sonship that is not interpreted in purely natural categories. Yet we must not forget that Gen. 6:2, 4 speaks of "sons of God" who took to themselves daughters of men and begot the "mighty ones". There is later evidence too of the old tradition of heavenly "sons of God" (Job 1:6; 2:1; 38:7; Pss. 29:1; 82:6; 89:7). Here in the OT is evidence of the pictorial idea of a heavenly court; the same idea recurs in e.g. a fragment of 4Q on Deut. 32:8. However, the idea of "sons of God" does not often appear subsequently, but rather is replaced by other phrases, "sons of heaven", "holy ones of heaven". Man's instruction in all art and science is traced back to the → angels (Eth. Enoch 6 ff.). Their fall is the real disaster of history.

2. *The King as God's Son.* Decisive for the messianic hope (→ Jesus Christ, art. *Christos*) is Nathan's prophecy in 2 Sam. 7:12–16: God will establish a house and a kingdom for David for ever. He will be a father to David's son, and this son of David is to be a son to him. The dynastic changes within the house of David were henceforth authorized by the divine legitimation of the succession. The original covenant between the people and their king was replaced by one which God himself gave which was between him and the royal house (cf. the Egyptian examples of such divine legitimation). Ps. 89:3(4) ff. takes up this divine legitimation given in 2 Sam. 7:12–16: the psalmist appeals to it in interceding for the king, the first-born, the highest among those born on earth (vv. 27[28] f.). There was also a coronation ritual based on 2 Sam. 7:12–16. "Only when Yahweh had acknowledged the new king as His son and, established his full royal name (2 S. 7:9; 1 Ki. 1:47), granted him a first request (Pss. 2:8; 20:5; 21:2, 4) and invested him with his crown (2 Ki. 11:12; Ps. 21:3) and sceptre (Ps. 110:2) could he begin his rule" (G. Fohrer, *TDNT* VIII 350).

The words, "He said to me, 'You are my son; I myself have begotten you today' " (Ps. 2:7), therefore belong to an original coronation ritual, as the "today" clearly shows. This may recall the legal act of adoption and yet there is another interpretation: God himself acknowledges the child born of a slave-woman – and so takes the place of his father (cf. Fohrer, *TDNT* VIII 351). The shout of joy in Isa. 9:6(5) perhaps arose out of this divine formula of acknowledgement: "To us a child is born, a son is given." Isa. 9:2–7(1–6); 11:1–9 describe later the enthronement of the king of salvation and the equipment of the new shoot of David's line with the gifts of the → Spirit of God. At his exaltation to sonship, his father confers upon him names that promise salvation and describe its constituents. The king is none other than God's representative on earth. With his coming, man's history of woe is at an end; he will bring salvation to the whole world.

3. *The Special Effects of these OT Beginnings in later Judaism.* (a) The description of the eschatological event put on God's lips in Jubilees (1:22–25) presupposes Israel's apostasy, its rebellion and obstinacy; Israel returns in all sincerity, with its whole heart and soul. God himself then circumcises them and bestows upon them a holy spirit. "I will then be your father and you will be my children. And they are all called children of the living God, and all angels and spirits know that they are my children and I am their father in truth and in righteousness, and that I love them" (cf. 2:20; 19:29).

In Qumran this eschatological process is given a distinctive form: men's attachment to the community of the elect is described as sonship (sons of light: 1QS 1:9; 2:16; of favour 1QH 4:32 f.; of grace: 1QH 7:20). In Israel itself the returning and transformation of God's people takes place in a community which claims for itself the fulfilment of the OT promises. The Qumran community fitted Ps. 2:7 and 2 Sam. 7:14 into their messianic expectation and interpreted them thus (4QFlor). 1QSa 2:11 f. may perhaps be translated: "if God causes the messiah to be born among them" (cf. Isa. 66:9).

([I.H.M.] The Qumran evidence shows that attention was being paid in Judaism to the significance of God's fatherly relationship to the messiah as his son, as expressed in 2 Sam. 7:14. In addition J. A. Fitzymer ("The Contribution of Qumran Aramaic to the Study of the New Testament", *NTS* 20, 1973–74, 382–407, especially 391–394) has drawn attention to the possible significance of 4QpsDan A for christology; he renders 1:7–2:1: "[But your son] shall be great upon the earth, [O King! All (men) shall] make [peace], and all shall serve [him. He shall be called the son of] the [G]reat [God], and by his name shall he be named. He shall be hailed [as] the Son of God, and they shall call him Son of the Most High." Whatever be the precise interpretation of this text (Fitzmyer's rendering is a tentative one), it obviously has some relevance for NT usage, especially for Lk. 1:32–35).

The apocalypse of Eth. Enoch (105:1–2) speaks of the eschatological wisdom. God will unite himself "for ever", together with his son, with men in the ways of truth.

In 2 Esd. (7:28 f.; 13:32, 37, 52; 14:9) we find the phrase "my son, *filius meus*", which can be traced back to a Gk. *pais* or Heb. *ʿebēḏ* tradition. The content of these references would fit in with Ps. 2:7; Isa. 11; their main emphasis is on the apocalyptic struggle with the nations and not on their enlightenment.

(b) The Jewish wisdom tradition places great value on the life of the individual

righteous man. The paraenetic material of Sir. 4:1–10 concludes, according to the Heb. text, with the promise, "and God will call you his son, and he will be gracious to you and rescue you from the pit"; however the Gk. text has something quite different. The picture of the righteous man also lies behind Wis. 2:13–18: he claims a special knowledge of God and calls himself God's child and calls God himself his father. His way of life is different from that of other men, and he can be regarded as God's servant in the sense of Isa. 53. The ideas of Wis. 5:5 are eschatological: the righteous man is reckoned among God's children and receives a portion among the saints (cf. Isa. 53:12; Dan. 7:18). The problem of Israel is also taken up in Wis. 12:19–21. God has taught his people that the righteous man must be a "friend of men", but that he can count on repentance. If even enemies and evil-doers are treated with forbearance and clemency, how great a clemency can the "sons" anticipate, whose fathers were granted oaths and covenants. This prepares the way for an important strand of thought in later Judaism which should not be overlooked.

(c) Important too is the influence of prayer with its address to "Our Father" on the tradition and the liturgy (Isa. 64:8[7]; Eighteen Benedictions, Petitions 4 and 6; → Prayer, *proseuchomai* OT 6; → Father, art. *patēr* OT 2). The origin and content of the tradition of divine sonship goes right back to Israel and the tradition of its election. Midr. Ps. on Ps. 2 takes as its starting-point Exod. 4:22 ("Israel is my first-born son"), then quotes from the tradition of the Servant of God in Isa. 53:12 and 42:1 and concludes with testimonies from the Hagiographa (Ps. 110:1; Dan. 7:13). According to Ps. 2:8 ("Ask of me and I will give you nations as your own possession"), messianic status is also part of the tradition concerning Israel.

To guard against any false ideas it was often carefully said, "You will be like a son" (cf. Gk. text of Sir. 4:10).

The equipping of individual charismatics with the gift of performing miracles is conspicuous in the rabbinic miracle-stories (Naqdimon b. Gurion, Ta'an. 19b–20a; Haninah b. Dosa, Ber. 34b; Honi the Circle-drawer, Ta'an. 19a). The Hellenistic period, which tended above all to attribute sonship to individuals, also saw a particular differentiation within the concept of a son: he had a special relation to God (like the righteous of Wis. 2:13–18) in contrast to other men and also now even within Israel. Honi the Circle-drawer can say "for I am like the son of your house in your eyes", and Shimon b. Shetach can say of him "what should I do, for you sin against God and yet he does what you want." Indeed, it even seems that we can see different views of the Torah. But this exalting of individual charismatics is also based on the fact that sonship is a special gift of God in Israel itself. The "children of God" (Deut. 14:1) gaze upon these "beloved ones" of God because their own fate (e.g. rain) depends on their prayer (cf. G. Vermes, *Jesus the Jew*, 1973, 206–211).

(d) Hellenistic Judaism held fast to this faith in God as Creator and Father, and saw in history the evidence of his providence, goodness and righteousness. For Josephus believed (*Ant.* 2, 6, 8[152]) that he was "Father of all" (cf. 1, 1, 4[20]); according to *Ant.* 5, 1, 25(93), he is "Father and Lord of the Hebrews". Josephus thus gives evidence of a fixed terminology that is conscious of the figurative nature of its statements. "Father" is not found as a mode of address in the prayers in his works. The patriarchs arose "from God himself" (*Ant.* 1, 3, 9[106]); they are examples of his special working. Josephus does not recognize any men as being God's sons in a special way.

Philo was very definitely interested in particular philosophical and exegetical problems to which he gave a speculative interpretation. In *Conf. Ling.* 63, the Logos is the eldest son of God and the cosmos the youngest. In *Sobr.* 56, Abraham is not only God's friend, from whom nothing is hidden, but also God's child (*hyios*). He is of noble birth because he has chosen God as his Father and is the only one to have been adopted by him as son. Philo takes pains to remain faithful to the text of the LXX of Gen. 18:17 (cf. also *Leg. All.* 3, 27; *Quaest. in Gen.* 4, 21; for other Jewish material, see M. Hengel, op. cit., 41–56).

NT 1. (a) The early Christian confession of Jesus as Son of God is in fundamental agreement with Jesus' manner of addressing God (Aram. *'abbā'*, → Father; Mk. 14:36; Gal. 4:6; Rom. 8:15; → Prayer, art. *proseuchomai* NT 1 (a)). It is something new when Jesus addresses God as "My Father"; this mode of address in prayer derives from the language of the family circle; it does not occur in the charismatic circles in Judaism (contrast Ta'an. 23b: "a Father who can give rain"). Jesus bestows a share in this eschatologically determined relation to God. Hence it is understandable, when Jesus speaks of himself as the "Son" and claims for himself a special → knowledge (art. *ginōskō* NT) of the Father (Matt. 11:27; Lk. 10:22; see 2, below). This statement about the Son is apocalyptic in origin and, as in Qumran (e.g. 1QS 4:21 f.; CD 3:13 f.), it involves → election, knowledge and → revelation. It is a problem how this fundamental statement is related to the references to Ps. 2:7 in Mk. 1:11; 9:7 (cf. Lk. 3:22). This could originally have been speaking of the "Servant of God" in the sense of Isa. 42:1 (Heb. *'abdî*, my Servant); yet this question remains open (see 3, below).

(b) The concept "Son of God", which is not used in this form by Jesus himself, is the essential confessional term of early Christianity (→ Confess). It is firmly rooted in → baptism, in preaching and in confessions (Acts 8:37 *v.l.*; 9:20; 13:33; Rom. 1:3 f.) and points back to the founding of the community and the event of Easter. Its close connexion with the confession of Jesus as messiah suggests that this sonship refers back to 2 Sam. 7:12, 14 (a royal title; cf. R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, I, 1952, 50). This traces the messianic element in Jesus' preaching back to the Davidic tradition. On the other hand, Lk. 4:18 f. (cf. Isa. 61:1–2) shows that the messianic element in Jesus' message is related to a particular endownment with the Spirit.

This problem was taken up by M. A. Chevalier (*L'Esprit et le Messie dans le Bas-Judaïsme et le Nouveau Testament*, 1958). He is anxious to show an original association of Ps. 2 and Isa. 11:1–10. This cannot, indeed, be detected in rabbinic Judaism, but is presupposed in apocalyptic texts and in the NT. This original messianic tradition which brought Ps. 2 and Isa. 11:1–10 together has also left its mark on the preaching of the Baptist. The gifts of the Spirit have an immediate point of contact with Isa. 11:2: the messiah is fully endowed with God's Spirit. Then the tradition breaks up: (a) the messiah will judge by the breath of his mouth or by fire (Isa. 11:4); (b) Jesus himself conceived of himself as God's Servant, upon whom the Spirit of the Lord rests, in the sense of Isa. 42:1; 61:1 f.

The question whether the messianic and adoptionist element of Ps. 2:7 or the tradition in Isa. 42:1; 61:1 f. concerning the *'eḇeḏ* and the Spirit is primary in christology must surely be answered in favour of the latter. The heavenly voice of

Mk. 1:11 probably said: "Behold my servant whom I uphold, my chosen, in whom my soul delights; I have put My Spirit upon him, he will bring forth justice to the nations" (Isa. 42:1). It was a confirmation of the gift of the Spirit (but see further 3, below, and *pais theou* NT 1). We can thus draw a definite conclusion: Jesus is "Son" in his unique relation to God and his unique life of prayer, and he is *'ebed*, Servant of God, as the bearer of the message of the heavenly voice that called him. Both concepts designate a function and a task, a being in the presence of God.

2. *The Concept of Sonship in the Tradition of Lk. 10:21 f. par. Matt. 11:25 f.* In Lk. 10:21 f., Matt. 11:25 ff. we have a thanksgiving prayer of Jesus which consists of praise and a word of revelation; Matt. 11:28 f. adds an invitation in the style of Sir. 24:18 ff. (cf. here Gos. Thom. logion 90, 96:16–20). Opinions are particularly divided on the genuineness and the point of the middle section (Matt. 11:27; Lk. 10:22). Here we have four skilfully constructed clauses. The meaning is that the Father has handed over to the Son the full → revelation; "just as only a father really knows his son, so only a son really knows his father". The son alone is in the position to mediate this knowledge to others. The logion has its parallels in apocalyptic (Dan. 2:20–23; Eth. Enoch 37:4; 1QS 11:15–20; Heb. Enoch 48C, 7). One can compare Jn. 10:15 (on the whole subject cf. J. Jeremias, *The Prayers of Jesus, SBT* Second Series, 6, 1967, 48–52). Jeremias takes the article before "son" and "father" in Matt. 11:27 as a generic one (a statement of general experience: "just as only a father really knows his son"). But it is more likely that the first clause is normative for the following: in the transmission of the revelation the special understanding of the Father and the Son is fulfilled.

Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1, 13, 2 (ed. Harvey) records a unique old Aram. tradition preserved amongst the gnostic sect of the Marcosians: "O My Father, how your gracious favour rests on me." Jesus knew himself to be the "simple One of God" who separated himself from those learned in the law and in so doing experienced God's favour. It remains undecided whether or not the shorter text attested by Irenaeus is secondary. W. Grundmann suggests that "it is understandable that this saying which is opposed to any rigid supernatural christological ideas could not long be tolerated and was speedily altered, while, on the other hand, the quotation in Irenaeus is hard to explain as a rephrasing" (*Die Gotteskindschaft in der Geschichte Jesu*, 1938, 140).

Ever since the works of E. Norden (*Agnostos Theos*, 1913), T. Arvedson (*Das Mysterium Christi*, 1937) and A. J. Festugière ("Cadre de la mystique hellénistique", in *Aux Sources de la Tradition Chrétienne*, 1950, 74 ff.), this group of ideas has been deliberately assigned a place in Hellenistic style and language about revelation. Here too we can then speak of a *gnōsis* which is directed towards God and sees him as the One who bestows salvation; we can speak of a self-knowledge of man, who comes from God and returns to him, and of the disclosure of a way, of the means and the intermediaries, who will help one in ascending. But even if we cannot disentangle the thought-forms of Qumran (e.g. 1QS 9:18; CD 2:3) and Matt. 11:25–27 from Hellenistic presuppositions, yet the real content of the logion is Semitic. The *da'at*, knowledge, that it presupposes is neither speculative nor mystic (cf. Jeremias, op. cit., 45 ff.).

[I.H.M.] The Semitic character of the saying is further evident from its use of parallel clauses to express a reciprocal relationship, since the Semitic languages lack a reciprocal pronoun for "one another". The conceptual background is to be found

in Jewish wisdom teaching, which in turn is based on the OT (cf. Exod. 33:12 f.; Job 28:25–28; Pr. 8:22–30; Sir. 1:1–10; Bar. 3:27–28; Wis. 8:3 f.). The saying grounds Jesus' right to be the mediator of knowledge of God to men in the exclusive relationship which a son has with his father, and thus implicitly he claims a unique filial status. It fits in well with Jesus' other references to God as his Father, and should be regarded as authentic.

3. *The Voice at the Baptism according to Mk. 1:11 par. Lk. 3:22.* Perhaps the words of God recorded in all the Gospels in their accounts of the → baptism (Mk. 1:11 par.) form the real source of all the statements about the Son, the Servant, the Beloved or the elect One. Here Jesus had an experience of being called (→ Call), chosen and selected for a special task. It is important that the heavenly voice is associated with the gift of the Spirit. "Echoing voices were not an uncommon phenomenon among the Jews of those days, and frequently these voices were heard to utter verses from scripture" (D. Flusser, *Jesus*, 1969, 29). Hence we must examine the Sem. basis of this text which, as it stands, has been influenced by Hellenistic ideas. If the *'ebed* tradition is the original one, then *'ebed* is represented by *hyios* and the Heb. *bāḥîr* of Isa. 42:1 by *agapētos*, beloved (LXX *eklektos*, elect One; → Elect., art. *eklegomai* OT 2). This would mean that the *'ebed* tradition was normative for Jesus' life. His baptism was a token of his death (→ Cross, art. *stauros*) which he undertook for the → sins of the whole nation.

This leaves as yet unsolved the critical problem of the value of the reading of Lk. 3:22 D and Justin, where Ps. 2:7 is quoted verbatim ("You are my son, today have I begotten you") (on Ps. 2:7 cf. Acts 13:33; Heb. 1:5). This reading favours the Son-tradition. Gos. Heb. 2 has a variant: "My son, in all the prophets I was waiting for you to come that I might rest in you" (cf. Henn.-Schn., I, 161–164).

[I.H.M.] While it is possible that behind the baptismal saying there lies a use of *'ebed*, which was later understood in terms of divine sonship, it is more probable that the secondary text in Lk. 3:22 D Justin has correctly recognized the presence of an allusion to Ps. 2:7 which goes back to the earliest form of the saying. From the beginning the text confirmed God's recognition of Jesus as his Son (E. Schweizer, *TDNT* VIII 367 f.) but also as his Servant.

4. *The Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen (Mk. 12:1–12 par.).* Mk. too knows of the appearance of the Son as contrasted with the sending of servants prior to the eschatological age. In Mk. 12:1–12 par. Matt. 21:33–46, Lk. 20:9–19 the sending of the servants is followed by the sending of his son as the final, despairing expedient of the owner. But the tenants' resistance is not broken, but rather stiffened; they seize the son, kill him and throw him out of the vineyard. Since the servants' commission is indistinguishable from that of the "beloved son", the parable's meaning lies in the extreme crisis of the contemporary historical situation. The original parable was not allegorical.

J. Jeremias (*The Parables of Jesus*, 1963², 74 ff.) alludes to the revolutionary temper of the Galilean peasants towards their foreign landlords and to the zealotism indigenous in Galilee that had roused them. It is important to note that the owner apparently lived abroad and is perhaps even regarded as a foreigner. The tenants had in mind the legal enactment that under certain conditions the estate of a deceased man was regarded as property without an owner which anyone might appropriate; hence he who first seized possession had the prior claim. Jesus was contending against the

tenants of the vineyard and the leaders of the nation, saying that they had again and again acted rebelliously against God and they were even rejecting the final messenger of God.

The parable has been allegorized in the course of time. For its hearers the idea of the "Son of God" need not have been messianic ([Tr.] although this does not mean that Jesus was unaware of the deeper significance of his words). Jeremias assumes that the concept "Son of God" is not attested in pre-Christian Palestinian Jud. (interpolations in Eth. Enoch 105:2; 2 Esd. 7:28 f.; 13:32, 37, 52; 14:9). "A few infrequent occurrences of the designation of the Messiah as Son of God are first found in later rabbinical literature in agreement with Ps. 2:7" (Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus* 73, n. 1; SB III 19 f.; see, however OT 3 (a) above). Note too the text of Gos. Thom.: "Then the master sent his son. He said: 'Perhaps they will fear my son!' Since those peasants knew that he was the heir of the vineyard, they seized him and killed him. Whoever has ears let him hear" (logion 65). We have to distinguish between the original parable of Jesus and the early church's interpretation.

5. *The Logion concerning the Father's Private Knowledge of the Eschaton* (Mk. 13:32). A hard problem is posed by Mk. 13:32. An old Sem. tradition lies behind it, which perhaps read "not even the angels know it". Some scholars hold that the words, "nor the Son, but only the Father", were added later (cf. G. Dalman, *The Words of Jesus*, 1902, 194; Jeremias, *The Prayers of Jesus*, 37; on the argument, which remains unsettled, see B. M. F. van Iersel, *'Der Sohn' in den synoptischen Jesusworten, Supplements to NovT* 3, 1961, 117–123, who upholds the authenticity of the whole saying). On the parousia see Present, art. *The Parousia and Eschatology in the NT* 2 (a).

6. *The Midrash concerning Jesus' Early Life (Matt. 1:18 ff.; Lk. 2:1 ff.).* An older story about Jesus' birth has been elaborated in the manner of a midrash (cf. the use of scriptural quotations). Lk. 1:32 ff. contains a concept of sonship that is based primarily on 2 Sam. 7:12–16 and makes use of the idea of the Davidic sonship, but gives it a prophetic form. Matt.'s view is different: he calls the messianic child the "Son of God", quoting the scriptures of Hos. 11:1 (Matt. 2:15). In his eyes, the way to mankind led to Jesus as Israel's messiah. The Redeemer (→ Redemption, art. *sōzō*), as a second → Moses, must come out of → Egypt (→ Fullness, art. *plēroō* NT 1 (b)).

These stories usher in a new way of looking at Jesus' divine sonship. The OT traditions are still there, but are given a Hellenistic interpretation and are developed to include a begetting (→ Birth, art. *gennaō*) by God without any earthly father (but see below the art. on *The Virgin Birth*). This idea is also at home in certain Jewish circles (cf. Philo, *Cher.* 40–47: "the men to whose virtue the lawgiver has testified, such as Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and Moses, . . . are not represented by him as knowing their wives"). The idea of an eschatological new creation by God (→ Creation, art. *ktisis*) recalls → Noah's birth; he was not like a man, but like the heavenly sons of God; he is not as we are (Eth. Enoch 106, 1QGenAp column 2; cf. on all this C. K. Barrett, *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition*, 1947, 18–24; D. Flusser, "Jesus in the Context of History", in A. Toynbee, ed., *The Crucible of Christianity*, 1969, 228 ff.).

[I.H.M.] The evidence for Jesus' own use of the term "Son" is thus comparatively small, and the main weight falls on Matt. 11:27 par. At the same time, however, the use of the title is found in statements addressed by others to Jesus. He is so

designated by the heavenly voice (Mk. 1:11; 9:7) and by evil powers (Matt. 4:3, 6; Mk. 3:11; 5:7). The temptation story is clearly meant to take up the ascription of sonship found in the baptismal narrative. Jesus refuses to misuse his relationship with God for his own ends. The words of the demons may reflect popular belief that miracle workers and exorcisers had a special relationship with God.

7. *Pre-Pauline Traditions and the Pauline Message.* W. Kramer (*Christ, Lord, Son of God, SBT* 50, 1966, 183) rightly distinguishes "Son of God" formulae which Paul quotes or adopts (6 passages: Rom. 1:4; 8:3, 32; Gal. 2:20; 4:4 f.; 1 Thess. 1:10) and his own formulations (9 passages: 1 Cor. 1:9; 15:28; 2 Cor. 1:19; Gal. 1:16; 4:6; Rom. 1:3, 9; 5:10; 8:29). Statements involving "Christ" or → "Lord" (*kyrios*) predominate. It is striking how much Paul has made use of existing material. But it is still an open question how much importance attaches to these "Son" statements. Obviously they imply Jesus' legitimation, his relation to God and his representation of God as his envoy. But it is doubtful whether Kramer (op. cit., 189) is right in claiming that the title and the concept of the Son of God are only of secondary importance for Paul (cf. M. Hengel, op. cit., 7–15). The confession of Jesus as messiah and the acclamation of him as *kyrios* are christologically independent themes, but the concept of him as "son of God" presupposes, not particular formulae, but complete statements.

(a) The twofold statement of Rom. 1:3–4 speaks of an enthronement and presupposes Pss. 2:7 and 110:1 ff. Resurrection and enthronement thus coincide in history. Both forms of existence, sonship of David and sonship of God, describe life on earth and in heaven; the second form of existence transcends the first but is not opposed to it. The addition "in power" perhaps applies to the divine sonship and could have a doxological purpose. This twofold statement uses Jewish material and can be assigned to the Aram.-speaking early church. They wanted thereby to show Jesus' importance rather than to describe the saving event.

(b) The appearance of statements about the sending of Jesus in Gal. 4:4 f. and Rom. 8:3 also seems to be pre-Pauline. One can discern here a formal scheme which can also be detected in the Johannine literature, though in a modified form (Jn. 3:17; 1 Jn. 4:9, 10, 14). The following final clauses (*hina*, so that) are characteristic: they give the main purpose of the sending. Behind this originally lay the scheme of the eschatological messenger who surpasses Moses (Deut. 18:15; Jn. 17:3).

E. Schweizer (*TDNT* VIII 374–6) assumes that statements in Hellenistic Judaism about → Wisdom (a power sent from God, Wisdom, Logos) are to be regarded as the basis of the Pauline and Johannine idea of pre-existence. The NT sending-formulae in any case are firmly rooted in time and history. That a gnostic redeemer myth can hardly be presupposed is shown by the fact that the "Son" title in the formulae of sending is not combined with exaltation or ascension (loc. cit., 375, n. 299).

(c) The giving or giving up of the Son (→ Judgment, art. *paradidōmi*; → Suffer; Rom. 4:25; 8:32; Jn. 3:16) probably also belongs to pre-Pauline material. The verb *paradidonai* that appears here could just as well be interpreted on the basis of the Passion-story as on the analogy of the sending-formula ("give" meaning "send"). The example of → Abraham, the patriarch who did not withhold his son (Gen. 22:12, 16), may also have played a part here. We have here a *kērygma* which is still influenced by old Sem. ideas of the rights of a messenger. It is concerned with God's decisive action as he commissions and authorizes his Son; he takes upon himself the

→ suffering of his Son and gives this suffering an ultimate significance as the expression of his Fatherly love.

It is not enough to ask where these statements of pre-existence originated; we must also ask in what circles these statements were current. Probably they belong to the missionary preaching and instruction of the Hellenistic Diaspora, since the problem of Israel is side-stepped in this material and the mission to mankind is in the foreground. Yet the main thing is the OT and Jewish background of this material. The "Son" is the One who carried out the divine purpose and not a Hellenistic hero or the mediator of divine powers.

(d) The summary of the old Gentile-Christian missionary *kērygma* in 1 Thess. 1:9 f. also seems to be pre-Pauline. It is probably built on a call to repentance (→ Conversion) and an expectation of salvation: it recalls elements of the Baptist's preaching of impending wrath (Matt. 3:7; Rom. 5:9). The resurrection serves as a pledge of future salvation. Probably the idea of Jesus' sonship appears as part of the *kērygma* in place of the tradition about the Son of man.

Kramer (op. cit., 123 ff.) suggests that we have here Aram. Jewish-Christian material which has been adapted into the Hellenistic *kērygma*. He points out that statements about the Son of God were not at first connected with the parousia.

(e) Earlier material is likewise found in the apocalyptic passage, 1 Cor. 15:23–28. Passages in the Pss. like 8:6(7) and 110:1 show the biblical material that is the basis of the christological affirmations here. In particular the absolute use of "the Son" characterizes this apocalyptic passage (v. 28). He takes on features which elsewhere indicate the designation "Son of man" (cf. Ps. 8). What is important here is his obedience towards the → "Father" and Creator.

(f) These pre-Pauline statements concerning the "Son of God" lead us not only to the heart of old credal formulations but also to the *kērygma* of the mission in the Diaspora. Paul himself not only handed down the statements that he found, but also gave them a soteriological interpretation and subordinated them to his preaching of the cross. The close connexion between the "Son" and the "sons", the superiority of the image of Christ and his form, and the son's right of succession are important elements in the doctrine of salvation; yet when they are adopted for preaching in Hellenistic circles they are thereby given ontological implications which could displace the emphasis on the functional purpose of the concept (cf. Phil. 2:5–11; Rom. 8:3).

(g) [I.H.M.] It is interesting that the only two references to the "Son" in Acts (9:20; 13:33 [Ps. 2:7 LXX]) both associate the term with the preaching of Paul. Clearly Luke regarded it as distinctive of Paul's christology. Although the term is infrequent compared with other christological titles, M. Hengel (op. cit., 7–15) has demonstrated that Paul kept it for use at the climax of theological statements and that he used it to demonstrate the close bond between Jesus and God in virtue of which Jesus is the mediator of salvation. Thus it is the Son who is the theme of the gospel (Rom. 1:3, 9), and it is by means of this title that Paul emphasizes the supreme value of the death of the One who stood closest to God as the means of reconciling men with God (Rom. 5:10; 8:32; Gal. 2:20; Col. 1:13 f.). The same idea is used to express the closeness of Jesus to God and appears when Jesus is described as being in the form or image of God and as his Firstborn. It should be noted that for Paul Jesus was God's Son during his earthly life, and that it was as God's Son that

he died. Consequently, he did not cease to be divine in his earthly existence, and his self-emptying cannot mean that he gave up his divine nature to assume human nature. The statements in → Empty, art. *kenos* NT 3, and → Form, art. *morphē* NT 1, are open to misinterpretation in this respect. It is better to say, "He emptied Himself in that He took the servant's form. . . ; and this necessarily involved an eclipsing of His glory as the divine Image in order that He might come, in human flesh, as the Image of God incarnate" (R. P. Martin, *Carmen Christi*, 1967, 194).

It is, then, all the more remarkable that Paul can speak of Christians as the sons of God (Rom. 8:14, 19; 9:26; 2 Cor. 6:18; Gal. 3:26; 4:6 f.) and claim that their destiny is conformity to the image of God's Son (Rom. 8:29); they are to share the glory of the exalted Son and must pattern their lives on his holy, sinless life.

8. *The Son of God in the Johannine Literature.* The tension between ontological overtones and functional purpose is clearly visible in the Johannine literature where, especially in the letters, the statements about the Son of God are of especial importance. In the Fourth Gospel, the sending of Jesus is a firm foundation for the doctrine of salvation. One believes and recognizes God and him whom he has sent (Jn. 17:3; cf. Num. 16:28). This statement about his being sent has its explicit purpose in showing Jesus' status as Son (K. H. Rengstorf, *TDNT* I 445). It is a matter of God's decisive act in commissioning and authorizing his Son – but the Son therefore makes the same claims and has the same rights as the Father (Jn. 5:23: the Father who has sent him). Here we are confronted with a particular interpretation of an older *kērygma.*

(a) Jn. 3:35 describes the Son's authority to teach and to act. The Father loves him (i.e. chooses him) and has placed all in his hands. The structure of the logion points to an Aram. original (cf. Matt. 11:27; Lk. 10:22). The Fourth Evangelist interprets this authority (Jn. 5:22: judgment over all flesh; 5:26: to have life in himself; 12:49: the command as to what he should say; 17:11 f.: the name which God has given him). It is the authority (→ Might, art. *exousia*) of One who is commissioned and executes justice. Hence the Son can do nothing by himself but always looks at what the Father is doing (5:19; 7:18). His work is the execution of a commission from which he does not deviate in the least. The authority of the Father is, on the one hand, a once-for-all act in the past and, on the other hand, a continuous activity in the present; it is on the latter that the main emphasis lies. 6:40 expressly says that God's purpose is to draw men into an encounter with the Son and so to faith. Only thus is eschatological (i.e. blessed, perfect) life achieved.

Hence, it is inadvisable to interpret Jn. on the basis of the ideas of gnostic mythology (R. Bultmann, *The Gospel of John*, 1971, 42 ff.). Christ is not for the evangelist an intermediate being who is at the same time both a cosmological and a soteriological figure. Nevertheless, the evangelist does think in terms typical of the Hellenistic *kērygma.* Bultmann also holds that God himself is present in the Son as in his copy (op. cit., 165 n. 1; derivation of the Father-Son relationship from Platonic, Hermetic and gnostic elements). "Nevertheless this interpretation remains in the sphere of mythology, which John reinterprets in accordance with his idea of revelation: that is, that in Jesus we encounter God himself, his words are God's words" (165 ff. n. 3). On his existential interpretation, "whoever is directed to the Son can be sure of having for himself the Father who loves the Son, and can be sure of encountering in him the omnipotence of God himself" (165 f.). It is the work of the exalted

One that creates certainty and not the faith of man that is directed towards the exalted One.

Yet we must assume that Jn. was speaking in a Hellenistic world, where the consciousness of philosophers (Epictetus *Dissertationes* 1, 24, 6) and gnostics (Iren., *Haer.* 1, 17, 1 (ed. Harvey)) of having been sent played a significant part.

(b) In contrast, Jn. developed the early church's baptismal confession; he takes over the confession (Jn. 20:31; cf. Acts 8:37), "Jesus is the messiah, the Son of God" (cf. the addition in Jn. 11:27: "who comes into the world"). This baptismal confession is also in view, when Jn. speaks of "faith" in the name of the Son of God" (Jn. 1:12; 3:18). Part of faith is the deliberate saying of Jesus' name as a confession and a testimony. 1 Jn. 4:15 and 5:5 portray the same thing. The absolute use of "the Son" is typical of John; but he also uses it with the gen. (1 Jn. 1:3, 7: "his Son"), when speaking of God the Father and Jesus.

The old Sem. functional ideas (commissioning and obedience) are supplemented and supplanted in Jn. by a different structure of thought which we must call oriental (as opposed to western). This oriental way of thought is not theoretical and does not speak in terms of possession, but it is practical and direct and speaks in terms of a participation in being. The commissioning and obedience are still Jn.'s starting-point, but their fulfilment leads to sharing in → truth and → light. Can we say that already in Jn. the terminology is used "formally" and has "become a cipher" (E. Schweizer, *TDNT* VIII 387)?

(c) [I.H.M.] The title "Son of God" is clearly fundamental in John's christology, and is used to express a number of basic convictions about Jesus. (1) It expresses the metaphysical or essential relationship between Jesus and his Father. So close is the link between them that to deny the Son is to deny the Father (1 Jn. 2:22 f.). Father and Son belong inseparably to each other (Jn. 1:18; 5:23; 1 Jn. 1:3; 5:20). The Son is pre-existent (Jn. 3:17; 11:27; 1 Jn. 3:8; 4:9–14). He is God's "only" Son, a term which expresses the special love between the Father and Jesus. (2) The NT in general does not speculate on the origin of the Son, and the use of the terminology of Sonship is not meant to encourage such speculation, but to draw out the nature of the relationship between Jesus and God; this relationship is one of mutual love (Jn. 3:35; 5:20) and of filial obedience (Jn. 5:19). (3) The Son shares the functions of the Father, especially as the judge and the bringer of life (Jn. 5:17–30). (4) The Son mediates between God and men. He was given by the Father in order that men might be saved (Jn. 3:16). While in the world, he remains in constant communion with the Father (Jn. 1:18; 3:13; 8:29; 16:32) and is thus able to reveal the Father to men. The title "Son" expresses above all the fact that Jesus is the Saviour. It had "messianic" associations, and in 1 Jn. it is close in meaning to "messiah", but for John, Jesus is the Saviour particularly because of his metaphysical relationship with God (Jn. 11:41; 12:27 f.; 17:1). This is why he is so concerned to emphasize the real and lasting nature of the incarnation (2 Jn. 7–11). See C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, 1953, 250–262; R. Schnackenburg, *Das Johannesevangelium*, II, 1971, 150–163.

(d) The problem of the idea of "sons of God" in Sem. thought is identical with that of "children of God" (→ Child); it is only in the Hellenistic tradition that the distinction arises between the "Son" of doctrinal statements and the children who become such through → faith and → baptism (Jn. 1:12; 1 Jn. 3:1, 10). Apart from this

the Qumran antithesis between the "sons of light" and the "sons of darkness" also has a part to play in Johannine thought.

(i) Jn. 1:12 speaks of the "authority" to become God's children (*tekna theou*) and 1 Jn. 3:1 of the gift of the name of "child" ("we are called"). From this gift proceeds our "being" ("and such we are").

(ii) The authority or gift of childhood is understood as a "begetting of God" (Jn. 1:13; 3:3; 1 Jn. 2:29; 3:9 f.; 4:7; 5:1, 4, 18). This process is the product of the "Spirit" or the receiving of baptism ("water and Spirit", Jn. 3:5). Here we have a pre-Johannine tradition which is didactically developed in a certain way (1 Jn. 2:29: "who does righteousness").

(iii) This new "being" is meant to include a "being determined by . . ." and hence a process of separation from evil, a recognition of the obedience required by God in the face of the eschatological → righteousness ("who does righteousness").

R. Schnackenburg (*Die Johannesbriefe*, 1963², Excursus 8, 175–183) gives us the material concerning being a child of God and begetting by God and decides that "being a child of God is, however, nothing natural, but belongs to the supernatural, divine realm" (175). There may be some contact with the mysteries' idea of renewal and with gnostic texts. The gnostic is by nature a spiritual man (*physei pneumatikos*, of spiritual nature) and he is transformed by *gnōsis*, even if he dresses this up in a sacramental ritual. He recalls his spiritual nature that has been there all along (R. Reitzenstein, *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen*, 1927³, 53 ff.). On the other hand, Jn. does not think in terms of natural processes but starts from the uniqueness of the Spirit of God and God's power. The new being must be conceived eschatologically and not analogically (*pace* Schnackenburg).

R. Bultmann (*The Johannine Epistles*, *Hermeneia*, 1973, 45–47) compares 1 Jn. with Corp. Herm. XIII 14 and the process of the coming into being of essence (*ousiōdēs genesis*). We should not overlook its kinship with gnostic religion, but Jn. thinks of renewal as an eschatological event.

Probably the correlation of Jn. with Jewish thought goes a stage further (cf. F. Nötscher, *Zur theologischen Terminologie der Qumran-Texte*, 1956, 148: "Eternal life is a sort of participation in the divine life, since God or Christ are alone fully possessed of life and are thereby the sole bestowers of life"; Jn. 5:21; cf. 11:25; 14:6). But we should not think of this in the categories of "spiritualizing" and "internalizing", but in terms of a continuation of the eschatological perspective.

9. *The Son of God in Hebrews.* We meet the absolute use of the name "Son" in Hebrews (Heb. 1:2, 8; 3:6; 5:8; 7:28); this has been influenced by the old Palestinian and Jewish-Christian usage (the emphasis on the son's position in God's house, the son as heir). We also meet "Son of God" as an official rank where the early Christian baptismal confession has left its mark (4:14; 6:6; 7:3; 10:29). It is very reticent about God's position as Father (1:5; 12:7, 9); this rests on an old tradition. Older traditional material is discernible in Heb. 1:2 f. (cf. Col. 1:15–17), which belongs to the world of the Hellenistic community.

It is striking how the two statements are juxtaposed in Heb. 1:2: He is heir (→ Inheritance, art. *klēros* NT 2) of all and he is the mediator of creation. In Hellenistic Christianity, the "Son" of the Palestinian Jewish tradition was regarded as the "copy" of the invisible God (Col. 1:15 f.) and the features of Wisdom were attributed to him (cf. Wis. 7:25 f.). This juxtaposition of historical and metaphysical elements is

expressed in the fact that the historical process is described in the aorist (1:1 f., 3 f.) and the metaphysical in the present (1:3). Hence we have here deliberate statements about being.

10. *The Son of God in Revelation.* In Revelation the concept "Son of God" appears in Rev. 2:18. It is there Christ's name for himself; according to 2:23 he shares in God's activity of → judgment (art. *krima*) (cf. Jer. 17:10); he grants the believer a share in his dominion over the nations (with Rev. 2:26 f.; cf. Ps. 27:8 f.). It is significant that the authority of the "Son of God" is described in OT terms. This is the only instance of the title in Rev.

11. *The Trinitarian Formula.* The triadic confessional formula "Father, Son and Holy Spirit" in Matthew 28:19 recalls the absolute use of the name "Son". The formula is a brief summary of the saving event, of catechesis and of the authorization for the baptism of the nations. That it is an old one is shown by Did. 7:3 and Justin, *Apol.* I 61, 3. Matt. is associated with a practice of baptism that is concerned to show that it has the highest and completest authority for its activities.

Some scholars think that the shorter form in Eusebius, which omits the command to baptize with its triadic formula, is original: "Go and make all nations disciples in my name, teach them to hold fast all that I have commanded you" (*Hist. Eccl.* 3, 5, 2). The command to baptize in the triune name occurs, however, in Did. 7:1–3. Perhaps we should not overlook the influence of Isa. 42:1 on the original form of this text: "Behold my servant, whom I uphold, my chosen, in whom my soul delights; I have put my spirit upon him, he will bring forth justice to the nations" (on this whole passage see F. C. Conybeare, "The Eusebian Form of the Text Matt. 28:19", *ZNW* 2, 1901, 275–288; H. Kosmala, "The Conclusion of Matthew", *ASTI* 4, 1965, 132–147; G. R. Beasley-Murray, *Baptism in the New Testament*, 1962, 77–92).

The self-designation "the Son" is especially important amongst the christological statements because it traces back the call, the election and the claims of Jesus to God himself and thus authenticates them. *O. Michel*

υἱὸς Δαυίδ

υἱὸς Δαυίδ (*hyios Dauid*), Son of David.

OT 1. "Son of David" is a NT predicate of Jesus that has a long tradition behind it in the OT and in the traditions of Judaism. This tradition is not derived from a late theological reflection, but points back to a historical event that is connected with the person of → David.

(a) Nathan's promise in 2 Sam. 7:12–16 is fundamental: (1) the raising up of a successor to David from his offspring; (2) the confirmation of his "house" and kingdom for ever. It is the basis for Pss. 2:7; 89:4; 132:11 (covenant-making and oath). Yet we see here (cf. Pss. 110:1 f.; 45:7) how the promise to David, which is the one decisive point in the Israelite monarchy, is associated with all the characteristic features of that view of kingship that was common to the East; the king is a "child of God" and as his assistant shares in the divine dominion over the world. 2 Sam. 7:14 may have been inserted later.

(b) Some prophets also presuppose this promise made to David and give it a future interpretation in terms of eschatology and the messianic hope: Isa. 9:6(5) f. (peace, justice and righteousness are seen as the characteristic conditions brought by

the messianic salvation); 11:1 ff. (shoot from the stock of Jesse, bestowal of the Spirit of the Lord, judgment with the "rod of his mouth", righteousness and faithfulness as signs of his dominion). Just as God's Spirit once rested upon David, so the new ruler, a second David, will be equipped with the Spirit of Yahweh. His wisdom and understanding are stressed, and justice and righteousness are the consequences of the appearance of this king. The Israelite recollection of David and Solomon is not lost sight of, but the influence of oriental kingship ideology now shows itself. The emphasis is upon this eschatological hope of salvation which transcends all human standards. Jer. 23:5 expressly mentions the "righteous branch" of David who will act in wisdom, justice and righteousness (30:9; 33:15).

Ezek. 34:23 and 37:24 make use of the image of the shepherd for their prophetic description: "I will set over them only one shepherd, who will tend them, my servant David." Isa. 55:3 explicitly refers to the "eternal covenant" and the realization of the "inalienable gifts of grace" promised to David; thus it gives an answer full of promise to the nation's complaint that its history is no longer favoured by God's gracious care (Ps. 89). This "eternal covenant" is also the beginning of salvation for the nation. Zech. 3:8 and 6:12 promise the "Servant" and "Branch": "for under him it will shoot up, and he will build the temple of the Lord." Obviously the blessing of the "house of David" and the inhabitants of Jerusalem are joined together in this messianic material (Zech. 12:8, 10; 13:1).

(c) A messianic sense is clear in Gen. 49:9 f. ("lion of Judah") and Num. 24:17 ("star of Jacob"), yet there seems to be no connexion with the promise of the "kingdom of the son of David". It is important that Isa. 11:1–10 and Mic. 5 presuppose that Yahweh once more starts his messianic work anew; both prophets look to the family whence David came and expect a completely new start in place of the ruling descendants of David. "The fact that they so expressly look for salvation in the anointed one of the future is tantamount to saying that the contemporary descendants of David have lost their saving function so emphatically attributed to them in the royal psalms" (G. von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, II, 1965, 171).

2. Later Judaism also took up the promise of a son of David with modifications of it in all sorts of ways in order to enable it to put up with its political oppression and its distress through its relationship to God.

(a) In the Wisdom literature, Sir. 47:11 and 1 Macc. 2:57 allude to the permanency of the throne or the throne fixed for eternity. Pss. Sol. 17 uses "Son of David" as a fixed messianic term. In a period when the Hasmonaeans were making messianic claims for themselves and were appropriating the glory of the priesthood, the old Davidic promises were revived. This Pharisaic psalm goes back to the old messianic tradition (2 Sam. 7:14; Isa. 9:6; 11:1, 10; Ps. 2:9). It is a time of affliction: the one who offers this prayer directs his prayer to God and holds him to his promise. He expects a change in which the dominion of the Gentiles will be broken and the pollution of sinners will be done away with. The messiah's appearance marks the beginning of the gathering of a holy nation, a dominion over the Gentiles and the establishment of righteousness. This (political) psalm fits into the period in Jerusalem's history prior to 63 B.C. and discloses the viewpoint of the Pharisees at that time. Thus the "Son of David" is to renew the dominion of David but in the way in which the Pharisaic party think of the coming of the messianic age. What a → Pharisee expects is clear from v. 35 f. (32): "But he rules over them as a righteous

king, instructed by God, and in his days no injustice shall be done amongst them for they are all holy and their king is the Lord's Anointed."

(b) Although messianic claims could be made for men of non-Davidic origin, the rabbis not only emphasized the "king, the messiah", but also the "Son of David" (cf. the discussion in T. J. Ta'an. 4:68d:44; SB I 13).

(c) The Qumran sect expected three future persons who would bring salvation: a prophet (→ Elijah or → Moses), and, in addition to the Davidic messiah, a priestly one who seems to have had the first place in this trio. 4Qflor 1:7 ff. finds in the key words "house" and "sanctuary" and "rest" of 2 Sam. 7:11–14 a messianic connexion: it involves the promise of the "establishment" of the seed of David and of the "throne of his kingdom". God will be a father to him and he will be a son to God. "That is the shoot of David who will appear with the Interpreter of the Law" (1:11). Just afterwards the text of 4Qflor 1:12 refers to Amos 9:11 ("I will establish again the fallen booth of David"; cf. Acts 15:16). This is treated allegorically in CD 7:15: "the books of the Law are the booth". 4Qpatr 1–4 confirms the connexion (2 Sam. 7:14 is interpreted with the aid of Gen. 49:10): as long as Israel has dominion none will be cut off who is enthroned over it, who belongs to the house of David. "For the staff of the king is the covenant of the king's rule"; "until the Anointed One of righteousness comes, the shoot of David" (cf. Jer. 23:5; 33:15; 4Qflor 1:11). The style is reminiscent of the Psalms (e.g. Ps. 89: God's covenant and oath to David, his elect one). 4QpIsa[a] quotes Isa. 11:1–4 and interprets this messianic passage of the Davidic ruler of the end-time. CD 7:18–20 refers to Num. 24:17 and interprets the sceptre of the "prince of the whole community" and the star of the "Interpreter of the Law". Likewise 1QM 11:6 and 4Qtest 12 refer back to Num. 24:17. The sceptre is again an allusion to the Davidic prince. 1QSb 5:20 ff. contains a series of benedictions that are based upon OT promises (Isa. 11:2 ff.; Mic. 4:13; 7:10; Gen. 49:9). Here the functions of the messiah are indicated with the help of the OT quotations; they include the "establishment of the nation's dominion". Hence, we can see in the Qumran literature a similar messianic tradition to that of the Psalms of Solomon (cf. 2 Sam. 7:12–16; Isa. 11:1–5).

This shows both the points of contact and the differences in relation to the NT: Qumran held different messianic expectations (and speaks of the anointed ones of Aaron and Israel), but early Christianity traced certain messianic features in the person of Jesus; these were, however, controversial and constantly took on new forms. Hence the messianic elements are formed into a christology. Test. Jud. 24:4–6 connects the shoot and the sceptre of the kingdom of Isa. 11:1 and Gen. 49:10; the promise here has a universal ring. 2 Esd. 12:31 mentions the "lion", which, it is pointed out in v. 22, is the "Anointed" (→ Jesus Christ, art. *Christos* οτ) of the line of David (Gen. 49:9). He will call men to account and will redeem the survivors of the nation. It is particularly stressed that the Most High "keeps" the messiah till the end of days.

(d) The literature of prayers has an important place here. God is called upon to have mercy on the kingdom of the house of David (Eighteen Benedictions, Petition 14), or to intervene on behalf of the shoot of David (Petition 15, Bab. recension). The rabbinic tradition speaks of the "Son of man" as messiah (T. J. Ta'an. 4:68d:44; cf. SB I 13) and of the coming "David" or the coming "Servant of David" (Tg. Ezek. 34:23 f.; cf. SB II 337). These formulations are culled straight from the OT promises

or the literature of prayers. They often presuppose the ruin of the nation and the world, the decline of religion and morality.

(e) [I.H.M.] It is possible that the title "Son of David" was understood particularly in terms of the character of Solomon who had a reputation for wisdom and even for power over evil spirits (Josephus, *Ant.* 8, 44–49; Testament of Solomon). The evidence is sparse, but it would certainly explain why the title "Son of David" is connected with exorcisms and healings in the Gospels (K. Berger, *NTS* 20, 1973–74, 3–9).

NT On a number of occasions, the NT presupposes that Jesus of Nazareth belongs genealogically to the line of David and that this descent from David was a messianic element in his history.

1. The credal formulae of Rom. 1:3–4 and 2 Tim. 2:8 presuppose that descent from David (a messianic element) and divine sonship, based on his resurrection from the dead (enthronement), are two stages in an old christology.

In Rom. 1:3–4, Paul quotes a confession handed down to him from the Palestinian community: the gospel concerns the "Son" (Mk. 1:11; 9:7) who was descended from the seed of David according to the flesh, but who has been installed as "Son of God" in power according to the Spirit of holiness through the resurrection from the dead. Here are described two consecutive episodes in Jesus' history according to God's plan of salvation: on earth he appears as the "Son of David" and so his destiny is indicated; by the resurrection, on the other hand, he is enthroned as the heavenly messiah in accordance with Ps. 110:1. Attention is centred on his messiahship and divine sonship and these are defined with reference to the resurrection. Sonship of David carries within itself a historical reference, but at the same time it points away to the expectation of the messianic hope (cf. *hyios tou Theou* NT 7 (c)).

2. The speeches in Acts distinguish between David who died and the "Holy One" who has been raised from the dead and who does not see corruption (Acts 2:27; 13:37, quoting Ps. 16:20). The quotation from Amos 9:11 f. in Acts 15:16 f. refers to the establishment of the booth of David and a new era of salvation for the → remnant of Israel (LXX or testimony tradition). The original promise (cf. CD 7:16; 4Qflor 1:12 f.) seems to have been refashioned in a Hellenistic way in conformity with Lk.'s concept of salvation. The promise of the "Son of David" is certainly presupposed, but it is not explicitly mentioned.

3. (a) The structure of Mark's Gospel corresponds to the confession of Rom. 1:3–4: the messiah (i.e. Son of David) is the "Son of God" to whom the evangelist bears witness. Mk. 12:35–37 (par. Matt. 22:41–46, Lk. 20:41–44) records a discussion which raises the question of the relation of the "Son of David" to "David's Lord" (according to Ps. 110:1; → Lord, art. *kyrios* NT 3 (b)). The answer is in accord with the later confession of Rom. 1:3–4: the "Son of David" must be exalted. That Mk. confirms that Jesus is a son of David is shown by the mode of address in Mk. 10:48 ([I.H.M.] cf. Test. Sol. 20:1).

[I.H.M.] The pericope is frequently regarded as a creation of the early church, even as a means of defending the claims of a Jesus who was not a lineal descendant of David to be the messiah. But there is no evidence that the Davidic descent of Jesus was ever doubted. The question is presented in a way which avoids explicitly identifying Jesus as the Son of David – which fits in with Jesus' careful avoidance of titles

that might be misunderstood. It juxtaposes two apparently conflicting statements based on Scripture and asks how they are to be reconciled. The messiah can be both a descendant of David and David's lord by virtue of his exaltation; the messiah is not merely a descendant of David but also the Son of God (cf. 2 Sam. 7:12–16), or possibly the Son of man. The objections to the authenticity of the saying are unconvincing (cf. I. H. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 1978, on 20:41–44).

(b) Matthew gives especial weight to Jesus' Davidic descent and heightens the way in which he is thus addressed and acclaimed (9:27; 12:23; 15:22; 20:30; 21:9, 15; 22:42, 45). A comparison with the text of Mk. shows the particularly strong echoes of salvation history in this emphasis on the descent from David ([Tr.] which appears in the stories of healing and of the messianic entry into Jerusalem). In the preface Jesus is described as "messiah" (*Christos*), "son of David" and "son of Abraham" (1:1); this indicates that his origin, and also his position in salvation history, is a theme of the whole book.

In Matt. 1:20 Joseph too, the father of Jesus, "Mary's husband" (1:16), is called "son of David"; this shows that the genealogical sense of the phrase has not been relinquished. In Judaism it had above all a legal significance: recognition by the father determined the succession (SB I 35). The degree to which this genealogy set forth Jesus' claim to a place in salvation history is shown by the structure of the family tree with its 3 groups of 14 members; in 1 Chr. 2:1 ff. and Ruth 4:18 ff. fourteen names are listed between Abraham and David. Matt. deliberately fits Jesus' messianic status into Israel's history and thereby emphazises his claims.

(c) It is significant that the Lucan birth-narrative presupposes our tradition of Jesus' Davidic sonship ("house of David", 1:27, 69; "city of David", 2:4, 11; "throne of David", 1:32), but only cautiously implies it (2:11). That Luke admits it genealogically is clear from the family tree (3:31). It is striking how Jesus is acclaimed as "King" by the lips of the Jewish people (19:38; 23:2): this draws out the full implications of the motif of Davidic sonship (cf. Jn. 12:13). It is easy to discern how Lk. wrestles with a particular body of Jewish material.

4. The Johannine tradition puts Jewish messianic questions to the tradition about Jesus: (a) when the messiah comes no one will know whence he comes (Jn. 7:27); (b) the messiah is of the line of David, from → Bethlehem, David's home (7:42). These objections levelled by Judaism can appeal to the OT (origins in Bethlehem) or given tradition (hiddenness of the messiah: 2 Esd. 7:28; 13:25, Syr. Bar. 29:3). It is not that the tradition is false, for it corresponds to statements which are also possible within the tradition about Jesus; but the evangelist is aware of a fact that is not within the scope of the tradition; the statements of the tradition cannot adequately accommodate the Christ whom he confesses. The title of honour "Son of David" does not occur in the Fourth Gospel in so many words; the confession of Jewish Christianity rather refers to the "king of Israel" (Jn. 1:49; 12:13; 19:19; cf. the interpretation in 18:37).

There is an archaic ring about Rev. 5:5 (cf. Gen. 49:9 f.; Isa. 11:1, 10) and Rev. 22:16 (cf. Isa. 11:1, 10; Num. 24:17), which is reminiscent of the messiah *ben Dāwîḏ* of the OT and the Qumran tradition. ([I.H.M.] Cf. Rev. 3:7 where Christ holds the key of David (Isa. 22:22) which controls entry to the heavenly banqueting hall; → Open, art. *kleis*.) The Jewish-Christian tradition has here been worked into the Johannine Christology.

5. [I.H.M.] The title "Son of David" thus sums up the NT confession of Jesus as a descendant of David who fulfils the promise of the coming of an anointed king, and who is the glorious antitype of both David and his son, Solomon. This messianic hope is fulfilled in Jesus' birth as the adopted son of Joseph at Bethlehem, in his works of mercy and healing, and in his entry to Jerusalem. Although the title is inadequate to convey the high status of the One who is David's (and everyman's) Lord, nevertheless it remains a fitting title for the exalted Son of God in whose possession is the key to the heavenly banquet.

6. In the patristic tradition, things are complicated by the interplay of later christological controversies. Ignatius is fond of citing the confession of Jesus as being of the seed or race of David (Ign., *Smy.* 1:1; *Rom.* 7:3; *Eph.* 18:2; 20:2; *Trall.* 9:1). He is here interested in a real man as opposed to docetism. On the other hand, Barn. 12:10 understands the Synoptic question about the relation of "David's Son" and "David's Lord" (Matt. 22:42–44) in a negative way; the passage of scripture means to say expressly that Jesus is not David's son, but his Lord. The Epistle is not dispensing with Jesus' humanity, but is opposing a Jewish-Christian view that regarded him as a "man born of men" (Justin, *Dial.* 47 ff.). Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 3, 19–20, 8; 3, 32, 3 ff., tells of the members of Jesus' family who, because of their membership of the house of David, are placed in serious jeopardy in the reign of Domitian. Hegesippus (quoted by Eusebius) says: "But there still survived of the family of the Lord the grandsons of Jude, his brother after the flesh, as he was called. They were informed against as being of the family of David." The old genealogical problem did not die out in the church; Hegesippus' account can hardly be doubted. *O. Michel*

The Genealogies of Jesus Christ

In the only comprehensive study of the subject of biblical genealogies, M. D. Johnson concludes that the genealogical form could be used as an alternative to narrative or poetic forms of expression as one of several methods of writing history and of conveying the theological and nationalistic concerns of a people (*The Purpose of Biblical Genealogies, with Special Reference to the Setting of the Genealogies of Jesus, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series* 8, 1969).

Old Testament. In the OT the following functions are suggested (*art. cit.*, 77–82):

1. To demonstrate existing relations between Israel and neighbouring tribes by tracing them back to common patronyms, thus establishing a degree of kinship and at the same time a degree of distinction between Israel and her neighbours.

2. To interrelate previously isolated elements concerning Israelite origins by the creation of a coherent and inclusive genealogical system.

3. To establish (by 2) continuity over those periods of time not covered by material in the tradition.

4. To serve as the vehicle for chronological speculation concerning the "Great Year" or world cycles; e.g. Gen. 5, to establish a date for the Flood; Gen. 11, the birth of Abraham; others, the date of the exodus.

5. To demonstrate the legitimacy of an individual in his office or to provide someone of rank with connexions to a worthy family or an individual of the past. This legitimacy principle appears to have been crucial with regard to cultic functions,

especially priesthood. Otherwise genealogies serve to identify and enhance the status of an individual.

6. In Ezra-Nehemiah (only) genealogies are important to establish and preserve the homogeneity of the race, a concern for the purity of "the holy seed" (Ezr. 9:2), taken up and strengthened in the rabbinic tradition.

7. To assert the importance of the principle of the continuity of the people of God through a period of national disruption; e.g. that the post-exilic Israel of the restoration is identical with the Israel of the monarchy, sharing its promises and its cultus.

8. To divide history into epochs, and demonstrate the meaningful outworking of the predetermined plan of God for history – the most frequent use of the genealogical form in the priestly writings.

Later Judaism. Old Testament interest in genealogical speculation continued on two levels. First, the concern expressed within rabbinic writings for individual legitimacy by a genealogical stratification of society, a concern which appears in both the earliest halakoth and the later midrashim with the same character and intensity. But genealogical records were not readily available to individual families within Judaism, with the important exception of the priesthood. This led to the need to use oral traditions and also midrashic exegesis to carry on genealogical investigation and speculation.

Secondly, the rise of messianic expectation has, as one corollary, the debates on the ancestry of the messiah, debates which may reflect the views of different parties within Judaism. In first-century Judaism there is not only the more general expectation of a messiah from the line of David. There is also a well supported opinion that the messiah is to come from the line of Aaron. The two genealogies of Jesus, in different ways, reveal a knowledge of such rabbinic discussion on the ancestry of the messiah and are written on the basis of the same midrashic methodology.

New Testament. It has usually been assumed that, if the Matthean and Lucan genealogies of Jesus are to have a legitimate place in the Gospel tradition, they must be evaluated from the point of view of historical reliability (Johnson, 140 ff.). Consequently, since the early church, scholars have discussed the differences between Matt. 1:1–17 and Lk. 3:23–38. The assumption, that both lists are intended to preserve historically accurate information, necessitates complicated and creative attempts at harmonization involving a number of problems:

1. From David to the exile, Matthew traces the line of descent through the royalty of Judah, while in Luke the line passes through Nathan, son of David.

2. The two lists meet again in Zerubbabel and Shealtiel.

3. After Shealtiel, the two lists are composed of different and otherwise unknown names, until the two lines come together again in Joseph.

4. The number of names from Solomon to the exile is 14 in Matthew, and 20 in Luke (Nathan to Neri); from the exile to Jesus, Matthew has 13 names, Luke 21.

5. Four women are included in Matthew.

6. Matthew has a 3 x 14 scheme of names.

7. Matthew's order descends, but Luke's ascends.

8. Matthew omits names prior to Abraham.

9. Matthew uses the formula "A *egennēsen* B"; Luke has *tou* + genitive.

10. Minor variations occur in orthography and form of names.

Harmonizing attempts have usually been made in one of three ways:

1. Both genealogies are Joseph's, but Matthew traces the biological ancestry, Luke the legal. Julius Africanus, *c.* A.D. 220 (Euseb., *HE* 1.7), is the first to have proposed levirate marriages to account for the differences. The theory runs: Matthan, grandfather of Joseph in Matthew's list, married Estha and begat Jacob. After the death of Matthan, Melchi (unrelated to Matthan), grandfather of Joseph in Luke's list, married Estha and begat Eli; hence Jacob and Eli were half-brothers. Eli died without children. Jacob married the widow in a levirate marriage and begat Joseph. Thus Matthew gives the physical ancestry of Joseph, Luke the legal. The artificiality of the reconstruction makes the hypothesis unconvincing.

2. Some modern scholars (including Westcott, Moffatt, Vincent Taylor) have reversed the first theory: Matthew gives the legal line of succession and Luke the natural descent. This at least recognizes the evident artificiality of Matthew's list. In its extreme form (P. Gaechter, *Das Matthäus Evangelium*, 1963, 30 f.), Matthew gives the legal line of throne succession, explicit prior to the exile, and becoming a "secret royal line" of descent between Zerubbabel and Joseph, while Luke provides the line of blood-relationship. At certain points in Matthew's list, *egennēsen* can mean adopted rather than begat. Thus Jeconiah, irrevocably condemned to childlessness in Jer. 22:24–30, adopted Shealtiel, actual son of Neri, descendant of David through Nathan. Matthew, after Zerubbabel, followed the supposed secret kings' line until it reached Jacob, who was without heir and did precisely what Jeconiah had done, viz. "appointed" Joseph, son of Eli from another Zerubbabel line, as his descendant, communicating to him the tradition of the continuation of the secret royal line from which the messiah would arise. But the whole suggestion is without the support of evidence and is no more satisfactory than the first theory. E. L. Abel points out some problems. 1. The same explanation of levirate marriage must be invoked to account for Shealtiel's two different fathers (Matt. 1:12; Lk. 3:27). 2. There is no reason why Estha should have been compelled to marry again since she already had a son. 3. It is questionable whether the levirate custom also applied to half-brothers (*NTS* 20, 1973–4, 203).

3. Annius of Viterbo (*c.* 1490) and Luther were the first to propose that Matthew gives Joseph's ancestry and Luke Mary's. This suggestion is based on a strained exegesis of Lk. 3:23, punctuating the verse to read "being the son, supposedly of Joseph (but actually) of Eli, son of Matthat, son of Levi". Eli is then assumed to be the grandfather of Mary and the whole list to be her pedigree (F. Godet, *A Commentary on the Gospel of St Luke*, 1878, I 127–30). It was not a Jewish custom to trace one's ancestry on the maternal side, so no such record would have been kept for Mary (Abel, 203).

Johnson (op. cit., 145) considers that none of these attempts is satisfactory. Each one is based on the assumption that the function of the genealogies was to preserve historical accuracy, whereas before and after the NT period that function was governed by midrashic speculation. The genealogy in Matthew finds its most natural setting in the genealogical and messianic speculation of Judaism, as preserved in the intertestamental and rabbinic literature. This is to be seen in both the details of the text of Matt. 1:1–17 and in its overall design. Moreover, the motifs and function of the genealogy find parallels in the narrative.

The opening words of Matt. 1, "The book of the genealogy (*biblos geneseōs*) of Jesus Christ", are usually interpreted as the title to the genealogical table which follows in vv. 2–16, but something more may be implied. On the only two occasions in the LXX where the phrase *biblos geneseōs* appears (Gen. 2:4, 5:1), it does not merely introduce a genealogy, but also mentions the process of the creation of the universe or of man. It is therefore possible that the use of this phrase at the beginning of Matthew's Gospel deliberately suggests that the advent of Jesus inaugurates a "new creation", or at least a new era for humanity and the world (D. Hill, *The Gospel of Matthew*, 1972, 74 f.).

Abraham and David are singled out as pivotal points in the genealogical development of the ancestry of Jesus. The two names are in the mainstream of Jewish messianism in both intertestamental and rabbinic literature, as well as of Christian messianism. Son of David emphasizes the royal messiahship (Pss. Sol. 17:21), while son of Abraham, which is also a messianic title (Test. Lev. 8:15), stresses Jesus' origin within the Jewish nation and faith: he is the true seed of Abraham in whom the promises of God are fulfilled. Luke takes the ancestry of Jesus back to Adam, thus pointing to his descent from the universal father of mankind; Matthew goes back no further than to the father of the Israelites (Hill, op. cit., 75).

The inclusion of the four women in Matthew's genealogy reveals the writer's knowledge of rabbinic speculation on the ancestry of the messiah. Women rarely occur in Jewish genealogies, and only when an irregularity of descent is involved or when there is something noteworthy about the woman's name (SB I 15). In OT genealogies, women are usually mentioned in order to distinguish among different families or individuals who were traditionally traced to the same figure in the past. Matthew's choice is remarkable in that it includes two harlots (Tamar, Rahab), and an adulteress (Bathsheba); and probably all four women were, as contemporary tradition held, of Gentile stock. The OT itself is specific about Ruth (1:4) and Rahab (Jos. 4), while "wife of Uriah" (Matt. 1:6) serves as a reminder that Bathsheba's husband was a Hittite. No OT basis exists for Rahab as mother of Boaz. This identification appears to reflect Jewish midrash tradition, which drew parallels between Rahab and Ruth, Tamar and Ruth, and Tamar and Rahab (Sifre Num. 10:29; Ruth R. 2:1, 4; Megillah 10b, 14b). In focusing upon Tamar, Rahab, and Ruth, and stating that Rahab was the mother of Boaz, the author of Matthew's genealogy displays a familiarity with the midrash.

Johnson comments on the main suggestions put forward to explain the presence of the four women (op. cit., 154 ff.).

1. They foreshadow Jesus' concern in Matthew for sinners and Gentiles; but the reason for doing this through blemishes in the messianic genealogy is obscure. 2. The women demonstrate how God can use even the humble and despised and sinful to accomplish his purpose. 3. The women are in some sense types of Mary; e.g. their unexpected intrusion is in anticipation of Mary's sudden introduction in Matt. 1:18 ff. But it is difficult to understand how women associated with immorality and Gentile ancestry can serve as parallels to Mary. 4. Matthew is consciously refuting or mitigating attacks on the legitimacy of Jesus' birth by pointing to blemishes in the biblical pedigree of David and his line. But the so-called refutation is of such a nature as to encourage calumny, for an opponent of Christian messianism could claim the case of Mary as a parallel to the four women with their blemishes. More probably it

was the genealogy and the birth narratives that prompted the calumnies. The conclusive argument against this approach is that Jewish tradition exonerated each of the four women, and pictured at least Rahab and Ruth as exemplars of conversion and faith. 5. Johnson himself concludes that Matthew's inclusion of the four women was to show that in every respect messianic categories fulfilled in Jesus were precisely those Pharisaic elements which were present in first-century Judaism (op. cit., 178, 209). The four women had come to occupy a place in rabbinic tradition to support the ancestry of a Davidic messiah, against those who maintained the expectation of a Levitical messiah. The genealogy is essentially midrashic in character. It is an interpretation of the structure and goal of history, tied to the details of Scripture, yet incorporating extra-biblical information – such as the inclusion of Rahab in the genealogy of David. To counter the Christian claim that Jesus was the Davidic messiah, the rabbis could not criticize the genealogy in Matthew, either in its structure or in its details, which were dependent on biblical data and Pharisaic tradition, but could only point to the irregularity of Jesus' birth and apply to him the scandal associated with an affair of a Jewish maiden with a Roman soldier who lived at a time far earlier than the birth of Jesus (M. Goguel, *Jesus and the Origins of Christianity*, ET 1960, I 74).

Johnson (op. cit., 210 ff.) supports the view of A. Vögtle (*BZ* 9, 1965, 48) that the Matthean genealogy is the product of a unified conception rather than a reworking of an existing list, and reveals similarities with the rest of the Gospel in matters of form, language, and theology. He draws attention to:

1. *Numerical structure.* Matthew's predilection for threes and sevens is frequently displayed, e.g. three temptations (4:1–11), three illustrations of righteousness (6:1–18), three miracles of healing (8:1–15), a threefold "fear not" (10:26, 28, 31), three questions (22:15–40), three prayers in Gethsemane (26:39–44). (An extensive list is in W. C. Allen, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St Matthew*, 1907, lxv.) An emphasis on the number seven occurs in 12:45 (demons), 15:34 (loaves), 15:37 (baskets), 18:21 f. (forgiveness), 22:35 (brothers), ch. 23 (woes). The arrangement of the genealogy into 3 x 14 or 3 x 7 x 2 seems entirely congruous. The evangelist emphasizes the form of the genealogy (1:17) because he intends it as a survey to underscore the predetermined character of the coming of Jesus as the Davidic messiah in three stages: the three groups of names show respectively the origin of David's house, its fall at the captivity, and its restoration in the Christ. It is possible that this artificial arrangement into three sections is to be connected with the name David, the three Heb. consonants of which (*d*, *w*, *d*) have a numerical value (by *gematria*) of 14 ($d = 4$, $w = 6$). As well as providing an aid to memory, this schematization would strengthen the already clear emphasis upon the Davidic character of Jesus (D. Hill, *The Gospel of Matthew*, 1972, 74). E. J. Goodspeed (*Matthew, Apostle and Evangelist*, 1959, 25) suggests that Matthew's pattern of 3 x 14 is to exhibit Jesus as the beginning of the seventh seven since Abraham, thus representing the climax of history. This numerical interest may also mark the author as Matthew the tax collector, the man of figures.

2. *Language.* Both Matthew's genealogy and the rest of his Gospel reveal the influence of the Gk. OT, a definite Jewish element, and a knowledge of rabbinic theology. In common with other NT writers, the evangelist usually turns to the LXX for OT references (the fulfilment-formula quotations, such as 1:22; 2:15; 4:14, are an

exception). Certainly Matthew uses the LXX for the genealogical names, e.g. Matt. 1:2 quotes 1 Chr. 1:34 as Jacob (LXX), not Israel (Heb.).

3. *Theology.* (a) Son of David. The opening verse of Matthew's Gospel introduces the genealogy with the claim that Jesus is *hyios Dauid*, son of David. The phrase is repeated nine times in the rest of the Gospel, usually in material peculiar to Matthew, and not elsewhere in the Synoptics apart from Marcan and Lucan parallels to Matt. 20:30 f. and 22:42, 45. The application of the title son of David to Joseph (1:20) serves to connect the birth pericope to the genealogy: Jesus is son of David because Joseph is son of David. Of all four Gospels, it is Matthew's which most clearly interprets the significance of Jesus along the lines of the Pharisaic conception of the Davidic messiah (see J. M. Gibbs, "Purpose and Pattern in Matthew's Use of the title 'Son of David' ", *NTS* 10, 1963–4, 446–64).

(b) Eschatology. The distinctive mark of the genealogy, in structuring history into three epochs culminating in the dawn of the messianic age in Jesus, is reflected in the Gospel as a whole. First, Elijah, the prophet of the end-times, has already come in the person of John the Baptist (Matt. 17:12 f.). John occupies a position at the beginning of the end-times, yet one distinct from the time of Jesus. Secondly, the ministry of Jesus is clearly seen to be a decisive event of eschatological history (e.g. 4:16, 12:6, 41 f.), though Matthew distinguishes between the dawn of the messianic age and the future age to come (12:32, a distinction not made in Mk. 3:29 or Lk. 12:10). Thirdly, Matthew stresses the future appearance of Jesus as the Son of man presiding over the final judgment (13:39 f., 49; 24:3). Johnson (op. cit., 222) quotes the suggestion of K. Stendahl (*Peake's Commentary on the Bible*, 1962, 770 f.) that Matthew counts the messiah (*Christos*, 1:16) as the fourteenth member, while Jesus is the thirteenth. "Christ" would then refer to Jesus in his risen state and/or at his coming (*parousia*) at the end of time, in the sense in which the futuristic eschatology of the early church could include a prayer that God would "send the Christ appointed for you, Jesus, whom heaven must receive until the time for establishing all that God spoke by the mouth of his holy prophets from of old" (Acts 3:20; cf. 2:36).

By comparison with Matthew, Luke in his genealogy has simply a continuous list of names, without grouping or elaboration (apart from 3:23). After the time of David a number of names are repeated: variations of Mattathias (five times), Jesus, Levi, and Melchi (twice each), Joseph (thrice), and Simeon/Simein. The general use of the names of the twelve patriarchs of Israel as personal names cannot be traced before post-exilic times, and was not common among the Jews until the Ptolemaic and Roman periods (Johnson, op. cit., 229 f.). This reflects the growing interest in family trees, particularly in post-exilic times when families of pure race proclaimed their membership of true Israel and their separation from those who had intermarried with Gentiles (Ezr. 9) by using tribal surnames (J. Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus*, 1967, 275).

The fact that Luke inserts his genealogy into a Marcan framework, i.e. between Jesus' baptism and temptation, suggests that he has a theological purpose in mind. The function of Luke's genealogy may be explained in several ways.

1. *Apocalyptic.* The 77 names are seen by K. Bornhäuser (*Die Geburts- und Kindheitsgeschichte Jesu*, 1930, 20–22) as eleven world-weeks, at the end of which the messianic week begins, a parallel with some apocalyptic reconstructions of history (SB IV 986 f.). This view would be contrary to H. Conzelmann's influential

work on *The Theology of St Luke*, 1960 (*Die Mitte der Zeit*, 1954), in which he argues that in Luke the apocalyptic fulfilment in the parousia is separated from the time of Jesus' ministry by the (indeterminate) period of the church, and that in interpreting the significance of Jesus' ministry, Luke excluded apocalyptic categories (Johnson, op. cit., 233). But Conzelmann's thesis has not gone unchallenged. "Conzelmann's mistake is that he has made a distinction between the ministry of Jesus, which (in his view) Luke has de-eschatologized, and the future time of the End. It is more correct to say that Luke has broadened out the time of the End so that it begins with the ministry of Jesus, includes the time of the church, and is consummated at the parousia. Luke has not pushed the End into the distant future; he has lengthened it to include the whole era of salvation from the time of Jesus onwards" (I. H. Marshall, *Luke: Historian and Theologian*, 1970, 121).

2. *Christ as the Second Adam.* A typological relationship of Jesus to Adam is seen in the fact that Luke leads the genealogy back not to Abraham (as Matthew) but to Adam, son of God, thus illustrating Luke's general concern to portray the universal character of Jesus' ministry (W. Manson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 1930, 35). But a veiled allusion of this nature in Luke's genealogy seems unlikely since the (Pauline) motif of Christ as the second Adam is nowhere explicit in Luke/Acts. Luke's genealogy in fact ends not with Adam but with God, and any typological significance is more likely to be of Jesus as Son of God (Johnson, op. cit., 235).

3. *Jesus as Son of God.* The position of the genealogy between the baptism and the temptation finds significance in the linking motif of Jesus as Son of God (3:22, 38; 4:3, 9). Moreover, the Lucan genealogy runs *backwards* from Jesus to God, which is without parallel in OT or rabbinic texts for a genealogy. "Thus it is not impossible that Luke saw in the genealogy one way of understanding the ascription of the Son of God title to Jesus: Jesus is Son of God not through the categories of preexistence or physical (or metaphysical) relationship between Father and Son, but through the line of OT patriarchs and post-biblical historical figures. In this way, Luke historicizes the title, emphasizing the continuity of the Son with the OT and with Judaism" (Johnson, op. cit., 237 f.).

4. *Jesus as Prophet.* Rather than listing the royal succession from David to the exile, as does Matthew, Luke proceeds from David to his third son born in Jerusalem, Nathan (2 Sam. 5:14), and from him through a series of unknown names up to Shealtiel and Zerubbabel, and thence through more unknown names to Joseph. In certain Jewish circles David's son Nathan was identified with the prophet of the same name (Tg. Zech. 12:12, Codex Reuchlinianus). If Luke was aware of the tradition, this may be the reason why he deviates from Matthew's genealogy: it was to bring out the prophetic element. Luke/Acts constantly emphasizes the rôle of prophecy in references to the OT, in Jesus' ministry, and in the mission of the church (Johnson, op. cit., 240–52). Not that Matthew is unaware of the prophetic strand. For "Abijah the father of Asa" (Matt. 1:7) the better reading is "Asaph", although king Asa is undoubtedly meant. In Matt. 1:10 "Amos" is read, where we should expect "Amon". J. Schniewind (*Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*, 1956, 10) thinks that the changes are deliberate and designed to recall the psalmist (Pss. 73:1; 75:1) and the prophet. If so, then Matthew's genealogy contains in a cryptic form the idea of the fulfilment of prophecy and the hopes of the Psalmist (Hill, op. cit., 75 f.).

5. *The Beginning of Jesus' Ministry.* In Luke 1:23 the person of Jesus is given

prominence in the use of the pronoun *autos*, he, which opens the sentence, by the addition of the name Jesus, and by the verb *ēn*, was, which separates pronoun from substantive and sets both in relief: "and himself was, he, Jesus. . .". Luke indicates this as the moment when Jesus formally comes forward to commence his proper work. With the baptism, the obscurity in which he has so far lived passes. Jesus is now detached from those who have hitherto surrounded him, i.e. Mary, Joseph, the Baptist. The genealogy of Moses is similarly placed (Exod. 6:14 ff.), not at the opening of his biography but at the moment when he appears on the stage of history as he presents himself before Pharaoh (F. Godet, *A Commentary on the Gospel of St Luke*, 1878, I, 196). *N. Hillyer*

The Virgin Birth

The term virgin birth is commonly used as the equivalent of virginal conception, but a strong tradition in the Roman Catholic Church holds that Jesus was not only conceived but actually born miraculously, leaving Mary still a *virgo intacta.* This idea first appears in the *Protevangelium of James* (probably late 2nd cent.), and thereafter emerges in various writers, e.g. John of Damascus (*De Fide Orthodoxa* 4, 15) and Bernard (*Sermo de Virginis Nativitate* 4). Aquinas writes, "Christ came out of the closed womb of his mother, and so there was no violence of the opening of passages" (*Summa Theologiae* III Q35, art. 6). This theory is accepted by E. C. Messenger as a proper doctrine of the church (*The Mystery of Sex and Marriage* II, 1948, 100 ff.). The doctrine honours the idea of the perpetual virginity of the Blessed Virgin Mary, but it encounters difficulty in Luke's deliberate quotation of "every male that *opens* the womb . . ." (Lk. 2:23; cf. Exod. 13:2, 12).

This article is concerned with the virginal conception, which issued in the birth without any human intercourse (Matt. 1:25).

1. *Survey of Sources.* (a) There are two obviously independent records of the conception of Jesus Christ, and both say that he was conceived miraculously through the agency of the Holy Spirit without male parentage (Matt. 1:20; Lk. 1:35). In Matt.'s account Joseph finds that, although betrothed to him, Mary is already pregnant. He knows that he is not the father of the child and resolves to dissolve the relationship quietly (Matt. 1:19; cf. Deut. 24:1–14; → Divorce). "But as he considered this, an angel of the Lord appeared to him in a dream, saying 'Joseph, son of David, do not fear to take Mary your wife, for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Spirit' " (Matt. 1:20). In Lk.'s account the angel Gabriel tells Mary of the favour of the Lord in granting her a son who will be called Jesus. In reply to Mary's question, "How can this be, since I have no husband?" (Lk. 1:34), the angel says, "The Holy Spirit of the Most High will overshadow you; therefore the child to be born will be called holy, the Son of God" (Lk. 1:35; → Shadow, art. *skia* NT 2). There is no alternative story in the NT, but there are other passages which make most sense if the writers knew of the virgin birth.

(b) Mark begins his Gospel where early preaching normally began, namely with the witness of John the Baptist (cf. Acts 1:22; 10:36 ff; 13:24). When, however, he gives the comments of the people in Mk. 6:3, he quotes these as, "Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary?" By contrast, Matthew (13:55) and Luke (4:22), who had

already recorded the virgin birth, have respectively, "Is not this the carpenter's son?" and "Is not this Joseph's son?"

(c) John writes of Jesus Christ as the eternal Son. He also begins with John the Baptist, yet later indicates that there were discreditable rumours about the birth of Jesus, when in Jn. 8:41 the Jews attack him with the words, "We [emphatic] were not born of fornication". There is also the unexpected alternative reading of John 1:13, which changes the plur. into sing.: ". . . who believe on the name of him who was born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, but of God." This reading rests on one Latin MS, the Verona Codex, but it was accepted by Tertullian (*De Carne Christi*, 19 and 24, where he treats the plur. reading as a forgery), Justin (*Apol. I.* 22, 2), and Irenaeus (*Haer.* 3, 16, 2). The *Epistula Apostolorum* (probably early 2nd cent.), says of Jesus Christ, "born, not by carnal lust, but by the will of God", which, as B. H. Streeter says, "seems to imply the famous Western reading of Jn. i. 13" (*The Four Gospels*, 1924, 70), which "makes John assert the Virgin Birth" (op. cit., 268 n. 1). The reading is strongly defended by Douglas Edwards, *The Virgin Birth in History and Faith*, 1943, 130 ff.

(d) Whenever Paul speaks of the birth of Jesus Christ, he uses the verb *ginomai*, which has the broad meaning of "come to be" (→ Birth). This is particularly significant in Gal. 4:4, 23 f. Jesus Christ "comes to be" by a woman, whereas Isaac and Ishmael, born of two women, are begotten and born, since the vb. *gennaō*, used here, carries overtones of the father's act. Paul uses the same general word in Rom. 1:3 ("came of the seed of David according to the flesh") and Phil. 2:7 ("coming to be in the likeness of men"). On each occasion, Paul avoids the normal word for *born*, which is understandable if, as the travelling companion of Luke, he knew that Jesus was born miraculously. It may well be that he had the virgin birth in mind when he drew the balance and contrast between → Adam and Christ in 1 Cor. 15:45–48. Adam is from earth and Christ from heaven, but both came miraculously from the hand of God. This interpretation of Paul's thought is not as forced as it might appear, since it is taken up and amplified by Irenaeus (*Haer.* 3, 21, 10) and the Nag Hammadi *Gospel of Philip* (ed. W. C. Till, *Patristische Texte und Studien* 2, 1963, 43 f.). There is thus little justification for speaking of the silence of the NT outside Matthew and Luke. Such reticence as there was in public preaching may well have been out of respect for Mary. We do not know how long she lived, but malicious tongues could easily have turned the virgin birth into scandal. Consider also how rarely any orthodox preacher today mentions the virgin birth in his normal run of sermons during the year, even though he often refers to the incarnation.

(e) After A.D. 100 the fact is alluded to by Ignatius (*Smyr.* 1:1, before A.D. 120), the *Apology* of Aristides (*c.* 140), Justin in his *Dialogue with Trypho* (e.g. 43 f., 68, 84), and Irenaeus frequently (e.g. *Haer.* 3, 21, 4f. and 9; 3, 22, 1–4). The Old Roman Creed (dated by F. Kattenbusch, soon after A.D. 100, *Das Apostolische Symbol*, II, 1900, 328) includes "Who was born of the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary". The fact that these early writers are protesting against those who deny the virgin birth shows that gnostics and others like the Ebionites knew it was an accepted part of Christian orthodoxy.

The virgin birth, according to the NT, is the channel by which the eternally pre-existing Second Person of the Trinity entered as a truly human being as part of the world of time and space. If Jesus were only a great prophet, without previous ex-

istence, his virgin birth would be of interest, but of no special significance.

2. *Criticism of the Virgin Birth.* Attacks on its historicity are partly on literary and partly on theological grounds, but no fresh facts have emerged that have not been discussed by such writers as James Orr and J. G. Machen.

(a) Literary. On the whole the tendency is to accept the early chapters as by Luke, although some allow for additions in revision. It is reasonable, then, to give weight to Luke's prologue, where he claims to have checked his facts from witnesses, whom he must often have met in his travels with Paul. We cannot exclude the virgin Mary herself. Indeed some think that Luke's story comes from Mary, while Matthew's comes from Joseph (e.g. M.-J. Lagrange, *Évangile selon Saint Luc*, 1927[4], 116–26; J. G. Machen, *The Virgin Birth of Christ*, 1932[2],194 ff.).

(b) Form criticism, however, regards the birth stories as the simple person's version of how Jesus was Son of God, in contrast to the more sophisticated idea that he became Son at his baptism, his resurrection, or eternally. One must then ask who evolved the two independent records, and why. Other religions have stories of virgins giving birth, but those stories are crudely polytheistic. Their very existence would militate against anything remotely similar emerging in Jewish-Christian circles, or among Gentile Christians who were constantly reacting against their religious environment.

(c) There is one often quoted literary criticism. The phrase in Lk. 1:34, "since I have no husband", is said by John of Damascus (8th cent.) to be missing from Greek codices. M. Dibelius regarded the story of the virgin birth as a legend based partly on Isa. 7:14 (*From Tradition to Gospel*, 1934, 124). H. D. A. Major regarded Lk. 1:34 f. as an interpolation, though made by the evangelist himself who could not restrain his love for the miraculous (in H. D. A. Major, T. W. Manson and C. J. Wright, *The Mission and Message of Jesus*, 1937, 262). The original story, Major held, was concerned with the Davidic descent of the messiah (cf. v. 33). Yet Lk. 1:34 is in all existing MSS.

A similar poorly supported objection is the reading of the Sinaitic Syriac text in Matt. 1:16, "Joseph begat Jesus, who is called Christ" (on the readings of this v. see Metzger, 2–7). Elsewhere this MS supports the virgin birth, but the reading is accepted by e.g. J. Klausner, *Jesus of Nazareth*, 1925, 232, and C. Montefiore, *The Synoptic Gospels*, II, 1909, 452, as expressing the historical reality of the situation.

(d) Both genealogies are apparently Joseph's, although Lk. 3:23 has the cautionary "as was supposed" of Joseph's parentage of Jesus. Yet it is not too difficult to see Luke's list as being Mary's (and hence Christ's) descent from David. Mary's father (Heli?) had two daughters, Mary and the unnamed wife of Zebedee (John 19:25; Matt. 27:56). If there were no sons, Joseph would become son of Heli on his marriage, to preserve the family name and inheritance (cf. Num. 27:1–11; 36:1–12, especially v. 8, which accounts for Mary marrying a man of the family of David). For a critical study of the genealogies see M. D. Johnson, *The Purpose of the Biblical Genealogies with Special Reference to the Genealogies of Jesus, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series* 8, 1969, and the discussion above on *The Genealogies of Jesus Christ.*

(e) Some find it impossible to reconcile what is said of the conception with the idea of the eternal Christ, as held by Paul and John (e.g. W. Pannenberg, *Jesus – God and Man*, 1968, 141–50; E. Brunner, *The Mediator*, 1934, 322–27; and *Dog-*

matics, II, 1952, 350 ff.). If, however, the records in Matthew and Luke represent the angelic communications to Mary and Joseph, they could not at this stage have grasped the later unfolding revelation of the eternal Christ. To them it was a beginner's truth that Mary was to be the mother of the messianic Son of God. Our modern carol services at Christmas start at the same place, but go on to the profound expressions of the incarnation without consciousness of contradiction.

3. *Physical Considerations.* Although the physical facts are usually ignored, the modern knowledge of genetics throws some light on the necessity for the virginal conception. Since the man alone carries the Y chromosome which produces a male child, there is no question of Mary's producing a child spontaneously, since this would have been a girl. Like every mother, Mary provided the 23 chromosomes in her ovum, to be fertilized by a sex cell containing 23 chromosomes which unite to form the 46 which are in every cell in the human body (except the sex cells with 23). Thus the virgin birth involves the preparation through the Holy Spirit of the 23 chromosomes which would be taken by the Son of God. From the moment of conception there is a potential individual person. If, then, Joseph had been the father, there would have been an already existing "person" to which the person of Jesus Christ must have been added, thus producing a Nestorian Christ, with two persons existing in one body, or alternatively reducing Christ to a God-filled man, like one of the prophets. As it is, there was no moment of time from the moment of conception when the forming child in Mary's womb was not God incarnate and yet truly human.

4. *The Virgin Birth and the Sinlessness and Divinity of Jesus.* The theory that the virgin birth in itself secured Christ's freedom from original sin (possibly Heb. 4:15; 7:26) raises more problems than it solves (cf. Karl Barth, *CD* I, 2, 172–202). It would tie a physical transmission of original sin to the husband, and would be effective only if we postulate the equal sinlessness of Mary. This is held by the Roman Catholic Church, as expressed by E. C. Messenger: "She, as a child of Adam, incurred the debt of original sin, and was exempted from the actual stain of original sin only by a special privilege, granted her in virtue of the merits of her Divine Son" (*The Mystery of Sex and Marriage, II*, 84). This view reflects Pius IX's definition of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception: "that the most Blessed Virgin Mary in the first instant of her conception, by a unique grace and privilege of the omnipotent God and in consideration of the merits of Christ Jesus the Saviour of the human race, was preserved free from all stain of original sin, is a doctrine revealed by God and therefore must be firmly and constantly held by all the faithful" (extract from the Bull *Ineffabilis Deus*, 8th December 1854). Yet many see that the original sinlessness of Mary would necessarily involve the sinlessness of her parents and grandparents *ad infinitum*.

Karl Barth, on the other hand, regards the virgin birth and the empty tomb as constituting "a single sign, the special function of which compared with other signs and wonders of the New Testament witness, is to describe and mark out the existence of Jesus Christ, amid the many other existences in human history, as that human existence in which God is Himself, God is alone, God is directly the Subject, the temporal reality of which is not only called forth, created, conditioned and supported by the eternal reality of God, but is identical with it" (*CD* I, 2, 182). "The man Jesus of Nazareth is not the true Son of God because He was conceived by the Holy Spirit and born of the Virgin Mary. On the contrary, because He is the true Son of God

and because this is an inconceivable mystery intended to be acknowledged as such, therefore He is conceived by the Holy Spirit and born of the Virgin Mary. . . . The mystery does not rest upon the miracle. The miracle rests upon the mystery. The miracle bears witness to the mystery, and the mystery is attested by the miracle" (*CD* I, 2, 202). *J. Stafford Wright*

→ Bethlehem, → Genealogy, → God, art. *Emmanouēl*, → Jesus Christ, → Spirit, → Woman

General works:
(a). J. M. Allegro, "Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature", *JBL* 75, 1956, 174–187; M. Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*, 1967[3]; W. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos: A History of the Belief in Christ from the Beginnings of Christianity to Irenaeus*, 1970; O. Cullmann, *The Christology of the New Testament*, 1963[2]; G. Dalman, *The Words of Jesus Considered in the Light of Post-Biblical Jewish Writings and the Aramaic Language*, 1909; R. H. Fuller, *The Foundations of New Testament Christology*, 1965; D. Flusser, *Jesus*, 1969; F. Hahn, *The Titles of Jesus in Christology*, 1969; F. J. Foakes Jackson and K. Lake, *The Beginnings of Christianity*, I, 1920; J. Jeremias, *New Testament Theology*, I *The Proclamation of Jesus*, 1971; B. Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic*, 1961; I. H. Marshall, *The Origins of New Testament Christology*, 1977; W. Marxsen, *The Beginnings of Christology*, 1969; C. F. D. Moule, *The Origin of Christology*, 1977; S. Mowinckel, *He That Cometh*, 1956; A. E. J. Rawlinson, *The New Testament Doctrine of the Christ*, (Bampton Lectures 1926) 1926; E. Stauffer, *Jesus and his Story*, 1960; V. Taylor, *The Names of Jesus*, 1953; and *The Person of Christ in New Testament Teaching*, 1958.
(b). H. R. Balz, *Methodische Probleme der neutestamentlichen Christologie*, 1967; O. Betz, "Die Frage nach dem messianischen Bewusstsein Jesu", *NovT* 6, 1963, 20–48; J. Blank, *Paulus und Jesus*, 1968; T. Boman, *Die Jesusüberlieferung im Lichte der neueren Volkskunde*, 1967; N. A. Dahl, "Die Messianität Jesu bei Paulus", in *Studia Paulina* (Festschrift für J. de Zwaan), 1953, 83–95; A. Hilgenfeld, *Die jüdische Apokalyptik in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung*, 1857, 1966.

On Servant:
(a). C. K. Barrett, "The Background of Mark 10:45", in A. J. B. Higgins ed., *New Testament Essays* (in memory of T. W. Manson), 1959, 1–18; and "Mark 10:45: A Ransom for Many", in *New Testament Essays*, 1972, 20–26; S. R. Driver and A. Neubauer, *The Fifty-Third Chapter of Isaiah according to the Jewish Interpreters*, 1876–77; I. Engnell, "The 'Ebed Yahweh Songs and the Suffering Messiah in 'Deutero-Isaiah' ", *BJRL* 31, 1948; R. T. France, "The Servant of the Lord in the Teaching of Jesus", *TB* 19, 1968, 26–52; and *Jesus and the Old Testament: His Application of Old Testament Passages to Himself and His Mission*, 1971, 110–135; M. D. Hooker, *Jesus and the Servant*, 1959; J. Jeremias and W. Zimmerli, *pais theou*, *TDNT* V 654–717; A. Kerrigan, "Echoes of Themes from the Servant Songs in Pauline Theology", *Studiorum Paulinorum Congressus*, II, 1963, 217–228; T. W. Manson, *The Servant-Messiah*, 1961; J. E. Ménard, "Pais Theou as Messianic Title in the Book of Acts", *CBQ* 23, 1961, 14–25; C. F. D. Moule, *The Phenomenon of the New Testament*, 1967, 82–99; C. R. North, *The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah*, 1956[2]; D. M. Stanley, "The Theme of the Servant of Yahweh in Primitive Christian Soteriology and its Transposition by St Paul", *CBQ* 16, 1954, 385–425; V. Taylor, *Jesus and his Sacrifice*, 1937.
(b). P. Benoit, "Jésus et le Serviteur de Dieu", in J. Dupont, ed., *Jésus aux Origines de la Christologie*, 1975, 111–140; L. Cerfaux, "L'Hymne au Christ – Serviteur de Dieu", in *Recueil L. Cerfaux*, I, 1954, 425–437; and "Saint Paul et le Serviteur de Dieu d'Isaïe", in *Recueil L. Cerfaux*, I, 1954, 439–454; J. Giblet, "Jésus, Serviteur de Dieu", *Lumière et Vie* 7, 1958, 5–34; A. von Harnack, "Die Bezeichnung Jesu als "Knecht Gottes" und ihre Geschichte in der alten Kirche", *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin* (phil.–hist. Klasse), 28, 1926, 212–238; H. Hegermann, *Jesaja 53 in Hexapla, Targum und Peschitta*, 1954; O. Kaiser, *Der königliche Knecht*, 1962[2]; E. Kränkl, *Jesus der Knecht Gottes*, 1972; E. Lohmeyer, *Gottesknecht und Davidssohn*, 1953[2]; E. Lohse, *Märtyrer und Gottesknecht*, 1963[2]; R. Mach, *Der Zaddik in Talmud und Midrasch*, 1957; C. Maurer, "Knecht Gottes und Sohn Gottes im Passionsbericht des Markus", *ZTK* 50, 1953, 1–38; H. Patsch, *Abendmahl und historischer Jesus*, 1972; M. Rese, "Überprüfung einiger Thesen von J. Jeremias zum Thema des Gottesknechts im Judentum", *ZTK* 60, 1963, 21–41; K. Romaniuk, "De Themate Ebed Yahwe in soteriologia sancti Pauli", *CBQ* 23, 1961, 14–25; H. W. Wolff, *Jesaja 53 im Urchristentum*, 1950[2].

On Son of man:
(a). C. K. Barrett, *Jesus and the Gospel Tradition*, 1967; J. N. Birdsall, "Who is this Son of Man?" *EQ* 42, 1970, 7–17; M. Black, "The Son of Man Problem in Recent Research and Debate", *BJRL* 45, 1962–63, 305–318; and "The 'Son of Man' Passion Sayings in the Gospel Tradition", *ZNW* 60, 1969, 1–8; F. H. Borsch, *The Son of Man in Myth and History*, 1967; and *The Christian and Gnostic Son of Man*, *SBT* Second Series 14, 1970; C. Colpe, *ho hyios tou anthrōpou*, *TDNT* VIII 400–477; O. Cullmann, *The Christology of the New Testament*, 1963[2], 137–192; G. Dalman, op. cit., 234–67; R. E. C. Formesyn, "Was there a Pronominal Connection for the Bar Nasha Selfdesignation?", *NovT* 8, 1966, 1–35; R. T. France, *Jesus and the Old Testament*, 1971, 135–148; R. H. Fuller, *The Foundations of New Testament Christology*, 1965; T. F. Glasson, "The Son of Man Imagery: Enoch xiv and Daniel vii", *NTS* 23, 1976–77, 82–90; A. Gelston, "A Sidelight on the 'Son of Man' ", *SJT* 22, 1969, 189–196; F. Hahn, *The Titles of Jesus in Christology*, 1969, 15–53; R. G. Hamerton-Kelly, *Pre-Existence, Wisdom and the Son of Man*, *Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series* 21, 1973; A. J. B. Higgins, "Son of Man – *Forschung* since 'The Teaching of Jesus' ", in A. J. B. Higgins ed., *New Testament Essays* (in memory of T. W. Manson), 1959, 119–135; and *Jesus and the Son of Man*, 1964; M. D. Hooker, *The Son of Man in Mark*, 1967; J. Jeremias, *New Testament Theology* I, 1971, 257–276; C. H. Kraeling, *Anthrōpos and Son of Man*, 1927; R. Leivestad, "Exit the Apocalyptic Son of Man", *NTS* 18, 1971–72, 243–267; B. Lindars, "The Son of Man in the Johannine Christology", in B. Lindars and S. S. Smalley, eds., *Christ and Spirit in the New Testament – In Honour of Charles Francis Digby Moule*, 1973, 43–60; and "Re-Enter the Apocalyptic Son of Man", *NTS* 22, 1975–76, 52–72; R. Maddox, "The Function of the Son of Man according to the Synoptic Gospels", *NTS* 15, 1968–69, 45–74; "The Quest for Valid Methods in 'Son of Man' Research", *TSF Bulletin* 61, Autumn 1971, 14–21; and "The Function of the Son of Man in the Gospel of John", in R. Banks, ed., *Reconciliation and Hope: New Testament Essays on Atonement and Eschatology Presented to L. L. Morris*, 1974, 186–204; T. W. Manson, *The Teaching of Jesus*, 1935[2]; I. H. Marshall, "The Synoptic Son of Man Sayings in Recent Discussion", *NTS* 12, 1965–66, 327–351; and "The Son of Man in Contemporary Debate", *EQ* 42, 1970, 67–87; C. F. D. Moule, "Neglected Features in the Problem of 'the Son of Man' ", in J. Gnilka, ed., *Neues Testament und Kirche*, 1974, 413–28; R. Otto, *The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man*, 1953; N. Perrin, *Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus*, 1967; and *A Modern Pilgrimage in New Testament Christology*, 1974; E. Schweizer, "The Son of Man", *JBL* 79, 1960, 119–129; and "The Son of Man again", *NTS* 9, 1962–63, 256–261; S. S. Smalley, "The Johannine Son of Man Sayings", *NTS* 15, 1968–69, 278–301; G. N. Stanton, *Jesus of Nazareth in New Testament Preaching*, *Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series* 27, 1974; H. M. Teeple, "The Origin of the Son of Man Christology", *JBL* 84, 1965, 213–250; H. E. Tödt, *The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition*, 1965; G. Vermes, "The Use of *bar nash/bar nasha* in Jewish Aramaic", Appendix E in M. Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*, 1967[3], 310–328; and *Jesus the Jew*, 1973, 160–191.
(b). L. Goppelt, "Zum Problem des Menschensohns", in *Christologie und Ethik*, 1968, 66–78; and *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, I, 1975, 226–253; G. Haufe, "Das Menschensohn Problem in der gegenwärtigen wissenschaftlichen Diskussion", *EvTh* 26, 1966, 130–141; J. Jeremias, "Die älteste Schicht der Menschensohn-Logien", *ZNW* 58, 1967, 159–172; R. Leivestad, "Der apokalyptische Menschensohn ein theologisches Phantom", *ASTI* 6, 1968, 49–105; H. Lietzmann, *Der Menschensohn*, 1896; G. Lindeskog, "Das Rätsel des Menschensohns", *StTh* 22, 1968, 149–174; O. Moe, "Der Menschensohn und der Urmensch", *StTh* 14, 1960, 119–129; U. B. Müller, *Messias und Menschensohn in jüdischen Apokalypsen und in der Offenbarung des Johannes*, 1972; R. Pesch and R. Schnackenburg, eds., *Jesus und der Menschensohn*, 1975; E. Ruckstuhl, "Die johanneische Menschensohnforschung 1957–1969", in J. Pfammatter and F. Furger, *Theologische Berichte I*, 1972, 171–284; R. Schnackenburg, "Der Menschensohn im Johannesevangelium", *NTS* 11, 1964–65, 123–137; S. Schulz, *Untersuchungen zur Menschensohn-Christologie im Johannesevangelium*, 1957; E. Schweizer, "Der Menschensohn", *ZNW* 50, 1959, 185–209; E. Sjöberg, *Der Menschensohn im äthiopischen Henoch*, 1946; and *Der verborgene Menschensohn in den Evangelien*, 1955; P. Vielhauer, "Gottesreich und Menschensohn in der Verkündigung Jesu", in *Festschrift für G. Dehn*, 1957, 51–79; and "Jesus und der Menschensohn", *ZTK* 60, 1963, 133–177 (both reprinted in P. Vielhauer, *Aufsätze zum Neuen Testament*, 1965, 55–91, 92–140).

On Son of God:
(a). G. Cooke "The Sons of (the) God(s)", *ZAW* 76, 1964, 22–47; O. Cullmann, *The Christology of the*

New Testament, 1963[2], 270–305; G. Dalman, op. cit., 268–88; R. H. Fuller, *The Foundations of New Testament Christology*, 1965; F. Hahn, *The Titles of Jesus in Christology*, 1969, 279–333; M. Hengel, *The Son of God*, 1976; E. Huntress, " 'Son of God' in Jewish Writings prior to the Christian Era", *JBL* 54, 1935, 117–123; W. Kramer, *Christ, Lord, Son of God*, 1966; E. Lövestam, *Son and Saviour*, 1961; I. H. Marshall, "The Divine Sonship of Jesus", *Interpretation* 21, 1967, 87–103; and "The Development of Christology in the Early Church", *TB* 18, 1967, 77–93; E. Schweizer, P. Wülfing von Martitz, G. Fohrer, E. Lohse, W. Schneemelcher, *hyios, hyiothesia*, *TDNT* VIII 334–397; G. Vermes, *Jesus the Jew*, 1973, 192–222.

(b). K. Berger, "Zum traditionsgeschichtlichen Hintergrund Christologischer Hoheitstitel", *NTS* 17, 1970–71, 391–426; J. Bieneck, *Sohn Gottes als Christusbezeichnung der Synoptiker*, 1951; W. Grundmann, *Die Gotteskindschaft in der Geschichte Jesu und ihre religionsgeschichtlichen Voraussetzungen*, 1938; and "Sohn Gottes. Ein Diskussionsbeitrag", *ZNW* 47, 1956, 113–133; B. M. F. van Iersel, *"Der Sohn" in den synoptischen Jesusworten, Supplements to NovT* 3, 1964[2]; J. Kögel, *Der Sohn und die Söhne*, 1904; T. de Kruijf, *Der Sohn des lebendigen Gottes. Ein Beitrag zur Christologie des Matthäus*, 1962; O. Michel and O. Betz, "Von Gott gezeugt", in W. Eltester, ed., *Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche, Festschrift für J. Jeremias, BZNW* 26, 1964, 3–23; P. Pokorny, *Der Gottessohn*, 1971; G. P. Wetter, *Der Sohn Gottes*, 1916.

On Son of David:

(a). G. Dalman, op. cit., 316–23; L. R. Fisher, "Can this be the Son of David?" in T. F. Trotter, ed., *Jesus and the Historian: Written in Honor of Ernest Cadman Colwell*, 1968, 82–97; J. M. Gibbs, "Purpose and Pattern in Matthew's Use of the Title 'Son of David' ", *NTS* 10, 1963–64, 446–464; F. Hahn, *The Titles of Jesus in Christology*, 1969, 240–278; E. Lohse, *hyios Dauid*, *TDNT* VIII 478–488.

(b). K. Berger, "Die königlichen Messiastraditionen des Neuen Testaments", *NTS* 20, 1973–74, 1–44; and "Zum Problem der Messianität Jesu", *ZTK* 71, 1974, 1–30; C. Burger, *Jesus als Davidssohn*, 1970; J. A. Fitzmyer, "Die Davidssohn-Überlieferung und Mt 22, 14–16 (und Par.)", *Concilium* 2, 1966, 780 ff. (Eng. tr. in *The Dynamism of Biblical Tradition*, 1966, 75–87); R. P. Gagg, "Jesus und die Davidssohnfrage. Zur Exegese von Markus 12:35–37", *TZ* 7, 1951, 18–30; B. M. F. van Iersel, "Fils de David et Fils de Dieu", *Recherches bibliques* 6, 1962, 113–132; E. Lövestam. "Die Davidssohnfrage", *Svensk Exeget. Årsbok*, 1962, 72 ff.; E. Lohmeyer, *Gottesknecht und Davidssohn*, 1953[2] ; W. Michaelis, "Die Davidssohnschaft Jesu als historisches und kerygmatisches Problem", in H. Ristow and K. Matthiae, eds., *Der historische Jesus und der kerygmatische Christus*, 1960, 317–330; F. Neugebauer, "Die Davidssohnfrage (Mark xii, 35–37 parr.) und der Menschensohn", *NTS* 21, 1974–75, 81–108; G. Schneider, "Die Davidssohnfrage (Mk. 12, 35–37)", *Bib* 53, 1972, 65–90; A. Suhl, "Der Davidssohn im Matthäus-Evangelium", *ZNW* 58, 1967, 57–81; W. Wrede, "Jesus als Davidssohn", *Vorträge und Studien*, 1907, 147–177.

On the genealogies of Jesus Christ:

(a). E. L. Abel,"The Genealogies of Jesus. . .", *NTS* 20, 1973–4, 203–10; H. A. Blair,"Mt. 1:16 and the Matthean Genealogy", *TU* 87, 1964, 149–54; R. E. Brown, *Birth of the Messiah* . . ., 1977; C. T. Davis, "The Fulfilment of Creation . . .", *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 41, 1973, 520–35; F. Hahn, *The Titles of Jesus in Christology*, 1969; A. D. Heffern, "The Four Women in St Matthew's Genealogy of Christ", *JBL* 31, 1912, 69–81; R. T. Hood, "The Genealogies of Jesus", in *Early Christian Origins*, ed. A Wikgren, 1961, 1–13; J. Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus*, ET 1969; M. D. Johnson, *The Purpose of the Biblical Genealogies; with Special Reference to the Setting of the Genealogies of Jesus, SNTS Monograph Series* 8, 1969; C. Kaplan, "Some N.T. Problems in the Light of the Rabbinics and the Pseudepigrapha, the Generation Schemes in Mt. 1:17; Lk. 3:24 ff.", *Bibliotheca Sacra* 87, 1930, 465–71; J. G. Machen, *Virgin Birth of Christ*, 1932, 173 ff., 203 ff., I. H. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 1978, 157–65, H. Milton, "The Structure of the Prologue to St Matthew's Gospel", *JBL* 81, 1962, 176 ff.; M. J. Moreton, "The Genealogy of Jesus", *TU* 87, 1964, 223 ff.; B. M. Newman, "Matthew 1:1–18: Some Comments and a Suggested Restructuring", *Bible Translator* 27, 1976, 209–12; D. E. Nineham, "The Genealogy in St Matthew's Gospel and its significance for the Study of the Gospel" (Manson Memorial Lecture, 1975), *BJRL* 58, 1976, 205–30; H. H. Oliver, "The Lucan Birth Stories and the Purpose of Luke-Acts", *NTS* 10, 1963–4, 202–6; H. A. Sanders, "The Genealogies of Jesus", *JBL* 32, 1913, 184–93; W. B. Tatum, "The Epoch of Israel: Luke i–ii and the Theological Plan of Luke-Acts", *NTS* 13, 1966–7, 184–95; B. H. Throckmorton, "Gen-

ealogy (Christ)", *IDB* II 365 f.; H. C. Waetjen, "The Genealogy as the Key to the Gospel according to Matthew", *JBL* 95, 1976, 205–30; R. T. Wilson, *Genealogy and History in the Biblical World*, 1977. (b). R. Bloch, "Juda engendra Pharès et Zara, de Thamar (Matth. 1:3)", in *Mélanges Bibliques rédigés en l'honneur de André Robert*, 1957, 381–9; K. Bornhäuser, *Die Geburts- und Kindheitsgeschichte Jesu*, 1930; U. Holzmeister, "Genealogia S. Lucae (Lk. 3:23–38)", *Verbum Domini* 23, 1943, 9–18; M. Krämer, "Die Menschwerdung Jesu Christi nach Matthäus", *Bib.* 45, 1964, 47 ff.; G. Kuhn, "Die Geschlechtsregister Jesu bei Lukas und Matthäus, nach ihrer Herkunft untersucht", *ZNW* 22, 1923, 206–28; M. Lambertz, "Die Toledoth im Mt. 1:1–17 und Lc. 3:23*b* ff.", in *Festschrift Franz Dornseiff*, ed. H. Kusch, 1953, 211–25; E. Nestle, "Salomo und Nathan im Mt 1 und Lc 3", *ZNW* 8, 1907, 72; L. Ramlot, "Les généalogies bibliques. Un genre littéraire oriental", *Bible et Vie Chrétienne* 60, 1964, 35–70; F. Spitta, "Die Frauen in der Genealogie Jesu bei Matthäus", *ZWT* 54, 1912, 1–8; SB I 1–6, IV 792 ff.; A. Vögtle, "Die Genealogie Mt. 1:2–16 und die Matthäische Kindheitsgeschichte", *BZ* 8, 1964, 45–58, 239–62; 9, 1965, 32–49; Y. Zakowitch, "Rahab als Mutter des Boaz in der Jesus-Genealogie (Matth. 1:5)", *NovT* 17, 1975, 1–5.

On the virgin birth:
(a). K. Barth, "The Miracle of Christmas", *CD* I, 2, 172–202; J. Bligh, "The Virgin Birth", *Heythrop Journal* 6, 1965, 109–97; T. Boslooper, *The Virgin Birth of Christ*, 1962; G. H. Box, *The Virgin Birth of Jesus: A Critical Examination of the Gospel Narratives of the Nativity, and Other Early Christian Evidence, and the Alleged Influence of Heathen Ideas*, 1916; R. E. Brown, *The Virginal Conception & Bodily Resurrection of Jesus*, 1973; "Genealogy (Christ)", *IDB Supplementary Volume*, 1976, 354; and "Virgin Birth", ibid., 940 f.; H. von Campenhausen, *The Virgin Birth in the Theology of the Ancient Church, Studies in Historical Theology* 2, 1964; W. T. Dayton, "Virgin Birth", *ZPEB* V 886–89; G. Delling, *parthenos*, *TDNT* V 826–37; D. Edwards, *The Virgin Birth in History and Faith*, 1943; H. Graef, *Mary*, I–II, 1963–65; J. Jeremias, "The Israelites of Pure Ancestry", in *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus: An Investigation into Economic and Social Conditions during the New Testament Period*, 1969, 275–302; M. D. Johnson, *The Purpose of the Biblical Genealogies with Special Reference to the Genealogies of Jesus, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series* 8, 1969; J. Kürzinger, "Virgin Birth", *BET* III 939–45; R. Laurentin, *Queen of Heaven*, 1961[3]; J. G. Machen, *The Virgin Birth of Christ*, 1932[2]; H. L. MacNeill, "The *Sitz im Leben* of Luke 1:5–2:20", *JBL* 65, 1946, 123–30; E. C. Messenger, *The Mystery of Sex and Marriage*, II, 1948; E. L. Mascall and H. S. Box, eds., *The Blessed Virgin Mary: Essays by Anglican Writers*, 1963; G. Miegge, *The Virgin Mary*, 1955; P. S. Minear, "Luke's Use of the Birth Stories", in L. E. Keck and J. L. Martyn, *Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays Presented in Honor of Paul Schubert*, 1968, 111–30; D. Moody, "Isaiah 7:14 in the RSV", *Review and Expositor* 50, 1953, 61–8; "On the Virgin Birth of Jesus Christ", ibid., 453–62; "The Miraculous Conception", ibid. 51, 1954, 495–507; ibid. 52, 1955, 44 f., 310–24; and "Virgin Birth", *IDB* IV 789 ff.; D. E. Nineham, *The Genealogy in St. Matthew's Gospel and its Significance for the Study of the Gospels*, Manson Memorial Lecture for 1975, reprinted from *BJRL* 58, 1976, 421–44; J. Orr, *The Virgin Birth of Christ*, 1907; W. Pannenberg, *Jesus – God and Man*, 1968, 141–50; K. Rahner, *Mary, The Mother of the Lord*, 1963; F. Ramsay, *The Virgin Birth*, 1926; W. M. Ramsay, *Was Christ Born at Bethlehem?*, 1898; and "Luke's Narrative of the Birth of Christ", *The Expositor*, Eighth Series 4, 1912, 385–407, 481–507; J. de Satgé, *Mary and the Christian Gospel*, 1976; E. Schillebeeckx, *Mary, Mother of the Redemption*, 1964, 9–47; V. Taylor, *The Historical Evidence for the Virgin Birth*, 1920; H. E. W. Turner, "The Virgin Birth", *ExpT* 68, 1956–57, 12–17; J. Stafford Wright, "The Virgin Birth as a Biological Necessity", *Faith and Thought: Journal of the Victoria Institute* 95, 3, 1966, 19 ff. (b). O. Bardenhewer, *Maria Verkündigung*, 1903; K. Bornhäuser, *Die Geburts- und Kindheitsgeschichte Jesu*, 1930; P. R. Botz, *Die Jungfrauschaft Mariens im Neuen Testament und in der nachapostolischen Zeit*, (Dissertation, Tübingen) 1935; H. Braun, "Der Sinn der neutestamentlichen Christologie", *ZTK* 54, 1957, 341–77; M. Dibelius, "Jungfrauensohn und Krippenkind", *Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften* 4, 1932 (reprinted in *Botschaft und Geschichte*, I, 1953, 1–78); K. Goldammer, W. Marxsen and P. Althaus, "Jungfrauengeburt", *RGG* [3] III 1068 f.; F. Kattenbusch, "Die Geburtsgeschichte Jesu als Haggada der Urchristologie", *ThStKr* 102, 1930, 454–74; R. Kilian, *Die Verheissung Immanuels*, 1969; R. Laurentin, *Structure et Théologie de Luc I–II*, 1964[4]; O. Michel and O. Betz, "Von Gott gezeugt", in W. Eltester, ed., *Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche*, *BZNW* 26, *Festschrift für J. Jeremias*, 3–23; J. Michl, "Die Jungfrauengeburt im Neuen Testament", *Mariologische Studien*, IV, 1969, 145–84; E. Norden, *Die Geburt des Kindes*, 1924; K. Prümm, "Empfangen vom Heiligen Geiste, geboren aus Maria der Jungfrau", in *Der*

christliche Glaube und die altheidnische Welt, I, 1935, 253–333; J. Riedl, *Die Vorgeschichte Jesu*, 1968; K. L. Schmidt, "Die jungfräuliche Geburt Jesu Christi", *ThBl* 14, 1935, 289–97; A. Steinmann, *Die jungfräuliche Geburt des Herrn*, 1926; A. Strobel, "Der Gruss an Maria", *ZNW* 53, 1962, 87–111; A. Vögtle, "Die Genealogie Mt. 1:2–16 and die Matthäistische Kindheitsgeschichte", *BZ* 8, 1964, 45–58, 239–62; ibid. 9, 1965, 32–49.

Song, Hymn, Psalm

The precise terminological distinctions between the three words discussed here, *hymnos*, *psalmos*, and *ōdē*, are not closely defined. *hymnos* probably had a religious and cultic significance right from the beginning, as a technical term for festive psalms of praise, and for liturgical calls and recitations. *ōdē* had occasional secular reference, but, at least in the biblical Gk. period, it generally indicated a particular kind of song concerned with lamentation or joy (Deut. 31:30 is an exception). *psalmos*, equally used with occasional secular reference, denoted originally a variety of instrumental music, then also the vocal accompaniment. Following on from the LXX, *psalmos* in the NT probably refers to that aspect of early Christian worship which, both in form and content, was closely modelled on the temple hymns of the OT and late Judaistic periods. See *ōdē* NT for the varying theological emphasis of the words in the NT.

ὕμνος

ὕμνος (*hymnos*), song, song of praise, hymn, ode; ὑμνέω (*hymneō*), celebrate, praise, sing.

CL *hymnos*, of uncertain origin, is something sung, a song. The word appears from Homer onwards in secular Gk. There is no one particular metrical form. Rather, *hymnos* is a general word used to include the most varied poetical forms. All along, the word *hymnos* is used for recited as well as for sung poetry. The secular sense is not always clearly distinguished from cultic. The following meanings of *hymneō* may be mentioned: (1) to sing of, celebrate, in poetry or prose; (2) to discuss, tell repeatedly, recite; (3) (pass.) ring (in one's ears).

Various formations occur, including the following after 300 B.C.: *hymnēsis*, lauding or praising, hymn or song-recital, or collection of songs; *hymnagorēs*, singer of hymns or songs; *hymnologia*, hymn-singing, songs. They are in part examples of late linguistic usages, which found *hymneō* too weak a word, and used it to mean to write or sing a song. In general, *hymnos* refers to songs to the gods, particularly a song in praise of the divinity, as distinct perhaps from *epainos*, → praise given to men.

OT 1. In the LXX the vb. is found 71 times and the noun 28 times. The vb. translates the Heb. *hālal* (in the piel form), to praise, at Jdg. 16:24; 2 Chr. 29:30 (twice); Neh. 12:24 *v.l.*; Ps. 22(21):22; *zāmar* (also piel), to sing or praise with instrumental accompaniment, at 1 Chr. 16:9; Isa. 12:5; *yāḏâh* (hiphil), confess, praise, at Neh. 12:24 *v.l.*; Isa. 12:4; 25:1; *yāḏa'* (hiphil), cause to be known, at 2 Chr. 23:13; *rānan*, cry for joy, at Prov. 1:20; 8:3; and *šîr*, sing, at Pss. 65(64):13; 137(136):3; Isa. 40:2.

It is without Heb. equivalent at 1 Esd. 5:60, 62; Tob. 12:6, 18 *v.l.*, 22 *v.l.*; Jub. 15:13 *v.l.*; 16:13; Est. 4:17; Job 38:7 *v.l.*; Ps. 71(70):8; Wis. 10:20; 1 Macc. 4:24; 13:47; 4 Macc. 4:12; and Dan. 3 LXX passim where the majority of instances occur. It is found frequently in variant translations of the Pss. (Hatch-Redpath, II–III, 1405). The Heb. *hal^{e}lûyâh* is often simply transliterated, including 17 times in Psalm headings (→ Amen, art. *hallēlouia*).

The noun *hymnos* also translates *hālal* in the piel (2 Chr. 7:6; Neh. 12:24 *v.l.*) and the cognate *t^{e}hillâh*, praise (Neh. 12:46; Pss. 40[39]:3; 65[64]:1; 100[99]:4; 119[118]:171; 148:14). It is used for *n^{e}ḡînâh*, a musical term perhaps denoting a stringed instrument, in the titles of Pss. 6 *v.l.*; 54(53); 55(54); 61(60); 67(66); 76(75); *šîr*, song (Neh. 12:46; Isa. 42:10); and *t^{e}p̄illâh*, → prayer (Ps. 72[71]:20). It is without Heb. equivalent at Jdg. 15:13; Ps. 137(136):3 *v.l.*; 1 Macc. 4:33; 13:51; 2 Macc. 1:30; 10:7 *v.l.*, 38; 12:37; 3 Macc. 7:16; 4 Macc. 10:21. It also occurs in variant translations of the Pss. Thus the words hardly occur from Gen. to 2 Ki.

In addition the following cognates occur: *hymnēsis* (Ps. 71[70]:7 for *t^{e}hillâh*; Ps. 118[117]:14 for *zimrâh*, melody, sound); *hymnētos* (Dan. 3:54, 56 LXX); *hymnographos* (4 Macc. 18:15); and *hymnōdeō* (1 Chr. 25:6 for *baššîr*).

2. Philo mentions the hymns of the *Therapeutae* (*Vit. Cont.* 25). If these were not the biblical Psalms, they could have been psalm-like songs. The Hallel psalms already occupied an outstanding position in the rites of the individual feast even when the first temple was standing, and continued to do so in the later worship of the synagogue (SB I 845). In the Passover festival the slaughtering of the lambs was accompanied by the repeated singing of these Hallel psalms (Pss. 114–118; SB IV 1 50). At the Passover meal, the first half of the Passover Hallel followed the Passover meal itself, the Haggadah, and the second half followed the final prayer of the meal and the drinking of the third cup (→ Feast, art. *pascha*; → Lord's Supper). The word *hymnos* was used by the rabbis as a loan-word (*himnon*), and specifically for a spiritual song as opposed to a secular.

3. Extra-canonical collections of hymns have also come down to us from various Jewish circles in Palestine; from the Qumran sect we have the great collection of *Hodayot*, the hymns of praise; and from Pharisaic circles the Pss. Sol., found in some MSS of the Gk. OT.

NT *hymnos* occurs in the NT only in Eph. 5:19 and Col. 3:16; *hymneō* only in Matt. 16:30 par. Mk. 14:26; Acts 16:25; Heb. 2:12.

1. The participle *hymnēsantes*, "when they had sung a hymn" (Matt. 26:30 par. Mk. 14:26) is generally understood by commentators to refer to the singing of the Hallel psalm at the close of the Passover meal prior to drinking the fourth cup. Whether or not this is so depends on whether Jesus' last meal with the disciples was in fact a celebration of the Passover (→ Lord's Supper, art. *deipnon* NT 4, where this view is argued). J. Jeremias argues that Jesus was greeted by the pilgrims on his entry into Jerusalem with the eschatological victory-cry from Ps. 118 (*The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, 1966^{2}, 258 ff.). This would mean that the Hallel Psalm was used here independently of the Passover meal. The present writer disagrees with the view that the Last Supper was a Passover meal ("*Dies tut zu meinem Gedächtnis.*" *Zur Auslegung von 1. Kor. 11, 24–25*, Dissertation, Mainz, 1959, 32–37, notes 261–285). He, therefore, thinks it unlikely that *hymnēsantes* refers to the Passover

Hallel. Any psalm or hymn of thanksgiving could have been used. According to Jeremias, Jesus strictly adhered to the law and customs concerning the Passover. If this is so, it is difficult to believe that Jesus should have broken off the celebrations suddenly before the decisive and important fourth cup with its messianic associations (cf. Bartels, op. cit., 35, notes 279 f.). ([Ed.] On the other hand, there are good reasons for thinking that Jesus did desire to keep the Passover with his disciples [cf. Lk. 22:15], but that he adapted the meal to meet the special needs of the situation → Lord's Supper, art. *deipnon* NT 4 (b).)

2. Acts 16:25 records how, after being beaten and imprisoned at Philippi, "about midnight Paul and Silas were praying and singing hymns to God [*proseuchomenoi hymnoun ton theon*], and the prisoners were listening to them." This need not have been a Hallel psalm. The story shows how they could praise God despite their circumstances (cf. the account of Joseph in Test. Jos. 8:5). Their action was at the same time a testimony to their fellow prisoners. God vindicated them, not so much by the earthquake which they did not use as an occasion for escape, but by the conversion of the jailer and their subsequent honourable release.

3. Heb. 2:12 gives to Ps. 22(21):22 a christological significance as an illustration of the solidarity of the speaker with the people of God: "saying, 'I will proclaim thy name to my brethren, in the midst of the congregation I will praise [*hymnēsō*] thee.' " The Ps. was cited by Jesus on the cross (Mk. 15:34 par Matt. 27:46; → God, art. *theos* NT 6 (d)). "Practically the whole of the lament to which the first part of the psalm is devoted was used in the Church from very early times as a *testimonium* of the crucifixion of Christ; not only is it expressly quoted, but its language has been worked into the very fabric of the New Testament passion narratives, especially in the First and Fourth Gospels [cf. Ps. 22:18 with Mk. 15:24 and Jn. 19:24; and see C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, 1952, 97 f.; B. Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic*, 1961, 88 ff.]. It is most natural, then, that when the psalmist's lament gives way to the public thanksgiving of which the second part of the psalm consists, the same speaker should be recognized, and the once crucified, now exalted Christ should be heard saying: 'I will declare thy name unto my brethren; in the midst of the congregation will I sing thy praise.' Following the Septuagint, our author used the word *ekklēsia* for 'congregation' (the Hebrew of Ps. 22:22 has *qāhāl*). The employment of this word in synonymous parallelism with 'brethren' in a Christian context indicates that those whom the Son of God is pleased to call His brethren are the members of His church. By virtue of His suffering He has now become 'the representative Head of a new mankind' " (F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, *NLC*, 1964, 45 f.; cf. C. H. Dodd, op. cit., 20).

4. On Eph. 5:19 and Col. 3:16 → *ōdē*.

5. From the time of Justin the eucharistic prayer was called a *hymnos* (*Apol. I*, 13). It may be asked, therefore, whether *hymnos* might have been used on occasion in the time of the evangelists for a form of early Christian eucharistic prayer.

K. H. Bartels

ψαλμός

ψαλμός (*psalmos*), a sàcred song, psalm; ψάλλω (*psallō*), sing (a hymn or praise).

CL In secular Gk. *psallō* is used from Homer onwards, originally meaning to pluck (hair), to twang a bow-string, and then pluck a harp, or any other stringed instrument. The noun *psalmos* refers in general to the sound of the instrument, or the actual production of the sound (cf. the scholion on Aristoph., *Birds* 218: "*psalmos* is actually the sound produced by the lyre").

OT 1. In the LXX *psallō* and *psalmos* stand generally for Heb. *zāmar* or *nāgan*, also for *šîr* (→ *ōdē*). Generally it is the Psalms of our Psalter that are meant (e.g. 2 Sam. 23:1, which both in the MT and LXX is obscure and difficult to translate). This accords with the received meaning of Heb. *šîr* or *mizmôr*, song, which is used in the headings to 49 Psalms, mostly with the addition of *tō Dauid* (according to, with, or for, David). It is sometimes used also with a gen. (e.g. *psalmos ōdēs*, Ps. 68[67]:1; or *odē psalmou*, Ps. 66[65]:1). It can be assumed that, at least during the OT period, the singing of the Psalms was always accompanied by musical instruments. Further, *psalmos* can mean any spiritual song, whether or not an instrumental accompaniment is mentioned (cf. Ps. 33[32]:2). A spiritual song is possibly indicated in 1 Sam. 16:16, 18 (*psallein en kinyra*, to sing to a lyre), though some believe secular music is meant. Finally, *psalmos* can refer to profane songs, such as the drunkards' songs of Ps. 69(68):12. For the classification of the various Pss. and their *Sitz im Leben* see the specialist studies listed in the bibliography below.

2. The particular significance of the Pss. (nearly always meaning the Psalms of David, but also later poems up to and including the Psalms of Qumran) consists in the fact that, by and large, they constitute the back-bone of Jewish synagogue worship. Some individual Psalms, or collections of Psalms, such as Ps. 105:1–15 and Ps. 96, comprised a daily form of prayer for the faithful Jew.

NT 1. In the NT two basic meanings can be ascertained. (a) *psalmos* stands for the Psalms of the OT; or the so-called *Kethubim*, "The Writings", of which the Psalms, as the first document in this division, represent a *pars pro toto*. This latter meaning occurs only in Lk. 20:42; 24:44; Acts 1:20; 13:33. Hence, this usage is Lucan.

(b) More generally *psalmos* means a hymn of praise, and *psallō*, to sing a spiritual or sacred song. All the passages are non-Lucan: *psalmos* in 1 Cor. 14:26; Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16; *psallō* in the second sense occurs only in Rom. 15:9; 1 Cor. 14:15; Eph. 5:19; Jas. 5:13. This is probably the secondary meaning; it is clear from the Lucan par. to Matt. (Lk. 20:42; Matt. 22:43) that the OT Psalms were regarded as a prototype of spiritual songs.

2. It is remarkable, not only that these words occur only 4 times in Lk., 7 times in Paul, and once in Jas.; but also that they are used by Lk. only in the first sense, and by the others only in the second sense. But the reason for this is not so much theological, as that the vocabulary is influenced by the respective contexts. Lk., for instance, emphasizes the continuity of salvation history in Judaism and Christianity. The meaning "hymn of praise" or "to sing a spiritual or inspired song" can be further subdivided as follows.

(a) A hymn of praise, or the singing of praises, is a typical manifestation, either of the Spirit of God in his present activity in the community of the baptized (Eph. 5:18 ff.; Col. 3:16), or of God himself (1 Cor. 14:25 f.). This will include free com-

positions as well as repeated liturgical fragments (cf.O. Cullmann, *Early Christian Worship*, *SBT* 10, 1953, 21 f.), and also new Christian songs (which may well have been modelled on the Pss. of the OT and of later Judaism, and which will often have exhibited similar features of ecclesiastical vocabulary), such as we know from the wording of the various songs of Rev. (cf. Rev. 5:9 ff; 7:12; 11:15, 17 f.; 12:10 ff.; 15:3 f.; 19:1 f., 6 ff.; for 5:9 and 15:3 → *ōdē*). Such songs are also mentioned in the famous letter of the younger Pliny, who writes (*Epistle* 10, 96, 7) that the Christians met "to sing a song [*carmen* = *hymnos*] antiphonally to Christ as to a god."

1 Cor. 14:15 also regards singing as a manifestation of the Spirit, being a higher activity than speaking in tongues on the grounds that it is more edifying: "For if I pray in a tongue, my spirit prays but my mind is unfruitful. What am I to do? I will pray with the spirit and I will pray with the mind also; I will sing with the spirit and I will sing with the mind also" (1 Cor. 14:14 f.). The contrast here is not between *tō pneumati*, with or in the spirit (either the speaker's or more probably the Holy Spirit), and *tō noi*, with or in the mind, but between being in the Spirit unintelligibly and therefore unedifyingly (in tongues) and being in the Spirit intelligibly (cf. vv. 16–19).

A similar meaning underlies Jas. 5:13, albeit in a weakened and less explicit sense: "Is any one among you suffering? Let him pray. Is any cheerful? Let him sing praise." This answer is given in response to the question: How is the devout Christian to react to adversity and prosperity? Our feelings must be expressed in an intelligible form and they should be directed to God.

(b) *psallō* has the sense to sing hymns of praise in God's honour in Rom. 15:9, where Ps. 18(17):49 and 2 Sam. 22:50 are seen as finding fulfilment in the coming of Christ and the response among the Gentiles: "and in order that the Gentiles might glorify God for his mercy. As it is written, 'Therefore I will praise thee among the Gentiles, and sing to thy name.' "

K. H. Bartels

ᾠδή

ᾠδή (*ōdē*), song, ode (of mourning, complaint or joy); ᾄδω (*adō*), sing.

CL *adō* is the contracted form of Att. Gk. *aeidō*. *ōdē* is a contracted form of *aoidē*. *ōdos*, a contraction of *aoidos* (singer), also occurs occasionally.

1. The vb. *adō* is used from Homer onwards with the following meanings: (a) to sing; (b) to produce all kinds of vocal sounds, e.g. the hoot of the owl or the croaking of a frog; (c) to produce the sound of a plucked string, or any other similar sound, such as the whistling of the wind in the trees; (d) (later) simply, to call; and also (e) to celebrate, praise or honour in the cult.

2. The noun *ōdē* occurs in Gk. tragedy with these meanings: (a) a song of mourning or lamentation; (b) a song of joy or praise; (c) poetry in general; and (d) singing in general, whether of men or birds. These words do not appear to have an intrinsically religious significance in non-biblical Gk.

OT In the LXX the vb. occurs 66 times rendering chiefly the Heb. *šîr*, sing (Exod. 15:1 twice, 21; Num. 21:17; Jdg. 5:1, 3; 2 Sam. 19:35; 1 Chr. 15:27; 16:9, 23; 2 Chr. 23:13; 29:28; 2 Esd. 2:41, 65, 70; 7:7; 10:24; Neh. 7:1, 44, 67, 73; 10:28, 39; 11:22; 12:28 f., 42, 45 ff.; 13:5, 10; Jud. 16:2; Pss. 7 title; 13[12]:6; 21[20]:13;

27[26]:6; 33[32]:3; 57[56]:7; 59[58]:16; 68[67]:4, 32; 89[88]:1; 96[95]:1; 98[97]:1; 101[100]:1; 104[103]:33; 105[104]:2; 106[105]:12; 108[107]:1; 137[136]:3 f.; 138[137]:5; 144[143]:9; 149:1; Eccl. 2:8 twice; Isa. 5:1; 26:1; Jer. 20:13). It also stands for the noun *šîr* (1 Chr. 6:31; 25:7; 2 Chr. 29:27; Isa. 23:16), *šārat*, serve (2 Esd. 8:17), *zammar*, sing (2 Esd. 7:24), *tôḏâh*, song of thanksgiving (Jer. 30[37]:19), and *pāṣaḥ*, be serene, (Ps. 98[97]:4). It has no equivalent at Hos. 7:2.

The noun *ōdē* occurs 87 times mainly for *šîr* and *šîrâh* (Exod. 15:1; Deut. 31:19 twice, 21 f., 30; 32:34; Jdg. 5:12; 2 Sam. 22:1; 1 Ki. 5:12 [4:32]; 1 Chr. 15:26; 16:42; 2 Chr. 5:13; 7:6; 23:18; 34:12; Neh. 12:27, 36; Pss. 137[136]:3 twice, 4; 144[143]:9; Amos 5:23; 8:10. It occurs 36 times in the titles of Psalms from Ps. 18 to Ps. 134. Other Heb. terms are *higgāyôn* (Pss. 9:16; 92[91]:3), *mizmôr* (in the titles of Pss. 4; 39[38]; 48[47]), *maśśā'* (1 Chr. 15:22, 27), *n*^{e}*ginôṯ* (Hab. 3:19), and *šigyōnôṯ*, (Hab. 3:1). Apart from various Ps. titles, *ōdē* occurs without Heb. equivalent in Jdg. 5:1 *v.l.*; 2 Sam. 6:5; 22:2; 1 Ki. 8:53; Jon. 2:3 *v.l.*; Isa. 5:1; 25:1; 26:1, 9; 38:9 (all *v.l.*); 1 Macc. 4:54; 13:51; 2 Macc. 7:6; 3 Macc. 6:32; 4 Macc. 18:18.

With the one exception of Deut. 31:30, where *ōdē* is spoken, singing is always indicated. Sometimes musical accompaniment is mentioned (e.g. 1 Chr. 16:42), and on occasion both music and dancing. David and the Israelites sang and danced before the ark (2 Sam. 6:5). Sometimes the vb. has a cognate acc. ("Moses sang [*ēse*] this song [*tēn ōdēn tautēn*]" (Exod. 15:1; cf. Num. 21:17 where *asma* is used). *asma*, song, does not occur in the NT, but is found in the LXX for *šîr* and *šîrâh* (Num. 21:17; Pss. 33[32]:3; 40[39]:3; 96]95]:1; 98[97]:1; 149:1; Eccl. 7:5[6]; 12:4; in the title of the Song of Songs and Cant. 1:1; Sir. 39:14; Isa. 5:1; 23:15; 26:1). *adō* is sometimes used in parallel with other words, such as *hymneō* (1 Chr. 16:9), *agalliaō*, rejoice, and *psallō* (Ps. 98[97]:4).

Sometimes the joyous nature of *ōdē* is stressed. But Amos 8:10 gives a dire warning to those who self-confidently await the day of Yahweh: "I will turn your feasts into mourning, and all your songs into lamentation. . . ." The new song was a song for festive occasions. The references in Chr. indicates something of the rôle of the temple singers and music in the cult.

Music is mentioned in various connexions in the OT: at a family gathering (Gen. 31:27); the acclamation of heroes (Jdg. 11:34; 1 Sam. 18:6); and the king's enthronement and martial occasions (Jdg. 7:18 ff.; 1 Ki. 1:39 f.; 2 Ki. 11:14; 2 Chr. 13:14; 2 Chr. 20:28); harem and court music (2 Sam. 19:35; Eccl. 2:8); feasts (Isa. 5:12; 24:8 f.); dirges and laments (2 Sam. 1:17 f.; 2 Chr. 35:25); incantations and cultic occasions (Exod. 28:35; Jos. 6:4–20; 1 Sam. 16:6 ff.; 2 Ki. 3:15); and occupational songs (Num. 21:17; Jdg. 9:27; Isa. 16:10; Jer. 31:4 f., 7; 48:33).

NT 1. In the NT *ōdē* and *adō* occur only 4 times in the Pauline writings and 6 times in Rev., with both noun and vb. together in Rev. (cf. Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16; Rev. 5:9; 14:3; 15:3). Rev. 5:9 indicates that the reference is always to a song that is sung: "And they sang a new song, saying, 'Worthy art thou to take the scroll and to open its seals, for thou wast slain and by thy blood didst ransom men for God from every tribe and tongue and people and nation.' " The verse is also an example of the so-called "Axios-acclamation" (from the Gk. *axios*, "worthy"), known in liturgical and juridical contexts from the time of the ancient Gk. world to the Byzantine em-

perors (cf. E. Peterson, *Heis Theos*, 1926, 176 ff.). In Rev. the whole creation – in heaven, on earth, and below the earth – acknowledges, as of right, the lordship of the → Lamb in their eschatological paean of praise. The "song of Moses" in Rev. 15:3 transposes the song of Moses in Exod. 15:1 and also includes words from Ps. 145:7, giving them a christological significance: "And they sing the song of Moses, the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb, saying, 'Great and wonderful are thy deeds, Lord God the Almighty! Just and true are thy ways, O King of the ages!' " "As Moses once sang God's praises after crossing the Red Sea, so the singers who have won their freedom through the Lamb celebrate God's deeds which have been revealed in his work as judge" (E. Lohse, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes*, *NTD* 11, 1966[9], ad loc.).

2. Songs clearly formed a central part of early Christian liturgy, as had already been the case in the worship of the OT community and of the later Jewish temple. The Pauline writings twice allude to songs in discussion of man's spiritual activity. Rather than be drunk with wine, the Ephesian Christians are urged to "be filled with the Spirit, addressing one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs [*psalmois kai hymnois kai ōdais pneumatikais*], singing and making melody [*adontes kai psallontes*] to the Lord with all your heart, always and for everything giving thanks in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ to God the Father" (Eph. 5:18 ff.). These would doubtless include the OT Psalms which the NT writers often freely quote, but would evidently include also Christian hymns. O. Cullmann regards Rev. 5:9, 12 f.; 12:10 ff.; 19:1 f.; 19:6 as among the oldest of Christian songs; he also places the Odes of Solomon in this period (op. cit., 21 f.). Perhaps the earliest Christian hymn is contained in Phil. 2:6–11 which Paul cites in support of his plea to the Philippians to have the mind of Christ. This may have been a pre-Pauline hymn or something which Paul had composed himself and was also known to his readers (for discussion see R. P. Martin, *Carmen Christi: Philippians ii. 5–11 in Recent Interpretation and its Setting in Early Christian Worship, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series* 4, 1967; and *Philippians*, *New Century Bible*, 1976, 90–102, 109–16). Other possible christological hymns are Col. 1:15–20; Eph. 2:14 ff.; 1 Tim. 3:16; 1 Pet. 3:18–22; Heb. 1:3; and the Prologue of Jn. (for discussion see J. T. Sanders, *The New Testament Christological Hymns: Their Historical Religious Background*, *Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series* 15, 1971).

Lk.'s account of the birth and infancy narratives contains psalms like the *Magnificat*, expressing Mary's praise for God's saving mercies (Lk. 1:46–55), the *Benedictus*, Zechariah's thanksgiving for his son, the future John the Baptist (Lk. 1:68–79), and the *Nunc Dimittis*, Simeon's psalm on seeing the infant Jesus in the temple (Lk. 2:29–32). These psalms are all couched in terms of Yahweh's saving acts against the background of OT expectation (on the opening chapters of Lk. see R. Laurentin, *Structure et Théologie de Luc I–II*, 1964[4]). Elsewhere music is mentioned in the NT in various connexions: dirges (Matt. 9:23); prophetic passages (Matt. 24:31; 1 Cor. 15:32; 1 Thess. 4:16; Heb. 12:19); the music (*symphōnia*) of the merrymaking at the return of the prodigal son (Lk. 15:25); and in a metaphorical sense (Matt. 6:2; 11:17; Lk. 7:32; 1 Cor. 13:1; 1 Cor. 14:7 f.).

Singing is an expression of Christian joy; it is at the same time edifying expression of the Spirit-filled life. Singing, music and spiritual verse are "a mode of the Word, in

which Christ makes Himself heard" (H. Schlier, *TDNT* I 164 f.). This may be compared with Ignatius, *Eph.* 4:1 f., where the middle or passive vb. *Christos adetai*, "Christ is sung", can also be understood actively as "Christ sings". The following clause adds: "sing in unity with one voice to the Father through Jesus Christ [*en henotēti adete en phōnē mia dia Iēsou Christou tō patri*]."

Col. 3:16 likewise sees singing as a means of edification and praise: "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly, as you teach and admonish one another in all wisdom, and as you sing psalms and hymns and spiritual songs [*psalmois hymnois ōdais pneumatikais*] with thankfulness in your hearts to God." Whilst pointing out that it is impossible to differentiate exactly between the three terms used here, E. Lohse says that, "Taken together, they describe the full range of singing which the Spirit prompts" (*Colossians and Philemon, Hermeneia*, 1971, 151). *psalmoi* often designates the OT Psalms (cf. Lk. 20:42; 24:44; Acts 1:20; 13:33), whereas *hymnos* is "the festive hymn of praise" (cf. LXX Isa. 42:10; 1 Macc. 13:51; Acts 16:25; Heb. 2:12) and *ōdē* is "the song in which God's acts are praised and glorified" (cf. Rev. 5:9; 14:3; 15:3) (E. Lohse, ibid.). H. Schlier is doubtless correct in seeing that Eph. 5:18 ff. and Col. 3:16 presuppose a situation similar to that in 1 Cor. 14:15, i.e. the regular worship of the early Christian community. The *eucharistountes*, "giving thanks", of Eph. 5:20 doubtless takes up vv. 18 ff. by way of summary. Even if one cannot agree with Schlier that this refers exclusively to the eucharistic prayer of thanksgiving, one can go along with him when he says that all such liturgical singing is acclaimed by the Amen of the whole congregation, and that if things are well sung, this can edify those who are present by building them into a community "in Christ". It only needs a glance into the various works on the history of worship in the earliest Christian communities to see the importance of liturgy for church life, and in particular the importance of singing in worship. Dom Gregory Dix, for instance, states that the first attacks of the Roman state were directed not so much against the holding of Christian belief, as against the liturgy, because it was "the expression of that belief in the *worship* of the *ecclesia*" (*The Shape of the Liturgy*, 1945, 146). Christian worship, from the standpoint of the state, was deliberate treason (*crimen laesae maiestatis*), while from the standpoint of the church it was "the supreme positive affirmation before God of the Christian life" (op. cit., 147). "For the Christian, as for the persecutor, the liturgy formed the very life not only of the church corporately, but of the individual soul" (op. cit., 148). Next to the preaching of the word and participation in the sacrament, the heart of worship was this "spiritual singing", a festive recognition of God in Jesus Christ as the Lord of the congregation and of the world. In this context, the use of *psallō* in parallel to *exhomologeomai*, → confess, in Rom. 15:9 is particularly important: even singing psalms is a confession of faith before God, in this case, concerning the eschatological conversion of the Gentiles.

K. H. Bartels

(a). A. A. Anderson, *The Book of Psalms, New Century Bible*, I–II, 1972; W. Bauer, "The Odes of Solomon", in Henn. Schn., II, 808 ff.; H. M. Best and D. Huttar, "Music; Musical Instruments", *ZPEB* IV 311–24; O. Cullmann, *Early Christian Worship, SBT* 10, 1953; M. J. Dahood, *Psalms*, I–III, *Anchor Bible*, 1966–70; G. Delling, *hymnos, hymneō, psallō, psalmos, TDNT* VIII 489–503; M. Dibelius and H. Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles, Hermeneia*, 1972; M. Dibelius and H. Greeven, *The Epistle of James, Hermeneia*, 1976; G. Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, 1945; B. D. Eerdmans, "The Hebrew Book of Psalms", *OTS* 4, 1947, 1–90; C. Grove, *Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, 1954[5];

H. H. Guthrie, *Israel's Sacred Songs*, 1966; J. Hempel, "Psalms, Book of", *IDB* III 942–58; J. Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, 1966[2]; A. S. Kapelrud, "Scandinavian Research in the Psalms after Mowinckel", *ASTI* 4, 1965, 74–90; A. D. Kilmer, "Music", *IDB Supplementary Volume*, 1976, 610 ff.; J. Z. Lauterbach, "Psalms", *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, X, 241–50; E. Lohse, *Colossians and Philemon, Hermeneia*, 1971; S. Mowinckel, *The Psalms in Israel's Worship*, I–II, 1962; J. B. Payne, "Psalms, Book of", *ZPEB* IV 924–47; R. P. Martin, *Carmen Christi: Philippians ii. 5–11 in Recent Interpretation and its Setting in Early Christian Worship, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series* 4, 1967; and *Philippians, New Century Bible*, 1976; W. O. E. Oesterley, *The Sacred Dance: A Study in Comparative Folklore*, 1923; G. von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, I–II, 1962–65; H. H. Rowley, "Psalmody and Music", in *Worship in Ancient Israel*, 1967, 176–212; C. Sachs, *The Rise of Music in the Ancient World*, 1943; J. T. Sanders, *The New Testament Christological Hymns: Their Historical Religious Background, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series* 15, 1971; H. Schlier, *adō, ōdē, TDNT* I 163 ff.; R. B. Y. Scott, *The Psalms as Christian Praise*, 1959; O. R. Sellers, "Musical Instruments of Israel", *BA* 4, 1941, 33–47; A. Sendrey and M. Norton, *David's Harp: The Story of Music in Biblical Times*, 1964; W. S. Smith, *Musical Aspects of the New Testament*, (Dissertation, Amsterdam) 1962; J. Stainer, *The Music of the Bible*, 1879; R. C. Tannehill, "The Magnificat as Poem", *JBL* 93, 1974, 263–75; A. Weiser, *The Psalms*, 1962; E. Werner, "Music", *IDB* III 457–69; "Musical Instruments", *IDB* III 469–76; and "Hebrew and Oriental Christian Metrical Hymns", *Hebrew Union College Annual* 23, 1946, 397–432; C. Westermann, "Psalms, Book of", *IDB Supplementary Volume*, 1976, 705–10; and *The Praise of God in the Psalms*, 1965; A. N. Wilder, *Early Christian Rhetoric*, 1964.

(b). W. Bauer, *Der Wortgottesdienst der ältesten Christen*, 1930; A. Büchler, "Zur Geschichte der Tempelmusik und der Tempelpsalmen", *ZAW* 19, 1899, 96–133, 329–44; *ZAW* 20, 1900, 97–135; F. Crüsemann, *Studien zur Formgeschichte von Hymnus und Danklied in Israel*, 1969; R. Deichgräber, *Gotteshymnus und Christushymnus in der frühen Christenheit. Untersuchungen zur Form, Sprache und Stil der frühchristlichen Hymnen*, 1967; G. Delling, *Gottesdienst im Neuen Testament*, 1952; I. Elbogen, *Der jüdische Gottesdienst in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung*, 1931[3]; R. Ficker, *šîr, THAT* II 895 ff.; H.-J. Kraus, *Psalmen*, I–II, *BKAT* 15, 1972[4]; R. Laurentin, *Structure et Théologie de Luc I–II*, 1964[4]; J. Leipoldt, *Der Gottesdienst in der ältesten Kirche, jüdisch? griechisch? christlich?*, 1937; E. Lohse, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes, NTD* 11, 1966[9]; É. des Places, "Hymnes grecs au seuil de l'Ère chrétienne", *Biblica* 38, 1957, 113–29; J. Quasten, *Musik und Gesang in den Kulten der heidnischen Antike und christlichen Frühzeit*, 1930; J. M. Robinson, "Die Hodajot-Formel in Gebet und Hymnus des Frühchristentums", in *Apophoreta. Festschrift E. Haenchen, BZNW* 30, 194–235; J. Schattenmann, *Studien zum neutestamentlichen Prosahymnus*, 1965; R. Stählin, "Die Geschichte des christlichen Gottesdienstes", *Leiturgia* 1, 1954, 1 ff.; C. Westermann, "Instrumentale Musik, Gesang und Dichtung in Israel", *RGG*[3] IV 1201–5; R. Wünsch, "Hymnus", Pauly-Wissowa IX, 1, 140 ff.

Soul

ψυχή

ψυχή (*psychē*), soul, life; ψυχικός (*psychikos*), pertaining to the soul or life, and thus physical (in contrast to spiritual), unspiritual.

CL 1. *psychē* is connected etymologically with the Indo-European root **bhs*, from which is derived the German vb. *blasen*, to blow. It originally meant breath, breath of life. The original meaning of *psychē* is therefore impersonal: the breath which gives life to man. For the concept of "the soul . . . as the bearer of conscious experiences" (J. B. Hofmann, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Griechischen*, 1949, 428), Homer retains *thymos* (related to Latin *fumus*, smoke; cf. *thyō*, to sacrifice). The latter denotes the warm flow of blood, the life-force, hence, emotion (excitement, courage, desire, craving).

Both words connote a psycho-physical entity, but not an identical one. As early as

Homer, *Il.* 11, 334, we find the attempt to combine the two, *thymos kai psychē.* When the dependence of the conscious soul (*thymos*) on the unconscious (*psychē*) became recognized, the meaning of *psychē* was broadened beyond its fixed usage in the earliest epic to include the content of *thymos.* Thus the *psychē*, which had originally been understood as an unconscious, impersonal basis of life, became the bearer of conscious experiences. The ideas about the transmigration of souls which were current in the 6th cent. B.C. indicate the conclusion of this process (→ Resurrection, art. *anastasis* CI): by now *psychē* embraces in equal measure the two concepts, basis of life and consciousness. The *psychē* is regarded as something permanent, and a person is given responsibility for its destiny.

If we examine this development in the meaning of *psychē*, we find that the word has three areas of meaning: (a) *psychē* in the sense of the impersonal basis of life, life itself; (b) the inward part of man; (c) an independent soul, in contrast to the body.

2. (a) In ancient Gk. literature, the soul is conceived as combined with the → body. When it leaves the body, the body loses its life (Homer, *Od.* 14, 426). A person's soul is snatched away, and with it his life (Homer, *Od.* 22, 444). Thus the soul can simply stand for life. A person may plead for his life (Soph., *OC* 1326; Hdt. 1, 24, 2); he may fight for his life (Homer, *Od.* 22, 245); he may risk his life (Homer, *Od.* 3, 74). One may accept compensation for the soul, i.e. the life of a man (Hdt. 2, 134, 4). A person may release his soul, and so his life, from himself (Eur., *Orestes* 1172). *psychē* can even come to mean things as dear as life, e.g. money (Hesiod, *Works* 696) and children (Eur., *Andromache* 419).

(b) *psychē* can refer to the inward part of man, his personality. Thus the soul can be equivalent to the person (Eur., *OC* 499). The soul, bound as it is to the body, is so much a personal force, that *psychē* can be used instead of the personal pronoun, so that "my soul" is equivalent to "I" (Soph., *Antigone* 227). According to the inner attributes of a person, his soul can be characterized as strong (Aristophanes, *Acharnenses* 393), or as wise. Men can be categorized according to the strength of their soul (Hdt., 5, 124). If man is anything at all, he is soul (Plato, *Alcibiades* 1, 130a).

The actual power of the soul is seen first of all in the movement which it imparts to the body in which it lives (Plato, *Laws* 896a–b). The concept of the soul becomes that of the character (Soph., *Philoctetes* 55) and of the disposition (Hdt., 3, 14, 1). Aristotle enquires into the nature of the soul, this inward force which fills and moves a man, and describes it as fire and warmth (Aristotle, *De Anima* 407 b 22), Plato presents the idea that the soul can be robbed of its body (Plato, *Laws* 873a–b).

The soul is the seat of perception, of desire and pleasure, and of enjoyment (Aesch., *Persae* 841). The word "soul" is used generally in place of emotion. "To have a soul" means the same as "to have a certain feeling" (Demosthenes, 28, 21). Thus the soul, and not the body, is the seat of love and erotic desire (Eur., *Hippolytus* 505), of hunger and thirst (Xen., *Institutio Cyri* 8, 7, 4). The powers of reason and of will are, however, also part of the soul. Thus the soul finds a place alongside thought and judgment (Soph., *Antigone* 176).

The properties of the soul are movement, observation, perception, and above all incorporeality (Aristotle, *De Anima* 405 b 11). Thus the soul can be assessed morally, according to its powers. The soul has a certain ability; its tasks are to care, to rule, to advise (Plato, *Republic* 1, 353D). Without the soul as the foundation,

sophia, wisdom, and *nous*, understanding, would have no chance to develop. Gk. philosophy generally pondered continually on the relationship between the different powers of the soul, and about their number and their capabilities. The Pythagoreans, for instance, regarded the soul as divided into three parts: *logismos*, thought, *thymos*, will, and *epithymia*, desire. Aristotle makes another tripartite division: nourishment, perception and thought (*De Anima* 413 b 11). Differences of view also exist on whether the soul is a special entity of quite different substance from the body, or whether, with Epicurus (*Epistulae* 1 p 19), one can assume that the soul has mass and is thus a body of infinitesimal size, which mixes itself with a vapour of warmth. For warmth can be observed to be the element of life, and remains even when the soul is conceived in a material form.

The Stoics held the soul to be material, nourished by material substances, and filling the body. It is correlated to the body. The substance of the soul is the *pneuma*, breath. Like the body, it results from procreation. It is fed by the evaporation of the blood, and by the air which it breathes in. *pathē*, affections, are the greatest enemies of the soul, and are in a position to rob it of liberty. They constitute an unnatural, irrational limitation for the soul.

The essential characteristic of the soul consists in the fact that it is in movement, that it can set itself in motion (Plato, *Phaedrus* 245e). Among all animate beings, man is the one in whom the deity has implanted the most powerful soul (Xenophon, *Memorabilia* 1, 9, 14). Furthermore, it has a share in divinity, since the divine power rules in man by means of the soul (Xenophon, *Memorabilia* 4, 3, 14). The soul can be trained, according to its various capabilities. The most important thing, however, as Socrates teaches (Plato, *Apology* 30b), is to cultivate or take care of, *epimeleisthai*, the soul, rather than wealth or happiness. For virtue does not result from wealth; on the contrary, the acquisition of wealth and of other good things both in private and in public life are the fruit of virtue. One could say that here for the first time we find the concept of the care of souls. Socrates is not concerned with speculations about the soul, its life before and after its time in the body, although these are questions which interested Plato (→ Resurrection, art. *anastasis* CL). Here a new ideal of education is envisaged, and the soul acquires a completely new meaning. This has nothing to do with the Orphic soul-demon, nor with the soul in Attic tragedy, nor with the Homeric, epic concept of *eidōlon*, the shadowy image of man which exists in the underworld (W. Jaeger, *Paideia*, II, 89 ff.; and *The Theology of the Early Greek Philosophers*, 1947). Since the soul is a spirit capable of thought and reason, which has moral awareness, the care of the soul is service of God. The soul, as part of the cosmos, must be brought into harmony with the cosmos. Man reaches this harmony by gaining full mastery over himself. In this way he can hold his own in the face of destiny and of nature; the soul is enabled to govern the body.

(c) The Homeric epics speak not only of the departure of the soul, i.e. the loss of life, but they also know something of an abode of souls. In this there is no attempt at a speculative or theoretical understanding of the soul in contradistinction to the body. Rather, we see the effect of the parapsychological experiences which were common among men of ancient times. This is the background of the portrayal of Patroclus' ghost: he is dead, but not yet in Hades, and the ghost is just like Patroclus in height, voice and clothing. The soul goes into the underworld like a vapour, accompanied by rustling, chirping, and buzzing (like bats, Homer, *Od.* 24, 5 ff.); one

could perhaps say that it flits. It is a likeness (*eidōlon*) of the person concerned, but not that person himself. The soul is thus represented here as an entity in its own right, as opposed to the body; it joins itself to its body and leaves it again (Homer, *Il.* 23, 64 ff., 100 ff.; *Od.* 11, 387).

Related to this in thought is the concept of a journey of the soul into the world beyond, and its return to the earth; or of its descent from the realm of light into the body (→ Knowledge, art. *ginōskō* CL 2 (c)) or to the earth, and its return to the heavenly world by means of a cycle of births, *kyklos geneseōn*. Another concept is that of a gathering of the souls in a field in the underworld, to hear the judgment as to whether they will partake in the eternal symposium, or lie in the mire of the underworld. The real driving force behind these ideas about the soul, and practices of liberating it, is the religious movement of Orphism. The concept of an independent soul, not tied to a body, which can leave its body for a certain time and then return, is found in other cultures as well (cf. for instance M. Eliade on Shamanism in *RGG* [3] V 1386 ff.; and in the Gk. world, W. Burkert, *Weisheit und Wissenschaft*, 1962, 98 ff.; and *Goēs. Zum griechischen Schamanismus, Rheinisches Museum*, Neue Folge 105, 1962, 36 ff.).

Plato provides us with the idea that the soul can be deprived of its body (*Laws* 873a–b), that it does not come fully into its own until it has been separated from the body (*Phaedo* 66e–67a), and that it is immortal (*Republic* 10, 608d; *Phaedo* 70c; *Phaedrus* 245c–e). He argues for the necessity of the soul's immortality on the ground that a lifetime is too short a period for the moral struggle in man. A man must therefore be able to collect and assess experiences from several incarnations of the soul. It has knowledge of the forms of ultimate reality which it acquired in pre-physical existence. The body is clothing for the soul (*peribolon*), or a kind of prison (*desmōtērion*; Plato, *Cratylus* 400c). Liberation from this prison may be achieved by Bacchic ceremonies, through the grace of gods who provide redemption, or by ascetic renunciation of earthly existence. The immortal souls are led into the underworld by Hermes. There, for the uninitiated, the *amyētoi* and *atelestoi*, there awaits the mire (*borboros*) of the underworld (Plato, *Phaedo* 60c).

Another conception of liberation is that according to which the soul rises to the light in a series of new incarnations, a kind of transmigration of the soul. Its particular deeds determine the character of its new existence (we find similar ideas in the Indian religions, but there Karma is a completely impersonal and moreover self-exhausting force). All these ideas depend on the belief that the soul is something totally independent of the body, having substance and immortality of its own.

In a figurative sense, the term *psychē* can also be used of the inspiring force in the constitution of a state. Isocrates speaks of the soul of the city (12, 138), and Demosthenes describes the virtue of men as the soul of Greece (60, 23). The thought of a world-soul as the life principle of the cosmos, so that the cosmos itself is soul and governing principle (*hēgemonikon*), is found in Chrysippus the Stoic.

OT 1. In the LXX (including the Apocrypha), *psychē*, soul, occurs over 900 times, and is distributed fairly equally among the various books. Most often it stands for the Heb. *nepeš* (originally, throat, gullet; then breath, exhalation), but also 25 times for *lēḇ*, → heart, inner man (especially in Pss., Chr., Isa.; elsewhere *lēḇ* is usually rendered by *kardia*), 5 times for *ḥayyâh*, living thing (otherwise rendered by *zōon*; →

life), twice (Gen. 41:8; Exod. 35:21) for *rûaḥ*, spirit (otherwise rendered by *pneuma*), and once (Lev. 17:4) for *'îš*, man (otherwise rendered by *anēr* or *anthrōpos*; → man). The Heb. *nᵉšāmâh*, breath, is generally rendered by *pnoē*, wind, breath (→ Spirit), but never by *psychē*.

(a) *nepeš* denotes that which makes a body, whether of man or beast, into a living being. Thus it can even on one occasion (Gen. 36:6) be translated *sōma* (→ body). When *nepeš* is translated as *psychē*, *psychē* "signifies that which is vital in man in the broadest sense" (G. von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, I, 1962, 153), in other words, that which is alive. We read of the living soul (Gen. 1:20; RSV "living creatures"). A dying person breathes out his soul (AV "gives up the ghost"; cf. Jer. 15:9), or pours it out (Lam. 2:12). It departs from the person who dies (Gen. 35:18). It (i.e. the life) can, however, return to a person's body (1 Ki. 17:21). "Soul for soul" means "life for life" (Exod. 21:23). → Blood, as the seat of life, can be practically identical with *psychē* (Gen. 9:4 f.; Lev. 17:11, 14; cf. Deut. 12:23; → Blood; → Reconciliation, art. *hilaskomai* OT 3 (c)).

(b) *psychē*, rendering *nepeš*, is the sensitive part of the life of the ego, the seat of the emotions, of love (Cant. 1:7), of longing (Ps. 63[62]:1) and of gladness (Ps. 86:4). This is not the subject of any further reflection. The "soul" reveals its life in movement and the most various expressions of the emotions. It is the uniting factor for the inner powers of man: hence the phrase "with all your soul" (Deut. 13:3). Within the soul dwell the desire for food (Deut. 12:20, 21), the lust of the flesh (Jer. 2:24), and the thirst for murder and revenge (Ps. 27[26]:12). The soul expresses its feelings: it weeps (Ps. 119[118]:28), is poured out in tears (Job 30:16), is "made long" in patient endurance (Job 6:11). But knowledge and understanding (Ps. 139[138]:14), thought (1 Sam. 20:4) and memory (Lam. 3:20), have their seat in the soul as well. To such a degree is the soul the summing up of the whole personality, of the whole self of a person, that "soul" can be equivalent in meaning to "I myself" or "yourself" (1 Sam. 18:1). In Gen. 2:7, *psychē* means "person" or "being".

So too living creatures can be described as souls: everything that lives, all living things, usually in a collective sense (Lev. 11:10). A "soul" in the laws means the person concerned in a particular ordinance (e.g. Lev. 4:2; 5:1, 2, 4, 15). When the people are numbered, counting is by "souls" (Exod. 1:5; Deut. 10:22). A clear indication of how unfamiliar the OT is with the concept of a soul separate from the body, or a soul which becomes separated from the body at death, is the fact that it can speak of a dead person as the soul of that person, and mean by this phrase the dead person in his corporeality (Num. 6:6).

(c) Whereas the usage of this word in the Qumran texts remains totally within the OT framework (e.g. 1QS 3:1, 8; 1QH 2:7–35; 3:6, 19; 5:12–39; 9:7 f., 28, 33; CD 16:1–9), Hellenistic influence is more clearly discernible in the apocryphal literature. While elsewhere we do not find reflection about the relationship between → body and soul, body and soul are here contrasted. A perishable body weighs down the soul (Wis. 9:15). The souls of the righteous are in the hand of God (Wis. 3:1). Pollution of souls is also mentioned (Wis. 14:26). It is especially bad when no healing can be found for the soul, so that it must perish eternally (Wis. 16:9).

2. Josephus makes use in his accounts of history and personalities of many-sided, powerful Hellenistic concepts, which he has at his disposal as a result of his education and training.

(a) For him too *psychē* is primarily the seat of outward, earthly life (to save the souls, as opposed to the goods, *Ant.* 9, 240; danger to the soul, i.e. mortal danger, *War* 1, 493).

(b) *psychē* is the sense of the inner man with its various powers as contrasted with the body (*War* 1, 430). It is the locus of the will and the virtues (*Ant.* 2, 9 distinguishes good birth and the virtue of the soul), the seat of the emotions (shock, *Ant.* 20, 83; hatred, *Ant.* 16, 93) and qualities (wickedness, *Ant.* 16, 301).

(c) Finally, immortal souls are contrasted with men's bodies (*War* 2, 154; cf. *Ant.* 18, 18, on the Essenes who regard their souls as immortal). The soul, not being subject to corruption, can pass over into another body. The evil soul will, however, suffer eternal punishment (*War* 2, 163). Mention should also be made of the speech which Josephus puts into the mouth of Eleazar, the leader of the rebels, at Masada (*War* 7, 341 ff.). Here too Josephus is moving in the world of Hellenistic thought concerning the immortality of the soul and its true life, separated from the body, in eternal fellowship with God (even Indian ideas are cited). Thus for Josephus the immortality of the soul and its connexion with eternal life open up opportunities which can be wasted, inasmuch as the immortal soul is determined and overpowered by the body.

(d) Josephus uses *psychē* and *pneuma*, → spirit, in the same context without further reflection. He says nothing of their individual functions. Clearly *pneuma* is the higher consciousness of man, while *psychē* stands for the life-force as such (*Ant.* 11, 240).

3. In Philo's doctrine of the soul, his doctrine of creation, which is conditioned by the OT, is further developed (*Migr.* 34). For him the soul is the side of human existence that has been equipped with divine powers and possibilities; it belongs to the divine Spirit (*Virt.* 217), and its first power is that of glorifying God. Of particular concern for Philo is the governing principle (*hēgemonikon*) of souls, the *nous*, understanding (*Leg. All.* 1, 39; → Reason). The essence of this governing part, the "soul" of the soul, is the Spirit of God (*Rer. Div. Her.* 55).

(a) Philo also knows *psychē* in the sense of life; its whole being is in the blood (*Det. Pot. Ins.* 84) and thus includes what is mortal.

(b) As in Gk. philosophy, we find in Philo the division of the soul into rational and irrational powers (*Agric.* 63), and also the concept of the soul as the seat of the emotions, especially virtue (*Det. Pot. Ins.* 59), and thus of life (ibid., 70). The power of the *nous* is expressed in thinking, willing, the power to beget, and perception.

(c) In striking contrast to the OT, Philo takes it for granted that there are bodiless souls (*Sacr.* 5; *Som.* 1, 135). He assumes that the universe, which for him is God's sanctuary, is filled with bodiless souls of a purely spiritual nature, i.e. the angels. In comparison with them, man appears as a mixture of reason and irrationality (*Spec. Leg.* 1, 66). He writes of higher beings which join themselves to mortal bodies for a certain length of time and then leave them again (*Plant.* 14). The soul achieves eternal life by the acquisition and practice of virtues (*Conf. Ling.* 161), especially that of glorifying God (*Op. Mund.* 155). The soul finally leaves the mortal part belonging to it behind (cf. above (a)), and goes into the world of things imperishable and incorruptible (*Migr.* 18). It is really at home in the divine world; in the body it finds itself in a place alien to it (*Som.* 1, 181). Being in constant motion, it belongs to God, who himself is the world-soul and is himself in constant motion (*Aet. Mund.* 84).

4. Hellenistic influences are also clearly discernible generally in Judaism. 4 Macc. in particular demonstrates this with its conception of an immortal soul which separates itself from the body in death. Death is the way to immortality (4 Macc. 14:5); the victor's prize for virtue is everlasting life, i.e. of the soul (4 Macc. 17:12). In the hour of death, the soul of the righteous man is received by the patriarchs (4 Macc. 5:37; 13:17). A clear example of the adoption of Hellenistic ideas is to be seen at about the middle of the 1st century A.D. in Johanan ben Zakkai. He speaks of Gehenna as an intermediate place of punishment (Berakoth 28b 23; cf. Ab. R. N. 25; 7a 51). The Midrash on Ecclesiastes (3:21, 22a) also pursues this line. Here the souls of the righteous as well as those of the ungodly rise at death to the heavenly height in order to receive the judgment on them. This view is in the background in two passages in the Gospel of Luke (in the Acts too Luke shows the influence of typical Hellenistic ideas), although *psychē*, soul, is not specifically mentioned: (a) at Lk. 16:23, Lazarus is in Abraham's bosom, and the rich man in the place of torment; (b) at Lk. 23:43, the well-known saying "Today you will be with me in Paradise" (→ Paradise). On the other hand, we do not find the concept of separate judgments for body and soul. If that were the case, the soul would have no responsibility for the body. Rather, we have the picture of a → resurrection, where God will bring the soul and the body together and then judge both. There is thus no room for the concept of the soul as the location of ideas, thoughts and moral conviction, with the body as the seat of the passions. Despite Hellenistic ideas about the soul, the typical Jewish hope remains of a resurrection, and thus of the righteousness of God, which can only then come into play. God holds an eschatological judgment on body and soul (Sanhedrin 91a). So too in the apocryphal literature (2 Esd. 7:78 ff.) we find the idea of a judgment of souls directly after death. By decree of the divine judge, the souls are sent to a place of refreshment and peace and sevenfold joy, or to a place of torments and of roaming in sevenfold pain. Thus Enoch catches sight of the dwellings of the righteous dead, who make request, and intercede and pray for the children of men (Eth. En. 39:4 f.). Similarly, Eth. Enoch 71:16 relates that at death the righteous enter heaven. The paraenetic ending of the book of Enoch follows the same theme: the souls of sinners go into the underworld, while the spirits (here meaning much the same as souls) of the righteous may rejoice and be glad, and do not die (Eth. Enoch 103:4, 7).

NT 1. In the NT, by way of contrast to the frequent use of the word in the LXX, *psychē* occurs in all only 101 times; of these 37 occurrences are in the Synoptic Gospels, 15 in Acts, and 10 in the Gospel of John. The majority of examples are therefore found in the narrative portions of the NT. In the Pauline Epistles it occurs altogether 13 times, 7 times in Rev., 6 times each in Heb. and 1 Pet., twice each in Jas., 2 Pet., and 1 Jn., and once in 3 Jn.

2. (a) In the NT *psychē*, soul, is also the seat of life, or life itself, as in the well-known saying, "whoever would save his life [*psychē*] will lose it; and whoever loses his life for my sake ... will save it" (Mk. 8:35 par. Matt. 16:25, Lk. 9:24; cf. Matt. 10:39; Lk. 17:33; Jn. 12:25). What it means to say, that he who gives up his life will truly find it, becomes clear from the example of Jesus himself and his death and resurrection: true life is ever only won through sacrifice. Quite clearly *psychē* means life again in the saying Mk. 10:45 par. Matt. 20:28: Christ's mission here is to give his life as a ransom for many (→ Redemption, art. *lytron* NT). So too at Lk. 14:26

"hate his own soul" means "hate his own life" (cf. Lk. 9:23, to deny oneself). The counterpart of Lk. 14:26 is Rev. 12:11 which speaks of those who have not loved their lives.

psychē embraces the whole natural being and life of man for which he concerns himself and of which he takes constant care. Thus Matt. 6:25 speaks of being anxious for the *psychē*, i.e. for its food. Life (*psychē*) and body (*sōma*) are God's handiwork: therefore they are of more importance than the food and clothing about which man is so concerned. At Lk. 12:19 the rich man addresses his soul, i.e. he speaks to himself. However, he does not bargain with the fact that his *psychē*, i.e. his life, can be taken from him at any moment. The citation of Ps. 16:10 in Acts 2:27 also speaks of the *psychē* – again in the sense of the seat of life – as being left by God in Hades, or given up to Hades (→ Resurrection, art. *anastasis* OT 2; → Hell), i.e. that the speaker will die. Even for Paul, to think little of the soul means to think little of one's life (Phil. 2:30).

Jn. 10:11 speaks of Jesus laying down his *psychē* for the sheep. This is the reason why the Father loves the good shepherd (Jn. 10:17). The same expression is also used in Jn. 13:37 f., where Peter offers his own ("I will lay down my life for you"). In connexion with both vbs. *tithenai*, to put, place, but here to lay down (John's Gospel), and *dounai*, to give (Matt. 20:28; Mk. 10:45), *psychē* means life, however the vbs. are interpreted.

In Rom. 16:4 Paul remembers those who have risked their own lives for his, and in Acts 15:26 Barnabas and Paul are described as men who have risked their *psychē*, i.e. their life, "for the name of our Lord Jesus Christ".

The word *psychē* is also found in the NT in recording numbers of people (Acts 7:14, "Jacob and all his kindred, seventy-five souls"; Acts 27:37, two hundred and seventy-six "souls" at the shipwreck on Malta; 1 Pet. 3:20, eight "souls" saved in → Noah's ark), and in the phrase "every soul" meaning "everyone" (Acts 2:43, "fear came on every soul"; cf. Acts 3:23; 27:22; Rom. 2:9; 13:1).

The expression "every living soul" (Rev. 16:3; cf. 8:9) is also to be understood in the OT sense. In the creation the dust of the ground was made into a "living soul" by the breathing in of the divine breath (cf. Gen. 2:7). Paul takes up this idea in 1 Cor. 15:45, in order to contrast this "living soul", the power and directing force of natural, earthly life, with the life-giving → Spirit present in Jesus Christ.

(b) *psychē* means the inner life of man, equivalent to the ego, person, or personality, with the various powers of the soul. In 2 Cor. 1:23 Paul pledges his "soul" in a kind of curse upon himself, as a form of solemn asseveration. The reference here is not only to the life, but to the whole man, with all that he believes, hopes and strives for. Similarly in 1 Thess. 2:8, Paul writes concerning himself and his coworkers, that they have given their "souls", i.e. their living powers of energy, themselves with all the powers of their personality, working day and night, in their care of the churches. "Soul" is meant in this sense of the person with its conscious powers in Jn. 10:24 in the Jews' question of Jesus, "How long will you keep us in suspense [*heōs pote tēn psychēn hēmōn aireis*]? If you are the Christ tell us plainly." Jesus speaks of souls which are in need of rest and peace (Matt. 11:29). In the depth of the soul sorrow is experienced (Matt. 26:38 par. Mk. 14:34; cf. Ps. 42[41]:6). In Lk. 1:46 soul is used in parallel with spirit. Both have here the meaning of the whole inner man, in contrast to the outward aspect of lips and speech. Above all, the soul is

spoken of here in a sense which goes beyond the world of Gk. thought. It is the seat of the religious life and of man's relationship to God. It is this religious root in human life which is referred to in Lk. 2:35, contrasted directly with the sword which wounds the body outwardly. We have here to do with a hidden, inward experience of the soul. The religious life of man is also the subject of 3 Jn. 2: "it is well with your soul." In this sense, the "righteous soul" is used in 2 Pet. 3:8 as a circumlocution for the religious man.

Of interest is the contrast of soul and spirit, as expressed in 1 Thess. 5:23, with its tripartite division of man. Here it is not a contrast between soul and body, but between → spirit, soul and body. The spirit in this context, as in Philo and Platonism, means the higher side of man, possibly something not far removed from Philo's *hēgemonikon* (cf. CL 2(c)). Soul thus means life, i.e. the fact of being alive, and the aspect of man which has to do with willing and emotion. In a similar way, in 1 Cor. 2:14 Paul contrasts the *anthrōpos psychikos* and the *anthrōpos pneumatikos*, man enlightened by God's Spirit. The former is animate man, filled with soul in the sense of life-force ("a living soul", Gen. 2:7; cf. 1 Cor. 15:45), the natural man, in contrast to the spiritual man. The spirit here referred to is (in distinction from that in 1 Thess. 5:23, see above) God's Spirit, not some higher spiritual power which is part of man's make-up even as natural man. In this contrast with spirit, soul does not refer to a different anthropological category, but to a different mode of existence.

The adj. *psychikos* is used again in Paul's discussion of the nature of the resurrection where the body of this life is contrasted with the resurrection body. The former is *psychikos*; the latter is *pneumatikos*. "It is sown a physical body [*sōma psychikon*], it is raised a spiritual body [*sōma pneumatikon*]. If there is a physical body [*sōma psychikon*], there is also a spiritual body [*sōma pneumatikon*]. Thus it is written, 'The first man Adam became a living being [*psychēn zōsan*]'; the last Adam became a life-giving spirit. But it is not the spiritual [*to pneumatikon*] which is first but the physical [*to psychikon*], and then the spiritual [*to pneumatikon*]" (1 Cor. 15:44 ff.). In this way Paul counters the objection against the absurdity of thinking of the resurrection as the resuscitation of our corpses (cf. v. 35; → Resurrection, art. *The Resurrection in Contemporary Theology* 2; → Seed, art. *sperma* NT 2 (e)). The RSV rightly brings out the contrast between life under the conditions of space and time and the resurrection life by translating the adj. here by "physical". In Jas. 3:15 the sense is best brought out by translating it with the RSV as "unspiritual". Here the contrast is worldly wisdom and divine wisdom: "This wisdom is not such as comes down from above, but is earthly, unspiritual, devilish" (Jas. 3:15). Finally, in Jude 13 the RSV translates it as "worldly": "It is these who set up divisions, worldly people, devoid of the Spirit." In each case the emphasis falls on man as he is in himself without the new life of God.

When, on the other hand, Heb. 4:12 talks of a dividing asunder of soul and spirit, we are probably to think of a purely conceptual and not otherwise discernible division of the innermost powers of man. "That the word of God probes the inmost recesses of our spiritual being and brings the subconscious motives to light is what is meant" (F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, *NLC*, 1964, 82). In Heb. 6:19 ("anchor of the soul"), "soul" again means the whole inner life of man with his powers of will, reason and emotion. In this connexion, mention should also be made of the use of *psychē* to mean insight, will, disposition, sensations, moral powers of

man. This is also the meaning of "with all your soul" (Matt. 22:37 par. Mk. 12:30, Lk. 20:27; cf. Deut. 6:5; → Command; → Love). *ek psychēs*, from the heart, freely (Eph. 6:6; Col. 3:23; in each case the only occurrence in the letter), should be understood in the same way (cf. also Sir. 6:26; etc.). Similarly we find the phrase *mia psychē*, with one mind (Phil. 1:27), resulting from *en heni pneumati*, in one spirit. The background here is probably the notion that the church is the body of Christ, which – in a similar manner to the human body – is filled with a soul, showing itself as real and alive when it completes the unity of the body by bringing about a unity of inner powers within the church. In Acts 4:32, likewise, the common mind is meant, which causes the church to be united with one heart and one soul. This inner power of the church members is also the target of the exhortation in Heb. 12:3, not to grow weary or faint in the soul, i.e. inwardly. Souls which are not firmly established can be enticed and led astray (Heb. 10:39). Here the dispute is with inner desires, the uncontrolled movements of the soul. Souls can also be activated in wrong and evil ways: they can be poisoned (Acts 14:2).

In quotations from the OT the popular parallelism of "my soul" and "I" as equivalent expressions has been taken over. Thus God himself speaks of his soul, embracing in this expression all that characterizes the living person of God in the OT: his love, wrath, faithfulness, etc. (Matt. 12:18, cf. Isa. 42:1; Heb. 10:38, cf. Hab. 2:4).

(c) Hellenistic Judaism is familiar with the concepts both of the soul's corruption and of the soul's salvation. These lines of thought appear in the later epistles of the NT, but no reference is intended to the immortal soul as guarantee or substance of eternal life. Although such passages show definite traces of Hellenism, they are nonetheless brought on to a rather different level by biblical tradition, basic eschatological insights, and the Christian experience of faith in the risen Lord. Thus what, for example, in Xenophon is a call referring to physical life, when he says "save your souls" (*Cyr.* 4, 4, 10) in the sense of "save your lives", becomes in the NT an exhortation to believe and obey the divine message. It is the task of the church leader to keep watch over souls destined for eternity (Heb. 13:17; O. Michel interprets "soul" here as "eschatological life" (*Der Brief an die Hebräer*, *KEK* 13, 1966[12], ad loc.).

Jas. 1:21 and 5:20 speak of the salvation of the soul which is in danger. The → death from which it is said that the soul will be saved is eternal death, exclusion from eternal life. The salvation of souls in this sense is the goal of faith and the content of the whole saving activity of God, in which he gives all those who are baptized a share (1 Pet. 1:9). It is probably for this reason that 1 Pet. 1:22 speaks of the purification and absolution of the soul, i.e. the inner life. It is a matter of the soul in its relationship to God. Against it, against its will and obedience the fleshly lusts strive (1 Pet. 2:11). The soul, as the part of us which believes and is sanctified, is destined to an inheritance in God's future kingdom. Thus here the contrast is not between spirit, soul and body, but between the soul and the lusts of the flesh. It is souls in this sense that are meant in 1 Pet. 2:25, their shepherd and bishop being Jesus Christ himself. For the slaves who are addressed here there is a contrast between him and their earthly overseers, with their arbitrary and unjust ways. The consciousness that they have a true "bishop" watching over their souls cannot but give the slaves strength to be patient, loving and humble (1 Pet. 2:25). "Soul" is used again in the

same sense of being destined for eternal life and victory over death, when Christians are exhorted in 1 Pet. 4:19 to entrust their souls to God in time of persecution, since he will preserve men for eternity.

Matt. 10:28 (cf. Lk. 12:5) also comes into this category. The soul is directed to God alone, who "is able to destroy both body and soul in hell." The soul in this sense only exists because it is called by God and because it allows itself to be called and filled with divine power. God alone has power over it. He can let it live, and he can destroy it. Similarly in Rev. 6:9 and 20:4 mention is made of the souls of those who have been slain, who are under the altar of God in heaven, i.e. under the altar in the heavenly counterpart of the temple. This imagery is probably based on the fact that the blood of sacrifice was poured out before or on to the altar (Lev. 4:7; → Sacrifice, art. *thyō* OT 3, NT 5). The martyrs, who have shed their blood for Christ's sake, are compared with the sacrifices. That is why their souls are under the altar, since the soul, i.e. the life, is in the blood. The dominant thought is that the souls which have been won by God, which have been saved, which believe in him and sacrifice themselves for him, are preserved in his keeping; and they are inextricably bound up with the realization of God's aims and place, in his heavenly world with its future destiny and its future appearance upon earth.

3. Although the Hellenistic term *psychē* appears more frequently in the later epistles of the NT than in other parts (cf. 2 (c)), it must not be imagined that this implies the concept of the soul as the real and valuable part of man, the eternal and permanent element. That would be a misunderstanding. This kind of thinking, which incidentally was characteristic of German Idealism, deduces the immortality and permanence of the soul from its own particular quality. This is just what the NT does not teach. The soul is simply that area in which decisions are made concerning life and death, salvation and destruction. Moreover, every statement about the *psychē* in the NT is linked in context with eschatological statements about renewal and resurrection. Outside such a context this line of thought is impossible. Part of this context of ideas is the teaching that God is judge, that his judgment determines whether the soul shall be saved or destroyed, and the fact that the salvation of the soul is always understood in connexion with the → resurrection of the body, i.e. a new embodiment of the soul. *G. Harder*

4. In addition to *psychikos* (discussed above under 2 (b)) the NT contains several other compounds. *anapsyxis*, which is found in cl. Gk. from Euripides and Plato, is found only at Acts 3:20 in the phrase *kairoi anapsyxeōs*, "times of refreshing", i.e. the age of salvation, which is promised to the nation of Israel if it repents. Although great numbers of Jews are converted (Acts 2:41; 4:4; 5:14; 21:20), the Israel that Luke describes in Acts is one in which large numbers of Gentiles are incorporated, and from which many of the old Israel remain aloof (cf. E. Schweizer, *TDNT* IX 664 f.). The cognate vb. *anapsychō* has a transitive meaning at the only place where it occurs in the NT, as compared with its intransitive sense in the LXX where it means to refresh oneself (Exod. 23:12; Jdg. 15:19; 1 Sam. 16:23; 2 Sam. 16:14; Ps. 39[38]:14). 2 Tim. 1:16 mentions how Onesiphorus often refreshed Paul whilst he was in prison. It is not clear whether this refers to physical needs or spiritual encouragement, or both. Probably they are not to be separated (cf. E. Schweizer, *TDNT* IX 664). The term *dipsychos*, "double minded", does not occur before Jas.

1:8. Perhaps it means with a divided heart (cf. 1QH 4:14; Deut. 29:17; Ezek. 14:3 ff.; Sir. 1:28; 1 Clem. 23:2 ff.; 2 Clem. 11:2 ff.; 19:2; Hermas, *Man.* 11:1 ff.; E. Schweizer, *TDNT* IX 665). But perhaps it was a local term (cf. S. Marshall, "*Dipsychos*: A Local Term?", *StudEv* VI = *TU* 112, 1973, 348–51). At any rate James makes the twofold point that such a man is unstable and that he cannot presume on the goodness of God, for prayer and devotion require a wholehearted attitude to God: "For that person must not suppose that a double-minded man [*anēr dipsychos*], unstable in all his ways, will receive anything from the Lord." The rare word *oligopsychos* means faint-hearted in Koine Gk., and means faint-hearted, discouraged in 1 Thess. 5:14. Such persons are to be encouraged, though the idle are to be admonished. *sympsychos*, harmonious, united in spirit, occurs in Phil. 2:2, where Paul exhorts the church to complete his joy by being of one spirit and love. Shortly afterwards he expresses the hope that he will be cheered (*eupsycheō*) by news of them, which no doubt implies the hope that they will have taken to heart his admonition of vv. 1–18. *C. Brown*

→ Adam, → Body, → Flesh, → Heart, → Heaven, → Hell, → Life, → Man, → Paradise, → Reason, → Resurrection, → Spirit

* in this bibliography denotes philosophical studies which are included for the sake of comparison of biblical ideas with modern views.

(a). A. W. Argyle, "The Christian Doctrine of the Origin of the Soul", *SJT* 18, 1965, 273–93; G. C. Berkouwer, *Man: The Image of God*, 1962; G. Bertram, A. Dihle, E. Jacob, E. Lohse, E. Schweizer, K.-W. Troger, *psychē* etc., *TDNT* IX 608–66; C. A. Briggs, "The Use of *nepeš* in the Old Testament", *JBL* 16, 1897, 17–30; R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, I, 1952, 190–246; J. Burnet, "The Socratic Doctrine of the Soul", *Proceedings of the British Academy* 7, 1915–16, 235–60; E. De Witt Burton, *Spirit, Soul and Flesh*, 1918; C. A. Campbell, *On Selfhood and Godhood*, Gifford Lectures 1953–55, 1957*; A. B. Come, *Human Spirit and Holy Spirit*, 1959; H. Conzelmann, *First Corinthians, Hermeneia*, 1974; O. Cullmann, *Immortality of the Soul or Resurrection of the Dead?* 1958; F. Delitzsch, *A System of Biblical Psychology*, 1867²; E. R. Dodds, *The Greeks and the Irrational*, 1951; W. Ellis, *The Idea of the Soul in Western Philosophy and Science*, 1940; R. H. Gundry, *Soma in Biblical Theology with Emphasis on Pauline Anthropology, SNTS Monograph Series* 29, 1976; W. Jaeger, "The Greek Ideas of Immortality" in K. Stendahl, ed., *Immortality and Resurrection*, 1965, 97–114; and *The Theology of the Early Greek Philosophers*, 1947; R. Jewett, *Paul's Anthropological Terms: A Study of their Use in Conflict Settings, Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Christentums* 10, 1971, 334–57; A. R. Johnson, *The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel*, 1949; H. Jonas, *The Gnostic Religion: The Message of the Alien God and the Beginnings of Christianity*, 1963²; A. Kenny, *The Anatomy of the Soul: Historical Essays in the Philosophy of the Mind*, 1973*; W. G. Kümmel, *Man in the New Testament*, 1963³; L. Köhler, *Hebrew Man*, (1956) 1973; R. Laurin, "The Concept of Man as a Soul", *ExpT* 72, 1960–61, 131–34; H. D. Lewis, *The Elusive Mind*, Gifford Lectures 1966–68, 1969*; and *The Self and Immortality*, 1973*; J. R. Lucas, "The Soul", in B. Mitchell, ed., *Faith and Logic: Oxford Essays in Philosophical Theology*, 1957, 132–48*; D. Lys, "The Israelite Sould according to the LXX", *VT* 16, 1966, 181–228, D. W. Mork, *The Biblical Meaning of Man*, 1967; C. F. D. Moule, "St. Paul and Dualism", *NTS* 12, 1965–66, 106–23; A. Murtonen, *The Living Soul, Studia Orientalia* 23, 1, 1958; M. P. Nilsson, "The Immortality of the Soul in Greek Religion", *Eranos* 39, 1941, 1–16; R. B. Onians, *The Origins of European Thought about the Body, the Mind, the Soul, the World, Time and Fate*, 1954²; C. Partee, "The Soul in Plato, Platonism and Calvin", *SJT* 22, 1969, 278–95; B. A. Pearson, *The Pneumatikos-Psychikos Terminology*, 1973; C. A. van Peursen, *Body, Soul, Spirit: A Survey of the Body-Mind Problem*, 1966*; B. Reicke, "Body and Soul in the New Testament", *StTh* 19, 1965, 200–12; H. H. Rex, "Immortality of the Soul or Resurrection of the Body, or What?", *Reformed Theological Review* 17, 1958, 73–82; H. W. Robinson, *The Christian Doctrine of Man*, 1911, 1–150; and "Hebrew Psychology", in A. S. Peake, ed., *The People and the Book*, 1925, 353–82; E. Rohde, *Psyche: The Cult of Souls and Belief in Immortality*

among the Greeks, I–II, 1966; G. Ryle, *The Concept of Mind*, 1949*; C. S. Sherrington, *Man on his Nature*, Gifford Lectures 1937–38, 1940*; C. Ryder Smith, *The Bible Doctrine of Man*, 1951; W. D. Stacey, "St. Paul and the Soul", *ExpT* 66, 1954–55, 274–77; K. Stendahl, ed., *Immortality and Resurrection*, 1965; G. F. Stout, *Mind and Matter*, Gifford Lectures 1919–21, 1931*; P. F. Strawson, *Individuals*, 1959*; G. N. A. Vesey, *The Embodied Mind*, 1965*; *Personal Identity*, 1974*; G. N. A. Vesey, ed., *Body and Mind: Readings in Philosophy*, 1964*; and *The Human Agent, Royal Institute of Philosophy Lectures* 1, 1968*; B. Williams, *Problems of the Self*, 1973*; H. W. Wolff, *Anthropology of the Old Testament*, 1974, 10–25; W. Zimmerli, *Man and his Hope in the Old Testament*, *SBT* Second Series 20, 1971.

(b). F. Barth, "La Notion Paulinienne de *PSYCHĒ*", *Revue de Théologie et Philosophie* 44, 1911, 316–36; J. H. Becker, *Het Begrip nepeš en het Oude Testament*, 1942; J. Böhme, *Die Seele und das Ich im homerischen Epos*, 1929; E. Brandenburger, *Fleisch und Geist*, *WMANT* 29, 1968; P. Bratsiotis, "*nepeš/psychē*. Ein Betrag zur Erforschung der Sprache und der Theologie der LXX", *Volume du Congrès Genève* 1965, *VT Supplements* 15, 1966, 58–89; W. Burkert, *Weisheit und Wissenschaft, Erlanger Beiträge zur Sprach- und Kunstwissenschaft* 10, 1962, 98–142; and *Goēs. Zum griechischen Schamanismus*, *Rheinisches Museum* Neue Folge 105, 1962, 36 ff.; G. Dautzenberg, "*Sein Leben Bewahren.*" *Psychē in den Herrenworten der Evangelien*, *Studien zum Alten Testament und Neuen Testament*, 14, 1966; M. Delcor, "L'Immortalité de l'Âme dans le Livre de Sagesse et dans les Documents de Qumrân", *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* 77, 1955, 614–30; E. Dhorme, *L'Emploi des Noms de Parties du Corps en Hébreu et en Akkadien*, 1923; A. Dieterich, *Eine Mithrasliturgie*, (1903) 1966; A. M. Dubarle, "La Conception de l'Homme dans l'Ancien Testament", *Sacra Pagina* I, *Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium* 12, 1959, 522–36; R. Dussaud, "La Notion d'Âme chez les Israélites et les Phéniciens", *Syria* 16, 1935, 267–77; E. von Dobschütz, *Die Thessalonicherbriefe*, 1909, 230 ff.; L. Dürr, "Hebr. *nepeš* = akk. *napištu* = Gurgel, Kehle", *ZAW* 43, 1925, 262–69; W. Eichrodt, *Das Menschenverständnis des Alten Testaments*, *AThANT*, 1944; H. Engelland, "Unsterblichkeit der Seele", *EKL* III 1578 ff.; E. Fascher, "Seele oder Leben?", *ThZ* 17, 1961, 305–18; A. J. Festugière, *La Révélation d'Hermès Trismegiste, III. Les Doctrines de l'Âme*, *Études Bibliques*, 1953; J. Fichtner, "Seele oder Leben in der Bibel", *ThZ* 17, 1961, 305–18; F. P. Fiorenza and J. B. Metz, "Der Mensch als Einheit von Leib und Seele", in J. Feiner and M. Löhrer, eds., *Mysterium Salutis*, II, 1967, 584–632; G. Fohrer, "Theologische Züge des Menschenbildes im Alten Testament", *Studien zur alttestamentlichen Theologie und Geschichte*, *BZAW* 115, 1969, 176–94; O. Gigon, *Grundprobleme der antiken Philosophie*, 1959, 229 ff.; G. Guignebert, "Remarques sur quelques Conceptions chrétiens antiques touchant l'Origine et la Nature de l'Âme", *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses* 9, 1929, 428–50; W. Gutbrod, *Die paulinische Anthropologie*, *BWANT* 67, 1934, 75 ff.; H. Hübner, "Anthropologischer Dualismus in den Hodayoth?", *NTS* 18, 1971–72, 268–84; A. Hultkranz and F. Hartmann, "Leib und Steele", *RGG*[3] IV 286 ff.; W. Jaeger, *Paideia*, II, 1944, 87 ff.; A. Kammenhuber, "Die hethitischen Vorstellungen von Seele und Leib, Herz und Leibesinnerem, Kopf und Person", *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* Neue Folge 22, 1964, 150–212; J. Köberle, *Natur und Geist nach der Auffassung des Alten Testaments*, 1901; W. Kütenmeyer, "Leib und Seele", *EKL* II 1062 ff.; F. M. T. de Liagre Böhl, "Das Menschenbild in babylonischer Schau", in C. J. Bleeker, ed., *Anthropologie Religieuse*, *Supplements to Numen* 2, 1955, 28–48; M. Lichtenstein, *Das Wort nepeš in der Bibel*, 1920; B. Lifschitz, "Der Ausdruck *psychē* in den griechischen Grabinschriften", *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 76, 1960, 159 ff.; D. Lys, *Nèphèsh. Études d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses* 50, 1959; C. Masson, "L'immortalité de l'Âme ou Résurrection des Morts?", *Revue de Théologie et Philosophie* New Series 3, 8, 1958, 250–67; R. Meyer, *Hellenistisches in der rabbinischen Anthropologie* 74, 1937; J. Moreau, *L'Âme du Monde de Platon aux Stoiciens*, 1939; M. P. Nilsson, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*, (1941) 1955[2], 637 ff.; W. Phillip, "Seele", *EKL* III 895 ff.; G. Pidoux, *L'Homme dans l'Ancien Testament, Cahiers Théologiques* 32, 1953; and "L'Homme dans l'Ancien Testament", in C. J. Bleeker, ed., op. cit., 155–65; B. Rigaux, *Les Épîtres aux Thessaloniciens*, 1956, 596 ff.; E. Rohde, *Psyche, Seelenkult und Unsterblichkeitsglaube der Griechen*, (1893) 1925 [10]; J. Rothermund, "Christliches und jüdisches Menschenbild", *KuD* 16, 1970, 199–222; F. Rüsche, "Blut, Leben und Seele", *Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums*, Supplementary Volume V, 1930; O. Sander, "Leib-Seele-Dualismus im Alten Testament", *ZAW* 77, 1965, 329 ff.; A. Safran, "La Conception juive de l'Homme", *Revue de Théologie et Philosophie* 98, 1965, 193–207; J. Scharbert, *Fleisch, Geist und Seele im Pentateuch*, *Stuttgarter Bibelstudien* 19, 1966; O. Schilling, *Geist und Materie in biblischer Sicht*, *Stuttgarter Bibelstudien* 25, 1967; M. Schmaus, "Unsterblichkeit der Geistseele oder Auferstehung von den Toten?", *Festschrift L. Jaeger und W. Stählin*, 1963, 311–37; J. Schmid, "Der

Begriff der Seele im Neuen Testament", *Festschrift G. Söhngen*, 1962, 128–47; W. H. Schmidt, "Anthropologische Begriffe im Alten Testament", *EvTh* 24, 1964, 374–88; J. N. Sevenster, *Het Begrip psychē en het NT*, 1946; and "Die Anthropologie des Neuen Testaments", in C. J. Bleeker, ed., op. cit., 166–77; F. Wehrli, *Hauptrichtungen des griechischen Denkens*, 1964, 62 ff.; C. Westermann, *nepeš*, *THAT* II 71–96; U. Wilckens, *Weisheit und Torheit*, 1959.

Spirit, Holy Spirit

πνεῦμα

πνεῦμα (*pneuma*), spirit, wind; πνέω (*pneō*), to blow; πνοή (*pnoē*), wind, breath; ἐκπνέω (*ekpneō*), breathe out; ἐμπνέω (*empneō*), to pant; πνευματικός (*pneumatikos*), spiritual; πνευματικῶς (*pneumatikōs*), spiritually; θεόπνευστος (*theopneustos*), God-breathed, inspired by God.

CL The Gk. root *pneu-*, from which the NT word for spirit is derived, denotes dynamic movement of the air. Its derivatives have the following meanings: *pneō*, to blow (of wind and air generally, also on a musical instrument); to breathe (also in the sense of to be alive); to emit a fragrance, etc.; to radiate heat, anger, courage, benevolence, etc. (all presumably considered to be borne along on the element of air). *pnoē* means blowing, breathing (particularly panting), inspiration (by a deity), steam, evaporation. *ekpneō* means to breathe out, blow out, stop breathing (i.e. to die), to get out of breath, to stop blowing. *empneō* means to breathe in, to be breathing, to be alive, to blow on to or into something, to inbreathe, inspire.

pneuma, spirit, a word of great significance in the NT, is formed from this root with the suffix *-ma* and denotes the result of this action, namely, air set in motion, considered as a special substance and with an underlying stress on its inherent power. When it first occurred (and there are no proven instances of it before the pre-Socratic school), it therefore meant wind or breath, but increasingly it took on the functions of related concepts, so that by the Hellenistic period it was a term of some importance, though still with a somewhat materialistic connotation.

The air that men breathe was considered to be the bearer of life (thus to discontinue breath means to die, Aesch., *Pers.* 507). From the 5th cent. onward Gk. physicians developed a physiology based on this and soon drew a distinction between man's inward, innate *pneuma* and the air he breathed. In Aristotle this *pneuma* was the formative power which, from the embryo onwards, gradually produced the mature individual and then, in the case of man, became the instrument whereby the soul controlled the body.

Already, therefore, it was approaching the meaning held by *psychē*, → soul, the distinction being that the latter was a purely functional term, while *pneuma* was regarded as a substance. In Stoic philosophy, however, *pneuma* took over the functions of *psychē* in relation to the senses and to thought and speech (some Stoic philosophers even came to identify it with *nous*, the specifically human power of intellect). Stoicism also regarded it as an elemental principle which gave coherence to the different entities in creation, while at the same time differentiating them one from another. Thus, as an ethereal, fire-like, extremely fine-textured substance, it arranged the world in terms of a descending scale, without which the world's very existence would have been an impossibility. In its purely ethereal form it was the Logos or God; as spiritual fire it was the soul of man; as physical *pneuma* it fashioned the

plants, and as "habitual" *pneuma* it gave coherence to inanimate objects. Hence, it came to be regarded as the fifth element (or "quintessence"), having already been used, instead of "air", as one of the four elements.

Probably under Stoic influence, Plutarch and several others abandoned the widely used functional term *epipnoia* (afflatus), which had formed the basis of Plato's theory concerning the various types of ecstatic inspiration (*Phdr.* 244 ff.; cf. 265b). In its place, and in obvious dependence upon Plato, they used *pneuma* to denote inspiration, regarding it as a material substance which filled a man and enabled him to prophesy. This prophetic *pneuma* was considered in turn to be "enthusiastic", visionary, demonic, holy (*hieron*), even divine. Papyrus finds reveal the active part it played in popular religion (always given to magic and soothsaying), and in the so-called Mithras Liturgy (ed. A. Dieterich, *Eine Mithrasliturgie*, 1923[3], 4, 14, 21) it appears among the four elements, being described as "holy" and "immortal" and as elevating its recipient above mortal nature, probably by analogy with prophetic ecstasy.

Finally, it is found in the sense of "spirit", "demon", in Hellenistic inscriptions and papyri (also in later writers, e.g. Iamblichus, *De Mysteriis* 2, 3, 10). There is certainly Near Eastern influence here, and possibly some Jewish influence.

The adj. *pneumatikos* (the suffix *-ikos* denotes "pertaining to") shares the meanings of its root noun and is used from the pre-Socratic school onwards. *theopneustos* (inspired by God) is rare, not being used before the Hellenistic period, and then only with reference to divination, apart from one isolated instance where it is applied to wisdom (cf. M. Dibelius and H. Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles*, *Hermeneia*, 1972, 120; → Scripture, art. *graphē* NT 1 (c)).

OT In the LXX the Heb. equivalent of *pneuma* is almost always *rûaḥ*; only three times does *pneuma* render *nᵉšāmâh*, breath. Furthermore, as far as LXX translations of *rûaḥ* are concerned, *pneuma* predominates, for of the 377 instances of *rûaḥ* in the Masoretic Text, 264 are translated by *pneuma*, the next most frequent rendering being *anemos*, wind, used 49 times. The idea behind *rûaḥ* is the extraordinary fact that something as intangible as air should move; at the same time it is not so much the movement *per se* which excites attention, but rather the energy manifested by such movement. The basic meaning of *rûaḥ*, therefore, is more or less that of "blowing".

1. Hence, in roughly one third of all instances, it is used for the wind, which, being intangible, has God as its immediate cause (Gen. 8:1; Amos 4:13; Isa. 40:7; Ps. 104[103]:4). In this same connexion, *rûaḥ* takes on two special senses: the direction of the wind (e.g. Ezek. 37:9; 42:16–20) and metaphorically, because of the wind's ephemeral nature (cf. Ps. 78[77]:39), nothing, nothingness (e.g. Eccl. 5:15, LXX *anemos*).

2. The same phenomenon occurs in the breath, both of man (Ezek. 37:8, 10, cf. 9), and of beasts (Eccl. 3:19, 21 and passim). It denotes the life-force of the individual (Jdg. 15:19) and of the group (Num. 16:22), that which is lacking in idols (Jer. 10:14) but not in God (Ps. 33[32]:6) or the messiah (Isa. 11:4). God gives (cf. Isa. 42:5) and protects it (Ps. 31[30]:6), but is free to take it back again (Ps. 104[103]:29), whereupon it returns to God (Eccl. 12:7). As a life-force it manifests

itself in varying degrees of intensity, the dominant idea being that of its accompanying vitality rather than that of breathing. It can be adversely affected by emotions ranging from anxiety (Gen. 41:8) and grief (Gen. 26:35), to utter despair (Job 17:1). It is heightened by jealousy (Num. 5:14) or anger (Jdg. 8:3), while there is a clear echo of the word's basic meaning in the vivid phrase expressing God's wrath: "the blast of his nostrils" (Exod. 15:8; Job 4:9).

This reveals the manner in which the OT speaks of → man: not clinically, with his human attributes all neatly classified, but concretely, i.e. the writers take a man as they find him and assess what he does, his behaviour towards his fellow-men and the attitude he displays towards the law of God. So concrete is the OT's approach that the basic terms it uses are taken from the ordinary, visible and tangible phenomena of the world about us. The thought implicit in *rûaḥ* is that breathing, with the movement of air which this involves, is the outward expression of the life-force inherent in all human behaviour. This is true of behaviour requiring a greater or a lesser degree of energy; behaviour in which energy has to be directed along certain channels (e.g. Ezr. 1:1: to stir up someone's spirit, i.e. to bring him to a decision), in which case spirit may be synonymous with plan or intention (Isa. 19:3); behaviour towards other men, whether humble (Prov. 16:9) or proud (Eccl. 7:8), patient (Eccl. 7:8) or impatient (Prov. 14:29); or towards God, guileless (Ps. 32[31]:2), steadfast (Pss. 51[50]:12; 78[77]:8), submissive and looking to him for deliverance when bowed down with trouble or broken in penitence (Pss. 34[35]:19; 51[50]:17), disobedient (Hos. 4:12; Isa. 29:24). "Spirit" frequently stands alongside → "heart" (e.g. Exod. 35:31–35), the ideas behind the two words being very similar; the difference, however, is that the heart dwells within man, having indeed been created by God, but is not a fleeting, oscillating gift like the breath of a man's spirit. The heart may be said to denote a man's aims, his resolves, and his courage, while the spirit may be said to denote the direction in which a man's vitality flows, the self-expression involved in his behaviour – including ecstatic behaviour.

The term spirit is never used for that higher quality in man which distinguishes him from the beasts. Rather, just as the wind comes from God and the spirit of man is God's gift, spirit is essentially of God. In about 100 passages it is expressly called the Spirit of God (e.g. Gen. 1:2), or of Yahweh (e.g. Isa. 11:2), while in Isa. 31:3 "spirit" is the power of God contrasted with the impotence of the flesh, i.e. of mere creatures; such power is inescapable and universally present (Ps. 139[138]:7). It can come mightily upon a man (Jdg. 14:6; 1 Sam. 16:13 and passim), can "clothe" him (Jdg. 6:34 and passim), enter into him (Ezek. 2:2 and passim), descend upon him (2 Ki. 2:9; Isa. 11:2 and passim), impel him (Jdg. 13:25), all of which indicates the powerful operation of God upon a man, enabling him to perform some ecstatic, supernatural deed, such as the salvation of Israel by the judges (Jdg. 3:10; 6:34; 11:29; 1 Sam. 11:16; 16:13; Num. 27:18), or the office and utterances of the prophets (N.B. the verb translated "to prophesy" refers to spirit-wrought ecstasy, e.g. Num. 11:25–27; 1 Sam. 18:10; for the prophets' office cf. 2 Ki. 2:9; Neh. 9:30; for their utterances cf. Num. 24:2; Ezek. 11:5, etc.; and for their ecstatic vision cf. Ezek. 3:12; 8:3; 11:1, 24). In addition, the spirit is described as the source of any ecstatic utterance (e.g. 2 Sam. 23:2), even of the craftsman's skill involved in the building of the tabernacle (Exod. 31:3), or indeed of any outstanding ability (Dan. 6:3).

3. Even destructive → evil is a spirit sent by God, for there is, as far as the OT is

concerned, no power of evil independent of him (1 Sam. 16:14, 15, 16, 23; Isa. 29:10; 1 Ki. 22:21 f.).

4. The writing prophets have a clearly delineated doctrine of the spirit. According to Isa. 32:15–20 (cf. Isa. 44:3), God will conclude his judgment of the proud and complacent, by pouring out from on high the spirit which, like rain, will bring about fertility, i.e. righteousness, peace and security. This salvation will be wrought by the offspring of → David (Isa. 11:1–8), who, being ordained by the Spirit of God, will exercise a dominion of perfect integrity and righteousness amid conditions of heavenly peace. Through the process of judgment and salvation, God heals his people's idolatry and backsliding (Hos. 4:12; cf. Isa. 29:24), giving a new spirit of godliness, not only to the nation at large (Ezek. 11:19 f.; 18:31; 36:26 f.; 39:29), but also to the individual (Ps. 51[50]:10). Ezekiel declares this to be nothing less than Israel's resurrection from the dead – his death having been caused by unbelief (Ezek. 37:1–14, a vision which, as the whole prophecy indicates, refers to the restoration of God's people as a whole and not to the personal revival of individuals within the nation). The later chapters of Isaiah proclaim the same message: the Servant of the Lord extends the blessings of his rule (already described in ch. 11) to include the Gentiles (42:1–4; 49:1–6), the covenant promise being fulfilled in God's irrevocable gift of his Spirit (59:21; cf. Joel 2:28 f.). Similarly in the past, the period of salvation at the exodus had been marked by the gift of the Spirit to Moses; indeed that whole national deliverance had taken place in the power of the Spirit (Isa. 63:11–14). The post-exilic prophets see this promise fulfilled in the re-establishment of Israel in Jerusalem (Hag. 2:5: the spirit in the midst of the people gives protection; Zech. 4:6: salvation comes not from an army nor from any human power, but from the Spirit of God). In this prophecy God's almighty, all-pervasive but intangible Spirit is linked with the covenant, for the latter reveals God not only working for the salvation of his people but bringing their lives into active conformity with his holy will, despite their hostility towards him.

5. In Judaism under the influence of its Hellenistic environment, the spirit was a vital force divinely breathed into man and forming a distinct part of his being; it was not distinguished from the → "soul" as far as terminology was concerned, but was contrasted rather with the body: the body is of the earth, the spirit stems from heaven (Wis. 15:11; rabbinic evidence for this and for what follows is found in E. Sjöberg, *TDNT* VI 375–89). At the same time in Palestinian Judaism the body was never the prison-house of the soul or its seducer into sin. Philo, on the other hand, called the flesh a "burden" which weighed down the spirit and confined it in earthly fetters; hence its appetites must be denied for the sake of the spirit (*Gig.* 31 ff.). Palestinian Judaism also differed from its Hellenistic counterpart in regarding the spirit not as part of a divine substance but rather as something divinely created and therefore to be clearly distinguished from its Creator. It possessed immortality (Wis. 12:1; Jub. 23, 26–31; Eth. Enoch 39:4 ff.), and at a later stage was also credited with pre-existence.

6. In the Qumran texts, the spirit manifested its presence when a man conducted his life wisely and with a view to pleasing God (1QS 5:21, 24), so that apostasy of spirit led to sinful conduct (1QS 7:18, 23), i.e. "spirit" expressed the basic orientation of a man's life. A variety of adjs. could be applied to it, e.g. "broken" (1QS 8:3), "apostate" (8:12), and it could also be viewed collectively as "the spirit of the

fellowship of [God's] truth", i.e. "the spirit of uprightness and humility" which atoned for sins (1QS 3:7 f.). This spirit was regarded as special insight either bestowed upon the devout man by God himself (1QH 12:11; 13:19 and passim), or created within him from his mother's womb (1QH 4:31; 15:22 and passim), i.e. it was either an eschatological gift or something eternally predestinated.

7. Although in the OT God is never said to dwell among "spirits" (1 Ki. 22:21 ff. merely contains an account of a "spirit" coming into his presence), this plur. came to be used throughout Judaism as a collective term for heavenly beings (e.g. Eth. Enoch 15:4, 6). "Spirits" (with or without the epithet "evil") also denoted the demons so familiar to Judaism (e.g. Eth. Enoch 15:6–10). Linked with this, and found throughout apocalyptic literature, was the belief in → Satan and his evil spirits, God's adversaries who tempted men to sin. The idea of temptation, however, became less prominent in rabbinic literature, where demons harmed men's health and threatened their lives.

8. Under the influence of Iranian cosmology, which regarded the epochs of the world as stages in the struggle between Ormazd and the evil spirit Ahriman, the Qumran texts developed the theory of two angels or spirits, one of "righteousness" or "light", the other of "iniquity" or "darkness". As the principles of good and evil which God had established on behalf of man, these two were locked in perpetual conflict in this world (1QS 3:13–4:26). Each had a retinue of virtues or vices respectively, likewise described as spirits. Echoes of this teaching are also to be found in Test. XII, e.g. Test. Jud. 20; Test. Ash. 6; Test. Reub. 3.

9. The "spirit of God" (e.g. Eth. Enoch 91:1), the "divine spirit" (Philo) and the "holy spirit" (as in rabbinic literature) sometimes meant the God-given spirit of man. In particular, however, it meant that spiritual reality, independent of man, which performed God's work on earth, e.g. creation (Wis. 1:7; 12:1 and passim), and especially prophecy (e.g. Sir. 48:12). The rabbis believed that this spirit spoke particularly in the OT scriptures, all of which were "uttered by him". Stress was laid upon Isaiah's promise of a messiah who would have a special endowment of the Spirit (Test. Lev. 18, 7, 11 and passim) and upon Joel's prophecy (2:28–29) concerning the pouring out of the Spirit upon all the godly in the last days (Sib. 3:582 ff.).

E. Kamlah

NT As in earlier Jewish thought, *pneuma* denotes that power which man experiences as relating him to the spiritual realm, the realm of reality which lies beyond ordinary observation and human control. Within this broad definition *pneuma* has a fairly wide range of meaning. But by far the most frequent use of *pneuma* in the NT (more than 250 times) is as a reference to the Spirit of God, the Holy Spirit, that power which is most immediately of God as to source and nature.

1. *The Human Spirit.* At one end of *pneuma's* spectrum of meaning it denotes the human spirit, or perhaps better, man in so far as he belongs to the spiritual realm and interacts with the spiritual realm. In this sense *pneuma* occurs in the NT nearly 40 times.

Thus the spirit of man is that aspect of man through which God most immediately encounters him (Rom. 8:16; Gal. 6:18; Phil. 4:23; 2 Tim. 4:22; Phlm. 25; Heb. 4:12; Jas. 4:5), that dimension of the whole man wherein and whereby he is most immediately open and responsive to God (Matt. 5:3; Lk. 1:47; Rom. 1:9; 1 Pet. 3:4),

that area of human awareness most sensitive to matters of the spiritual realm (Mk. 2:8; 8:12; Jn. 11:33; 13:21; Acts 17:16; 2 Cor. 2:13; 7:13). Often in talk about this area of encounter, it is not clear whether the language refers to the spirit of man, or to a particular force that he experiences through this dimension of his being, or to a spirit or power from without. Hence, the ambiguity of several passages: Mk. 14:38 par. Matt. 26:41 – probably the Holy Spirit since the language is drawn from Ps. 51:12; Lk. 1:17, 80; 9:55(D); Acts 18:25 – probably the Holy Spirit (cf. Rom. 12:11); Rom. 8:15; 11:8; 1 Cor. 4:21; 6:17; 14:14, 32; 2 Cor. 4:13; 12:18; Gal. 6:1; Eph. 1:17; 4:23; 2 Tim. 1:7; Rev. 22:6.

The NT writers can speak of the (human) spirit as though it was a something possessed by the individual; but this does not mean that they envisaged the spirit of man as a divine spark (the real "I") incarcerated in the physical, "the ghost in the machine" (an anthropology more typical of Greek philosophy). This language is more likely to be simply a natural and easy way of speaking about man in his belongingness to the spiritual realm, the power he experiences in him which relates him to the beyond, "the dimension of the beyond in the midst". So Lk. 8:55 (cf. Jdg. 15:19); Rom. 8:16; 1 Cor. 2:11; 5:5; 7:34; 16:18; 2 Cor. 7:1; 1 Thess. 5:23 (cf. Deut. 6:4). Here too there still persists the ancient Hebraic idea of the *pneuma* (*rûaḥ*) as the breath of God (2 Thess. 2:8; cf. Jn. 20:22), the breath of life (Rev. 11:11; 13:15).

So too death as a giving up the spirit (Matt. 27:50; Lk. 23:46; Acts 7:59) is to be interpreted not so much as the release of the ghost from the machine, but in terms rather of the physical body ceasing to be the embodiment of the whole man. At death man ceases to exist *both* in the realm of the physical *and* in the realm of the spiritual, and continues existing *only* in the spiritual; and the physical body, ceasing to be the embodiment of the whole man in the observable world, becomes merely a corpse (Jas. 2:26). Whereas, in Paul's terms, the danger confronting man in the world is that he lives *solely* on the level of the world of sense and soul ("according to the flesh") and not also and predominantly on the level of the spirit ("according to the Spirit"), so that when the body dies, the whole man dies in the destruction of the flesh (cf. 1 Cor. 15:42–50) – the danger Paul evidently seeks to counter in 1 Cor. 5:5.

From this it follows also that the dead person can be thought of simply as a *pneuma*, as belonging wholly to the spiritual realm (Lk. 24:37, 39; 1 Tim. 3:16; Heb. 12:23; 1 Pet. 3:18 f.; 4:6). It is possible that Paul also thought of man as able, while still in this life, to leave his body temporarily and to project himself through the spiritual realm into the presence of others (1 Cor. 5:3; Col. 2:5) or into heaven (2 Cor. 12:2–4; → Paradise); but the two former passages may simply be earnest expressions of empathetic concern and fellow feeling, and in the latter Paul evidently did not know how to understand the experience himself.

2. *Evil Spirits and Good Spirits.* It was natural in the world-view of the first century that the mysterious powers which afflict men should be thought of as evil spirits and → demons (so more than 40 times, mainly in the Synoptic Gospels, 30 times, and Acts 8 times, not at all in the Fourth Gospel; e.g. Matt. 8:16; Mk. 1:23, 26 f.; 9:25; Lk. 4:36; 11:24, 26; Acts 19:12 f., 15 f.; also 1 Tim. 4:1; Rev. 16:13 f.; 18:2). This power of evil can also be depicted as a particular spirit which dominates the world of man, the spirit or god of this world (1 Cor. 2:12; 2 Cor. 4:4; Eph. 2:2; cf. 2 Cor. 11:4; 1 Jn. 4:6; → Satan). These were all understood as experiences of personal

forces from the spiritual realm, evil or unclean because they injured and hindered a man's full relationship with God and his fellows. But at no time do the NT writers give way to a dualism, where the evil which thus manifests itself is as strong as God. Always the evil spirits are shown as inferior to God and subject to the power of the Spirit of God operating through his agents. Indeed it was precisely this effective power over evil spirits in his ministry of exorcism which Jesus saw as proof that the end-time kingdom was already present, since it indicated to Jesus that the final rout of → Satan had already begun (Mk. 3:23–7 par. Matt. 12:25–29, Lk. 14:17–20; Matt. 12:27 f.; cf. Lk. 11:19 f.; Lk. 10:17 f.).

Other forces operating upon man's world from the spiritual realm are thought of as good spirits or → angels (Acts 23:8 f.; Heb. 1:7, 14; 12:9). But Paul and John in particular recognize the ambiguity of such experiences of spirits, and the need for a discernment of spirits to distinguish good from evil (1 Cor. 12:10; 14:12; 2 Cor. 11:4; 1 Thess. 5:19–22; 2 Thess. 2:2; 1 Jn. 4:1, 3, 6). Compare the ambiguity noted above over (human) spirit and (Holy) Spirit.

3. *Jesus and the Spirit.* (a) If we are to understand Jesus' teaching on the Spirit as fully as possible, we must recall that Jesus' ministry followed that of John the Baptist. The Q traditions (Matt. 3:7–12; Lk. 3:7–9, 15–8), generally agreed to be the earliest, present John as a prophet of → judgment; his proclamation included, perhaps largely centred on the imminent coming of one who would administer God's final judgment. In particular, the Coming One would baptize *en pneumati hagiō kai pyri* ("in holy spirit and fire"). Suggestions that John spoke only of a → baptism in → fire or only of a baptism in wind (= *pneuma*) and fire (with addition and alterations made in the light of → Pentecost) need no longer be entertained: John's message was not solely of judgment (about wheat as well as chaff, Matt. 3:12); the Coming One's baptism was in some sense a promise to those who accepted John's baptism of repentance; and the Qumran community, who probably influenced John to some extent, had already been speaking of the *pneuma* as a cleansing, purifying power (particularly 1QS 3:7–9; 4:21).

John's metaphor is best understood as a variation on a prominent theme within intertestamental apocalyptic expectation, viz. the belief in the messianic woes, the conviction that the new age could be inaugurated only after a period of affliction and suffering – "the birth pangs of the messiah" (SB I 950; cf. e.g. Dan. 7:19–22; 2 Bar. 25–30). Thus "fire" could denote judgment and purification (e.g. Amos 7:4; Mal. 3:1 f.; 4:1), *pneuma* likewise (e.g. Isa. 4:4; Jer. 4:11 f.), and the river or flood vividly portrayed overwhelming calamity (Ps. 69:2, 15; Isa. 43:2). Notice particularly how the three elements were combined in Isa. 4:4; 30:28; Dan. 7:10. John's baptism in the Jordan (presumably by immersion) was therefore a very potent symbol of the end-time tribulation = baptism in Spirit and fire = God's fiery *pneuma* like a great stream through which all men must pass. Those who acknowledged their liability to judgment by submitting to the symbolized judgment of John's baptism would experience the messianic woes as a cleansing by a spirit of judgment and by a spirit of burning (Isa. 4:4). Those who denied their guilt and did not repent would experience the Coming One's baptism in Spirit and fire as the bonfire which burned up the unfruitful branches and chaff.

(b) Jesus' understanding of his own mission in terms of the Spirit was, however, different. This comes to clearest expression at two places in the Jesus-tradition:

Jesus' explanation for his success as an exorcist, and Jesus' consciousness of inspiration.

(i) Jesus' explanation for his success as an exorcist is preserved in the group of four or five controversy sayings in Mk. 3:22–9 and Q (Matt. 12:24–29 par. Lk. 11:15–23; → Satan). Almost all scholars accept Matt. 12:28 par. Lk. 11:20 as an authentic word of the historical Jesus. The arguments in favour of "Spirit" (Matt.) or "finger" (Lk.; → Hand, art. *cheir* NT 3) as original are fairly evenly balanced, though the case for "Spirit" is probably stronger (cf. J. D. G. Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit*, 1975, 45 f.). But either way the saying embodies a claim to exorcize by the power of God. The emphasis in the Gk. falls on the two phrases, "Spirit of God" and → "kingdom of God": "Since it is by the Spirit of God that I cast out demons then the kingdom of God has come upon you." The significance of the saying is twofold. First, the presence of the kingdom (the distinctive note in Jesus' proclamation) is defined in terms of the effective power of the Spirit. The end-time rule of God can be said to be already operative, because the end-time power is evidently at work conquering demonic power (cf. the weakly attested Lucan variant to the second petition of the Lord's Prayer, "May your Holy Spirit come upon us and cleanse us", Lk. 11:2). Second, Jesus is claiming a unique empowering by the Spirit: there were other exorcists, but their work did not bear the same significance (Matt. 12:27 par. Lk. 11:19). Jesus' exorcisms were so effective that he was able to conclude that his was the power of the end-time rule of God. The same self-understanding is implied in Mk. 3:27: that he had been empowered by God to begin the final battle with Satan. It is also implied in Mk. 3:28 f. par. Matt. 12:31 f., Lk. 12:10 which are frequently attributed to a post-resurrection origin, but without sufficient justification (J. D. G. Dunn, op. cit., 49–52). Probably first spoken in response to attacks on his exorcistic ministry (as Mk. claims, Mk. 3:30), it again testifies to Jesus' understanding of his exorcisms: they were obviously effected by the power of the Spirit, and there was an eschatological finality about this power that to deny it was to put oneself beyond forgiveness (→ Revile, art. *blasphēmeō*).

(ii) Jesus' consciousness of inspiration is clearly implied in the astonishingly authoritative claims made by Jesus ("But I say . . .", Matt. 5:22 etc.), and in his understanding of himself as a → prophet (particularly Mk. 6:4 par. Matt. 13:57; cf. Jn. 4:44; Lk. 13:33). Since the Spirit was principally regarded as the Spirit of prophecy in the Judaism of that time, Jesus' claim was in effect a claim to be inspired by the Spirit. And since the rabbis taught that the Spirit had been withdrawn from Israel since Malachi and would be given again only in the last days, Jesus was in effect claiming to be the eschatological prophet (see particularly Deut. 18:15, 18 f.; Isa. 61:1 ff.). In fact, there is good evidence that Jesus himself regarded Isa. 61:1 f. as fulfilled in his own ministry, as Lk. 4:18 f. states explicitly. This understanding of his mission as a Spirit-anointed proclamation of good tidings to the poor is clearly implied in the first two or three Beatitudes (Matt. 5:3–6 par. Lk. 6:20 f.) and in Matt. 11:5 par. Lk. 7:22, which few would dispute as authentic words of the historical Jesus. There are several points of significance here: Jesus attributed his ministry and its effectiveness to an anointing with the end-time Spirit (presumably at Jordan, as all the Gospels affirm, see below, 4); consequently his ministry had eschatological significance – the hopes for the new age were already being realized through his ministry; the proclamation of this good news to the → poor was even more important

to him than his work of healing (proclamation to the poor is the climax of the Matt. 11:5 list); the Spirit was so bound up with Jesus that he himself was part of the offence of his own ministry (Matt. 11:6), he himself as thus empowered by the Spirit had become the focus of eschatological significance.

(c) Jesus therefore saw his ministry in relation to the Spirit in terms more of eschatological blessing than of judgment. His response to the Baptist in Matt. 11:5 par. Lk. 7:22 seems deliberately to pick up the promise of blessing in Isa. 29:18–20; 35:3–5 and 61:1 f., and to ignore the threat of judgment which all three passages also contained. But probably he did not reject the Baptist's message outright. There are some indications that he did see his ministry also in terms of dispensing fiery judgment (Lk. 9:54; 12:49 f.; Mk. 9:49; Matt. 10:34–6 par. Lk. 12:51–3; Gos. Thom. 10, 16, 82), and the parallelism of Lk. 12:49–50 suggests that Jesus anticipated his death as a fiery baptism, that is as a suffering of the messianic woes (cf. Mk. 10:38 f.; 14:27, 36 and the probable influence of Dan. 7 and Isa. 53 on his understanding of his mission). It is possible then that he also saw his own earlier anointing with the Spirit in terms of the Baptist's preaching – that is, as a baptism with Spirit.

But did Jesus also see himself as dispenser of the Spirit, as baptizer in Spirit? The answer is uncertain, since it is not clear how Jesus envisaged the vindication which he almost certainly looked for beyond death or in particular his relation to his disciples prior to his parousia as the glorious Son of man. The only pre-resurrection saying in the Synoptics, Mk. 13:11, has a very restricted reference – to the disciples' experience of persecution and trial. Acts 1:5 quite likely is a Lucan interpretation giving Jesus' assurance more precise reference to → Pentecost. The Paraclete promises of Jn. 14–16 (see below, 7) could be drawn ultimately from a core of primitive tradition, as elsewhere in John. Lk. 22:29, Jesus' last will and testament, is also relevant in view of the close tie-up between Spirit and kingdom in Jesus' thought.

Further than this we cannot penetrate back into the thought and self-understanding of Jesus, since no other Spirit-saying as such can be attributed to him with any confidence, apart from the inconsequential Mk. 12:36, which simply echoes the contemporary doctrine of inspiration.

4. *The Evangelists' View of Jesus and the Spirit.* In the four Gospels the relation between Jesus and the Spirit already implied in Jesus' own teaching is immeasurably strengthened. The Evangelists have no doubts that Jesus was the wholly unique Man of the Spirit. His birth, or rather conception, was effected by the power of the Spirit without the agency of a human father: Matt. 1:18–25 – so that Jesus fulfils the Emmanuel prophecy (Isa. 7:14); Lk. 1:35 – an allusion to the Shekinah, perhaps with the further implication that Jesus as Son of God manifests the divine glory (cf. Jn. 1:14). The message of the Baptist on the relation between Jesus and the Spirit is tailored by Mark to fit the Christian fulfilment of Pentecost (1:8 – all note of judgment is omitted) and by the Fourth Evangelist to present John simply and solely as the perfect witness to Christ (Jn. 1:19–34). All the Gospels are clear that at Jordan Jesus was anointed with the Spirit and thus entered upon his messianic rôle (Mk. 1:11; Matt. 3:17; Lk. 3:22; Jn. 1:33; cf. 3:34). The Synoptics all stress that Jesus went forth to his temptations at the instigation of the Spirit (Mk. 1:12; Matt. 4:1; Lk. 4:1). Mark concentrates this introduction to his Gospel into a few sentences, thereby tying together the promise of the Baptist (Mk. 1:8) with the descent of the Spirit on Jesus (Mk. 1:10) and the Spirit's thrusting Jesus into the wilderness (Mk. 1:12). All

agree that Jesus' ministry was effective by the power of the Spirit: in addition to the controversy sayings (above, 3 (b)), Matt. and Lk. reinforce this view by incorporating quotations from Isa. (Matt. 12:18 = Isa. 42:1; Lk. 4:18 = Isa. 61:1; see also Acts 10:38). The portrayal of Jesus as the dispenser of the Spirit (Mk. 13:11 par. Matt. 24:20; Lk. 21:15) is strengthened by Lk. 11:13's redaction of the Q saying Matt. 7:11 ("Holy Spirit" substituted for "good things") and the inclusion of Lk. 24:49 and Acts 1:5, 8 as post-resurrection sayings, in a different way by the Matthean formulation of the great commission (Matt. 28:19), and in a much fuller way by John (see below, 7). Jesus' post-resurrection ministry is also characterized in terms of the Spirit in Acts 1:2, with the outpouring of the Spirit explicitly referred to Jesus in Jn. 20:22 and Acts 2:33.

It should be noticed that none of the evangelists is content to portray Jesus simply as the pneumatic exemplar or the first (Christian) charismatic. To be sure, Luke does portray Jesus' ministry in more distinctively charismatic terms, particularly in Lk. 4:1, 14 and 10:21, but Jesus is hardly presented as an ecstatic even by Luke, and any parallel at this point between the ministry of Jesus and that, say, of Peter in Acts is only incidental. It is possible that there was a stronger charismatic element in Jesus' ministry which the Evangelists have suppressed (so H. Windisch), though not very likely. On the other hand, it is very unlikely that the pneumatic features and Spirit sayings attributed to Jesus should be completely discarded. The evangelists' portrait of Jesus at this point bears the stamp of authenticity.

We should, however, not ignore a certain schematization which Luke has contrived in his two volumes (Luke-Acts) whereby Jesus, precisely in his relation with the Spirit, provides a bridge between the old age of Israel and the new age now recognized as the age of the church. Thus the conception and birth of Jesus by the power of the Spirit takes place in the context of a sporadic reappearance of the Spirit of prophecy (Lk. 1:15, 17, 41, 67; 2:25–7) – a last flare-up of the spiritual power and vitality of the divine revelation of the OT era before Jesus alone fills the centre of the stage. As a result of the descent of the Spirit at Jordan, Jesus, already Son of God (1:35; 2:49), enters a fuller relation of sonship or higher stage of his mission as Son (Lk. 3:22, citing Ps. 2:7 in full in a variant arguably original; Acts 10:38), wherein he is led by the Spirit as the archetypal Son (Lk. 4:1–14; cf. Rom. 8:14–7; Gal. 4:6 f.; 5:18). But only with his ascension does Jesus enter upon the fullness of sonship and messianic office (Acts 2:36; 13:33), and only then does he become Lord of the Spirit, the one who dispenses the Spirit to others not only by virtue of his own anointing, but by virtue also of his death and exaltation (Acts 2:33).

5. *The Spirit in the earliest Christian Communities and in Acts.* "Holy Spirit" denotes supernatural power, altering, working through, directing the believer (there is no significant difference between the phrase with the definite article and without). This is nowhere more clearly evident than in Acts where the Spirit is presented as an almost tangible force, visible if not in itself, certainly in its effects. This power of the Spirit manifests itself in three main areas in Luke's account of the early church.

(a) The Spirit as a transforming power in conversion. Christianity properly speaking dates from the earliest experiences of the Spirit after Jesus' death and resurrection. Luke sets the first of these in → Jerusalem at the first Pentecost after Jesus' resurrection, and there is no substantial reason why this location and dating should be rejected (→ Pentecost). It was evidently a very dramatic experience, and certainly

ecstatic in nature (including visionary elements and automatic speech). It transformed the group of disciples into a confident and dynamic sect, keen to propagate and live out their faith in Jesus as messiah and soon-coming Son of man. Luke has caught much of the atmosphere of these early days in the opening chapters of Acts (2–5), though he almost wholly omits the sense of eschatological fervency which must have featured strongly.

Probably too this first experience was understood to set something of a pattern for the reception of the Spirit thereafter (as Acts 11:15 f. suggests): the Spirit was the eschatological gift *par excellence*, and possession of the Spirit would be *the* mark of one who belonged to the messianic community of the last days (hence the promise of the Spirit as the climax to the first sermon of Peter, Acts 2:38 f.); and the coming and reception of the Spirit would be determined by the visible transformation of the individual, usually reckoned in manifestations of ecstasy (a view probably confirmed by the ecstatic experience referred to in Acts 4:31). Consequently at critical or problematic moments of the early mission thereafter what was looked for above all else was the reception or possession of the Spirit (Acts 9:17; 11:15 f.; 15:8; 18:25; 19:1 f.) as testified by clear-cut manifestations of spiritual power or ecstasy (Acts 8:15–9; 10:44–7; 19:6). Luke draws attention only to inspired utterance (prophecy and glossolalia), but that may be because for him prophecy is *the* sign of the Spirit (see below (b), and cf. 6 (a)).

Luke also well represents this early evaluation of the Spirit. The Spirit is tied in with ecstatic manifestations to such an extent that its presence cannot be assumed in the absence of such tangible effects: it is precisely their absence in the cases of the Samaritans in Acts 8:12 ff. and the Ephesians in Acts 19:1 ff. which causes the evangelists in question to conclude each time that the Spirit had not yet been given; and it is the *manifest* presence of the Spirit in the case of Cornelius and company in Acts 10:44 ff. and Apollos in Acts 18:25 (cf. Rom. 8:11) which proves that they *already* belong to the eschatological community (hence the reasoning of Acts 11:15–8). Thus, on the one hand, there is no justification for the conclusion either that Luke ties the Spirit to baptism (as manifestly he does not in Acts 8:12 ff. and 10:44 ff.), or that he views the Spirit as a gift subsequent to conversion – for Luke there is only one "gift of the Spirit" and that clear-cut in its effects on the receiver. And on the other, Luke's view of the Spirit is dominated by the early enthusiastic understanding of the first Christians (Acts 9:31 and 13:52 are probably only formal exceptions), exciting and challenging in its vitality, but lacking the richer theological balance of Paul.

(b) The Spirit of prophecy. For the first Christians, the Spirit was most characteristically a divine power manifesting itself in inspired utterance. The same power that had inspired → David and the prophets in the old age (Acts 1:16; 3:18; 4:25; 28:25) was now poured out in eschatological plenitude as Joel had foretold (Acts 2:17 ff.; cf. Joel 2:28–32); the excited sense that → Moses' ancient hope had been fulfilled, that all the Lord's people were prophets, that the Lord *had* put his Spirit upon them (Num. 11:29), comes through clearly in Acts 2:17 f., 38 f. and 4:31; and certainly it was inspired utterance which indicated the coming of the Spirit in Acts 2:4; 10:44 ff. and 19:6. Beyond conversion, this power was experienced as a surge of inspiration in moments of crisis and relief, giving both words and boldness of speech (Acts 4:8, 13, 29–31; 7:55; 13:9), and more generally the Spirit was understood as

the power enabling effective testimony and teaching (Acts 5:32; 6:10; 18:25). But while this Spirit was given to all and all might experience a filling up of the Spirit and overflowing of inspired utterance in particular instances, there evidently arose quite quickly the recognition that certain individuals had a fuller bestowal of the prophetic Spirit, or at least were more regularly inspired to prophesy – hence the appearance of both resident and wandering prophets in the earliest communities (Acts 11:27 f.; 13:1; 15:32; 20:23; 21:4, 9–11). The particular noun phrase *plērēs pneumatos*, "full of the Spirit" (as distinct from the more regular Lucan verbal phrase ". . . were filled with the Spirit", Lk. 1:41, 67; Acts 2:4; 4:8, 31; 9:17; 13:9), may derive from a special "Hellenist" source (Acts 6:3, 5; 7:55; 11:24; though note Luke 4:1). In this case it could denote either a more sustained experience and manifestation of inspiration, or it might simply be a variant on the verbal phrase.

Luke shares this view of the Spirit as pre-eminently the Spirit of prophecy: it is precisely that gift known at best so sporadically in the old age (Lk. 1–2) which in the new age has become the prerogative of all (emphasized by the addition of "and they shall prophesy" to the Joel quotation in Acts 2:18). It is also rather surprising that Luke never links the Spirit specifically with any of the miracles performed in Acts (though such a link is implied in 2:19, 43; 4:30 f. and 6:8), presumably because the link with prophecy is so dominant. In addition, we need simply observe: that he makes no effort to distinguish prophecy from glossolalia in Acts 2:17 f. = 2:4, 13, and 19:6, and may indeed have thought prophecy was always manifestly ecstatic in character; and that he makes no effort to resolve the problem of conflicting prophecies in Acts 20:22 and 21:4.

(c) The Spirit as the director of mission. The Spirit was evidently experienced as a numinous power pervading the early community and giving its early leadership an aura of authority which could not be withstood (Acts 4:31; 5:1–10; 6:10; 8:9–13; 13:9–11). With the movement out from Jerusalem after Stephen's death, the Spirit becomes much more regularly understood as the power of mission, directing the evangelists into the new developments that continually opened up before them (Acts 8:29, 39; 10:19; 11:12; 13:2, 4; 15:28; 16:6 f.; 19:21; cf. 7:51). In this expansion ecstatic visions evidently played a significant rôle too (particularly Acts 9:10; 10:3, 7, 10–16; 16:9 f.; 22:17 f.), but these are not attributed to the Spirit (despite 2:17). In Luke's presentation this compulsion to mission and outreach characterized the earliest community's understanding of the Spirit from the first (Acts 1:8; 2:5–11, the inspired utterance of Pentecost as telling the mighty works of God to Jews "from every nation under heaven"). So too the more formally structured ecclesiastical leadership of presbyters or overseers (→ bishops) is attributed specifically to the Spirit in Acts 20:28 (cf. 15:28). However, the more fundamental theological question as to the relation between the exalted Christ and the Spirit is not clarified: Christ introduces "the last days" by dispensing the Spirit (Acts 2:33), but thereafter the two are brought together only in the enigmatic reference to "the Spirit of Jesus" in Acts 16:7.

6. *The Spirit in the Pauline Letters.* Of the NT writers, Paul most deserves the title, "the theologian of the Spirit", for he gives a more rounded and more integrated teaching on the Spirit than we find in any other literature of that time, or indeed for several centuries before and after.

(a) The Spirit as the fundamental mark of belonging to Christ. As with the first

Christians (above 5 (a)) so with Paul, the gift of the Spirit is what makes the individual a member of Christ (Rom. 8:9; cf. 1 Cor. 2:12; 2 Cor. 11:4; 1 Thess. 4:8), united with him through the Spirit (1 Cor. 6:17), a sharer in his sonship (Rom. 8:14–6; Gal. 4:6). The Spirit, as it were, is the exalted Lord's steward taking possession of his property on his behalf (1 Cor. 3:16; 6:19 f.). It is the reception of the Spirit through faith which marks the beginning of the Christian life (Gal. 3:2 f.), a gift which fulfils the promise to → Abraham and which therefore is another name for justification (Gal. 3:14; 1 Cor. 6:11) – that is, the gift of righteousness understood as having "the character of power" (cf. E. Käsemann, " 'The Righteousness of God' in Paul", *New Testament Questions of Today*, 1969, 168–82). Alternatively expressed, it is by being baptized in the one Spirit, drenched with the one Spirit, that individuals become members of the one body of Christ (1 Cor. 12:13). For Paul it was precisely the gift of the Spirit which distinguished the Christian from the Jew, the new age from the old (Rom. 2:29; 7:6; 2 Cor. 3:6–8; Gal. 4:29; Phil. 3:3). The Spirit constitutes that immediacy of personal relationship with God which Moses had fitfully enjoyed (2 Cor. 3:13–8) and which Jeremiah had only foreseen from afar (2 Cor. 3:3, referring to Jer. 31:33 f.; cf. Eph. 2:18). In all this, "Spirit" is almost synonymous with "grace" in the sense of God's action in reaching out to men and establishing a positive relation with them (as e.g. in Rom. 3:24; 1 Cor. 15:10; 2 Cor. 6:1; Gal. 1:15; Eph. 2:8).

It is important to realize that for Paul too the Spirit is a divine power whose impact upon or entrance into a life is discernible by its effects. In some cases the manifestation was charismatic utterance and act (1 Cor. 1:4–7; Gal. 3:5; cf. above 5 (a)). But in others it was evidently an overwhelming experience of being accepted by God (Eph. 1:7 f.), of being swamped by divine love (Rom. 5:5), of a joy that made light of affliction (1 Thess. 1:6). In others again it was an experience of illumination as to the significance of Jesus (1 Cor. 2:10–12; 2 Cor. 3:14–17; 4:6; Gal. 1:12, 15 f.; cf. Eph. 1:17; 3:5) or of liberation from the deadening effect of the law and of sin's power (Rom. 8:2; 2 Cor. 3:17) or of moral transformation dramatic in its suddenness (1 Cor. 6:9–11). It is most probably to some such experiences that Paul refers in the vivid metaphors of 1 Cor. 12:13, and when he likens the Spirit to a → seal affixed to goods or documents to indicate ownership (2 Cor. 1:22; Eph. 1:13; 4:30). Many interpreters have referred these passages to baptism, but it is more likely that it was the vivid experience of the Spirit itself which Paul recalls (as also e.g. in 1 Cor. 2:4 f.; 1 Thess. 1:5).

(b) The eschatological Spirit. As for Jesus so for Paul, the Spirit is the power of the new age already broken into the old, not so as to bring the old to an end or render it wholly ineffective, but so as to enable the believer to live in and through the old age in the power and in the light of the new. Thus the Spirit is the "down-payment and guarantee" (*arrabōn*) that God will complete the work begun in Christ and through the Spirit (2 Cor. 1:22; 5:5; Eph. 1:13 f.; → Gift); the Spirit is the "first fruits" (*aparchē*) of God's harvest at the end of time (Rom. 8:23; → Sacrifice; → Seed); the Spirit is the first instalment of the believer's inheritance in the kingdom of God (Rom. 8:15–17; 14:17; 1 Cor. 6:9–11; 15:42–50; Gal. 4:6 f.; 5:16–24; Eph. 1:13 f.). This means also: (1) The gift of the Spirit is only the beginning of a life-long process of being saved, of sanctification, of being conformed to the image of Christ (2 Cor. 3:18; 2 Thess. 2:13; cf. Rom. 8:28; 16:16; Gal. 6:8; Eph. 3:16 f.). (2) The believer's life in

the present is characterized by a tension and even warfare between the old age and the new, between the desires of the flesh and those of the Spirit, between the powers of death and of life both at work in him and each seeking to gain the mastery over him (Rom. 7:14–25; 8:10, 12 f.; Gal. 5:16 f.). (3) The final consummation of God's redemptive activity is the completion of what he has already begun in the gift of the Spirit and is achieved when the Spirit takes full control over the whole person – that is, in the → resurrection of the body, when and only when the believer becomes a "spiritual body", wholly belonging to the new age, wholly like Christ, wholly under the Spirit's direction (Rom. 8:11, 23; 1 Cor. 15:44–9; 2 Cor. 5:1–5; Eph. 1:14). Consequently, (4) there is no foundation in Paul for a distinctively second or third gift of the Spirit – the Spirit always has the essential character of that power which *begins* the process of salvation and carries it through to completion. Nor is there room in Paul for a gift of the Spirit in this life which sets the believer free from the eschatological tension and warfare between → flesh and Spirit. On the contrary, the Spirit's activity in the present age is marked more by → *hope* than by fulfilment or complete victory (Rom. 5:5; 8:18–25; 15:13; Gal. 5:5; Eph. 1:17 f.), and prayer in the Spirit is at the same time the inarticulate groaning of this-worldly → weakness (Rom. 8:26 f.; → Prayer, art. *entynchanō*).

(c) Life in the Spirit. For Paul, the believer has a responsibility to live his life in the power of the Spirit. In general terms that means to let his character be moulded by God according to the pattern of Jesus Christ – not as something which the believer achieves for himself ("work"), but as something which by attentive openness to God he allows the Spirit to produce through him (→ "fruit") (2 Cor. 3:18; Gal. 5:18–23; cf. Rom. 8:28; 9:1; 14:17; 15:13, 30; 2 Cor. 6:6; Gal. 6:1; Col. 1:8). In particular, it means that Paul was able to talk of his daily conduct as a "walking by the Spirit", a being "led by the Spirit", as an "ordering one's life by the Spirit" (Rom. 8:4–6, 14; Gal. 5:16, 18, 25; cf. Rom. 8:13; Gal. 6:8). It is noticeable that he contrasts this experience of daily guidance with the sort of dependence on the rule book of the law which had characterized his previous religious practice (Rom. 7:6; 2 Cor. 3:6; Gal. 5:1, 16). That is to say, he experienced the Spirit precisely as the fulfilment of the prophetic hope that the law would be written on the heart not just on tablets of stone, that men would know God for themselves and be able to discern God's will immediately without having to refer to the Scriptures and the case-law of tradition each time (Rom. 12:2; 2 Cor. 3:3, alluding to Jer. 31:31–34). Similarly worship and prayer were not a matter of liturgical rote or outward form, but worship was characterized precisely as worship in or by the Spirit of God (Rom. 2:28 f.; Phil. 3:3; cf. Eph. 2:18, 22), and → prayer precisely as prayer in the Spirit (Eph. 6:18; see also Rom. 8:15 f., 26 f.; 1 Cor. 14:14–7; Gal. 4:6).

(d) The charismatic Spirit. It is important for Paul that the Spirit is a shared gift; it is a centripetal force drawing believers together into the one body of Christ. Thus, on the one hand, the corporate life of Christians arises out of the shared experience of the Spirit. They are constituted the one body of Christ by their common participation (*koinōnia*) in the one Spirit (1 Cor. 12:13; 2 Cor. 13:14; Eph. 4:3 f.; Phil. 1:27; 2:1; → Fellowship). And, on the other, the continuing existence and unity of any church depends on the sharing of that shared Spirit; that is to say, the Spirit who creates community constantly seeks to manifest himself in the concrete expressions of grace (*charismata*) which alone can build up that community to maturity in Christ (Rom.

12:4–8; 1 Cor. 12:14–26; 14:12, 26; Eph. 4:11–16). These manifestations of the Spirit are marked out for Paul as given (not achieved by man), as expressions of divine energy (not human potential or talent), as acts of service which promote the common good (not for personal edification or aggrandizement) (1 Cor. 12:4–7). Such *charismata* may be individual acts or utterances such as Paul mentions in Rom. 1:11, 1; Cor. 12:8–11 and 14:26, or more regular ministries as in Rom. 12:6–8; 1 Cor. 12:28 and Eph. 4:11. In particular, the Spirit seeks to come to expression in speech: it is prophecy which serves to build up the church most effectively (Rom. 12:6–8; 1 Cor. 14:1–5, 13–9; see also 1 Cor. 2:13 f.; 7:40; 12:3), just as it is the speech inspired by the Spirit which is most effective to convict and convert the unbeliever. Paul experienced the Spirit as a centrifugal as well as a centripetal force (Rom. 15:16–19; 1 Cor. 2:4 f.; 14:24 f.; 2 Cor. 3:4–6; Eph. 6:17; 1 Thess. 1:5). The importance which Paul places on the *charismata* of the Spirit explains his concern lest they be restricted in their range or expression (Eph. 5:18 f.; 1 Thess. 5:19 f.; cf. Eph. 4:30); but concern equally lest they be abused by overemphasis on some or by failure to exercise critical discernment on any (Rom. 12:3; 1 Cor. 2:12–14; 1 Thess. 5:19–22; cf. 1 Cor. 12:3; 2 Thess. 2:2).

(e) The Spirit of Christ. Most significant of all, the Spirit for Paul has been constitutively stamped with the character of Christ. Christ by his resurrection entered wholly upon the realm of the Spirit (Rom. 1:4; cf. 8:11). Indeed, Paul can say that Christ by his → resurrection "became life-giving Spirit" (1 Cor. 15:45). That is to say, the exalted Christ is now experienced in, through and as Spirit. Christ now cannot be experienced apart from the Spirit: the Spirit is the medium of union between Christ and the believer (1 Cor. 6:17); only those belong to Christ, are "in Christ", who have the Spirit and in so far as they are led by the Spirit (Rom. 8:9, 14). Conversely, the Spirit is now experienced as the power of the risen Christ – the Spirit now cannot be experienced apart from Christ. It is precisely the confession of Jesus' Lordship which marks out that inspiration which is the Spirit's (1 Cor. 12:3). It is precisely the reproduction of Jesus' own distinctive Abba-prayer which marks out the Spirit as the Spirit of the Son (Rom. 8:15 f.; Gal. 4:6). It is precisely the transformation of the believer's character into the character of Christ which marks out the eschatological Spirit (2 Cor. 3:18). The Spirit is now nothing less and nothing more than the Spirit of Christ (Rom. 8:9; Gal. 4:6; Phil. 1:19; cf. 2 Thess. 2:8). The more formless and impersonal power which characterized the Spirit in the old age has been given sharper definition and personality. It is because the Spirit has taken the shape of Christ that the character of Christ can and must serve as the basic criterion whereby the Spirit's activity may be discerned; only that which makes the individual or church more like Christ can claim fully to be an expression of the Spirit of Christ.

7. *The Spirit in the Gospel and Letters of John.* The Spirit is also of considerable importance in John's theology. His understanding of the Spirit overlaps with that of earlier NT writers at several points. In particular, the new life of the Spirit is presented under the very vigorous metaphors of (re)birth from above (Jn. 3:5–8; 1 Jn. 3:9), of new → creation (Jn. 20:22, the verb deliberately echoing Gen. 2:7; Ezek. 37:9; Wis. 15:11), of life-giving → water and → bread (Jn. 4:14; 6:63; 7:38 f.), and of → anointing (1 Jn. 2:20, 27). And in the Johannine writings as elsewhere the Spirit is also detectable by the effects of his coming (Jn. 3:8), so much so that the immediacy of the Spirit's indwelling is one of the tests of life in 1 Jn. (3:24; 4:13). Once again the

recognition of the vividness and immediacy of the experience of the Spirit for John should cause interpreters to hesitate before they refer such verses as Jn. 1:33; 7:38 f.; 1 Jn. 2:20 to baptism as such. Jn. 3:5 (water) may very well indicate that for John baptism has a part in birth from above, but not that the two were equated in John's mind. Indeed, Jn. 13:10 may be a protest against such a view, just as Jn. 6:63 may be seen as a protest against a too literal understanding of the words of institution in the Lord's Supper (Jn. 6:53–8).

More distinctive of John's pneumatology is the way in which he expresses the relation between the Spirit and Christ. (1) Although his christology is very high (Jesus as the incarnate Logos), it is noteworthy that he gives a firm place to the tradition of Jesus being anointed with the Spirit at Jordan (Jn. 1:32 f.; 3:34). (2) He ties Jesus' gift of the Spirit much more closely to Jesus' death: to receive the Spirit of the ascended Jesus is to eat his flesh given for the life of the world (Jn. 6:51–8, 62 f.); it is from the side of Jesus glorified in his death that the Spirit (= water) comes (Jn. 7:38 f., with 7:38 punctuated so as to refer to Jesus, as was most probably John's intention; 19:34); it is the crucified Jesus who "handed over the Spirit" (Jn. 19:30); it is Christ newly risen and ascended who bestows the Spirit on the disciples (Jn. 20:22). The recognition that John is making a theological point in Jn. 20:22 (death, resurrection, ascension and gift of Spirit form a single theological unity), rather than offering a strict chronological account, should render unnecessary any attempt to achieve a chronological or theological harmonization of Jn. 20:22 with Acts 2. (3) The unity of Christ and Spirit in personality and mission is neatly expressed by identifying the Spirit as the "other Paraclete" (Jn. 14:16), where Jesus is by implication the first Paraclete (cf. 1 Jn. 2:1), so that the Paraclete continues the presence and work of the Son once the Son has departed (Jn. 14:16–28; → Advocate); or, alternatively expressed, so that the Spirit becomes the seed of sonship, the Spirit of the Son (1 Jn. 3:9, 24; 4:13). Thus, as in Paul, the Spirit is conformed to the character and work of Christ and only that Spirit which displays that character and testifies to Jesus the Christ is to be recognized as the Spirit of God (1 Jn. 4:1–3, 6; 5:6–8).

Where John derives the title "Paraclete" (*paraklētos*) from is not clear. It is quite possible that he coined the title himself to express in a single word the various functions he attributed to the Spirit. The nearest parallels to the forensic and intercessory functions are to be found in late Jewish angelology (cf. particularly Job 16:19; 19:25; 33:23, 26; 1QS 3:20; CD 5:18; 1QM 13:10) and in early Christian understanding of the Spirit (Mk. 13:11; Acts 5:32). If a single word translation of *paraklētos* is desired, rather than "Paraclete", RSV's "Counsellor" is both sufficiently precise and sufficiently comprehensive (but see the discussion under Advocate, art. *paraklētos* NT). The chief function attributed to the Paraclete is that of witness, revealer, interpreter: this embraces both recalling of the teaching originally given (14:26; 15:26; 16:14; cf. 1 Jn. 5:6–8) and leading into new truth (Jn. 16:12 f.; cf. Isa. 42:9; 44:7; 1 Jn. 2:27). This implies that new revelation and original teaching are to be held in constant tension for John, so that the Spirit's rôle is never simply that of repeating the original teaching as first given, nor that of revealing new truth wholly unrelated to the old, but that of reinterpreting the old to give it contemporary significance and that of revealing the new in a way consistent with the old. The freedom and restraint in John's own portrait of Jesus exemplifies this function of the interpreter Spirit, as no doubt John intended. The same sort of balance between the freedom of present in-

spiration and the constraint of earlier revelation is present in the description of true worship in Jn. 4:23 f.: as God is Spirit in his communication and communion with men, so men must worship in the liberty of the Spirit and in accordance with his definitive revelation in Christ.

Finally, we may note the Spirit's rôle in mission in Jn. 16:8–11, where the NEB translation serves as a useful commentary. This, together with 1 Cor. 14:24 f., is the only passage which talks of the Spirit's rôle in bringing conviction of sin. It is noteworthy that for John the chief sin is failure to recognize the real significance of Jesus, that he has conquered the prince of this world. On the other hand, when men respond to the Spirit-inspired mission of the disciples, their sins are forgiven (Jn. 20:22 f.).

8. *The Spirit in other NT Writings.* The Spirit is nowhere else so prominent in the rest of the NT.

(a) The Pastorals show far less consciousness of the Spirit as a present reality. He is mentioned in the early formulae preserved in 1 Tim. 3:16 as the mode of Jesus' exalted life (cf. Rom. 1:4; 1 Cor. 15:45; 1 Pet. 3:18) and in Tit. 3:5 as the power of regeneration and renewal poured out by Christ (cf. Acts 2:33; Jn. 3:5–8). In 1 Tim. 4:1 he is the inspirer of prophecy in the period prior to these "later times". 2 Tim. 1:7 is very like Rom. 8:15, but overall the Spirit's manifestations have become more formalized and institutionalized (1 Tim. 4:14; 2 Tim. 1:6) and the Spirit is more the power preserving tradition than leading into new truth (2 Tim. 1:4).

(b) Hebrews recalls the charismatic vitality of the early mission (Heb. 2:4) and conversion is still understood as a coming to share in the Spirit and in the illumination and eschatological powers by which the Spirit manifests himself. The statements of Heb. 3:7; 9:8 and 10:15 reflect the traditional view of the Spirit as the inspirer of → Scripture, so that Scripture can be presented as the voice of the Spirit. More distinctive is the fierceness of Hebrews' warning that the new relation of grace can be so abused that the Spirit of grace be lost (Heb. 6:4 ff.; 10:29), and the author's assertion that Christ was enabled to offer himself up in death by the power of the eternal Spirit (Heb. 9:14).

(c) James 4:5 presents more puzzles than clarity: to what Scripture does it refer? Does it speak of the human spirit as the breath of God, as in ancient Hebrew thought (Gen. 6:3; Job 33:4), or of the divine Spirit as given in conversion, as more regularly in the NT? (See S. S. Laws, "Does Scripture speak in vain? A reconsideration of James iv. 5", *NTS* 20, 1973–74, 210 ff.)

(d) 1 Peter's understanding of the Spirit is nicely typical of the NT – the Spirit of prophecy (1 Pet. 1:11), the inspirer of mission and the power of the gospel (1 Pet. 1:12), the power that sets men apart for God (1 Pet. 1:2) and transforms into the image of God's glory through suffering and persecution (1 Pet. 4:14), the mode of existence in the life beyond death (1 Pet. 3:18; 4:6).

(e) Jude 19–20 is very Pauline in character: believers are those who by definition have the Spirit, whereas those who boast of their spirituality thereby give evidence of their unspirituality (cf. 1 Cor. 2:12–3:4); he alone outside the Pauline letters exhorts his readers to pray in the Spirit (cf. 1 Cor. 14:15; Eph. 6:18).

(f) 2 Peter 1:21's view of inspiration is the nearest the NT approaches to the more typically Greek idea of inspiration as a complete surrender of mind and will to the overpowering Spirit.

(g) The seer of Revelation attributes his inspiration and visions to the Spirit (Rev. 1:10; 4:2; 14:13; 17:3; 21:10; 22:17) and writes to the seven churches at the Spirit's dictation (Rev. 2:7, 11, 17, 29; 3:6, 13, 22). He probably refers to the Spirit of God under the symbolism of the seven spirits (Rev. 1:4; 4:5; → Number, art. *hepta*), particularly as he also represents them as the spirits (Spirit) of the exalted Jesus (Rev. 3:1; 5:6). Perhaps his most interesting reference is to "the testimony of Jesus" as "the Spirit of prophecy" (19:10), presumably an affirmation that prophecy must always be understood in relation to and be judged by the Jesus-tradition and/or the earliest witness to Christ. Note also Rev. 11:11, where *pneuma* is the breath of resurrection life, a divine power which antichrist tries to ape in order to deceive (Rev. 13:15).

9. *Spiritual (pneumatikos). pneumatikos*, the adj. formed from *pneuma*, conveys the sense of belonging to the realm of spirit/Spirit, of the essence or nature of spirit/Spirit, embodying or manifesting spirit/Spirit. Within the NT it is almost exclusively a Pauline word; elsewhere in the NT it occurs only in 1 Pet. 2:5, which is a letter quite heavily influenced by Pauline theology anyway. 15 out of the 24 Pauline occurrences are in 1 Cor. Where the word is introduced at key points in that letter (2:13–3:1; 12:1; 14:1, 37; 15:44–6), it looks very much as though Paul is both taking over and reformulating the language of his opponents, thereby meeting the challenge of what is best understood as an incipient gnosticism expressing an élitist and perfectionist spirituality.

Paul uses the word in three ways. (a) As an adj., a spiritual something. Whatever gift (*charisma*) Paul shares with the Romans will be spiritual, from the Spirit and expressing the life and power of the Spirit (Rom. 1:11). The law is spiritual in the sense that it derives from the Spirit (given by revelation and inspiration) and was intended to achieve a fruitful encounter between divine Spirit and human spirit (Rom. 7:14). The → resurrection body is spiritual in that it embodies the Spirit; Spirit is the unifying centre and motivating force of its existence (1 Cor. 15:44, 46). Paul's point is that the spiritual (body) does not precede the natural (so as to be untainted by the natural), but rather the spiritual (body) succeeds the natural (body). It is in some sense a re-creation of the natural, and so is not yet (→ Soul, art. *psychē* NT 2 (b)). According to Eph. 1:3, the blessings are spiritual in that they derive from the Spirit and take their character from the Spirit. Similarly, "spiritual understanding" (Col. 1:9) and "spiritual songs" (Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16; → Song), and perhaps also "spiritual stones" and "spiritual sacrifices" (1 Pet. 2:5; → Rock).

In 1 Cor. 10:3 f. the adj. could be taken in a similar way – food, drink, rock which embodied the Spirit, in the sense of conveying the Spirit (so, e.g., E. Käsemann, "The Pauline Doctrine of the Lord's Supper", *Essays on New Testament Themes*, *SBT* 41, 1964, 113). On this view, Paul's understanding of the → Lord's Supper has been heavily influenced by the mystery cults – to partake of the meal is to partake of the cult deity, to take into oneself his spirit. 1 Cor. 10:1–4, however, is better understood as a midrash with allegorical elements (cf. 2 Cor. 3:7–18; Gal. 4:22–31), where "the rock" which accompanied the people in the wilderness in the old legend is to be interpreted as equivalent to Christ in his presence with his people, and the manna and water from the rock are to be interpreted as pictures of the Christian's supernatural sustenance. In this case *pneumatikos* is used in a slightly extended sense, almost equivalent to "allegorical", so explicitly the adverb in Rev. 11:8, and perhaps also the

adjective in 1 Pet. 2:5 – that is "spiritual" in the sense of *denoting* a spiritual reality or conveying a spiritual *meaning* rather than in the sense of actually conveying the Spirit itself. (For further discussion of 1 Cor. 10:3 f. → Hunger, art. *pinō* NT 4 (a).)

(b) As a masc. noun, spiritual man. Both Paul's opponents and Paul himself claim that some Christians are "spiritual men" and others are not – that is, they are possessed by and manifest the Spirit of God more than others, or in a manner not yet experienced by others (1 Cor. 2:13, 15; 3:1; 14:37; Gal. 6:1). But where for Paul's opponents this higher spirituality is marked out by superior wisdom and speech and divisive self-concern, for Paul the "spiritual man" is marked out by his love and concern for others, by his *lack* of self-conceit and envy, and by his ability to distinguish what is loving from what is merely lawful, what is of God from what is merely inspired, what is for the benefit of the whole community from what merely edifies the individual (1 Cor. 2:13–15; 14:37).

(c) As a neut. noun, the spirituals, spiritual things. In Rom. 15:27 and 1 Cor. 9:11 "the things of the Spirit" seem to denote the whole range of activities, attitudes, experiences, etc. which ultimately depend on and derive from the Spirit and which draw their significance from the Spirit – in contrast to the merely material, or to those activities, attitudes etc. which derive from the flesh and draw their significance from the merely physical, human and worldly. In 1 Cor. 12:1; 14:1 and probably 2:13 *pneumatika* is used in a more restricted sense in reference to spiritual gifts, more or less equivalent to *charismata*. Of the two words the latter seems to be Paul's preferred choice (cf. Rom. 1:11; 12:6; 1 Cor. 1:7). The Corinthian situation and the way in which Paul introduces the subject of 1 Cor. 12–14 strongly suggest that "the spirituals" is the word preferred by many Corinthians, emphasizing perhaps thereby the more ecstatic character of their spirituality. The use of *pneumatika* in Eph. 6:12 in reference to evil spirits confirms that *pneumatika* has a more ambiguous meaning than *charismata* in Paul's mind, and underlines again the ambiguous nature of "spiritual things" which necessitates that discernment and evaluation (1 Cor. 2:13–15; 14:37) which the Corinthians so evidently lacked (14:12).

J. D. G. Dunn

10. *Other Words Used in Connexion with the Spirit.* The noun *pnoē* which is used in the LXX chiefly for *nᵉšāmâh* means a blowing, wind. It occurs in the description of the coming of the Spirit at → Pentecost: "And suddenly a sound came from heaven like the rush of a mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting" (Acts 2:2). The account recalls the moving of the Spirit of God over the waters in creation (Gen. 1:2), and perhaps too the wind which preceded God speaking to → Elijah (1 Ki. 19:11). In both cases the movement of the wind precedes the utterance of the Word of God. The quotation from Joel 2:28–32 in Acts 2:17–21 indicates that Peter proclaimed the manifestation of the Spirit as the sign that the new created order was dawning. In Acts 17:25 *pnoē* means breath (cf. Gen. 2:7) in the proclamation that the God who made all things does not live in shrines, "nor is served by human hands, as though he needed anything, since he himself gives to all men life and breath and everything."

The cognate vb. *pneō* occurs in the parable of the houses built on the rock and the sand, signifying the day of reckoning (Matt. 7:25, 27), in the saying about the south wind (Lk. 12:55), in the account of the storm (Jn. 6:18), in the vision of the four winds held back by the angels (Rev. 7:1), and in the description of the movement of

the Spirit which man cannot discern (Jn. 3:8). *ekpneō* means to breathe out, to breathe one's last, expire (Mk. 15:37, 39; Lk. 23:46). *enpneō* means to breathe on, to breathe, and is used fig. of Saul's threats of murder against the disciples of the Lord (Acts 9:1). For *theopneustos*, lit. God-breathed, inspired by God (2 Tim. 3:16) → Scripture, art. *graphē* NT 1 (c). *C. Brown*

→ Gift, → God, → Jesus Christ, → Pentecost

(a). C. K. Barrett, *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition*, 1947; and "The Holy Spirit in the Fourth Gospel", *JTS* New Series 1, 1950, 1–15; G. R. Beasley-Murray, "Jesus and the Spirit", A. Descamps and A. de Halleux, eds., *Mélanges Bibliques en hommage au R. P. Béda Rigaux*, 1970, 463–78; H. Berkhof, *The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit*, 1965; R. E. Brown, "The Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel", *NTS* 13, 1966–67, 113–32; F. D. Bruner, *A Theology of the Holy Spirit*, 1970; E. D. Burton, *Spirit, Soul and Flesh*, 1918; W. D. Davies, "Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Flesh and Spirit", in K. Stendahl, ed., *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, 157–82; J. Denney, "Holy Spirit", J. Hastings, ed., *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, I 731–44; L. Dewar, *The Holy Spirit and Modern Thought*, 1959; W. P. Dickson, *St. Paul's Use of the Terms Flesh and Spirit*, 1883; J. D. G. Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, *SBT* Second Series 15, 1970; "2 Corinthians 3:17 – 'The Lord is the Spirit' ", *JTS* 21, 1970, 309–20; "The Washing of the Disciples' Feet in Jn. 13:1–20", *ZNW* 61, 1970, 247–52; "Spirit and Kingdom", *ExpT* 82, 1970–71, 36–40; "John 6 – a Eucharistic Discourse?", *NTS* 17, 1970–71, 328–38; "Spirit- and Fire-Baptism", *NovT* 14, 1972, 81–92; "Jesus – Flesh and Spirit: an Exposition of Romans 1:3–4", *JTS* 24, 1973, 40–68; "1 Cor. 15:45 – Last Adam, Life-giving Spirit", in B. Lindars and S. S. Smalley, eds., op. cit., 127–41; *Jesus and the Spirit: A Study of the Religious and Charismatic Experience of Jesus and the First Christians as Reflected in the New Testament*, 1975; and *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament: An Inquiry into the Character of Earliest Christianity*, 1977; J. E. Fison, *The Blessing of the Holy Spirit*, 1950; M. Green, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, 1975; N. Q. Hamilton, *The Holy Spirit and Eschatology in Paul*, 1957; G. S. Hendry, *The Holy Spirit in Christian Theology*, 1965^2; D. Hill, *Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings: Studies in the Semantics of Soteriological Terms*, *Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series* 5, 1967, 202–93; P. G. S. Hopwood, *The Religious Experience of the Primitive Church*, 1936; R. B. Hoyle, *The Holy Spirit in St Paul*, 1927; J. H. E. Hull, *The Holy Spirit in the Acts of the Apostles*, 1967; R. Jewett, *Paul's Anthropological Terms: A Study of their Use in Conflict Settings*, *Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Christentums* 10, 1971; and "Spirit", *IDB Supplementary Volume* 1976, 839 ff.; G. Johnston, *The Spirit-Paraclete in the Gospel of John*, 1970; H. Kleinknecht, F. Baumgärtel, W. Bieder, E. Sjöberg, E. Schweizer, *pneuma* etc. *TDNT* VI 332–455; K. Lake, "The Holy Spirit", in F. J. Foakes Jackson and K. Lake, *The Beginnings of Christianity*, V, 96–111; G. W. H. Lampe, "The Holy Spirit in the Writings of St Luke", in D. E. Nineham, ed., *Studies in the Gospels*, 1955, 159–200; "Holy Spirit", *IDB* II 626–38; "The Holy Spirit and the Person of Christ", in S. W. Sykes and J. P. Clayton, eds., *Christ, Faith and History: Cambridge Studies in Christology*, 1972, 111–30; and *The Seal of the Spirit*, 1967^2; A. R. C. Leaney, "The Johannine Paraclete and the Qumran Scrolls", in J. H. Charlesworth, ed., *John and Qumran*, 1972, 38–61; B. Lindars and S. S. Smalley, eds., *Christ and Spirit in the New Testament. In Honour of Charles Francis Digby Moule*, 1973; D. Moody, *Spirit of the Living God*, 1968; J. Moltmann, *The Church in the Power of the Spirit*, 1977; R. Otto, *The Idea of the Holy*, 1923; J. K. Parratt, "The Holy Spirit and Baptism in the New Testament", *ExpT* 82, 1970–71, 231–5, 266–71; B. A. Pearson, *The Pneumatikos-Psychikos Terminology*, Society for Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 12, 1973; I. de la Potterie and S. Lyonnet, *The Christian Lives by the Spirit*, 1971; J. Pryke, " 'Spirit' and 'Flesh' in the Qumran Documents and Some New Testament Texts", *Revue de Qumrân* 5, 1965, 345–60; T. Rees, *The Holy Spirit in Thought and Experience*, 1915; H. W. Robinson, *The Christian Experience of the Holy Spirit*, 1928; E. Schweizer, *pneuma*, *TDNT* VI 332–455; E. F. Scott, *The Spirit in the New Testament*, 1923; R. Scroggs, "Paul: *SOPHOS* and *PNEUMATIKOS*", *NTS* 14, 1967–68, 33–55; T. S. Smail, *Reflected Glory*, 1975; W. D. Stacey, *The Pauline View of Man*, 1956; B. H. Streeter, ed., *The Spirit*, 1919; H. B. Swete, *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament*, 1910; and *The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church*, 1912; J. V. Taylor, *The Go-Between God*, 1972; G. Vos, "The Eschatological Aspect of the Pauline Concept of the Spirit", *Biblical and Theological Studies*, 1912, 211–59; A. W. Wainwright, *The Trinity in the New Testament*, 1962; B. B. Warfield, "The Spirit of God in the Old Testament", in *Biblical and Theological Studies*, 1952, 127–56.

(b). M. Albertz and C. Westermann, *rûaḥ*, *THAT* II 726–52; H. von Baer, *Der heilige Geist in den*

Lukasschriften, 1926; H. Bertrams, *Das Wesen des Geistes nach der Anschauung des Apostels Paulus*, 1913; E. Brandenburger, *Fleisch und Geist: Paulus und die dualistische Weisheit*, 1968; F. Büchsel, *Der Geist Gottes im Neuen Testament*, 1926; H. Clavier, "Brèves Remarques sur la Notion de *Sōma Pneumatikon*", in W. D. Davies and D. Daube, eds., *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology. In Honour of Charles Harold Dodd*, 1956, 342–62; C. Colpe, "Der Spruch von der Lästerung des Geistes", in *Der Ruf Jesu und die Antwort der Gemeinde: Festschrift für J. Jeremias*, 1970, 63–79; G. Dautzenberg, *Urchristliche Prophetie*, 1975; M. Dibelius, *Die Geisterwelt im Glauben des Paulus*, 1909; G. Friedrich, "Geist und Amt", *WuD* 3, 1952, 61–85; D. A. Frövig, *Das Sendungsbewusstsein Jesu und der Geist*, 1924; E. Fuchs, *Christus und der Geist bei Paulus*, 1932; H. Gunkel, *Die Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes nach der populären Anschauung der apostolischen Zeit und nach der Lehre des Apostels Paulus*, 1888; W. Gutbrod, *Die paulinische Anthropologie*, 1934; G. Hasenhüttl, *Charisma: Ordnungsprinzip der Kirche*, 1969; C. Heitmann and H. Mühlen, eds., *Erfahrung und Theologie des Heiligen Geistes*, 1974; I. Hermann, *Kyrios und Pneuma*, 1961; R. Koch, "L'Aspect Eschatologique de l'Esprit du Seigneur d'après Saint Paul", *Studiorum Paulinorum Congressus Internationalis Catholicus 1961*, 1963, 131–41; H. Leisegang, *Pneuma Hagion*, 1922; J. Lindblom, *Gesichte und Offenbarungen*, 1968; W. Michaelis, *Reich Gottes und Geist Gottes nach dem Neuen Testament*, 1931; W. Pfister, *Das Leben im Geist nach Paulus*, 1963; B. Rigaux, "L'anticipation du salut eschatologique par l'Esprit", *Foi et Salut selon S. Paul*, 1970, 101–30; P. Schäfer, *Die Vorstellung vom heiligen Geist in der rabbinischen Literatur*, 1972; J. Schniewind, "Das Seufzen des Geistes", *Nachgelassene Reden und Aufsätze*, 1952; G. Schrenk, "Geist und Enthusiasmus", *Studien zu Paulus*, 1954, 107–27; K. Stalder, *Das Werk des Geistes in der Heiligung bei Paulus*, 1962; P. Volz, *Der Geist Gottes*, 1910; H. Weinel, *Die Wirkungen des Geistes und der Geister im nachapostolischen Zeitalter bis auf Irenäus*, 1899; H. D. Wendland, "Das Wirken des Heiligen Geistes in den Gläubigen nach Paulus", *TLZ* 77, 1952, 457–70; G. P. Wetter, *Charis*, 1913; H. Windisch, "Jesus und der Geist nach synoptischer Überlieferung", in S. J. Case, ed., *Studies in Early Christianity*, 1928, 209–36.

Stir up, Trouble, Agitate

ταράσσω

ταράσσω (*tarassō*), shake together, stir up, disturb, unsettle, thrown into disorder; *τάραχος* (*tarachos*), commotion, confusion, disturbance; *ταραχή* (*tarachē*), stirring up, disturbance.

CL *tarassō*, a Homeric term (the root *tarach-*, still discernible in *trachys*, rough, harsh, savage), means to shake something out of inertia and throw it into confusion, i.e. to disturb, to upset, to confound, to agitate (from the stirring up of the sea or movement of the air, to violent emotional agitation), hence to confuse, but also, to shake (both of shaking up a medicine and of shaking a conviction, causing shock). There is a corresponding use of the passive: to be disturbed, agitated, confused, even to become alarmed. The noun *tarachos* similarly connotes agitation, confusion, tumult.

OT The LXX uses *tarassō* on the whole in the same way as cl. Gk., to render various Heb. equivalents (cf. Ezek. 32:2, 13, to trouble water; Ps. 46:6 [45:7], of the nations; Isa. 8:12, to be dismayed, alarmed).

NT In the NT *tarassō* occurs 17 times, *tarachos* twice (Acts 12:18; 19:23), and *tarachē* only once (Jn. 5:4 *v.l.*). The meaning is essentially the same as in cl. Gk.

1. *tarassō* is used of troubling water (Jn. 5:4, 7). The water in the Bethesda pool was probably disturbed from time to time by an intermittent spring. Popular belief supposed that at such times an angel endued the water with healing properties. R. D. Potter points out that there is no spring in this part of Jerusalem, but fragments of

pipes have been found in the vicinity. The moving of the water could have been caused by renewal from the pipes ("Topography in the Fourth Gospel", *StudEv I* = *TU* 73, 1959, 336). The pool was 16 metres deep, with no shallow end. A cripple would have had to be carried and held all the time.

2. (a) It is used in the act. in a figurative sense to express the stirring up of spiritual or emotional excitement or confusion, as for instance when the Jews excited, i.e. stir up inwardly, the crowds (Acts 17:8, 13), or when false teachers brought the churches into confusion (Acts 15:24; Gal. 1:7; 5:10; cf. also Acts 12:18, *tarachos*). The participle *hoi tarassontes* in Gal. 1:7 may indicate that the false teachers have made it their conscious aim to throw the churches of Galatia into confusion. Probably, however, Paul is simply making it clear that as the result of another, adulterated gospel, the churches of Galatia have become confused in their understanding and therefore also in their actions – a confusion which may be fatal, since it destroys the living organism of the church. The generic sing. in Gal. 5:10 refers to the same false teachers (cf. H. Schlier, *Der Brief an die Galater*, *KEK* 7, 1951[11], 238). They will have to answer for the confusion they have sown before the judgment-seat of God.

At Jn. 11:33 *tarassō*, together with *embrimaomai* (be deeply moved), denotes the wave of anger which came over Jesus when confronted with so much lack of faith and hope, although life itself, and the Lord over death, are present in his person.

(b) The pass. is always used in the NT in a negative sense, connoting emotional disturbance: to become terrified, to be afraid or overawed.

It is worth noting that in the Synoptic Gospels *tarassomai* is found only 5 times, always with this meaning, and that two of these are in epiphany stories (Matt. 2:3; 14:26; Mk. 6:50; Lk. 1:12; 24:38). In every case the reference is to an emotional shock which is brought about not by any human action, but by the action of God. This is also the implication of Matt. 2:3, where Herod and Jerusalem are shaken at the report of the messiah's birth. A different thought is contained in the expression *mē tarassesthō hymōn hē kardia*, let not your hearts be troubled (Jn. 14:1, 27). In this formula, found both in Semitic (e.g. Pss. 55[54]:5; 143[142]:4) and in cl. Gk. (e.g. Soph., *Ant.* 1095), the → heart stands for the self. Since the disciples are now to be left alone in a world within which a conflict will take place between the powers of this world and God's revelation, the believer, in his isolation from the world, will undergo inward shock and anxiety. This anxiety is overcome, however, by faith in God, which is identical with faith in Jesus, since this faith knows of a home (Jn. 14:1) where death has been conquered. The believer need not remain in a condition of fear and anxiety, since he has the promise of eschatological → peace (Jn. 14:27; cf. also 1 Pet. 3:14).

At Jn. 12:27 Jesus' words "my soul is troubled" do not refer simply to an emotional experience. The fear and anxiety experienced by the One who has been sent shows that he has humbled himself to the utmost, in order to take upon himself the lost condition of man, and in this very condition to glorify the Father.

3. *tarachos* denotes the stir caused by Christians in both its occurrences (Acts 12:18; 19:23). *H. Müller*

Strength, Force, Horn, Violence, Power

The words of this group, whose meaning is very similar to that of words dealt with under → Might, are concerned with the ability of one party to impose its will upon another. The words associated with *bia* denote coercive force, but may include the idea of friendly though firm persuasion. *ischys* denotes primarily, though not exclusively, physical power, while *kratos* is similar in meaning but refers rather to the exercise of authority. *keras*, horn, which can indicate strength, and *ischys* are the two words closest in meaning to *dynamis* and *exousia*.

βία

βία (*bia*), force, violence; *βιάζω* (*biazō*), to use force or violence; *βιαστής* (*biastēs*), a violent man; *βίαιος* (*biaios*), violent.

CL & OT 1. *bia* is found from Homer onwards and is used in rabbinic literature as a borrowed word; it means force and the use of force. The LXX uses it fairly infrequently, but as a translation of 6 Heb. words (e.g. *pērēḳ*, Exod. 1:13 f.). Occasionally God's power is described as *bia* (Isa. 28:2; 30:30), while in the LXX version of Ezek. 44:18 the new order of priests is said to be powerless: *kai ou perizōsontai bia*, "and they shall not be girded with power." Other instances of *bia* in the LXX are Exod. 14:25 (*ḳᵉḇēḏuṯ*), Neh. 5:14 f., 18; Est. 3:13; Wis. 4:4; 5:11; 7:20; 17:5, 18; 19:13; Sir. 20:4; 30:20; Hab. 3:6; Isa. 17:13; 52:4; 63:1; Dan. 11:17; 1 Macc. 6:63; 3 Macc. 2:28; 3:15; 4:7; 4 Macc. 11:26; 17:2, 9.

2. *biazō* is quite rare in the act., but in the mid. expresses the idea of forcible action both in deed and word. Trans. it means to violate, rape; intrans. to use force, enforce one's will; and pass. to suffer violence. It occurs 18 times in the LXX, where it translates 7 Heb. words. The following shades of meaning all contain the idea of forcible action: to urge (using friendly constraint; e.g. Gen. 33:11; Jdg. 13:15 f.; 19:7; 2 Sam. 13:25, 27); to rape (Deut. 22:25, 28); and to break through (Exod. 19:24). Other instances of the vb. in the LXX are 2 Ki. 5:23; Est. 7:8; Sir. 4:26; 31(34):21; Jon. 1:13 *v.l.*; 2 Macc. 14:41; 4 Macc. 2:8; 8;24; 11;25.

3. *biastēs*, which does not occur in the LXX, means a violent man, and carries a derogatory sense.

NT 1. In the NT *bia* occurs only in Acts and denotes force or violence (cf. also *biaios*, violent, Acts 2:2; → Spirit, art. *pneuma*). Thus Acts 27:41 refers to the force of waves smashing a ship. Acts 21:35 records the violence of the mob threatening Paul, while in Acts 5:26 Peter and the apostles are arrested, "but without violence", for fear of the crowd. In every case the violence is a potential threat to men's lives.

2. These Lucan passages may give us an insight into Lk. 16:16: "The law and the prophets were until John; since then the good news of the kingdom of God is preached, and everyone enters it violently [*pas eis autēn biazetai*]" (cf. par. Matt. 11:12). The latter is a saying widely attributed to Q which Lk. has independently rephrased. If so, *pas eis autēn biazetai* would mean: everyone acts against the kingdom of God with violence. This would imply a background of persecution, such as Lk. describes in Acts, and the sense of the saying would be: ever since the

kingdom of God has been preached, violence has been used against it. Furthermore, the polemical nature of the context should be noted: in reply to the Pharisees' mockery (v. 14), Jesus replies: "What is exalted among men is an abomination in the sight of God" (*enōpion* is typically Lucan). However, basing their argument upon the use of *eis* rather than of *pros* or *epi*, most exegetes consider Lk.'s meaning to be: everyone presses into the kingdom of God. To take the vb. as pass., i.e. "everyone is forced into the kingdom of God", is probably the unlikeliest interpretation. In recent Lucan research Lk. 16:16 has special significance for our understanding of the unique nature of the third Gospel, because of the clear way in which it distinguishes one epoch from another (cf. H. Conzelmann, *The Theology of St Luke*, 1960, 20 ff.).

The earlier formulation can be seen in Matt. 11:12, but here too various interpretations are possible. To take the vb. as mid. gives the unlikely meaning: the kingdom of heaven uses force, it coerces. To take it as intrans. gives a more probable interpretation: the kingdom of God accomplishes its purpose mightily, it is eagerly striven for, and those who violently press towards it seize (upon) it. But this translation, although frequently advocated, is still unsatisfactory, since it depicts the kingdom as "suffering violence" in a good sense, with men pressing towards it and striving vehemently to grasp it, whereas their action is more likely to be hostile. The best interpretation, therefore, is the one which takes *biazesthai* as pass. in an unfavourable sense: the kingdom of heaven suffers violence, and violent men assault it, meaning either that hindrances are placed in its way, or that it is forcibly introduced. A special problem arises in the second half of the verse in regard to the phrase *harpazousin autēn*. Matt. presumably understands the vb. as meaning to take something away from someone (cf. 13:19), but this was not necessarily Q's interpretation. At the stage of tradition represented by Q, the accusation levelled at Jesus may possibly have been common knowledge, namely that he had sought to snatch at equality with God (cf. Phil. 2:6; Mk. 14:61 f.; Matt. 26:63 f.), to which Matt. 11:12 Q may have been replying: Not Jesus, but "the persecutors [*biastai*] lay violent hands upon the kingdom of heaven". For further discussion → Snatch, art. *harpazō* NT1 (d). *G. Braumann*

ἰσχύς

ἰσχύς (*ischys*), strength, power, might; *ἰσχύω* (*ischyō*), be strong, powerful; *ἰσχυρός* (*ischyros*), strong, powerful, mighty; *κατισχύω* (*katischyō*), to be strong, powerful, be dominant, prevail.

CL 1. Found from Hesiod onwards, *ischys* denoted the strength and power possessed by living beings or by things (→ Might). In the Gk. tragedies it was applied to deities, but at a later period became less prominent.

2. *ischyō* means to be able to do something, be capable of, have the ability to, be strong, healthy (e.g. Sophocles, *Trach.* 234: "When I left him, he was alive, healthy, flourishing, and untroubled by any sickness"). In addition, it can mean to use force, exercise power, particularly bodily, physical power. Then finally, and particularly in the legal sphere, it acquired the meaning to be valid, be applicable, have value.

3. From Sophocles onwards, *katischyō* meant to be superior to others, be the victor, gain the upper hand, prevail.

4. *ischyros*, found from Aeschylus onwards, means strong either in body or mind, and can be applied to deities, living creatures or things.

OT 1. In the LXX *ischys* translates 30 Heb. words altogether (and in particular *kōaḥ*), being the term most frequently used to denote manifestations of power. It can express man's physical strength (e.g. Jos. 8:3; Jdg. 16:5; Pss. 22[21]:15; 31[30]:10; Ezek. 30:21) or his intellectual power (Prov. 8:14), but is used particularly for divine power, e.g. Num. 14:13, "Then the Egyptians will hear of it, for thou didst bring up this people in thy might from among them" (cf. Pss. 29[28]:4; 147[146]:5). As such it can be a gift of God to men (Mic. 3:8; Pss. 18[17]:1; 29[28]:11).

2. *ischyō* is used in the LXX to translate 24 Heb. equivalents, including *ḥāzaq*. It denotes becoming strong, or being strong in the physical sense, of things (e.g. "lest your bonds be made strong", Isa. 28:22), and of men (e.g. "and it came to pass when Israel was strong [*enischysen*]", Jdg. 1:28).

3. *katischyō* stands for 16 Heb. equivalents, very frequently for *ḥāzaq* (in the qal and piel), and denotes being superior in a physical sense. It is used of men (e.g. Jos. 17:13: "when the children of Israel grew strong"; Ezek. 30:24: "I will strengthen the arms of the king of Babylon"), of things (Isa. 54:2: "strengthen your stakes") and of God's power (1 Chr. 29:12, "it is in thy hand to make great and to give strength to all").

4. In the LXX *ischyros* translates 25 Heb. equivalents, and is also frequently found in the other Gk. translations of the OT. The word denotes strong of persons (e.g. Num. 13:18, whether the people are strong or weak), of animals (e.g. Prov. 30:30, the lion), of things (Isa. 8:7, water) and of God (Deut. 10:17).

NT 1. This group of words is found in almost all the NT writings (*ischyō* being especially common in Lk.) and refers to the strength and power (*ischys*) of living creatures (e.g. Heb. 11:34) or things (e.g. Heb. 6:18, strong consolation; Heb. 5:7, strong cries). The particular translation depends on the nuances of the context. Peter (Mk. 14:37) and the disciples (Matt. 26:40) have to answer the question "Are you not *able to* watch [with me] one hour?" Men are called upon to → love God with (*ex* or *en*) all their strength (Mk. 12:30; Lk. 10:27). Salt which has lost its taste is *fit for* nothing (Matt. 5:13). In Lk. 15:14 the famine is described as *great*. The prayer of a righteous man *has* great *power in its effects* (Jas. 5:16). The → gates of Hades shall not *prevail* (Matt. 16:18); the voices of the mob *prevailed* (Lk. 23:23). In a metaphorical sense the healthy can be called *ischyontes* in contrast with the sick (Mk. 2:17; cf. also Rev. 6:15). As a legal term *ischyō* means to avail, to be valid (Heb. 9:17, of the validity of a will; cf. Gal. 5:6).

2. Some NT passages need special attention. The synoptic tradition uses this group of words in a manner which implies approval of the action or quality involved; thus the strong man is safe, unless one comes who is stronger than he (Mk. 3:27). Since in Isa. 49:24 f. it is God who sets the prisoners free, Mk. 3:27 may first of all have suggested that God, being the stronger one, has conquered → Satan, the strong one, and cast him out of heaven. In the Marcan context, however, the passage means that his victory over the demons proves Jesus to be stronger than the strong, i.e. stronger than demons or demon-possessed men (cf. Acts 10:38); acting in the power of God, he has conquered them and is now spoiling them of their prey. His superiority is also seen vis-à-vis John the Baptist; the expected one is mightier than John, and will demonstrate this by baptizing with the Holy Spirit and with → fire (the

fire of judgment) (Matt. 3:11; Lk. 3:16 Q), or with the Holy Spirit as a gift of salvation (Mk. 1:7, 8). Finally, *ischyō* is used in various places to depict Christ's superior power in contrast to the impotence of others, thereby emphasizing the greatness both of the → miracle and of the one by whom it is wrought. In Mk. 5:4 the observation that no one had sufficient strength to subdue the demoniac, prepares us to appreciate the greatness of Christ's miracle. This particular emphasis, intelligible in the light of form criticism, reappears in Lk. 8:43: the seriousness of the malady indicates the remarkable nature of the cure (cf. also Rev. 18:10). Christ's opponents also are inferior to him (Lk. 14:6; cf. 14:29 f.; 20:26), their impotence merely throwing his superior power into sharper relief; the same superiority is evident in the growth of the infant church in Acts 19:20, and in "the wisdom and the Spirit" with which Stephen spoke (Acts 6:10) – and in spite of which he was stoned to death.

3. In defending himself against his opponents in Corinth, who were proud of their strength and their abundance of → gifts (1 Cor. 4:10), Paul set → weakness and impotence over against strength. Even the weakness of God is stronger than men (cf. 1 Cor. 10:22); God puts the strong to shame by choosing what is weak (1 Cor. 1:25 f.). Paul himself had to suffer the reproach that, while his letters were weighty and strong, he himself was weak (2 Cor. 10:10). Nevertheless, Paul did not regard his own lack of strength as a disadvantage. On Paul's "thorn in the flesh" (2 Cor. 12:7) → Fruit, art. *skolops* NT. Since he argued from the strength of God which the non-believer regards as foolishness, i.e. weakness (1 Cor. 1:18), in other passages he could say that → circumcision or uncircumcision, being Jew or Gentile, avail nothing for those who are in Christ (Gal. 5:6), since Christ's power, like God's power, carries the day, and is transmitted to those who live in him (Phil. 4:13). On this basis there is no power inherent in man; it can exist only when God's strength is displayed in human weakness (2 Cor. 12:9).

4. Eph. and 2 Thess. use the *ischyō* word-group to express their own concept of strength and power, which is somewhat different from the other Pauline literature (→ Might, art. *dynamis*). Eph. 1:19 and 6:10 speak of the power of God, not the power of Christ, and 2 Thess. 1:19 echoes Isa. 2:10, 19 in ascribing to the power of God the punishment of the ungodly at the last day.

5. In Rev. the grandeur of the imagery is conveyed by *ischys* and *ischyros*. "Might" figures among the ascriptions addressed to the → Lamb (Rev. 5:12), and to God (Rev. 7:12; 18:8). Strength is also attributed to the → angels (Rev. 5:2; 10:1; 18:21; cf. 2 Pet. 2:11), whose voice is mighty (Rev. 18:2; cf. 19:8) and who are superior to the → dragon (Rev. 12:8; cf. the use of *ischys* in inscriptions about princes, A. Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East*, 1927⁴, 363). They belong to the heavenly kingdom and are thus closely associated with God, hence in the worship of heaven the hymn addressed to God may likewise be addressed to them.

G. Braumann

κέρας

κέρας (*keras*), horn.

CL *keras* is etymologically related to Eng. "horn" (cf. also Heb. *qeren*; Lat. *cornu*). It is found from Mycenean Gk. and Homer onwards, and is a common word in

profane Gk. It denotes the horn of an animal and later came to mean courage or stubbornness.

In ancient religion, though probably not in Greece, horns symbolized the strength of gods and men (a vestige of earlier animal-worship). Thus Assyrian princes, and Babylonian priests, wore two-horned headdresses similar to those which normally adorned the gods. Alexander the Great was known as "The Horned One".

OT In the LXX *keras* is used in two different connexions.

1. (a) It denotes the horns of animals (Deut. 33:17) and is particularly frequent with this meaning in apocalyptic and late Jewish literature (e.g. Dan. 7:7; 8:3; Eth. Enoch 90:9).

(b) In priestly and sacrificial contexts the word refers to the twisted horn-like corners or projections of the altar (Exod. 27:2; Lev. 4:7; Ps. 118 [117]:27; → Sacrifice, art. *thyō* OT 2; → Temple; → Tent).

2. From these two original connotations there arose the figurative use of *keras* to express the power and might of men and Yahweh. As in the prophetic and symbolic act of Zedekiah (1 Ki. 22:11), the horn frequently denotes physical power and superiority in men (Mic. 4:13), but also well-being in general (1 Sam. 2:1; Job 16:15, LXX *sthenos*). When Yahweh is addressed (in priestly language) as "the horn of my salvation [*keras sōtērias mou*]" (Ps. 18:2 = 2 Sam. 22:3), he is considered to be the power which brings about the salvation of men and preserves it against hostile attacks.

NT In the NT *keras* is found only in Lk. 1:69 and in Rev.

1. In Zechariah's → song of praise (Lk. 1:68–79), which is strongly reminiscent of OT psalms and full of OT imagery, the phrase "horn of salvation" is taken over from Ps. 18:2 and means "saving power". The vb. "to raise up" (*ēgeiren*) parallels "to exalt" (*hypsōsei*) in 1 Sam. 2:10: by his acts in history God brings about salvation. The addition of "in the house of his servant David", which goes back to Ps. 132:17, specifies the messiah as the horn of salvation (cf. Eth. Enoch 90:37 f., where the messiah appears as a white bull with black horns). Lk. 1:69 glorifies God as the one who has demonstrated his power in history, and who by sending the messiah has raised up for men a power that brings salvation.

2. Rev. 9:13 refers to the horns of the golden altar before God (→ Sacrifice, art. *thyō* NT 9). The allegorical use of horns in Rev., where they have no organic connexion with the animals concerned and so cannot in any sense be envisaged biologically, is connected with OT and Jewish apocalyptic. The → Lamb bears seven horns (Rev. 5:6), the → dragon and the beast ten each (Rev. 12:3; 13:1; 17:3 → Animal, art. *thērion*). "In accordance with the symbolic meaning of the number seven . . . and of the figure of the horn, the seven horns of the Lamb express the divine plenitude of power" (W. Foerster, *TDNT* III 670; → Number, art. *hepta*). Rev. (17:3, 7, 12, 16) has taken over the ten horns of Dan. 7:7 as well as their application to the ten kings (cf. Dan. 7:24), who, according to Rev. 17:12 ff., give over their power to the beast, but, joining with the latter in his war against the Lamb, are vanquished. The meaning of the allegory is disputed. Many interpret it as referring to its own historical period, i.e. the beast represents Nero *redivivus* and the ten horns represent princes or Roman emperors. Foerster's interpretation is also possible, however: the passage shows

that "all the rulers of the last time and their subjects (cf. 19:17 ff.), are at the disposal of Antichrist in the open battle against Christ" (*TDNT* III 671).

H.-G. Link, J. Schattenmann

κράτος

κρατέω (*krateō*), to be strong, to take possession of, hold, grasp, seize; κράτος (*kratos*), power, might, rule; κραταιόω (*krataioō*), make strong, strengthen; κραταιός (*krataios*), strong, mighty; παντοκράτωρ (*pantokratōr*), the Almighty; κοσμοκράτωρ (*kosmokratōr*), ruler of the world; κράτιστος (*kratistos*), most honourable, illustrious, excellent.

CL & OT 1. *krateō*, found from Homer onwards, can mean to be strong, to possess might (e.g. Sophocles, *OT* 530, "for what the mighty do, I do not see"); to be in control of, to be master of (e.g. Sophocles, *Ai.* 1099, "as one who is master of himself", *autou kratōn*); to obtain victory over, to gain the upper hand over. *krateō* can also indicate the act of seizing, and particularly that of arresting (e.g. Sophocles, *OC* 1380 f., "therefore do (the curses) seize thy seat and throne"), or can express a continuous action, i.e. holding fast, keeping. In the legal sphere the word acquired the meaning to have the right of possession. All the above senses, except the legal one, occur in the LXX, where it is found some 170 times, frequently as a translation of *ḥāzaq* hiph., e.g., "be strong" (Jer. 20:7), "rule" (Prov. 16:32; 4 Macc. 1:5), "take control" (1 Macc. 10:52; 2 Macc. 4:27); "seize" (Jdg. 8:12; Ps. 137[136]:9), "hold" (Cant. 3:4). The expression "to take by the hand" (*kratein tēs cheiros*) is found at Gen. 19:16; Isa. 42:6; cf. Isa. 41:13; 45:1; Jdg. 16:26B; 1 Sam. 15:27; Josephus, *War* 1, 352; *Ant.* 14, 480. But it is not found in secular literature. In Philo *krateō* means to "rule" (*Leg. All.* 1, 73; 1, 100; *Rer. Div. Her.* 269; *Cher.* 115; *Decal.* 149), to "be lord over" (*Post. C.* 42), "conquer" (*Ebr.* 75; 105), and to "gain the upper hand" (*Leg. All.* 3, 92).

2. *kratos*, found from Homer onwards, denotes power and strength, such as physical strength (e.g. Homer, *Il.* 7, 142, "this man Lycurgos slew, but not by strength did he do it"), or the power possessed by men, rulers or gods (e.g. Homer, *Il.* 2, 118, "for to him belongs supreme power"). The word is a title of royalty (Deissmann, *op. cit.*, 368), and also means rule or dominion (e.g. Herodotus, 3, 69, "he who has dominion over the Persians") and victory (e.g. Homer, *Il.* 1, 509, "meanwhile grant victory to the Trojans"). In the LXX *kratos* corresponds to 9 Heb. words, often being used, however, without a Heb. equivalent. It denotes the power and strength of men and things, e.g., Ps. 89:9 (LXX 88:10), particularly the power of God, e.g. Ps. 62:11 (LXX 61:13), which can be given to men, e.g. Ps. 86:16 (LXX 85:16).

3. *krataioō*, to make strong, to take courage, to gain the upper hand over, is found no earlier than the LXX (e.g. Job 36:22; Jud. 13:7; 2 Sam. 1:23; 11:23; Ps. 105[104]:4), where it occurs 64 times; elsewhere it occurs rarely (e.g. in Philo, *Conf. Ling.* 101, 103; *Agric.* 160).

4. *krataios* mighty, full of power (e.g. Homer, *Il.* 11, 119, "the mighty beast"), can be found in combination with *cheir*, → hand, as early as Sophocles, *Phil.* 1110, "with strong hands". The LXX usually applies the adj. to God (e.g. Deut. 7:21; Pss. 24[23]:8; 71[70]:7; Prov. 23:11), and combines it with *cheir* in 31 passages. In

nearly every instance the reference is to the mighty hand of God (e.g. Exod. 3:19; 6:1; 13:3, 9, 14, 16; Deut. 7:8, 19, 21; 11:2; Ps. 136[135]:12).

5. *pantokratōr*, the Almighty, not found before the LXX, is used as a title for deities (e.g. of Hermes, *Epigrammata Graeca* 815, 11; of Isis, *Inscriptiones Graecae* V, 2, 472). The LXX translates *ṣᵉḇa'ôṯ* and *šadday* by *pantokratōr*, and the word also occurs in the magical papyri (e.g. Job 5:17; 8:5; Hos. 12:6[5]; Amos 3:13; 5:14 ff.; Zech. 1:3–17; 8:1–23; Mal. 1:4–14; Jer. 3:19).

6. *kosmokratōr*, ruler of the world, not found before the Christian era, is a designation of the planets, then generally of the rulers of the universe on whom the fate of men depends. The LXX and Philo make no use of the word. It returns, however, as a borrowed word in rabbinic literature.

7. *kratistos*, found since Homer, also in the LXX (e.g. Amos 6:2), in Philo and Josephus, is a very respectful form of address used to persons of high rank.

NT 1. In the synoptic tradition *krateō* is sometimes a technical term meaning to arrest or seek to arrest: Matt. 14:3 par. Mk. 6:17 tells of the arrest of John the Baptist; Mk. 12:12; 14:1, 44 par. Matt. 26:48 report the plan to arrest Jesus; and Mk. 14:46 describes his actual arrest. It is striking that Luke obviously avoids the expression in this sense (the only exception being Acts 24:6, 23). Acts of seizing, if not of official arrest, are recorded in Mk. 14:51; Matt. 18:28; 22:6.

2. *krateō* means generally to take hold of: Jesus took hold of the dead child's hand (Mk. 5:41 par. Matt. 9:25, Lk. 8:54), and of that of a sick woman (Mk. 1:31). It is characteristic of the → miracle stories that the miracle-worker touches the patient's → hand in order that his miraculous power may flow into the other's body. Matt. mentions the taking hold of a sheep that has fallen into a well on the Sabbath (Matt. 12:11), and speaks of the disciples taking hold of Jesus by the feet (Matt. 28:9).

3. The holding fast of Jewish → tradition is called in question in Mk. 7:3 f., the reason being that such tradition consists of human ordinances rather than the commandment of God (v. 8; → Hand, art. *cheir* NT 2). In the course of time a Christian tradition developed, observance of which was laid down as binding (2 Thess. 2:15; Heb. 4:14; 6:18; Rev. 2:13, 25; 3:11), while those who clung to false doctrines were opposed (Rev. 2:14 f.).

Mk. 9:10 tells how the disciples kept the word of Jesus to themselves and did not pass it on; this evangelist consistently depicts the messiahship of Jesus as having to remain → secret. The OT and Jewish concept of sins being retained (cf. Matt. 16:19; 18:18) is expressed by *krateō* in Jn. 20:23 (cf. *paratērein anomias* Ps. 130:3 LXX; *diatērein hamartias* Sir. 28:1; → Bind; → Open, art. *kleis* NT 3).

The Emmaus disciples saw Jesus but failed to recognize him; their eyes "were holden" (Lk. 24:16 AV). In Acts 2:24 death is said to have been unable to hold Jesus. The lame man, once he was healed, clung to Peter and John (Acts 3:11), showing that he owed his healing to them, and ultimately to God. The idea of holding fast is also expressed in Acts 27:33: they supposed that they had obtained their purpose. These examples indicate that in his use of *krateō* Lk. thinks of "holding fast", the continuous action, rather than of the momentary act of "taking hold".

4. *kratos*, like → *ischys*, is used along with other words *dynamis*, → might; *timē*, honour, *doxa*, → glory; *charis*, → grace, etc.) as an attribute and honorific title for

kings, emperors and their households, all these terms being later applied to God (1 Pet. 5:11; Rev. 5:13) and to Christ (1 Tim. 6:16; 1 Pet. 4:11; Rev. 1:6; 5:13). Power which is not used directly on men, i.e. which is not soteriological in character, serves to describe majesty and grandeur. The word itself is immaterial, as is shown by its interchangeability with other words; thus in Rev. 4:9; 7:12, *kratos* is missing. The holding of the seven stars and the four winds (Rev. 2:1; 7:1), and the seizing of the → dragon (Rev. 20:2), are apocalyptic and symbolic ways of expressing power and might. On the other hand, those passages which reveal the effects of God's power are anthropological: in the *Magnificat* God puts forth his strength in order to scatter the proud (Lk. 1:51). Acts 19:20 also describes God's power at work among men: the word of God (i.e. the gospel and its proclamation) has had a success which can only be ascribed to God. Eph. 1:19, although in the form of a doxology, teaches nevertheless by its use of *eis hēmas* that "the working of the power of his might" is seen in believers; similarly in Eph, 6:10 "the power of his might" is to become effective in those who are addressed (cf. Col. 1:11). The power of death, according to Heb. 2:14, has been taken from the devil.

5. *krataioō* is used in the Lucan birth narratives to describe the child Jesus growing and becoming strong in spirit (Lk. 1:80) and wisdom (Lk. 2:40). Otherwise the word is not common in the NT. It clearly refers to manly strength in 1 Cor. 16:13, which is a quotation (cf. Ps. 31:24; 2 Sam. 10:12); and has a metaphorical sense in Eph. 3:16; in gnostic terminology, the inner man is expected to be strengthened with might. The phrase *esō anthrōpos* means the inner man, the new man, the man who has become new; *not* the introspective, inward-looking man.

6. *krataios* occurs only in 1 Pet. 5:6: the hand of God, under which man is called to humble himself, is a mighty hand.

7. The term *pantokratōr*, the Almighty, the Lord of all, occurs both in connexion with OT quotations (2 Cor. 6:18; cf. Hos. 1:10; Isa. 43:6) and independently (Rev. 1:8; 4:8; 11:17; 15:3; 16:7, 14; 19:6, 15; 21:22). In both cases the title serves to describe the immense greatness of God. He has power over all men and all things.

8. *kosmokratōr* occurs only in Eph. 6:12 and then in the plur.: it refers to the cosmic rulers, the evil spirits, against whom we are to wage war.

9. *kratistos*, most excellent, honourable, is a friendly form of address in Lk. 1:3; when applied to Felix and Festus, however (Acts 23:26; 24:3; 26:25), it is used in its official sense. In its technical sense, corresponding to Lat. *egregius*, it was applied to members of the equestrian order in Roman society. *G. Braumann*

→ God, → Might

(a). G. B. Caird, *Principalities and Powers*, 1956; H. Conzelmann, *The Theology of St Luke*, 1960; A. Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East*, 1927[4]; W. Foerster, *keras*, *TDNT* III 669 ff.; W. Grundmann, *ischyō* etc., *TDNT* III 397–402; W. Michaelis, *kratos* etc., *TDNT* III 905–15; C. H. Powell, *The Biblical Concept of Power*, 1963; H. Schlier, *Principalities and Powers in the New Testament*, 1961; G. Schrenk, *biazomai, biastēs*, *TDNT* I 609–14.

(b). W. Foerster, "Die Bilder in Apk. 12 f. und 17 f.", *ThStKr* 104, 1932, 279 ff.; E. Grässer, *Das Problem der Parusieverzögerung in den synoptischen Evangelien und der Apostelgeschichte*, *BZNW* 22, 1960[2]; W. Grundmann, *Der Begriff der Kraft in der neutestamentlichen Gedankenwelt*, *BWANT* 4, 8, 1932; SB I 9 f., 70; II 110 f.; I. Scheftelowitz, "Das Hörnermotiv in den Religionen", *ARW* 15, 1912, 451–487; G. Strecker, *Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit. Untersuchung zur Theologie des Matthäus*, *FRLANT* 82, 1971[3].

Suffer

πάσχω

πάσχω (*paschō*), suffer, endure; κακοπαθέω (*kakopatheō*), suffer evil, endure hardship; συνκακοπαθέω (*synkakopatheō*), endure hardship together with someone; συμπαθέω (*sympatheō*), have compassion, sympathize with; συμπάσχω (*sympaschō*), suffer the same thing as, suffer together with, sympathize with; πάθημα (*pathēma*), suffering, affliction, misfortune; παθητός (*pathētos*), subject to suffering, capable of suffering; πάθος (*pathos*), suffering, passion.

CL The etymological derivation of *paschō* (with the stems *penth-*, *ponth-*, *path-*) is still not clear.

1. The basic meaning of the vb., in use from Homer onwards, is that of experiencing something which stems from outside of myself but which affects me, either for good or ill. The opposite idea is expressed by vbs. denoting freedom of action, e.g. *erxai* (Homer, *Od.* 8, 490), *energein* (*Corp. Herm.* 12, 11; → Work, art. *ergon*).

2. (a) *paschō* originally meant nothing more than "to be affected by", but how one was affected had to be expressed by additional words, e.g. *kakōs paschein*, to be in a bad situation (Homer, *Od.* 16, 275); *eu paschein*, to be in a good situation (Sophocles, *OC* 1489). However, since such additions tended to be negative, the vb. itself came to have a negative meaning, unless there were clear indications to the contrary. Thus the idea of being affected is replaced by that of suffering, e.g., *anthrōpinon ti paschein*, to die (further instances are given by W. Michaelis, *TDNT* V 904 ff.). In most cases it is a matter of being delivered up to an adverse fate or to malevolent gods and men (Diogenes Laertius, 5, 61; Diodorus Siculus, 13, 98, 2), and only rarely refers to enduring a punishment.

(b) The situation is similar in the case of the noun *to pathos*. It means that which is passively experienced, in contrast with nouns denoting action, such as *ergon* (→ Work), *praxis* (→ Work, art. *prassō*) and *poiēma* (→ Work, art. *poieō*). The nature of the experience is then specified by the addition of adjs., e.g. *makarion pathos paschein*, to be in a blissful state (Plato, *Hp. Mi.* 364a). But for the most part *pathos* describes the emotions of the soul, i.e. human feelings and impulses which a man does not produce within himself but finds already present, and by which he can be carried away. Although used by Aristotle in both a good and a bad sense (cf. especially *Eth. Nic.* 2, 4, 1105b, 20 f.), *pathos* acquired a predominantly negative meaning, that of passion, especially among the Stoics (see below, 4).

3. At an early period questions were being asked concerning the purpose and the meaning of suffering. Salutary lessons can be learned from one's own suffering and that of others; trials make men wise, according to the epic poet Hesiod (*Works* 218). The tragedies teach the profound truth that through suffering we learn who we are and what station befits us in life (Aeschylus, *Ag.* 170; *Prom.* 309).

4. The Stoics extended the idea of suffering into something universal and cosmological: all non-divine being is subject to suffering, i.e. it is affected by external influences and emotions. Such emotions, however, hinder true knowledge and the practice of virtue, so the passions (*pathē*) must be overcome in order that the ideal of "dispassionateness" (*apatheia*) may be attained.

5. The Hermetic writings, too, regard everything created as subject to suffering, the latter being unknown only in the sublimest of heavenly spheres. Hence the re-

quirement facing the mystic is that the self be liberated from the → body (cf. → Knowledge, art. *ginōskō* CL). Such liberation occurs in this life at moments of ecstasy but will be permanently enjoyed only after death (*Corp. Herm.* 1, 15; 1, 122; cf. W. Michaelis, *TDNT* V 906 f.).

OT 1. In the LXX *paschō* occurs only 21 times. It translates the Heb. *ḥāmal*, to feel compassion (Ezek. 16:5; Zech. 11:5), and also *ḥālâh* niph., to be affected, impressed (Amos 6:6), since there is no exact equivalent for *paschō* in Heb. The same is true for *to pathos*, which in Job 30:31 translates *'ēḇel*, although the latter is elsewhere rendered, far more appropriately, by *to penthos*, mourning (Gen. 27:41; Deut. 34:8; Isa. 60:20; Amos 5:16 and passim). Despite the absence of precise Heb. equivalents, however, the ideas expressed by *paschō* and its derivatives are clearly present in the OT, where the question of suffering is approached from various angles.

(a) The cause of suffering is most commonly seen to lie in the inherent causality of an evil deed: such a deed brings its own retribution by virtue of its consequences, and so produces suffering. This idea is by no means restricted to the subjective and individualistic sphere (Gen. 20:3 ff.; Jos. 7; 1 Sam. 14:24 ff.) and thus shows similarity with the thought of the Gk. tragedies: "the moral suffering of Oedipus is . . . brought about by the fact . . . that he has done something, albeit unwittingly and unintentionally, which in itself is heinous" (K. von Fritz, "Tragische Schuld und poetische Gerechtigkeit in der Antike", *Stud. Gen.* 1955, 195). On the questions of expiation and propitiation → Reconciliation, art. *hilaskomai* OT.

(b) On the other hand, this idea is restricted to the individual, particularly in the Wisdom poetry, one reason certainly being messages about individual → guilt and responsibility such as that of Ezek. 18, which must undoubtedly have brought relief to the minds of the exiles. "He who digs a pit will fall into it, and a stone will come back upon him who starts it rolling" (Prov. 26:27). Each individual is personally responsible for the moral decisions he makes.

(c) These two ideas, however, are not mutually exclusive. Rather, they indicate that whenever Israel was called upon to suffer, he always endeavoured to understand what Yahweh was doing in history. If Yahweh is not a dead but a living God, then both good and evil come from him (Amos 3:6; Job 2:10), although he may use secondary causes as well. The OT therefore leaves practically no room for suffering that is fortuitous (1 Ki. 22:19–23; Job 1:1–2:10; Jdg. 9:23; cf. however 1 Sam. 26:10). The question of suffering is not thought through anthropologically for man to obtain a deeper insight into his own existence (see above, CL 3), but is entirely a matter of God's providence. Thus G. von Rad makes the following comment on the story of Joseph: "this chain of guilt and suffering has nothing in common with the pessimistic belief in fate found in Greek tragedy, for the story of Joseph distinctly has guidance as its subject. God has directed all things for good" (*Old Testament Theology*, I, 1962, 172; cf. Gen. 45:5 ff.; 50:20, 24).

(d) The fact that there is no tension between the problem of suffering as such and the problem of one's own individual suffering is indicated by the Psalms of lament, which show the psalmist overwhelmed with every conceivable kind of trouble (Ps. 22). Such Psalms are not biographies of the psalmist, nor do they give allegorical accounts of his spiritual experiences; rather they are liturgical formularies for common use within the OT community. Important for the psalmist is not the analysis of his

personal sufferings but his experience of comfort from the priestly oracle (see J. Begrich, "Das Priesterliche Heilsorakel", *ZAW* 52, 1934, 81 ff.) or from seeking refuge in Yahweh (Ps. 17:8 and passim).

2. The question as to the purpose of suffering is one which emerges only in course of time. Hence Prov. 12:1; 13:1 refer to its educational value: suffering improves character.

3. The Book of Job in particular is radical and uncompromising in its attitude to the view of suffering dealt with under 1 (a). In his own case Job can acknowledge no causal connexion between guilt and suffering (Job 6:24). He comes to see one thing very clearly: that mere man cannot enter into litigation with Almighty God (9:32 f.); and the book therefore ends with a hymn in which God declares his own omnipotence; his inscrutable wisdom reduces men to silence even in the face of unaccountable suffering (38:1–42:6). For what man can claim to understand the mysteries of human life or presume to give God counsel or reproof? Thus the Book of Job challenges us not to offer blind allegiance to a theological scheme linking sin with suffering, but rather to submit to God himself.

4. (a) A further aspect of the suffering of the innocent is the exemplary suffering endured by chosen individuals (e.g. → Moses, Num. 11:11; → Elijah, 1 Ki. 19; Hosea, Hos. 1–3; Jeremiah, Jer. 15:10; 18:18; 20:14 ff.), men whose very office exposes them to suffering. "The hearers refuse the prophet's message, and in so doing refuse the God from whom the message comes. Hence the fate suffered by the prophets visibly demonstrates Israel's hostility to Yahweh. By rejecting his prophets, they reject God himself" (J. Stamm, *Das Leiden des Unschuldigen in Babylonien und Israel*, *AThANT* 10, 1946, 67). Yahweh's own suffering as a result of his people's → sin is therefore exemplified in the suffering of elect individuals (→ Election).

(b) The idea of vicarious suffering comes to a climax in Isa.'s message concerning the "Suffering Servant" (→ Son of God, art. *pais theou*; cf. H. H. Rowley, "The Servant of the Lord in the Light of Three Decades of Criticism", and "The Suffering Servant and the Davidic Messiah", in *The Servant of the Lord and Other Essays on the Old Testament*, 1965², 1–60, 61–94). His suffering is seen as punishment for the sins of others (Isa. 53:4–6).

5. In Wis. the educational aspect of suffering once again emerges (Wis. 12:22). Israel's enemies suffer by way of punishment and warning (Wis. 12:20, 25–27). When God's children suffer, this is God carefully leading them to repentance (Wis. 12:19, 21). However, the educational and manward aspects of suffering (see above, CL 3) receive less emphasis than its teleological and redemptive aspects. According to 2 Macc., even the God-fearing man suffers as a punishment for his sin (2 Macc. 7:18, 32), though joy comes from suffering as a martyr "in the fear of God" (2 Macc. 6:30) (→ Fear, art. *phobos* OT 2). "In general Philo's usage is very much under the influence of the terminology and outlook of Gk.-Hell. philosophy" (*TDNT* V 909). Josephus, however, who frequently deals with the subject, sees the possibility of pious Jews suffering any extreme "for their Law" (*War* 2, 196). *paschō* rarely refers to a happy experience (*Ant.* 3, 312); more often it is used in the sense of to endure (*Ant.* 7, 209 and passim). to suffer punishment (*Ant.* 4, 270 and passim), or even to suffer death (*Ant.* 9, 43). But not all suffering leads to death. In rabbinic Judaism, especially after the destruction of Jerusalem and the consequent cessation

of the sacrifices, atoning power was attributed to all suffering for sin; since it was intended to lead the sinner to repentance, he could only thank God for it (SB I 169, 417 f.; II 274–282). There was also a doctrine of vicarious suffering (SB II 275, 279–282), and of meritorious suffering (SB II 193 f., 275). Earthly sufferings, in the rabbinic view, could mitigate retribution in the world to come (cf. 1 Pet. 4:1). Thus the righteous man could actually see God's love at work in his sufferings, while the unrighteous, having no sufferings to bear, was thereby deprived of the chance to make amends (cf. W. Wichmann, *Die Leidenstheorie. Eine Form der Leidensdeutung im Spätjudentum*, *BWANT* 4, Folge, 2, 1930). It must, however, be admitted that *paschō* and its derivatives provide the content rather than the precise terminology of the rabbinic theology of suffering (cf. texts given by Wichmann, op. cit., 91 ff.). Gen. R. 44:6 on Gen. 15:1 contains the statement (probably directed against Christianity) that in every generation there is one righteous man who makes atonement for sin through his sufferings (cf. Midrash on Cant. 1:14, § 60).

6. The Qumran community looked forward to the birth of a messiah amid numerous woes and birth-pangs described in cosmic terms (1QH3:5–18; which alludes to Isa. 9:5 and 26:16–21). A. R. C. Leaney comments: "Here we have a prayer, the metaphor of useless travail, followed by promise of rebirth, and vindication of God's people by punishment of iniquity" ("The Eschatological Significance of Human Suffering in the Old Testament and the Dead Sea Scrolls", *SJT* 16, 1963, 294). Leaney also sees Isa. 60:21 in 1QH 8:1–8. 1QH 9 expresses confidence in Yahweh's vindication amid suffering: "But behold, from desolation to ruin, and from the pain to the sore, and from the travail to the throes, my soul meditates on Thy marvellous works. In Thy mercies Thou hast not cast me aside; season by season, my soul shall delight in the abundance of mercy. I will reply to him who swallows me up and I will rebuke my oppressor; I will declare his sentence unjust and declare Thy judgement righteous." Leaney contends that the author is in no doubt that he lives in the time of the messianic woes and that his duty is to enter fully into the creative process which he describes poetically as a travailing to bring to birth, but the enthusiasm at Qumran for the law and their desire for the rebirth of the nation were to be cruelly disappointed in A.D. 70 (op. cit., 295).

NT 1. The vb. *paschō*, used 42 times in the NT, does not occur in OT quotations or in the Gospel of Jn. and the Johannine Epistles. It is also absent from Rev., apart from 2:10, and among the general epistles occurs only in 1 Pet. Paul rarely uses it (only 9 times, including *sympaschō*); it is very common, however, in the Synoptic Gospels, Acts and Heb. The noun *pathēma* is found only in Paul (Rom. 8:18; 2 Cor. 1:5 ff.; Phil. 3:10; Col. 1:24; 2 Tim. 3:11; including 2 passages where the word means passion: Rom. 7:5; Gal. 5:24), in 1 Pet. 1:11; 4:13; 5:1, 9, in Heb. 2:9 f.; 10:32. *synkakopatheō* (Heb. 4:15; 10:34) and *kakopatheō* (2 Tim. 2:9; 4:5) occur with reference to suffering as followers of Christ. In addition, *kakopatheō* is used more generally in Jas. 5:13. The adj. *pathētos* occurs only once (Acts 26:23; Christ was subject to suffering), while *sympatheō* is used twice, to express the thought that the exalted Christ (Heb. 4:15) and his people (Heb. 10:34) are able to exercise compassion. *pathos* occurs only in Rom. 1:26; Col. 3:5; 1 Thess. 4:5.

In the light of the fact that the Synoptic Gospels are, in a sense, passion accounts extended both backwards and forwards in time, i.e. the passion is their central theme,

it is striking that they make relatively little use of *paschō* and *pathēma*. In Jn. the whole life of the incarnate Logos is presented as his passion (Jn. 1:5, 11 and passim), though as a passion in which he is glorified (→ Glory, art. *doxa*). Despite this emphasis, however, Jn. makes no use at all of these words, so that the importance of the passion idea in the NT cannot be inferred from mere statistics.

2. There are only a few places where *paschō* and its derivatives are used in a general sense. Thus in Gal. 3:4; Lk. 13:2; Acts 28:5 it could equally well be rendered by "to experience". Pilate's wife is badly frightened by a dream (Matt. 27:19), and the woman with the issue of blood has suffered a great deal at the hands of many physicians (Mk. 5:26). Principally, however, the word-group serves to describe the suffering of Christ and that of his disciples.

3. *The Suffering of Christ.* (a) *paschō* has a twofold use in reference to Jesus' passion: first, it can refer exclusively to his → death, especially in phrases where, although death is not explicitly mentioned, his suffering stands alongside something else, such as his resurrection (Lk. 24:46; Acts 3:18; cf. 3:15; 17:3), his entry into glory (Lk. 24:26), or his showing himself alive (Acts 1:3). In such passages his suffering is *pathēma tou thanatou* (Heb. 2:9), i.e. death itself (Heb. 13:12).

On the other hand, in the fourfold statements of Mk. 8:31 par. Matt. 16:21 and Lk. 9:22; cf. Mk. 9:12 par. Matt. 17:12; Lk. 17:25, where the forthcoming sufferings of Christ are first announced, the phrase *polla pathein*, suffer many things, can only refer to those sufferings prior to his trial before the high priest, and scarcely to his death, (i) because his being killed receives separate mention as the 3rd element of the four; (ii) because *polla pathein* cannot be a summary of his being rejected, being killed, and rising again. In Lk. 17:25, however, the use of the first two elements suggests that "suffering and being rejected" is a fixed phrase. "On God's side the fate of Jesus is a *polla pathein*, on man's an *apodokimasthenai*" (W. Michaelis, *TDNT* V 915; cf. above OT 4 (a)). Matt., by contrast, deliberately extends the scope of *polla pathein* to cover the sufferings of Christ up to and including his death: he must "suffer many things from the elders, high priests and scribes, and be killed ... and be raised" (Matt. 16:21). On the cup of suffering of Christ → Hunger, art. *pinō* NT 3.

(b) The NT strongly insists that Christ's passion is no accident but is of divine → necessity (art. *dei*; Matt. 16:21 par.; Lk. 13:33; 17:25; 24:26; Acts 17:3) and has been predicted in the OT (Mk. 9:12; Lk. 24:26; Acts 3:18; 1 Pet. 1:11). Hence, the author of Heb. says that like the OT sin-offering (Lev. 16:27), Jesus suffered outside the gate of Jerusalem (Heb. 13:11–13).

(c) Christ's suffering acquires its soteriological aspect from the fact that it is substitutionary in character: he is the atoning → sacrifice for our → sins (Heb. 13:12; 1 Pet. 2:21 and passim). This is proved by quotations from Isa. 53 (cf. 1 Pet. 2:22, 24 with Isa. 53:9, 5). Thus through the suffering of death (Heb. 2:9 f.), Christ becomes the author of believers' salvation (*archēgos*; → Begin, art. *archē*; *sōtēria*, → redemption; → reconciliation; see above OT 4 (b)).

(d) The uniqueness of Christ's sufferings follows from this, and is shown by the fact that in the Synoptic Gospels *paschō* is used only in those words of Christ which refer to his own passion. Heb. also uses it only in connexion with Christ (except Heb. 10:32), and emphasizes *par excellence* the uniqueness, all-sufficiency and completeness of his atoning sacrifice: his vicarious suffering took place *ephapax*, once for all (Heb. 7:27; 9:12; Rom. 6:10; cf. 1 Pet. 3:18; → One, art. *hapax*).

(e) Christ's vicarious suffering means, however, for his followers not deliverance *from* earthly suffering, but deliverance *for* earthly suffering. He has suffered and been tempted as we are (Heb. 2:18), yet without sin (Heb. 4:12); indeed, since he has shared in all his people's experiences, he is able as the exalted one to "sympathize with their weaknesses" (*sympathēsai*, Heb. 4:15). His suffering was a test which he was called upon to undergo and in which he learned obedience (Heb. 5:8). Having been tested by suffering (see above, OT 3), he is our pattern and example (*hypogrammos*, 1 Pet. 2:21; → Image, art. *hypogrammos*). His suffering requires us as his followers to tread a similar path (1 Pet. 2:21; Heb. 13:12 f.).

(f) Christ is described as *pathētos*, subject to suffering, only in Acts 26:23. As suffering and resurrection are mentioned together (see above, 3 (a)), the thought here is similar to that in Lk. 24:26 and Acts 17:3. Hence, the question is not whether Christ, being God, could suffer. The more his deity was stressed in the post-NT period, the greater became the danger of Docetism, which argued from his deity to his "impassibility", i.e. inability to suffer (see above, CL 4, 5). Ignatius, however, basing his argument upon the idea of atonement, pointed out that unreal suffering meant unreal redemption (Ign., *Pol.* 4, 2). Certainly Christ is *apathēs*, incapable of suffering, in his pre- and his post-existence (Ign., *Pol.* 3, 2; Ign., *Eph.* 7, 2), but on soteriological grounds it was necessary to maintain his complete humanity (Ign., *Smy.* 4, 2) and consequently his ability to suffer (cf. 1 Pet. 4:1, *Christou pathontos sarki*, Christ having suffered in the flesh).

4. *The Suffering of Christ's People.* (a) Suffering and fellowship. The idea of suffering is inseparable from the NT concept of *koinōnia* (→ Fellowship; → Lord's Supper). He who arms himself with the same mind as Christ will have to suffer in the flesh (1 Pet. 4:1; cf. 2 Cor. 11:23 ff.). To suffer "as a Christian" (1 Pet. 4:16) means to share in the sufferings of Christ (1 Pet. 4:13; Phil. 3:10), to suffer with him (*sympaschomen*, Rom. 8:17). Indeed, such is the mystic union existing between Christ and his body the church that their sufferings may be identified as one and the same (2 Cor. 1:5; → Church). Different churches are united by the bonds of common suffering (1 Thess. 2:14; 1 Pet. 5:9), and the same applies to any individual church. If the members of a fellowship are to show not merely sympathy with one another but active and practical compassion (*sympaschō*), then true unity in the faith is required (1 Cor. 12:26; Heb. 10:34). A further important example of fellowship in suffering is that existing between the apostle on the one hand and the local church (2 Cor. 1:6 f.) or an individual disciple (2 Tim. 1:8; 2:3) on the other. The great example is Jesus Christ (1 Pet. 2:21), not only for an apostle himself as a "witness of the sufferings of Christ" (1 Pet. 5:1; cf. Ignatius, *Rom.* 6, 3), but also for those who follow an apostle (2 Tim. 3:10 f.) or who are called upon to imitate him (1 Cor. 11:1). Just as the prophets were good examples of how to endure unjust suffering (*kakopatheia*, Jas. 5:10; contrast the bad example set by the generation in the wilderness, which lusted after evil things, *kaka*, 1 Cor. 10:6), so now the apostles set a good example. Their sufferings are part of their ministry (→ Serve, art. *diakoneō*), and serve to identify the true servants of the church (cf. 2 Cor. 11:23 ff.). The apostle Paul's "sufferings for ... the church" (Col. 1:24) are not redemptive but missionary in character.

But not all suffering is fellowship with the sufferings of Christ. For suffering to be in this category, the apostles and the church must suffer for the sake of their office or of their Christian calling (see above, OT 4 (a)); they must suffer as Christians (1 Pet.

4:16), unjustly (1 Pet. 2:19 f.), being regarded not *as* evildoers or murderers (1 Pet. 4:15; Lk. 23:32 ff.), i.e. justly so (Lk. 23:41), but merely *like* evildoers (1 Pet. 2:12) and made to suffer as such (*kakopatheō*, 2 Tim. 2:9). True suffering in this sense is called suffering "according to God's will" (1 Pet. 4:19), suffering "in the name" of Jesus Christ (Acts 9:16; Phil. 1:29), "for the gospel" (2 Tim. 1:8), "in mindfulness of God" (1 Pet. 2:19; → Conscience), "for righteousness' sake" (1 Pet. 3:14), and – looking forward in hope – "for the kingdom of God" (2 Thess. 1:5).

(b) The eschatological aspect of suffering. Just as Christ's suffering is not an end in itself, but a means to a great end, namely, perfection (Heb. 2:10), so also in the case of his people (1 Pet. 5:9; AV translates *epiteleisthai* as "[the same afflictions] are accomplished . . .", so doing justice to the root *telos*, → goal). The essential goal for which the Christian suffers is that of the kingdom of God. Compared with the hope of "eternal glory", a Christian's present period of suffering shrinks to "a little while" (1 Pet. 5:10). In Rom. 8:18 Paul emphasizes that the sufferings of the present time bear no comparison with future glory, so that even suffering may be regarded as a precious gift (Phil. 1:29; 1 Pet. 2:19) from "the God of all grace, who has called you to his eternal glory" (1 Pet. 5:10). The Gospel of Jn. views the whole of Christ's earthly life from this same standpoint, that of his glorification, and therefore makes no use whatsoever of *paschō*. In the same way Paul, in Phil. 3:10, speaks of the aim of his new life as being to enter experimentally into the → knowledge (first) of the power of Christ's → resurrection, and (only then) of the fellowship of his sufferings. Again and again in the NT suffering and glory (Rom. 8:17; 1 Pet. 5:1, 10), as well as suffering and → patience (2 Thess. 1:4 f.; Heb. 10:32), are mentioned in the same breath. Thus Paul conceives his fellowship with the Corinthians as being fellowship in suffering and in comfort (2 Cor. 1:7). Indeed, Paul can take the idea of suffering as being temporary because advancing towards eschatological glory, and extend it to cover the whole of → creation (Rom. 8:18 ff.; see above, OT 4, 5): not only man but the whole creation is treading the path of suffering which leads to the glorious goal (*telos*). Thus the Christian awaits not the *end* of suffering but its *goal*. "The raising of Christ is not merely a consolation to him in a life that is full of distress and doomed to die, but it is also God's contradiction of suffering and death, of humiliation and offence, and of the wickedness of evil" (J. Moltmann, *Theology of Hope*, 1967, 21).

B. Gärtner

→ Beat, → Cross, → Demon, → Evil, → Fall, → Guilt, → Heal, → Lament, → Reconciliation, → Redemption, → Satan, → Sin, → Tempt, → Torment, → Weakness, → Woe

(a). M. B. Ahern, *The Problem of Evil*, 1971; A. Bertrangs, *The Bible on Suffering, St. Norbert Abbey Series* 11, 1966; J. Bowker, *Problems of Suffering in Religions of the World*, 1970; A. Büchler, *Studies in Sin and Atonement in the Rabbinic Literature of the First Century*, 1928; R. Bultmann, *lypē* etc., *TDNT* IV 313–24; P. Dhorme, *The Book of Job*, 1967; C. T. Francisco, "Evil and Suffering in the Book of Hosea", *Southwest Journal of Theology* 5, 1962–63, 33–41; J. Hick, *Evil and the God of Love*, 1977²; A. R. C. Leaney, "The Eschatological Significance of Human Suffering in the Old Testament and in the Dead Sea Scrolls", *SJT* 16, 1963, 286–301; L. J. Kuyper, "The Suffering and Repentance of God", *SJT* 22, 1969, 257–77; C. S. Lewis, *The Problem of Pain*, 1940; E. Lohse, *History of the Suffering and Death of Jesus Christ*, 1967; J. L. McKenzie, "Divine Passion in Osee", *CBQ* 17, 1955, 287–99; J. Moltmann, *Theology of Hope: On the Ground and the Implications of a Christian Eschatology*, 1967; and *The Crucified God*, 1974; W. Michaelis, *paschō* etc., *TDNT* IV 904–39; L. B. Paton, "The Problem of Suffering in the Pre-exilic Prophets", *JBL* 46, 1927, 111–31; G. von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, I, 1962; H. H. Rowley, "The Servant of the Lord in the Light of Three Decades of

Criticism", and "The Suffering Servant and the Davidic Messiah", in *The Servant of the Lord and Other Essays on the Old Testament*, 1965², 1–60 and 61–94; *Submission in Suffering and Other Essays*, 1951; and *Job, New Century Bible*, 1970; J. A. Sanders, *Suffering as Divine Discipline in the Old Testament and in Post-biblical Judaism*, 1955; J. Scharbert and J. Schmid, "Suffering", *EBT* III 890–97; A. Schweitzer, *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*, 1931; E. F. Sutcliffe, *Providence and Suffering in the Old and New Testament*, 1955; A. Wikenhauser, *Pauline Mysticism*, 1960.
(b). E. Balla, "Das Problem des Leidens in der Geschichte der israelitisch-jüdischen Religion", in *Eucharisterion*. Festschrift H. Gunkel, *FRLANT* 19, 1923, I, 214–60; J. Begrich, "Das priesterliche Heilsorakel", *ZAW* 52, 1934, 81 ff.; G. Braumann, "Leidenskelch und Todestaufe (Lk. 10, 38 f.)", *ZNW* 56, 1965, 149 ff.; H. Braun, *Das Leiden Christi. Eine Bibelarbeit über den 1. Petrusbrief, ThEH* 69, 1940; J. Carmignac, "La Théologie de la Souffrance dans les Hymnes de Qumrân", *Revue de Qumrân* 3, 1961–62, 365–86; H. Conzelmann, "Historie und Theologie in den synoptischen Passionsberichten", in *Zur Bedeutung des Todes Jesu*, 1967, 35 ff.; J. Coste "Notion grecque et Notion biblique de la Souffrance éducatrice", *RSR* 43, 1955, 481–523; F. K. Euler, *Die Verkündigung vom leidenden Gottesknecht aus Jes. 53 in der griechischen Bibel, BWANT* 4. Folge, 14, 1934; H. Frey, "Zur Sinndeutung des Leidens im Alten Testament", *WuD* 6, 1959, 45–61; K. von Fritz, "Tragische Schuld und poetische Gerechtigkeit in der Antike", *Stud. Gen.*, 1955, 190 ff.; O. Garcia de la Fuente, "El Problema de Dolor en la Religion babilonica", *La Ciudad de Dios* 174, 1961, 43–90; H. Gödan, *Christus und Hippokrates*, 1958; E. Güttgemanns, *Der leidende Apostel und sein Herr, FRLANT* 90, 1966; E. Haenchen, "Historie und Geschichte in den johannischen Passionsberichten", in *Zur Bedeutung des Todes Jesu*, 1967, 35 ff.; N. J. Hein et al., "Leiden", *RGG*³ IV 294 ff.; A. Juncker, *Jesus und das Leid*, 1925; K. Keller-Hüschemenger, *Die Kirche und das Leiden, BEvTh* 20, 1954; A. Köberle, "Ursprung und Sinn des Schmerzes", *Wege zu Menschen* 4, 1962; H. Kremers, "Leidensgemeinschaft mit Gott im Alten Testament", *EvTh* 13, 1953, 122 ff.; and "Leiden", *EKL* II 1067 ff.; E. Larsson, *Christus als Vorbild, Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis* 23, 1962; R. Liechtenhan, "Die Überwindung des Leidens bei Paulus und in der zeitgenossischen Stoa", *ZTK* 3, 1922, 368–99; E. Lohse, *Märtyrer und Gottesknecht, FRLANT* 46, 1963²; C. Maurer, "Knecht Gottes und Sohn Gottes im Passionsbericht des Markusevangeliums", *ZTK* 50, 1953, 1–38; G. Mensching, *Die Bedeutung des Leidens im Buddhismus und Christentum*, 1930²; D. Meyer, "*polla pathein* (Mk. 8, 31 par.; 9, 12b; Lk. 17, 25)", *ZNW* 55, 1964, 132 ff.; W. Michaelis, *Herkunft und Bedeutung des Ausdruckes "Leiden und Sterben Jesu Christi"*, 1945; W. Nauck, "Freude im Leiden", *ZNW* 46, 1955, 68 ff.; W. Nestle, "Die Überwindung des Leids in der Antike", in *Griechische Weltanschauung in ihrer Bedeutung für die Gegenwart*, 1946, 414 ff.; N. Peters, *Die Leidensfrage im Alten Testament*, 1923; G. von Rad, "Die Konfessionen Jeremias", *EvTh* 3, 1936, 265 ff.; E. Reisner, "Schuld und Unschuld des Leidens", *EvTh* 14, 1954, 246 ff.; J. Scharbert, *Der Schmerz im Alten Testament*, 1955; K. H. Schelkle, *Die Passion Jesu in der Verkündigung des Neuen Testaments*, 1949; G. Schille, "Das Leiden des Herrn", *ZTK* 52, 1955, 161 ff.; J. Schneider, *Die Passionsmystik des Paulus*, 1929; T. von Sicard, "Der Schmerz und die Seelsorge", *Wege zu Menschen* 8, 1961, 257 ff.; J. J. Stamm, *Das Leiden des Unschuldigen in Babylon und Israel, AThANT* 10, 1946; G. Strecker, "Die Leidens- und Auferstehungsvoraussagen im Markusevangelium", *ZTK* 64, 1967, 16 ff.; A. Vanhoye, "Structure et Théologie des Récits de la Passion dans les Évangiles Synoptiques", *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* 99, 1967, 135 ff.; W. Wichmann, *Die Leidenstheorie. Eine Form der Leidensdeutung im Spätjudentum, BWANT* 4, Folge 2, 1930; H. W. Wolff, *Jesaja 53 im Urchristentum*, 1952³.

Suffice, Satisfy

The words dealt with here reflect the fact that reality hardly ever tallies with men's expectations, that goals are set but not achieved, or that given conditions are felt to be unacceptable. That which does comply with the norm or does meet men's requirements is described by the adj. *hikanos*, either in an ethical sense (worth, worthy, competent) or a material sense (enough, sufficient). However, where the idea is not that of meeting a given standard but of acknowledging its rightness, this is expressed by words of the *arkeō* group. The thought here is of remaining within certain bounds, the latter being either inherent in a given situation, or self-imposed, or seen as God-

given. There is a close affinity here with words dealt with under → humility.

ἀρκέω

ἀρκέω (*arkeō*), be enough, suffice, be adequate; pass. be satisfied or content with; ἀρκετός (*arketos*), enough, sufficient, adequate; αὐτάρκεια (*autarkeia*), sufficiency, contentment; αὐτάρκης (*autarkēs*), self-sufficient, independent, content.

CL *arkeō*, suffice, be sufficient, pass. to be satisfied, is found already in Homer with the meaning to give protection, ward off, to have power, to help. The adj. *arketos* does not occur until the 1st cent. A.D. (Chrysippus of Tyana, *A Handbook of Cookery*) and means sufficient, while the noun *autarkeia* (from Democritus and Hippocrates onwards, 5th cent. B.C.) denotes a sufficiency of means, a "competence", such as that enjoyed by an independent, self-supporting man. Similarly *autarkēs* means self-sufficient, hence strong (Herodotus, 1, 32), and is frequently found with the vb. *einai*, to be, in the sense of to be satisfied.

In the moral philosophy of Stoicism the ability to be content (*arkeisthai*) became the essence of all the → virtues. So the Stoic Diogenes Laertius speaks of Socrates as being *autarkēs kai semnos*, contented and devout. To practise the virtue of contentment was to acquiesce wisely in that which suited one's own nature or one's *daimōn*; becoming independent of things, a man relied upon himself or – as others taught – submitted to the lot meted out to him by the gods (Diogenes Laertius, 2, 24; Epictetus, *Dissertationes* 1, 1, 12 f.). To have no needs was the ideal of Stoicism.

OT The LXX makes little use of *arkeō* and its derivatives, its main Heb. equivalents being *māṣā'*, to attain to, find, be sufficient, reach, and *hôn*, wealth, sufficiency, (adv.) enough. In Num. 11:22 the meaning is to be sufficient; in 1 Ki. 8:27, to contain, be sufficient for; in Prov. 30:15; 2 Macc. 5:15; 4 Macc. 6:28; Wis. 12:22, to satisfy. OT piety, however, knows more of the wisdom of contentment than the mere incidence of words would indicate (cf. Pss. 73[72]:23 ff.; 131[130]; Hos. 12:8 f.; 13:6; G. Kittel, *TDNT* I 465).

NT The words are not widely used in the NT: *arkeō* and *arketos* occur only 11 times in all, of which 6 are in the Gospels; *autarkēs* and *autarkeia* (3 times) are found only in Pauline writings.

1. On the one hand, *arkeō* expresses the idea that something is sufficient (e.g. oil, Matt. 25:9; bread, Jn. 6:7), while, on the other hand, it describes the attitude of mind which is satisfied or content with what is available (Heb. 13:5), with food and clothing (1 Tim. 6:8) or with wages (Lk. 3:14).

2. *arketos*, enough, is used as an adjectival predicate in Matt. 6:34; 10:25; 1 Pet. 4:3. *autarkeia* occurs only in 2 Cor. 9:8 and 1 Tim. 6:6. Paul is convinced that if only they give from the heart, the Corinthians will "in all things always have a full sufficiency", i.e. God will richly bestow upon them all the necessities of life (→ Poor, art. *ptōchos* NT 4). Contentment, when linked with → godliness, is said in 1 Tim. 6:6 to be great gain. This is very similar to Stoic thought (cf. Diogenes Laertius' opinion of Socrates, CL above). Similarly in Phil. 4:11 Paul describes his own attitude: he has learned, in whatever state he is, to be content (*autarkēs einai*).

3. Such an attitude of contentment presupposes in the NT the trust and confidence which God's children have in their heavenly Father. Since they are secure in his love, they can be content with what they have, because it is allotted them by God himself who, in his promises, undertakes to watch over them all their lives (Heb. 13:5). Such confidence (→ faith) banishes anxiety about the future, for the future, like the present, is provided for by God (Matt. 6:34). His children are delivered from anxiety about themselves that they may be free to care for others (→ Care).

In 2 Cor. 9:8 Paul is lavish in his praise of God's grace, which is given in superabundance to those who for their part willingly give (→ Fullness, art. *perisseuō*; cf. *perisson* in Jn. 10:10). God gives them "a full sufficiency" that they may "provide in abundance" for every good work. Under the gospel the mark of *autarkeia* is no longer autonomy and self-sufficiency but freedom to give to others; man, amazingly enough, no longer lives exclusively for himself.

4. For Paul, contentment springs from complete readiness to accept whatever God gives (Phil. 4:11). He makes no distinction between the necessary and the superfluous, but simply gives thanks for everything. He can accept both abundance and want as part of his life, and he gives thanks that he has received both as a gift together with God's gracious forgiveness and quickening power. In the case of the sickness which he has to endure as a thorn in the flesh, he is called upon to exercise the virtue of contentment and to request no more than God is graciously pleased to give. The sickness serves as a repeated reminder to him that he is utterly dependent, in all he does, upon the enabling power of his Lord (2 Cor. 12:7 ff.); → Fruit, art. *skolops*).

5. Finally, the scope of the word becomes clear in one further passage, namely Jn. 14:8. Philip claims that if he and the other disciples were shown the Father, then, according to this account, they would be "satisfied" (*kai arkei hēmin*). The answer he receives is that their true need, like that of all men, is in fact more limited: it is sufficient to see Christ, for he who sees him sees the Father. Christ's revelation of God is the most complete and comprehensive revelation conceivable to man.

B. Siede

ἱκανός

ἱκανός (*hikanos*), enough, worthy, able, competent, qualified; ἱκανότης (*hikanotēs*), ability, competence; ἱκανόω (*hikanoō*), enable, make sufficient, qualify.

CL *hikanos*, found only from the time of the Gk. tragic poets, is related to *hikanō*, to attain, reach. The word conveys the idea of attaining a fixed goal, realizing a set purpose, and means adequate, sufficient, large enough, numerous enough.

OT 1. In the LXX (and other Jewish and Christian translations of the OT) *hikanos* mostly renders the Heb. *day*, sufficiency, enough, need: what craftsmen need for their work (Exod. 36:7); a brother's need of help (Lev. 25:25 ff.); what is needed to ward off hunger (Prov. 25:16), for a sacrifice (Lev. 5:7), or to bring down divine judgment (Obad. 5). Here then it is no longer a result or a person being assessed as to whether they reach a given standard; the whole reference is to a person and his

needs. The sense of the word has shifted from that of objective measurement (to suffice, be enough) to the personal idea of to need, stand in need of.

2. It is also striking that the LXX renders the divine *šadday* not only by *pantokratōr*, the Almighty, but also, quite often, by *ho hikanos*. *šadday* may originally have been a non-Israelitish deity who provided a ready transition to Yahweh (cf. O. Eissfeldt, *Kleine Schriften*, III, 1965, 441 ff. on Ps. 91:1 f.). Passages sometimes attributed to the priestly document in Genesis regard the patriarchal families as being worshippers of *šadday* (Gen. 17:1; 28:3; 35:11; 43:14; 48:3), and speak of them meeting with Yahweh only through the call of Moses (Exod. 6:2 ff.). Yet at an early date *šadday* was only another name for Yahweh, the meaning of which was not understood (cf. O. Eissfeldt, op. cit., I, 145 f. on Ps. 91:9). The similar verses Isa. 13:6 and Joel 1:15 represent a prophetic attempt to interpret the name: *šadday* brings fearful judgment (*šōḏ*, havoc, devastation) upon his people Israel. The LXX translation produced another interpretation. The Heb. consonants were divided into two groups, vocalized to make the relative *še* and *day*, and then read as follows: Yahweh, "who is sufficient (of himself)", the Almighty (Ruth 1:20 f.; Job 21:15; 31:2; 40:2; Ezek. 1:24). As *šadday*, Yahweh has not to conform to some external standard or to some ideal (this would have been the same as the Gk. concept of *moira*, fate, to whom even the gods were subject); rather he himself sets the standard for himself and hence also for his creation.

NT 1. The use of the word in the NT comes largely from the language of Hellenism and Gk. Judaism. By far the most instances (27 out of 40) occur in Lk.'s writings, where *hikanos* almost always means much, considerable, applied either to → time (Lk. 8:27 and passim) or to → numbers (Acts 11:24 and passim); nothing of theological importance arises here, except in the difficult saying of Christ concerning the two swords (Lk. 22:38).

Having originally sent his apostles forth on their preaching mission without any external means of protection (Lk. 22:35), Jesus now urges them to show courage and endurance in the face of trials. The swords are not intended for use, as Lk. 22:49 ff. and Acts 21:38 ff. indicate. Rather the apostles are to have the courage of "sword-bearers", men who are ready to risk their lives for their cause. Since Jesus perceives that this is their intention, he says, "It is enough!" This verse, in other words, gives no support to the theory of the "two swords", by which the Bull *Unam Sanctam* (1302) sought to confer upon "Peter's successor" supreme temporal and spiritual power.

2. Almost all other instances of *hikanos* in the NT occur in Paul. Taken in connexion with Mk. 1:7 and Matt. 8:8, they indicate the development of an early Christian language of confession: I am not worthy, nor is anyone worthy (2 Cor. 3:5; 2:16) to be an → apostle (1 Cor. 15:9), to be a minister of the new covenant (2 Cor. 3:6) or to serve Christ (Mk. 1:7). I am not worthy of his presence (Matt. 8:8), which transforms me into his likeness (cf. 1 Cor. 11:1). It is entirely of God's grace that we are able to do anything (2 Cor. 3:5 f.; Col. 1:12: *hikanotēs* and *hikanoō*). By contrast, 2 Tim. 2:2 clearly indicates that in the later period gifts, particularly faithfulness, made some men more competent to teach than others. But this in no way obscured the conviction that the Christian's sufficiency is always the gift of God. Paul who is thoroughly conversant with Gk. usage where *hikanos* means con-

siderable (of time, Rom. 15:23; or of numbers, 1 Cor. 11:30), follows the LXX in its use of the word to translate Heb. *day*, need. A Christian's own worth is meaningless when it comes to his sufficiency before God. Works acceptable to God are not those performed for God, but only those which he himself requires and which the Christian therefore receives at his hand (cf. Exod. 4:10 ff.). *W. von Meding*

→ Fullness, → Right, → War

(a). A. Alt, "The God of the Fathers", in *Essays on Old Testament History and Religion*, 1966, 1–66; C. K. Barrett, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, *BNTC*, 1973; H. Conzelmann, *The Theology of St Luke*, 1960; G. Kittel, *arkeō* etc., *TDNT* I 464–67; R. P. Martin, *Philippians*, *New Century Bible*, 1976; I. H. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, *New International Greek Testament Commentary*, 1978; W. Michaelis, *machaira*, *TDNT* IV 524–27; K. H. Rengstorf, *hikanos* etc., *TDNT* III 293–96.

(b). R. Bultmann, *Der Stil der paulinischen Predigt und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe*, *FRLANT* 13, 1910; O. Eissfeldt, *Kleine Schriften*, III, 1965, 441 ff.; E. Lohmeyer, *Die Briefe an die Philipper, Kolosser und an Philemon*, *KEK* 9, 1956[11]; K. H. Rengstorf, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, *NTD* 3, 1965[10] ; A. Schlatter, *Die beiden Schwerter*, *Beiträge zur Förderung der christlichen Theologie* 20, 6, 1961; H. Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief*, *KEK* 6, 1924[9].

Sun, Moon, Stars

The three words which designate the heavenly luminaries commonly occur together or at least in the same context. The literal, metaphorical, and apocalyptic usage of these words is similar. The apocalyptic application is the most significant for NT theology and is discussed most fully under *hēlios*.

ἥλιος	ἥλιος (*hēlios*), sun.

CL & OT 1. *hēlios* is found throughout Greek literature in literal reference to the most conspicuous of the heavenly bodies. The use of the word in the LXX is quite similar to that of classical Greek. The most common use in the LXX is to mark time, whether of the day, by reference to its rising, setting, and midday heat, or of the season. The second most frequent use is the more specialized "under the sun" by which Ecclesiastes designates life in the real world, a usage found also in the Greek writers. Both the LXX and Greek literature use the rising of the sun to designate the direction East; the intense heat and light of the sun are referred to occasionally.

The permanence of the sun and the fixed order it manifests are sometimes stressed. Throughout the LXX the sun is understood to be the creation of God, the greater light made to rule the day (Gen. 1:16).

2. Metaphorical use of *hēlios* is found in classical Greek and the LXX, generally in referring to excellence, permanence, beauty or strength (Jdg. 5:31; Ps. 89:36 [LXX, 88:37]; Cant. 6:10; Wis. 7:29; Sir. 23:19; 26:16; 58:7). It is also associated with → righteousness (Wis. 5:6).

3. The conspicuous character of the sun, its fundamental importance to life and especially agriculture, its daily journey across the sky – all readily explain the nearly universal worship of the sun in primitive societies. Frequently the sun is personified into a god, e.g. Shamash in Mesopotamia, Helios in the Greek world, Sol Invictus in

the Roman world. The OT clearly stands against this widespread practice, strictly forbidding the worship of the sun, moon, and stars (Deut. 4:19; 17:3; cf. 2 Ki. 23:5, 11; Jer. 8:2; Ezek. 8:16). In the LXX we do come near to a personification of the sun in Mal. 4:2 (LXX 3:20), "But for you who fear my name the sun of righteousness shall rise, with healing in its wings." (This is probably related to the representation of the sun as a winged disk common in the art of the Ancient Near East.) The LXX avoids *hēlios* in its translation of the Hebrew of Ps. 84:11 (LXX 83:12): "The LORD God is a sun (*šemeš*) and shield."

4. A specialized group of references in the LXX, which are particularly important to the background of the NT, may be described as apocalyptic in tone. (a) Although the judgment oracles in particular refer to anticipated judgment in history, at the same time they allude to and foreshadow the divine wrath of final judgment. Most frequent is the reference to a darkening of the sun as a prelude to or an accompaniment of divine judgment. In some passages an impending historical judgment is in view: Isa. 13:10 (Babylon); Ezek. 32:7 (Egypt); Joel 2:10, 31; 3:15 (Jerusalem); Micah 3:6 (Jerusalem). There is, however, a tendency for this language to shade into a description of the eschatological Day of the Lord. This tendency becomes more apparent in the utilization of the same language in the Pseudepigrapha (e.g. Ass. Mos. 10:5; Sib. 3:801 f.) and in the NT. In addition to a darkening of the sun, judgment may be indicated by other irregularities: e.g. the sun does not rise (Job 9:7); it stands still (Hab. 3:11); it goes down at noon (Amos 8:9) or while yet day (Jer. 15:9); it shines at night (2 Esd. 5:4). In the contexts of these passages one regularly finds reference to shame, sorrow, and confusion. (b) In the eschatological blessing that follows judgment "the sun shall be no more your light by day . . . but the Lord will be your everlasting light" (Isa. 60:19 f.). (c) On the other hand, indicative of the incomparable glory of the promised new reality, "the light of the sun will be sevenfold, as the light of seven days" (Isa. 30:26). This is metaphorical language for judgment and blessing. Parallels in classical literature are not easily found since the framework of eschatological expectation is lacking. Perhaps the closest is found in Roman writers (e.g. Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* 2, 30; Plutarch, *Caesar* 69, 3; Dio Cass. 45, 17, 5) who connect a darkened sun with tragedy as in the death of Caesar or the war between Octavian and Mark Antony.

Mention should be made of astronomical and quasi-religious speculation about the sun and moon found in Eth. Enoch 72–74; 78; Sl. Enoch 11–16; Gr. Baruch 6–9.

NT 1. The NT continues the ordinary usage of *hēlios* as the marker of time (Mk. 1:32 par. Lk. 4:40; Mk. 16:2; Eph. 4:26) and direction (Rev. 7:2, 16:12; Acts 27:20, referring to the impossibility of navigation), and the source of scorching heat (Matt. 13:6 par. Mk. 4:6; Jas. 1:11; Rev. 7:16; 16:8). Consistent with the OT idea of "life under the sun", Jesus teaches that the Father in heaven "makes his sun rise on the evil and on the good" (Matt. 5:45). In his argument concerning the nature of the resurrection body, Paul speaks of the contrasting glory of the sun, moon and stars (1 Cor. 15:41). Paul's Damascus Road experience causes a blindness that makes him unable to see the sun (Acts 13:11).

2. The metaphorical use of *hēlios* is found quite often. In the transfiguration narrative of Matt. 17:2 (but not the parallels) the face of Jesus is said to have "shone like the sun." John's vision of Christ similarly describes his face as "like the sun shin-

ing in full strength" (Rev. 1:16). The description of the mighty angel of Rev. 10:1 likens his face to the sun. The angel who announces the great supper of God in Rev. 19:17 is described as "standing in the sun." The woman of Rev. 12 (probably to be identified with the Zion of Isa. 66:7 ff.), who gives birth to the child destined to rule all nations, is portrayed as "clothed with the sun" (Rev. 12:1). Jesus teaches in Matt. 13:43 that "the righteous [*dikaioi*] will shine like the sun in the kingdom of their Father." The light from heaven which Paul saw on the Damascus Road prior to his blindness is described as "brighter than the sun" (Acts 26:13).

3. References to *hēlios* which are apocalyptic in tone are relatively frequent in the NT and of course are dependent upon the same imagery as found in the LXX references listed above.

(a) Most obviously eschatological, signifying the wrath of God in judgment, are the references in Rev. At the opening of the sixth seal "the sun became black as sackcloth" (Rev. 6:12); at the blowing of the fourth trumpet "a third of the sun was struck" so that its light was diminished by a third (Rev. 8:12); at the fifth trumpet the sun was darkened by smoke from the opened bottomless pit (Rev. 9:2). Similar in tone is the saying of Jesus in the Synoptics that "the sun will be darkened" (Matt. 24:29 par. Mk. 13:24) or, less precisely, that there will be signs in the sun (Lk. 21:25). These words clearly have an eschatological ring to them although their primary reference is probably to the historical event of the fall of Jerusalem (→ Generation; → Present). The same problem confronts us in the quotation of Joel 2.28–32 in Acts 2:17–21. How is one to understand "the sun shall be turned into darkness" etc. (Acts 2:20), as it stands in the context? Certainly the primary meaning of the quotation as a whole is the eschatological fulfilment experienced in the reception of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost. It is possible that Peter regarded the second half of the quotation (Acts 2:19–20) as simply symbolic for the inauguration of the eschatological age. (J. D. G. Dunn regards it as probable that cosmic signs were understood as "apocalyptic stage-effects which did not belong to the substance of the prophecy or require literal fulfilment," *Baptism in the Holy Spirit, SBT* Second Series 15, 1970, 47.) There is the further possibility of an association in his and his listeners' minds between the failing of the sun's light at the time of the crucifixion, Lk. 23:45 (cf. the darkness recorded in Matt. 27:45 par. Mk. 15:33), and the prophecy of Joel (F. F. Bruce, *The Book of Acts, NLC*, 1965, 69). It is, however, consistent with the meaning of this language elsewhere (both OT and NT) to understand Acts 2:19–20 as referring to coming judgment (here, eschatological). The point is that eschatology has begun and judgment is part and parcel of eschatology (at least for Peter, if not for Luke). Warnings and the call to repentance are therefore timely (Acts 2:38, 40; 3;19, 23). Salvation is available to those who call on the name of the Lord, as the last verse of the Joel passage stresses (Acts 2:21; cf. 4:12). (Haenchen explains the inclusion of Joel 2:30–31 [Acts 2:19–20] in the quotation as due mainly to the interest of Luke in this final verse, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 1971, 186.)

(b) Like the LXX, the NT also contains the use of *hēlios* in describing the glorious aspect of eschatology, here as exhibited in the city coming down out of heaven, the new Jerusalem. That city is of such splendour that there is no need of the sun to shine (Rev. 21:23). God's servants there will "need no light of lamp or sun, for the Lord God will be their light" (Rev. 22:5).

It is worth noting that, whereas most of the references to *hēlios* in the LXX are

literal rather than metaphorical or apocalyptic in character, in the NT the reverse is true. This is of course explained by the eschatological orientation of the NT. Our difficulty in understanding its language about cosmic signs simply reflects the inherent complexity of fulfilment without consummation. Moreover, there is a theological interconnexion between God's blessings on the one hand and his judgments on the other, whereby earlier blessings may typify eschatological blessing and earlier judgments may typify eschatological judgment. So magnificent is the kingdom inaugurated by Christ at his first advent that it may rightly be characterized in language that, strictly speaking, refers to the consummation (e.g. Luke 4:18; 7:22; 10:18, 24). In the same way, so full of significance is the fall of Jerusalem as a judgment sign that it connotes the eschatological judgment and, as do many other judgments in the historical narrative of the Bible, points proleptically to the eschaton and so may be described in the boldest of language (as in our passages about the darkening of the sun, etc.).

hēlios in the NT focuses alternately on glory and judgment. Given the prominence of revelation, fulfilment, and anticipated consummation in the NT, the symbolic imagery of *hēlios* receives special emphasis. *D. A. Hagner*

σελήνη

σελήνη (*selēnē*), moon; σεληνιάζομαι (*selēniazomai*), be moon-struck.

CL & OT 1. The use of *selēnē* in its literal sense is not uncommon in the classical writers or in the LXX. Commonly in view is its specialized function of marking time by waxing and waning. The religious festivals of the Hebrews, as of many primitive societies, were determined by the lunar calendar (see especially Sir. 43:6–8). (It should be noted that *ḥōḏeš*, "month", is translated by *neomēnia*, "new moon", in the LXX.) Also found are references to nocturnal light which the moon provides, and in the LXX the fixed order it demonstrates (Jer. 31:35 [LXX 38:35]), its beauty (Ps. 8:3), and its permanence (Ps. 72[71]: 5, 7). 2. A few metaphorical references are found in the LXX (e.g. Cant. 6:10; Sir. 27:11; 50:6). 3. The moon with its unique cycle of phases, its growth and decline, its effect upon the tides, though a lesser light, is more prominent in pagan mythology and religion than is the sun. Classical writers refer to Selene, the moon goddess. Worship of the moon, as of sun and stars, is prohibited in the OT (see references under *hēlios*). A specialized reflection of popular belief in the preternatural power of the moon is the promise that under Yahweh's protection the moon will not smite one by night (Ps. 121[120]:6). 4. As with the sun, the prospect of eschatological judgment and blessing affects the light of the moon. (a) In judgment it will be darkened (Eccl. 12:2; Isa. 13:10; Ezek. 32:7; Joel 2:10); "confounded" (Isa. 24:23); turned into blood (Joel 2:31; Ass. Mos. 10:5); held up in its course (Hab. 3:11; cf. Eth. Enoch 80:4; 2 Esd. 5:4). (b) In blessing its light will be as the light of the sun (Isa. 30:26); the moon will not function as a luminary at night (Isa. 60;19); no longer will the moon withdraw itself (Isa. 60:20).

In the LXX the moon is never referred to alone; only twice is the moon referred to apart from the sun, and in both places it is associated with the stars (Job 25:5; Ps. 8:3).

NT In the NT *selēnē* occurs only in association with *hēlios*. Only two occurrences are not apocalyptic in tone: a reference to the glory of the moon as distinct from sun and stars in Paul's argument about the resurrection body, and the metaphorical reference in the description of the woman of Rev. 12 (see above, on *hēlios*) who has the moon under her feet (12:1). The cognate verb *selēniazomai* is found in Matt. 4:24 and 17:15, and reflects the popular connexion of demon possession with the moon (cf. the English word "lunacy"). The latter passage describes symptoms of something like epilepsy and the malady is attributed to an evil spirit which the disciples are unable to cast out. *selēniazomai* does not occur in the LXX, although it is common in the papyri (Moulton-Milligan, 571).

The cosmic phenomena associated with eschatological happenings regularly include references to the moon alongside those to the sun. (a) In passages where judgment is in view the apocalyptic language of the LXX is utilized. As the sun will be darkened, so "the moon will not give its light" (Mk. 13:24 par. Matt. 24:29). The Lucan parallel simply indicates that there will be signs in sun, moon and stars (Lk. 21:25). The quotation of Joel 2:31 in Acts 2:20 speaks of the moon being turned into blood; Rev. 6:12 similarly says that at the opening of the sixth seal "the full moon became like blood." When the fourth angel blew his trumpet in Rev. 8:12, the moon, together with sun and stars, was darkened by one third. (b) The only other reference to *selēnē* concerns the eschatological era of blessing: the holy city, the new → Jerusalem is said to need no moon to shine upon it since the glory of God is its light (Rev. 21:23).

The applicability of apocalyptic language both to events which have happened in history as well as to events more properly eschatological is discussed at the end of the article on *hēlios*. *D. A. Hagner*

ἀστήρ

ἀστήρ (*astēr*), star; ἄστρον (*astron*), star, constellation.

CL & OT 1. The literal use of *astēr* and *astron* is found in Greek writers and LXX. The latter may refer to a constellation, but in the LXX ordinarily the plural forms of the two words are interchangeable. In the OT, the stars, like the sun and moon, are the creation of God (Gen. 1:16). They are referred to in classical writers and LXX in indicating time (i.e. by their appearance), and by their fixed order, direction as well as (with the moon) light and beauty. The most frequent use of both *astēr* and *astron* in the LXX is in reference to their incalculable number, usually with the descendants of the patriarchs in mind (cf. Gen. 15:5; 22:17; 26:4; Exod. 32:13; Deut. 1:10; 10:22; 28:62).

2. The metaphorical use of *astēr* and *astron* is common in classical literature and LXX. Most frequent in classical usage is the application to an illustrious person. In the LXX, those "who turn many to righteousness" will shine "like the stars for ever and ever" (Dan. 12:3). Often similes employ the beauty or glory of the stars (e.g. 1 Chr. 27:23; Wis. 7:29; Sir. 50:6). Obad. 4 speaks of pride as setting one's nest among the stars; similarly Isa. 14:12 refers to *Heōsphoros* (RSV: Day Star) who in his proud heart will ascend above the stars of God and make himself like the Most High (cf. 2 Macc. 9:10) (→ Light, art. *phōs* NT 4). In Num. 24:17 an *astron* is prophesied to come forth out of Jacob, a man (*anthrōpos*) out of Israel who will rule

in victory. (This text is understood as messianic at Qumran, but is not utilized in the NT unless possibly in Rev. 22:16; cf. 1QM 11:5–7; CD 7:19–20 and 4Qtest 12 f.) It was applied to Simeon Bar Kochba, whose name in Aram. means "Son of a Star", the leader of the Jewish rebellion against the Romans in A.D. 132. The guerilla leader Bar Kochba was regarded as the messiah in his resistance to Hadrian's project to rebuild Jerusalem as a Graeco-Roman city with a temple to Jupiter on the site of the Jewish temple. (Cf. E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ [175 B.C.–A.D. 135]*, eds., G. Vermes and F. Millar, I, 1973², 543 ff.).

3. Astrology and the worship of the stars are known both in Greek writers and LXX. Although the stars are sometimes personified in the LXX (e.g. Jdg. 5:20; Ps. 148:3; Bar. 3:34; Ep. Jer. 60), a strong stance is taken against astrology and the worship of the stars (Deut. 4:19; Isa. 47:13; Jer. 8:2; Amos 5:26). The polemic in Jer. 10:2 (i.e. not to be dismayed at the signs of the heavens as the nations are) is probably directed against astrology (cf. Wis. 13:2).

4. The imagery of darkened stars is associated with suffering and judgment in the LXX (Job 3:9; 9:7; Eccl. 12:2; Wis. 17:5). The failure of the stars to give their light becomes standard apocalyptic language used to describe historical and eschatological judgment (Isa. 13:10; Ezek. 32:7; Joel 2:10; 3:15). Occasionally the imagery varies, referring to stars falling, the host of heaven rotting away, and the skies being rolled up like a scroll (Isa. 34:4; cf. Dan. 8:10). This metaphorical language points symbolically to the eschatological era.

NT *astēr* and *astron* are both found in the NT; the difference between the two words is stylistic, Lk.-Acts for example exclusively using *astron*, Rev. exclusively *astēr*.

1. Out of the 28 occurrences of the words, only five may be described as ordinary or literal: Acts 27:20 (as guides to navigation at sea); 1 Cor. 15:41 (where *astēr* occurs three times in reference to differing orders of glory); and Heb. 11:12 (referring to the innumerable descendants of → Abraham).

2. Unique to the infancy narrative of Matt. (2:1–12) is the story of the magi and the *astēr* which led them to Bethlehem. It was not uncommon in the ancient world to associate the birth of a great ruler with extraordinary phenomena in the heavens. Whether in Matt. we have to do with a miraculous star or something natural such as the conjunction of planetary bodies or a supernova is uncertain. Quite possibly the star seen by the wise men was, as Johannes Kepler first suggested, a conjunction of the planets Jupiter and Saturn which occurred three times in 7 B.C. This possibility is strengthened by a Jewish astrological tradition about the conjunction, as well as the common association of Jupiter with kingly rule (and hence the messiah) and Saturn with the Jewish people. (Cf. R. A. Rosenberg, "The 'Star of the Messiah' Reconsidered," *Biblica* 53, 1972, 105–9.) It must be remembered that the magi were experts in esoteric knowledge, persons for whom astrology with its careful observation of the stars would have been centrally important (→ Magic, art. *mageia* NT 2(b)). Theologically the star may be said to serve as a sign of the dawning of the new, glorious era of the kingdom which the birth of the King inaugurates.

3. The metaphorical use of *astēr* is frequent in the NT, especially in Revelation. Five times in the opening chapters of Rev. reference is made to seven stars. These seven stars are held in the right hand of the One who discloses himself to John in a vision (Rev. 1:16, 20; 2:1); one reference omits the specific mention of the right hand

(Rev. 3:1). In Rev. 1:20 the mystery is explained: the stars are "the angels of the seven churches" (the seven lampstands are said to symbolize the seven churches). It is unlikely that the mention of the seven stars is to be explained by actual heavenly bodies, whether the seven planets or a particular constellation. More probably the number derives from the common seven-branched candelabra of Israel, if not from the symbolic perfection of the number itself. Nevertheless, as G. R. Beasley-Murray suggests (following E. Lohmeyer, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes*, *HNT* 16, 1953 [2]), there may also have been an association of the seven stars in Revelation with the sovereignty symbolized by the seven planets (*The Book of Revelation*, *New Century Bible*, 1974, 79). True sovereignty, over against the sovereignty claimed by the Roman emperors, thus lies with Christ and his people.

The symbolism of the "morning star" (*ho astēr ho prōinos*) in Rev. 2:28 and 22:16 is also difficult. The latter passage has Jesus say "I am the root and offspring of David, the bright morning star." Although this can be related to the words of Num. 24:17 (a star shall come out of Jacob), more probably it alludes to the morning star Venus, with the connotation not only of beauty, but of daybreak, and so of sovereignty and victory. Venus as the symbol of victory and sovereignty is attested in Roman times (Lohmeyer, op. cit., followed by Beasley-Murray, op. cit., 93 and 342). In Rev. 2:28, then, we may also understand the morning star given to the faithful as sovereignty or rule, which has the virtue of being consistent with the context as well as avoiding the awkward identification of the morning star with Christ.

Further metaphorical use of *astēr* is found in the crown of twelve stars worn by the woman of Rev. 12:1, where the stars obviously symbolize the twelve tribes of Israel. Jude 13 speaks of ungodly and heretical persons as "wandering stars" destined to an eternal darkness.

Stephen's speech in Acts provides an allusion to the worship of stars in the OT period (7:43).

4. The stars are associated with the sun and moon in the apocalyptic imagery of eschatological judgment. In contrast to the LXX, where the darkening of the stars is common, only one passage in the NT refers to this: Rev. 8:12, where with sun and moon the light of the stars is darkened by one third. Elsewhere the eschatological imagery in the NT refers to the falling of the stars from the sky, a phenomenon mentioned only twice in the LXX. Jesus speaks of a time when "the stars will be falling from heaven" (Mk. 13:25 par. Matt. 24:29; Lk. again simply refers to "signs" in the stars, using the word *astron*, 21:25). The next clause in this passage reads "and the powers [*hai dynameis*] in the heavens will be shaken." In this clause (also in Lk. 21:26) the powers may simply refer to the heavenly bodies previously mentioned. On the other hand, cosmic powers in the sense of spiritual authorities and powers may be in view (→ Might). In either case, what is symbolized by this language is an event, a turning point, of very great significance. If, as is probable, this language refers to the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, the theological continuity with and anticipation of the final eschatological judgment is not to be missed.

Further employment of the imagery of falling stars is found in Rev. At the opening of the sixth seal the stars fell to the earth "as the fig tree sheds its winter fruit when shaken by a gale" (Rev. 6:13). Isa. 34:4 is recalled in the words which follow: "the sky vanished like a scroll that is rolled up" (Rev. 6:14). The blowing of the third trumpet announces the falling of "a great star from heaven, blazing like a torch,"

which has the name Wormwood (Gk. *apsinthos*) and makes bitter a third of the waters (Rev. 8:10 ff.; → Gall). At the fifth trumpet a star is seen "fallen from heaven to earth" (Rev. 9:1) and finally the tail of the dragon in Rev. 12 "swept down a third of the stars of heaven, and cast them to the earth" (Rev. 12:4).

Unlike the sun and moon in the NT, there is no reference to the stars in the context of eschatological blessing. The closest we come to this is the identification of Jesus as "the bright morning star" (Rev. 22:16).

In the apocalyptic language about sun, moon, and stars a recurrent question concerns how literally it is to be understood. One may debate the possibility of these luminaries being literally darkened, but not that the stars literally fall to earth, or that the sky is rolled up like a scroll. These statements about the stars underline the figurative nature of apocalyptic language. The real meaning of this language is theological. In the NT we have moved into the era of fulfilment prior to the consummation of God's purposes. Momentous events have occurred and are yet to occur – all of which are part of the same fabric of judgment and blessing, and call for the most exalted language. *D. A. Hagner*

→ Light, → Present, → Time, → Weather

(a). G. R. Beasley-Murray, *A Commentary on Mark Thirteen*, 1957; *The Book of Revelation, New Century Bible*, 1974; W. Foerster, *astēr, astron, TDNT* I 503–5; T. H. Gaster, *Myth, Legend and Custom in the Old Testament*, 1969; "Sun", *IDB* IV, 463–5; "Moon", *IDB* III, 436–7; L. Hartmann, *Prophecy Interpreted*, 1966; B. O. Long, "Astrology," *IDB Supplementary Volume*, 1976, 76–78; D. M. Roark, "The Great Eschatological Discourse," *NovT* 7, 1964, 123–7; R. A. Rosenberg, "The 'Star of the Messiah' Reconsidered," *Biblica* 53, 1972, 105–9; "Star of Bethelehem," *IDB Supplementary Volume*, 1976, 842; D. S. Russell, *The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic*, 1964, 271–6. (b). R. Pesch, *Naherwartungen*, 1968, 157–66.

Swear, Oath

ὀμνύω

ὀμνύω (*omnyō*), swear; ὅρκος (*horkos*), oath; ὁρκίζω (*horkizō*), adjure, implore; ἐνορκίζω (*enhorkizo*), adjure, cause someone to swear; ἐξορκίζω (*exhorkizō*), adjure, charge under an oath; ἐξορκιστής (*exhorkistēs*), exorcist; ἐπιορκέω (*epihorkeō*), swear falsely, commit perjury, break one's oath; ἐπίορκος (*epihorkos*), perjured, perjurer; ὁρκωμοσία (*horkōmosia*), asserting on oath, taking an oath.

CL 1. (a) *omnyō* (from Hdt. onwards) is a parallel form to *omnymi* (both are attested from Hom. onwards). It originally meant to hold fast (holy objects), and thence to swear. The word is used either with the acc. of the person or thing (e.g. Xen., *Anab.* 7, 6, 18) or with the prepositions *pros, kata, epi, en* or *eis*. Occasionally it is followed by an infinitive.

(b) *horkos* (from Hom. onwards) meant originally the staff which was grasped and raised in swearing (Hom., *Il.* 10, 321 and 328), thence oaths in general. The noun occurs frequently in the phrases *horkon omnyein*, to take up the oath-staff, and *horkon didonai* or *lambanein*, to give or accept on oath (Aristotle, *Rhet.* 1, 15, 1377a, 7 f.). The corresponding vb. *horkizō* has the meaning: (i) to put on oath (Xen., *Sym.* 4, 10); (ii) adjure (Josephus, *Life* 258; in the NT only in Mk. 5:7; Acts

19:13). The compound *enhorkizō* is a stronger form and means to adjure (in the NT only in 1 Thess. 5:27). *exhorkizō* expresses in particular the idea of adjuring by a deity or → demon (in the NT only in Matt. 26:63; Acts 19:13, *v.l.*). *exhorkistēs* is an exorcist who drives out demons by magical formulae (in the NT only in Acts 19:13; → Satan). *epihorkeō* (from Hom. onwards) means to swear falsely, commit perjury or break an oath (in the NT only in Matt. 5:33); correspondingly *epihorkos* means perjurious (in the NT only in 1 Tim. 1:10). The noun *horkōmosia* is infrequent and means asserting on oath (in the NT only in Heb. 7:20 f., 28).

(c) The etymology of *omnyō* and *horkos* suggests that the gestures of grasping an object or raising one's hand were from the first part of the act of swearing. The original meaning of the oath lay in the guaranteeing of man's word. An undoubtedly higher court of appeal was frequently provided by calling upon a deity (cf. the *theoi horkioi* as a witness to the truth, e.g. *nē Dia*, by Zeus). The formula of the oath originally had the character of conditionally cursing oneself (→ Curse), if the statement should prove not to correspond to the truth. A distinction can be drawn between assertive oaths, which are concerned with past and present events and are chiefly taken in court, and promissory oaths which promise a future activity and play an important part in religious as well as private life.

2. (a) In their public life the Greeks applied oaths to many areas, for many reasons and in many forms. Their original setting was a cultic one, but the practice of swearing oaths found a place in politics and law with oaths for officials, citizens and judges. Even the appropriate deities were fixed by the legislator. "This means that the oath in public life gives religious sanction and divine basis to the political order" (J. Schneider, *TDNT* V 458). Apart from this, oaths were used in contracts whose reliability might be guaranteed by the pledging of valuable property (the marriage-bed, children or weapons). The Greeks also used oaths in medicine.

The Hippocratic oath is generally attributed to the Greek physician Hippocrates (*c.* 460 – *c.* 357 B.C.) who was a native of the island of Cos. "I swear by Apollo Physician, by Asclepius, by Health, by Heal-all, and by all the gods and goddesses, making them witnesses, that I will carry out, according to my ability and judgment, this oath and this indenture: To regard my teacher in this art as equal to my parents; to make him partner in my livelihood, and when he is in need of money to share mine with him; to consider his offspring equal to my brothers; to teach them this art, if they require to learn it, without fee or indenture; and to impart precept, oral instruction, and all the other learning, to my sons, to the sons of my teacher, and to pupils who have signed the indenture and sworn obedience to the physicians' Law, but to none other. I will use treatment to help the sick according to my ability and judgment, but I will never use it to injure or wrong them. I will not give poison to anyone though asked to do so, nor will I suggest such a plan. Similarly I will not give a pessary to a woman to cause abortion. But in purity and holiness I will guard my life and my art. I will not use the knife either on sufferers from stone, but I will give place to such as are craftsmen therein. Into whatsoever house I enter, I will do so to help the sick, keeping myself free from all intentional wrong-doing and harm, especially from fornication with woman or man, bond or free. Whatsoever in the course of practice I see or hear (or even outside my practice in social intercourse) that ought never to be published abroad, I will not divulge, but consider such things to be holy secrets. Now if I keep this oath and break it not, may I enjoy honour, in my life and

art, among all men for all time; but if I transgress and forswear myself, may the opposite befall me" (E.T. by W. H. S. Jones, *Hippocrates, Loeb Classical Library*, 1952, I, 298 ff.).

(b) In earlier times men almost always swore by the gods (Xen., *Anab.* 6, 6, 17). Plutarch describes in his *Life of Dio* (56) the undertaking of a "great oath": "They required of him the great oath. He who would take it enters the sanctuary of Demeter and Persephone; after sacred ceremonies he puts on the goddess's purple mantle and, taking a blazing torch in his hand, pronounces the words of the oath." In the Hellenistic-Roman period, oaths by deities were supplemented or replaced by those involving kings or emperors: they involved either the person or the entire dynasty of the ruler of the day. It was the custom among the Romans for the one who took the oath to take a stone in his hand and ask that he might be hurled forth like this stone if he broke his word. Jupiter Lapis was the god of oaths in dealings between different peoples.

(c) The increasing frequency of the making of oaths led to a decline in their power and authority. Hence, we early find a tendency to limit or abolish oaths in Greece. Rhadamanthys was the first to try to limit the everyday use of oaths and to make their misuse punishable (cf. Plato, *Ap.* 22a). Sophocles wrote: "I do not wish to bind you by an oath as I would a base man. [Theseus] You would have won no more indeed than with my word! The love of Delphic Apollo enjoins: 'Use no oaths!' " (*OC* 650). The Pythagoreans also forbad their disciples to use oaths. Plutarch declares that an oath, being a constraint upon the spirit of a free man, was an indignity (*Quaestiones Romanae* 44). The Stoic Epictetus shared the same view (*Enchiridion* 33, 5), and his disciple, Marcus Aurelius, wrote: "You must always be able to do without the swearing of oaths and the calling up of witnesses" (*Meditationes* 3, 5). However, these efforts to abolish oaths met with no success in Greece.

OT 1. The LXX usually translates the niph. of *šāḇa'* by *omnyō*, and the hiph. by *horkizō*. The original meaning of *šāḇa'* is to come under the influence of seven things (cf. *šeḇa'*, seven). Gen. 21:20 f. provides evidence that in early times an oath was ratified by the sacrifice of seven animals (cf. Gen. 15:10). *horkos* corresponds to the Heb. *šᵉḇû'âh*, oath, and occasionally to *'ālâh*, → curse, act of cursing, or, words of a curse (Prov. 29:24). The terms are found chiefly in narrative books, *horkos* often and *omnyō* principally in Gen. and Deut.

2. (a) A very ancient form of oath is the practice of calling Yahweh to witness between two partners: "God is witness between you and me" (Gen. 31:50; cf. 1 Sam. 20:12). Special weight is given to an oath by the similarly ancient practice of invoking a curse on oneself if the oath is broken: "The LORD do so to me, and more also, if . . ." (1 Sam. 20:13). The most frequent form is the phrase, "As the LORD lives" (Jdg. 8:19; 1 Sam. 20:3); this may be varied into an oath by the life of the king (1 Sam. 17:55) or of the person addressed (1 Sam. 1:26; 20:4).

(b) In treaties (between Abraham and Abimelech, Gen. 21:23; Jacob and Laban, Gen. 31:50), and bequests by father to son (Jacob and Joseph, Gen. 47:31), the oath had its original promissory function: the partners placed themselves under the power and judgment of Yahweh, who was invoked and recognized as witness for the validity of the promise. Thus the OT oath originally contained by implication a confession of faith in Yahweh (Deut. 6:13; 10:20). To swear falsely is tantamount to a

misuse of Yahweh's → name (Exod. 20:7; Lev. 19:12). The OT does not know the assertive oath of a witness before a lawcourt; instead it has the so-called oath of purification in which the accused, in the absence of pertinent witnesses, asserts his innocence before Yahweh and corroborates this with curses upon himself if he is guilty of perjury (Num. 5:11–28). Since perjury can rarely be detected by man (in which case, Lev. 5:3–6 would apply), the person guilty of it is generally assigned to the judgment of God (1 Ki. 8:31 f.).

(c) Whereas in Gen. we read chiefly of oaths taken by men, Deut. speaks primarily of Yahweh's oath. Yahweh swears by himself, and the form of oath is: "As I live . . ." (Num. 14:21; cf. Gen. 22:16; Amos 6:8). Yahweh guarantees with an oath the truth of his word, so that his oath is tantamount to a corroboration of his → promise. He has sworn the land of Canaan to the patriarchs (Deut. 1:8; 6:10, 18, 23), and sealed with an oath the → covenant he made with the fathers of Israel (Deut. 4:31; 7:8, 12; 29:12 ff.). The basic elements contained in Yahweh's promises to the patriarchs in Gen., viz. the people (Gen. 12:2), the land (Gen. 13:15), and the covenant (Gen. 17:7), are taken up again in the exhortations of Deut. and their validity reinforced by references to Yahweh's oath (Deut. 8:1, the land; Deut. 8:18, the covenant).

(d) Yahweh's oath can also, however, take the form of a → curse, with which he punishes the disobedience of his people. Thus the grumbling Israelites will die in the wilderness (Num. 14:21, 28; Deut. 1:34 f.; 2:14); Moses will not enter the promised land (Deut. 4:21); the guilt of Eli will not be expiated (1 Sam. 3:14). The double-sided nature of Yahweh's oath, serving as it does both as corroboration of his promise and curse of disobedience, corresponds in fact to the structure of → blessing and → curse (cf. Deut. 28; 30:19).

3. In rabbinic Judaism the practice of oath-taking was widespread. The following types of oath may be distinguished: (a) corroborative oath; (b) oath of testimony; (c) oath under pledge (oath of purification); (d) judge's oath; (e) rabbinical oath; and (f) perjurious oath (cf. J. Schneider, *TDNT* V 461; SB I 321 ff.). As in Hellenism, there were efforts to limit the excessive use of oaths (Sir. 23:9 ff.). Philo, like the Stoics, advocates the abolition of oaths (*Spec. Leg.* 2, 2–38). In his opinion it is best not to swear, second best to swear truly, but the worst thing of all is to commit perjury (*Decal.* 84–93; cf. J. Schneider, *TDNT* V 179). The most radical rejection of oath-taking is found among the Essenes, who instead prized the plain word very highly (cf. Josephus, *War* 2, 8, 6; cf. also CD 9:1–10:3 which, commenting on 1 Sam. 25:26, allows the oath of cursing to be demanded only by judges). But the Essenes had oaths of initiation (Josephus, *War* 2, 8, 7; CD 15:5; 1QS 5:7–11).

NT The NT generally uses *omnyō* in references to swearing; less frequently *horkos*, and on two occasions only, *horkizō*. Words of this group occur here and there in various books; only in Matt. and Heb. do they appear more frequently.

1. (a) Matthew has handed down to us, in the fourth antithesis of the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. 5:33–37), the decisive pronouncement of Jesus on oaths. It is joined (v. 33) to the OT prohibition of perjury (Lev. 19:12), and the commandment to keep one's vows (Num. 30:3 f.; Deut. 23:23). In contrast, Jesus pronounces a total prohibition: *mē omosai holōs*, "you shall not swear at all" (v. 34). In order to exclude any misunderstanding that might water the teaching down, four explanatory phrases

are added to give sharpness and clarity: neither by heaven, earth, Jerusalem nor one's own head is one permitted to swear (vv. 34–36). This constitutes an attack on the contemporary Jewish practice of oath-taking, in which the attempt was made to avoid the misuse of God's name in the numerous oaths which were taken each day, by means of circumlocution. According to D. Hill, heaven is not the Jewish periphrasis for the divine name but stands here for the heavenly world (*The Gospel of Matthew, New Century Bible*, 1972, 126). In the Mishnah, swearing by the heavens and the earth is not binding upon witnesses (Shebuoth 6:13). Such an oath would be thus ambiguous and indeed a contradiction in terms. V. 34 contains an allusion to Isa. 66:1: "Heaven is my throne and the earth is my footstool." In v. 35 "by Jerusalem" means "towards Jerusalem", and may reflect the rabbinic view that a vow made "by Jerusalem" is nothing unless it is sworn towards Jerusalem, i.e. while facing in the direction of Jerusalem (Tosefta Nedarim 1). The rest of the phrase refers to Ps. 48(47):2. An oath "by the life of thy head" is referred to in Mishnah Sanhedrin 3:2. Although it might be thought that a man has power over his head (i.e. over the colour of his hair), it is not so. This is determined by God. What was not realized here was that, in invoking other authorities, one still had God to reckon with, as the Lord of all of them. The third woe (Matt. 23:16–22) attacks with like severity the casuistic attitude to oaths and vows of the scribes and Pharisees. He who swears by the altar, the temple, or heaven, includes in his oath him who has given these things their authority, namely God. In this way the hair-splitting rules governing the Jewish practice of oath-taking are reduced to absurdity. With these explanations, it is impossible to be in any doubt about the universal validity of Jesus' prohibition: Jesus forbids every oath, whether it is made in the religious sphere, in court, in everyday life, or in private. For the oath adds nothing to the simple affirmation or negation. "Let what you say be simply 'Yes' or 'No'; anything more than this comes from evil" (Matt. 5:37).

(b) In view of the freedom with which oath-taking is presupposed and practised in the OT, the question arises as to the purpose and meaning of Jesus' radical prohibition of swearing. An oath demands complete truthfulness in what a man says, and thus presupposes lying (→ Lie) in everyday human speech. The OT uses the oath to fight the lie. Lying, however, creeps even into the taking of oaths, in the form of perjury and the misuse of God's name, as the casual practice of the Hellenistic period and of rabbinic Judaism demonstrates. Jesus therefore uses a prohibition of swearing in order to fight against lying. His aim in this is stated in the last sentence of the antithesis: "Let what you say be simply 'Yes' or 'No' " (Matt. 5:37; cf. also Jas. 5:12). He replaces swearing by a simple "yes" and "no" without invocation of God's name. As a result the disciple is by no means released from responsibility before God. On the contrary, not only isolated statements, but the whole speech of the Christian takes place in the presence of the all-knowing God. Each of his words is to be nothing but truth, so that none needs to be confirmed by an oath. An oath casts a shadow of doubtfulness over all his other words: therefore it is "from the evil one". The disciple, however, is called to be "a light even in his words" (D. Bonhoeffer, *The Cost of Discipleship*, 1959^6, 123).

The aims of Jesus in forbidding oaths is not to substitute a secular form of words (yes or no) for a religious one, but to insist on absolute truthfulness in every word of man. The fourth antithesis, which opposes Jewish practice, but not the intention of

the OT, is to be understood not as a law of the letter, but a law to be obeyed in spirit. If the truth is going to be obscured by refusal to take an oath, it will be necessary to decide in favour of taking an oath, as in the OT, for the truth's sake. The radical nature of Jesus' prohibition aims at bringing about complete truthfulness in human speech.

(c) The words of Jesus are frequently introduced by the formula, "Truly [*amēn*; → Amen] I say to you" (Matt. 5:18), or in the antitheses of the Sermon on the Mount, "But I [*egō de*] say to you" (Matt. 5:22, 28, 32, 34, 39, 44). These are not forms of oath, but rather the underlining of Jesus' words by the authority of his person (*egō*, → I). He is the truth (cf. Jn. 14:6), and his words are therefore true (*amēn*). "For all the promises of God find their Yes in him. That is why we utter the Amen through him, to the glory of God" (2 Cor. 1:20). Before the Sanhedrin Jesus was pressed to state on oath that he was the Son of God (Matt. 26:63 f.). Jesus refused the oath, and simply affirmed what the high priest has asked with the words: "You have said so", which is equivalent to the confession: "Yes, I am the Son of God".

(d) Matt. 14:7 par. Mk. 6:23 provides an example of the rash practice of oath-taking. Herod, intoxicated at his birthday feast, casually swore to grant whatever his step-daughter might ask. The mother, Herodias, took the opportunity to demand the head of John the Baptist who had been imprisoned by Herod for denouncing Herod's liaison with her. In the denial scene, Peter maintained that he did not know Jesus, and corroborated this lie with an oath and curses on himself (Matt. 26:74, par. Mk. 14:71; cf. Lk. 22:60). H. Merkel suggests that Peter may even have cursed Jesus ("Peter's Curse", in E. Bammel, ed., *The Trial of Jesus. Cambridge Studies in Honour of C. F. D. Moule*, *SBT* Second Series 13, 1970, 66–71).

2. No forms of oath are found in Paul's writings. Instead he used asseverations to underline the sincerity of his words. Particularly in his battle for the churches in Galatia and Corinth, he calls God to witness for the truth of his life story (Gal. 1:20), his actions (2 Cor. 1:23), and his gospel (Rom. 1:9). To put beyond all doubt his concern for his own nation (lest it be misunderstood as anti-Jewish polemics), he asserts (Rom. 9:1): "I am speaking the truth in Christ. I am not lying; my conscience bears me witness in the Holy Spirit." Attacked by his opponents, the apostle calls God to witness to his truthfulness.

3. As in the OT, so in the NT we read of God's oath. In Lk. 1:73; Heb. 6:13; and Acts 2:30, the oath of God means no more than his → promises given to → Abraham and → David. Hebrews even carries over the negative divine oath, God's → curse upon the disobedient Israelites in the → wilderness (Heb. 3:11, 18; 4:3; cf. Num. 14:21–23; Deut. 1:34), in order to add a warning exhortation to obedience and zeal for the promised → rest of the people of God (Heb. 4:9–11). Heb. 6:16 f. alludes to the practice of oath-taking, in order to contrast human oaths by someone or something greater, with God's plain oath by himself. Heb. 7:20–22 (*horkōmosia*) goes still further, drawing a distinction between God's plain word and his word under oath. In contrast to the appointment of → Levitical priests, which is made without an oath, Heb. uses God's oath in Ps. 110:4 to demonstrate confidently that Christ's priesthood is better, and unchangeable. Rev. 10:6 mentions, in an echo of Dan. 12:5–7, an angel who announces the end with an oath.

4. Jesus rejected oath-taking completely, Peter committed perjury, Paul used asseverations, and Hebrews speaks of God's oaths of promise and cursing. All this

must be interpreted by reference to the demand for unconditional truthfulness. "The cross is God's truth about us, and therefore it is the only power which can make us truthful. When we know the cross we are no longer afraid of the truth. We need no more oaths to confirm the truth of our utterances, for we live in the perfect truth of God" (D. Bonhoeffer, op. cit., 125). *H.-G. Link*

→ Blessing, → Covenant, → Curse, → Promise, → Revile, → Truth

(a). S. Blank, "The Curse, Blasphemy, the Spell and the Oath", *Hebrew Union College Annual* 23, 1950–51, 73–95; D. Bonhoeffer, *The Cost of Discipleship*, 1959[6]; 122–25; H. C. Brichto, *The Problem of Curse in the Hebrew Bible*, 1963; A. E. Crawley, E. Beet, M. A. Canney, "Oath", *ERE* IX 430–38; D. Daube, *Studies in Biblical Law*, 1947; M. Greenberg, "The Hebrew Oath Particle *Ḥay/Ḥē*", *JBL* 76, 1957, 34–39; T. M. Gregory, "Oath", *ZPEB* IV 476–79; C. H. W. Johns, *The Relation between the Laws of Babylonia and the Laws of the Hebrew People*, 1914; M. G. Kline, "Oath and Ordeal Signs", *WTJ* 27, 1965, 115–39; ibid. 28, 1965, 1–37; G. van der Leeuw, *Religion in its Essence and Manifestation*, 1964[2], §59; S. A. B. Mercer, *The Oath in Babylonian and Assyrian Literature*, 1912; H. Merkel, "Peter's Curse", E. Bammel, ed., *The Trial of Jesus. Cambridge Studies in Honour of C. F. D. Moule, SBT* Second Series 13, 1970, 66–71; M. H. Pope, "Oaths", *IDB* III 575 ff.; V. Rogers, "The Use of *r'š* in an Oath", *JBL* 74, 1955, 272 f.; J. Schneider, *omnyō*, *TDNT* V 176–85; and *horkos* etc., *TDNT* V 457–67; J. E. Tyler, *Oaths: Their Origin, Nature and History*, 1835. H. L. White, "The Divine Oath in Genesis", *JBL* 92, 1973, 165–79.

(b). O. Bauernfeind, *Eid und Frieden, Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Geistesgeschichte* Neue Folge 2, 1956; H. Bethke, ed., *Eid, Gewissen, Treuepflicht, Antworten* 8, 1965; A. Gerlach-Praetorius, *Der Kirche vor der Eidesfrage. Die Diskussion um den Pfarrereid im "Dritten Reich", Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Kirchenkampfes* 18, 1967; J. Hempel, "Die israelitischen Anschauungen von Segen und Fluch im Lichte der altorientalischen Parallelen", *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 4, 1925, 20 ff.; M. Honecker, "Der Eid in einer säkularisierten Gesellschaft", *EvKomm* 2, 1969, 569 ff.; F. Horst, "Der Eid im Alten Testament", *EvTh* 17, 1957, 366 ff. (reprinted in *Gottes Recht, ThB* 12, 1961, 292 ff.); C. A. Keller, *šb'*, *THAT* II 855–63; W. Luther, *"Wahrheit" und "Lüge" im ältesten Griechentum*, 1935; S. Morenz et al., "Eid", *RGG*[3] II 347 ff.; G. Niemeier, ed., *Ich schwöre. Theologische und juristische Studien zur Eidesfrage*, 1968; J. Pedersen, *Der Eid bei den Semiten*, 1914; J. Scharbert, " 'Fluchen' und 'Segen' im Alten Testament", *Biblica* 29, 1958, 1–26; E. Seidl, *Der Eid im römisch-ägyptischen Provinzialrecht*, I–II, 1933–35; G. Stählin, "Zum Gebrauch von Beteuerungsformeln im Neuen Testament", *NovT* 5, 1962, 115 ff.; H. Strathmann, "Eid", *EKL* I 1027 ff.; G. Wehmeier, *Der Segen im Alten Testament*, 1970; E. Ziebarth, "Eid", Pauly-Wissowa, V, 2075–83.

T

Take, Receive

The process of taking can be understood actively in the sense of taking possession of, passively in the sense of taking delivery. The two Gk. vbs. *lambanō* and *dechomai* correspond to these two operational directions. *lambanō* stresses primarily the active aspect of getting hold of, whereas *dechomai* emphasizes more the passive attitude of receiving. The meanings of the numerous compounds formed from both vbs. are frequently assimilated to one another, as are the meanings of the root words in figurative senses and contexts, and they are occasionally used synonymously. Both word-groups have a special significance in the NT through expressing particularly the complementary movements of faith in appropriation and acceptance.

δέχομαι

δέχομαι (*dechomai*), take, receive, accept; *δεκτός* (*dektos*), acceptable, welcome, agreeable, favourable; *ἀποδέχομαι* (*apodechomai*), admit; *ἀποδοχή* (*apodochē*), acceptance, approval; *ἀπόδεκτος* (*apodektos*), acceptable, pleasing; *εὐπρόσδεκτος* (*euprosdektos*), acceptable, pleasant, welcome; *προσδέχομαι* (*prosdechomai*), take up, receive, welcome, wait for, expect; *δοχή* (*dochē*), reception, banquet; *εἰσδέχομαι* (*eisdechomai*), take in, receive, welcome.

CL 1. *dechomai* is used from Homer onwards, and is cognate with Lat. *dexter*, (on) the right hand. Its basic meaning is accept or receive (Homer, *Il.* 23, 647). Letters, presents, and offerings etc. are the principal objects. It can also be used more specifically in the sense of to receive words, i.e. to hear, understand (*logon dechesthai*, Eur., *Medea* 924), and to accept persons, i.e. offer hospitality (Xen., *Oec.* 5, 8). Man is generally the subject, who is able to accept things increasingly even to the point of enduring blows of fate (Homer, *Il.* 18, 115). More rarely the subject, in a religious context, is the godhead who receives sacrifices and prayers (Homer, *Il.* 2, 240). The corresponding noun *dochē* means primarily a receptacle (Eur. and Plato), and then, figuratively, reception of people, a meal for guests (Plut.). The accompanying verbal adj. *dektos* (unattested before the NT) or *dekteos* (first used by Lucian) indicates, lit., that which one can accept, and then, generally, agreeable, welcome, favourable (cf. in the NT Lk. 4:19; 2 Cor. 6:2).

2. (a) The compound *apodechomai*, similarly attested since Homer, strengthens the positive significance of the simple vb. in the sense of welcoming, approving, agreeing, valuing (Polyb., 21, 35, 5; Philo, *Abr.* 90; Josephus, *Ant.* 9, 176). The common Hellenistic noun *apodochē* correspondingly means acceptance, approbation, approval (Polyb. 1, 5, 5; Josephus, *Ant.* 6, 347; cf. in the NT 1 Tim. 1:15; 4:9). The

verbal adj. *apodektos* (as in Plut. *Mor.* 1061a; cf. 1 Tim. 2:3; 5:4 in the NT) has a similar meaning to *dektos*, viz. acceptable, agreeable, pleasing.

(b) *prosdechomai* (used since Homer) refers either to persons, meaning to admit someone to a place or into a community (Plato, *Leg.* 4, 708a; Josephus, *Ant.* 14, 285); or to things meaning to accept something (Xen., *Hell.* 7, 4, 2; and especially in the LXX). Further, as with *ek-* or *apekdechomai*, it has the meaning of to expect, or wait for (Eur., *Alcestis* 130; Soph., *Phil.* 123; cf. in this eschatological context the discussion of the compounds in → Hope, art. *apokaradokia*).

OT In the LXX the word-group occurs chiefly in prophetic, cultic, Wisdom and Apocryphal literature. *dechomai* is a rendering frequently of Heb. *lāqaḥ*, take, (cf. also → *lambanō*); *eisdechomai* generally renders *qāḇaṣ*, gather, collect; *prosdechomai* predominantly renders *rāṣâh*, be pleased; *dektos* nearly always renders *rāṣôn*, goodwill; and *dochē* (right up to Dan. 5:1 LXX) always renders *mišteh*, meal for guests, feast.

1. (a) Apart from everyday usage (e.g. Gen. 33:10, accept gifts), *dechomai* denotes primarily the readiness to receive and accept the divine word (Deut. 33:3; Jer. 9:20) and action (e.g. *paideia*, discipline, correction, Zeph. 3:7). In Jer. and Zeph. it occurs in the negative declarations of judicial prosecution: Israel has not accepted Yahweh's correction (Jer. 2:30; 5:3; 7:28; Zeph. 3:2) and will therefore have to endure the divine → judgment (Jer. 25:28, the picture of the cup of wrath; cf. Hos. 4:11). *dechomai* thus obtains the further meaning of involuntary and necessary submission to disaster.

(b) *eisdechomai*, on the other hand, is found largely in prophetic announcements of salvation. Yahweh will again gather his outcast and scattered people and thus receive them again into fellowship with him (Hos. 8:10; Mic. 4:6; Jer. 23:3; Ezek. 20:34; Zeph. 3:19 f.; cf. 2 Cor. 6:17).

2. Occasionally *dechomai*, *prosdechomai* and *dektos* also occur in cultic priestly passages. The formulations *ou (pros-)dechthēsetai/(pros-)dechthēsetai* or alternatively *ou dekton/dekton* are the LXX translations of the so-called declaratory formulae: "it is not acceptable." By this means the priests made known the acceptance or rejection of an offering for Yahweh (Lev. 22:19–25). Yahweh is here represented as the receiver of the offering; but the decision, concerning the acceptance or rejection or repudiation of the gifts, in the mouth of the priest equally embraces a divine judgment as to whether the man who is bringing his offering is acceptable to Yahweh or not (cf. the pass. constructions in the LXX; see G. von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, I, 1962, 260 f.; → Sacrifice).

3. In the Wisdom literature *dechomai* characterizes the intellectually and existentially open and receptive life of the pious man: the wise man accepts the words of wisdom (Prov. 4:10); he heeds commandments (Prov. 10:8); he accepts discipline (Prov. 16:17) and receives insight (Prov. 21:11). The word *dektos*, continuing the prophetic critique of → sacrifice (cf. Jer. 6:20), gains a non-cultic and ethical stamp in the Wisdom literature: "To do good is the beginning of the right way; that is more acceptable to God than to present sacrifices" (Prov. 16:7 LXX; cf. 15:8, 28 LXX [29]; Sir. 2:5; 3:17).

NT In the NT the *dechomai* word-group is found chiefly in the Synoptic Gospels

(especially in Lk.) and in Paul who also uses the compounds frequently.

1. As in the whole ancient world, and particularly in Judaism, so in the NT hospitality plays a large rôle. Because of their wandering existence Jesus, Paul and the other apostles were very dependent on it. Lk. mentions from time to time the friendly reception which Jesus and Paul met with amongst the people and in the congregations (Lk. 8:40; Acts 18:27; 21:17, *apodechomai*), just as Jesus and Paul willingly accepted those who approached them (Lk. 8:11; Acts 28:30). Paul thanks his congregations for their hospitality (Gal. 4:14; 2 Cor. 7:15) and exhorts them to be ready to accept others as well (Col. 4:10). Being a Christian includes exhibiting this kind of humanitarianism.

2. (a) Acceptance of disciples and apostles is not however simply a matter of an unwritten humanitarian law. On the contrary, the messenger of Jesus represents his message and person: "He who receives you receives me, and he who receives me receives him that sent me" (Matt. 10:40; cf. Lk. 9:48; 10:16; Jn. 13:20). The apostles' continuation of Jesus' mission (cf. *TDNT* I 414; II 53 for the background of the office of the Shaliach [*šālîaḥ*]) means that the hospitality they are offered stands for acceptance of Jesus and therefore acceptance of God.

But Christ does not only meet men in his messengers, he also confronts his church *incognito* in every unfortunate man in need of help: "Whoever receives one such child in my name receives me" (Mk. 9:37 par. Matt. 18:5; Lk. 9:48). God is to be accepted in the non-religious secular sphere of everyday life.

(b) It corresponds with this that *dektos*, *apodektos* and *euprosdektos* have lost their cultic content, as was already the case in the Wisdom literature. The offering that is pleasing to God now is the → sacrifice of the individual life for daily service in the world (Phil. 4:18; Rom. 12:1; 15:16). *apodektos* is used in 1 Tim. 2:3 and 5:4 to express what is acceptable to God: intercession for rulers who also come within the scope of God's salvation and the duty of children to parents. *dektos* occurs in Lk. 4:19 (cf. Isa. 41:2); Lk. 4:24; Acts 10:35; 2 Cor. 6:2 (cf. Isa. 49:8); and Phil. 4:18. *euprosdektos* is found at Rom. 15:16, 31; 2 Cor. 6:2; 8:12; 1 Pet. 2:5.

3. In the early Christian communities the phrase *ton logon dechesthai*, to receive the word, became a technical term for the believing acceptance of the → gospel (Lk. 8:13; Acts 8:14; 11:1; 17:11; 1 Thess. 1:6; 2:13). *dechesthai* is also linked with *basileia tou theou*, the → kingdom of God (Mk. 10:15 par. Lk. 18:17), *euangelion*, gospel (2 Cor. 11:4), *charis*, → grace (2 Cor. 6:1; cf. Rom. 5:17, where *lambanō* is used), and *agapē tēs alētheias*, love of the → truth (2 Thess. 2:10). The parallelism or synonymity of believing and receiving is evident from Acts 2:41, where the Western text D replaces *apodexamenoi* by *pisteusantes*. Faith is nothing but the affirmative acceptance of God's rule, as a child accepts a gift (Mk. 10:15 par. Lk. 18:17; cf. Matt. 18:3).

4. The Hellenistic word *apodochē* occurs only in a kerygmatic formula in 1 Tim. 1:15a: "The saying is sure and worthy of full acceptance that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners" (cf. also 1 Tim. 4:9). There remains the application of Isa. 61:2 in Lk. 4:19: with the coming of Jesus the "acceptable" (*dektos*) time of salvation has begun (cf. 2 Cor. 6:2; cf. above 2 (b)).

H.-G. Link

λαμβάνω

λαμβάνω (*lambanō*), take, receive; ἀναλαμβάνω (*analambanō*), take up, take to oneself; ἀνάλημψις (*analēmpsis*), reception; ἐπιλαμβάνομαι (*epilambanomai*), lay hold of, grasp, catch; καταλαμβάνω (*katalambanō*), seize, grasp, attain, make one's own, take possession; μεταλαμβάνω (*metalambanō*), receive a share; μετάλημψις (*metalēmpsis*), sharing, receiving; παραλαμβάνω (*paralambanō*), take to oneself, take with or along, take over; προλαμβάνω (*prolambanō*), anticipate, take, get; προσλαμβάνω (*proslambanō*), take, receive or accept into one's society; πρόσλημψις (*proslēmpsis*), admission, acceptance; ὑπολαμβάνω (*hypolambanō*), take up, think, assume, be of the opinion that; ἀπολαμβάνω (*apolambanō*), receive, get back.

CL 1. *lambanō*, originally grasp, seize, is attested since Homer.

(a) It means to take or grasp. It can indicate both benevolent and hostile actions, and have as object either people or things; e.g. take a wife, collect taxes, accept a verdict, take a road, and fig. take courage. It is used with a material subject, as when, for example, fear or terror seizes men. *lambanō* may serve to enliven the style when used pleonastically.

(b) *lambanō* also means to receive, regularly with acc. of the thing; used to embrace all areas of life from simple things to spiritual benefit.

2. The compounds strengthen or enlarge the basic meaning. *analambanō* means receive up (on) high, to receive to oneself; the corresponding noun being *analēmpsis*, lifting or taking up. *hypolambanō* means take up from below; then take hold, take up, and finally mentally to apprehend, believe, hold an opinion. *epilambanō* means to lay hold of, occupy, and also assist; mid. obtain for oneself, hold firm, seize. *katalambanō* strengthens the original intention, meaning to seize, take a firm grip, attack; mid. seize for oneself; mental apprehension is basically appropriation and understanding. *metalambanō* takes the partitive gen. of the thing, and means to gain a share, get, receive; *metalēmpsis* denotes participation, acceptance. In *prolambanō* the temporal significance of *pro* is dominant; it means take in advance, forestall. *proslambanō* allows a slight reminder of the prepositional *pros*, and means to take in addition, draw in; mid. take aside, admit. The corresponding noun is *proslēmpsis*, admission, acceptance. *paralambanō* stands with the acc. of person or thing, and means to draw someone to oneself, take over an office or a thing.

OT 1. In secular speech *lambanō* and its compounds are widely attested.

In the LXX (chiefly for the Heb. *lāqaḥ*, and more rarely *nāśā'*) the act. meaning of take dominates: e.g. take the sword (Gen. 34:25), take a wife (Gen. 4:19). It has a material subject in Exod. 15:15: "trembling seizes them." The pass. meaning of receive is rarer: e.g. receive presents, take bribes (1 Sam. 8:3), receive an office or reward (Ps. 109[108]:8; Prov. 11:21).

2. The following compounds may be mentioned. *analambanō* is used regularly in the LXX with personal or material objects. It is theologically significant in the aorist pass. for the translation of Enoch (Sir. 49:14) and of Elijah (2 Ki. 2:11; Sir. 48:9; 1 Macc. 2:58). The LXX uses *epilambanō* in its basic meaning of holding or taking hold in 2 Sam. 13:11; Isa. 3:6; Jer. 31:32; Zech. 14:13. *katalambanō* is used in the LXX to describe God's holding grip, and men's. God's → hand takes hold of the world (Isa. 10:14). He traps men (Job 5:13), and comprehends the incomprehensible

(Job 34:24). Man asks how he is to conceive of God and lay hold of his righteousness and wisdom, i.e. make it his possession (Sir. 15:1; 27:8). The powers of destruction also clutch at man and attack him (Gen. 19:19; Num. 32:33). *proslambanō* (act. form only in Wis. 17:10) denotes the way in which God draws his people or elect out of danger and destitution to himself (Pss. 18[17]:17; 27[26]:10; 65[64]:5; 73[72]:24; 1 Sam. 12:12).

3. *paralambanō* has a distinct meaning in Hellenism and in Judaism. It means to receive, and indicates the way one takes over a tradition, whether it is the teaching and training of a philosopher, or the mysteries and rites of the mystery religions. In Judaism, tradition limited itself to the Torah and its exegesis (cf. Mk. 7:4). The technical term for the receiving of tradition is *qibbēl*. The rabbis, too, passed on certain subject matter in teaching (cf. SB I 579; Ḥagigah 2:1) under conditions of strict secrecy in order to prevent misunderstandings amongst the religiously impure.

NT 1. In the NT *lambanō* is attested 258 times; it is found to a conspicuous degree in Matt. (53 times), John (46 times) and Rev. (23 times), whereas the whole Pauline corpus contains only 34 occurrences of the word.

(a) *lambanō* has a broad range of meaning: to take (in the more active sense), e.g. bread, lamps, the tithe, and (fig.) to take one's cross upon oneself (Matt. 10:38), or take the form of a servant (Phil. 2:7). It also means to remove or take possession of, e.g. remove money (Matt. 28:15), diseases (Matt. 8:17, cf. Isa. 53:4), a crown (Rev. 3:11), peace from the earth (Rev. 6:4). In a theological context Jesus has the power to take his life back again (Jn. 10:18). The enemy also has the ability to attack people's lives (cf. Matt. 21:35 ff. in context) or to seize the sick (Lk. 9:39). Emotions take control of men (Lk. 5:26; 7:16). Further, *lambanō* has the sense of admit: to admit someone into the house; with a personal object, the important sense of receiving Jesus (Jn. 1:12; 5:43; 13:20), and, connected with that, receiving his words (Jn. 12:48; 17:8; Mk. 4:16).

(b) Secondly, *lambanō* means to receive (in the more passive sense): e.g. a bite, money, alms. It is important with theological objects: eternal life (Mk. 10:30), the Spirit (Jn. 7:39), grace (Rom. 1:5), condemnation (Mk. 12:40), forgiveness (Acts 10:43), mercy (Heb. 4:16). Finally *lambanō* is used as a circumlocution for the pass.; e.g. receive edification, be edified (1 Cor. 14:5).

(c) *lambanō* is theologically significant in its meaning of receive. It corresponds with God's giving (*didonai*): God gives – man receives.

(i) Jesus himself lives by receiving: he has received his commission, the Spirit, power (Jn. 10:18; Acts 2:33; Rev. 2:28). He is the gift of God and lives by receiving. In taking the form of a servant (Phil. 2:7) and taking away our infirmities (cf. Matt. 8:17 with reference to Isa. 53), he takes upon himself the death of a sinner and fulfils the commission which he has received from the Father (Jn. 10:18). So too in resurrection and exaltation: the crucified One is worthy to receive "power and wealth and wisdom and might and honour and glory and blessing" (Rev. 5:12). Even the exalted One remains the receiving One.

(ii) Only when a man receives, does he find himself and stand within the God-given order and plan which Jesus Christ reveals. For the man who hears the witness of Jesus, the acceptance of that word decides over life and death. At this point, Jn. distinguishes the various objects which are received, accepted or laid hold of. He who

receives the *martyria*, the witness of Jesus, sets his seal to this "that God is true" (Jn. 3:33). By his acceptance of the word he attests the truth of God and lives by it. He who accepts the *rhēmata*, the words, of Jesus gains knowledge of the word of revelation: Jesus comes from God and receives his life from God (Jn. 17:8; cf. 1 Cor. 2:12). So Jesus himself, who is the *rhēma theou*, the Word of God, can become the object of believing acceptance. Whoever receives him has a share of his inexhaustible grace and receives the Holy Spirit (Jn. 1:16; 7:39; 20:22). Whoever does not accept him, i.e. does not recognize or acknowledge him, has a judge (Jn. 12:48). That same word of Jesus will be his judge on the last day.

(iii) For Paul *lambanō* means sharing in the fulfilment of the promise in Christ (Gal. 3:14), receiving the Spirit (Rom. 8:15), receiving grace and the gift of righteousness (Rom. 5:17), just as he himself received his apostleship as an especial token of God's grace (Rom. 1:5). Though poor in God's sight, the man who receives is exceedingly rich (1 Cor. 4:7); for when he accepts, he receives eschatological salvation, fellowship with Christ and life in the future world (Phil. 3:12 ff.).

2. The compounds *analambanō* and *hypolambanō* develop the aspect of taking up.

(a) *analambanō* means to take with or take up, to bring, or take someone on board (2 Tim. 4:11; Acts 20:13 f.). Used fig. in Eph. 6:13 – "take up the whole armour of God" – it is a powerful picture of the active fight of the believer against the powers of darkness (cf. also v. 16; → War). *analambanō* in the aorist pass. is used of the ascension of the resurrected One, which is attested in the concise formula, he "was taken up" (*analēmphtheis*, Acts 1:11; *anelēmphthē*, Acts 1:2, 22; 1 Tim. 3:16). The goal of the taking up is heaven, the sphere of God's glory (1 Tim. 3:16). There is a similarly brief formulation of the ascension of Christ without any indication of place in the longer ending of Mk. which describes the status of the risen Christ who is seated at the right hand of God (Mk. 16:19; → Hand, art. *dexia*). The vb. also occurs at Acts 7:43; 10:16; 20:13 f., 23:31; 2 Tim. 4:11.

analēmpsis, lifting up high, being taken up, is found in the NT only in Lk. 9:51 and is generally interpreted of Christ's ascension, but *analēmpsis* can also mean death, decease (Arndt, 56; cf. intertestamental literature, e.g. Pss. Sol. 4, 18). Both are implicated in the NT expectation of Jesus' death, since the death includes the exaltation of the Lord.

(b) *hypolambanō* occurs 5 times in the NT. Acts 1:9: "a cloud took him out of their sight." This taking suggests a taking upwards from below, lifting up in the sense of hiding or carrying away. 3 Jn. 8 exhorts that strangers are to be taken up, i.e. hospitably welcomed and cared for. When extended to mental processes *hypolambanō* approximates to the Eng. "to pick up someone's words" (Lk. 10:30). It can also express supposition: "These men are not drunk, as you imagine" (Acts 2:15 NEB; cf. Lk. 7:43).

3. The compounds *epilambanō* and *katalambanō* intensify the original meaning of the word and mean seize.

(a) *epilambanō* denotes both violent apprehension and trustful holding of the hand. Paul is seized by his opponents (Acts 17:19; cf. 9:27; 16:19; 18:17; 21:30, 33; 23:19; Lk. 23:26). Fig. *epilambanō* means to catch somebody out in their speech; thus Jesus' opponents attempted to catch him out in his words (Lk. 20:20). Jesus himself touched the blind, the children, the man with dropsy (Mk. 8:23; Lk. 9:47;

14:4), and stretched out his hand to Peter as he began to sink (Matt. 14:31) in order to help him. In the Synoptics the use of *epilambanō* is pointed and striking: it denotes both the scheming behaviour of Jesus' opponents and also the love of the Lord as he turns to give help to the sick and lost.

Paul finds *epilambanō* the right word for characterizing the movement of faith. It is directed to eternal life: "take hold of eternal life" (1 Tim. 6:12). *epi* states the goal; *lambanō* denotes the intensity of the act of faith. It also occurs at Heb. 2:16; 8:9. *anepilēmptos* means irreproachable (1 Tim. 3:2; 5:7) and is a qualification for bishops and church members in their care of widows.

(b) *katalambanō* is used in the NT to designate the attack of evil powers, and also the grip of Christ on men. The lad with epilepsy was attacked by a dumb spirit and dashed to the ground (Mk. 9:18). The → darkness which has not "received" the → light, i.e. has neither accepted nor comprehended Christ (Jn. 1:5, cf. v. 11), overtakes men when they do not have Christ (Jn. 12:35). Paul warns his readers against a false reliance on their faith, since the Day of the Lord will "surprise you like a thief" (1 Thess. 5:4). On the positive side, *katalambanō* marks the hold of Christ on a believer. Paul has been apprehended by Jesus Christ; he is the possession of Christ and therefore, in the fight of faith, is stretching out towards the goal of the high calling (Phil. 3:12 f.). Only someone who has been laid hold of strives to obtain the victor's imperishable → crown of eternal life (1 Cor. 9:24). The mid. *katalambanomai* (of mental or spiritual comprehension or perception) denotes grasping truth, by which one may recognize God's hidden actions (Acts 4:13; 10:34; 25:25). The vb. also occurs at Rom. 9:30 (of the Gentiles attaining righteousness, even though they did not pursue it), and Eph. 3:18 (of the believer comprehending the extent of God's love).

4. *metalambanō* and *metalēmpsis* (only in 1 Tim. 4:3) indicate participation in physical and spiritual benefits. Food is taken and eaten (Acts 2:46; 27:33; cf. 2 Tim. 2:6). God created it "to be received with thanksgiving" (1 Tim. 4:3). The earth "receives a blessing from God" (Heb. 6:7). God waits for the Yes which responds to his offer, for the obedience and thankfulness which respond to the giver and his gifts. Heb. 6:4 ff. includes the warning that a blessing which has been received is forfeited for ever by an act of conscious apostasy from Christ. Every kind of discipline serves towards our participation in God's holiness (Heb. 12:10). Only in Acts 24:25 is *metalambanō* followed by the acc. *kairon*, meaning "when I find a convenient occasion" or "when I have an opportunity."

5. In *prolambanō* the temporal significance of *pro* is retained, "she [the woman] is beforehand with anointing my body for burial" (Mk. 14:8, NEB), i.e. she has anointed it in advance. The woman's loving action is a prophetic sign of his imminent death and a substitute for the anointing of the body, as yet not carried out. 1 Cor. 11:21 speaks of individuals going ahead with their own meals (*to idion deipnon prolambanei*) at the Lord's Supper; their actions are unbrotherly and unworthy, for they are doing in advance on their own what all should do together. In Gal. 6:1 Paul encourages clemency towards a sinner, if he "is overtaken in any trespass." Here *prolēmphthē* suggests in the *pro* of the initial syllable that the sinner has been forcibly laid hold of by sin before he was able to reflect. Paul therefore requests gentleness and brotherly assistance.

6. *proslambanō* is found in the NT only in the mid. It means to take along (Acts

17:5), take (of food, Acts 27:33, 36), and to take aside, introducing an intense personal conversation. "Peter took him to one side" (Mk. 8:32; cf. Matt. 16:22; Acts 18:26). *proslambanō* has a theological importance when meaning "admit into fellowship." "God has welcomed him", i.e. the one who is weak in faith (Rom. 14:3). "Welcome one another . . . as Christ has welcomed you" (Rom. 15:7). Paul exhorts the Romans to seek out those who have a weak faith, because strong and weak are equally accepted into fellowship with God through Christ's death. Even for Jews, who by their rejection of Christ are rejected from salvation, Paul awaits *proslēmpsis*, acceptance by God: "For if their rejection means the reconciliation of the world, what will their acceptance [*proslēmpsis*] mean but life from the dead?" (Rom. 11:15). Because he in himself experienced that God accepted him and conferred new life on him, he connects the acceptance of his own people inextricably with the gift of eternal life.

7. In the Gospels and Acts *paralambanō* is frequently followed by the acc. of person, i.e. take someone with oneself, to choose out from a large number, offer fellowship to a chosen one or introduce a particular plan. Thus Jesus took to himself three disciples in order to reveal himself to them (Matt. 17:1; 20:17; 26:37; cf. Mk. 5:40). He "came to his own home and his own people received him not" (Jn. 1:11; on this interpretation → Possessions, art. *peripoieomai* NT 3). But for believers there stands the promise: "I will take you to myself that where I am you may be also" (Jn. 14:3; cf. Matt. 24:40).

Paul further uses *paralambanō* to denote the acceptance of mental and spiritual benefits, and refers the actual acceptance: (i) to teaching and ethical traditions which he has received, amongst which may be numbered the words of institution of 1 Cor. 11:23 and the *paraklēsis* of Phil. 4:9 (cf. 1 Thess. 4:1; 2 Thess. 3:6); (ii) to "the Word of God which you heard from us" (1 Thess. 2:13); to the "gospel" which Paul according to 1 Cor. 15:3 received; and, according to Col. 2:6, to "Christ Jesus" the Lord; (iii) to the personal revelation of Jesus Christ which Paul received outside Damascus; the gen. "of Jesus Christ" designates him as both content and mediator of the revelation.

8. *apolambanō* means: (i) to receive (adoption, Gal. 4:5; → Child, art. *hyios* NT 2 (a) on *hyiothesia*; the good things in life, Lk. 16:25; cf. J. D. M. Derrett, "Dives and Lazarus and the Preceding Sayings", in *Law in the New Testament*, 1970, 78–99; material things, Lk. 18:30 *v.l.*; rewards and punishments, Lk. 23:41; Rom. 1:27; Col. 3:24; 2 Jn. 8); (ii) receive in return, get back (the same amount, Lk. 6:34; the prodigal son, Lk. 15:27); (iii) take aside (Mk. 7:33); (iv) welcome (3 Jn. 8 *v.l.*).

B. Siede

(a). G. Delling, *lambanō* etc., *TDNT* IV 5–15; W. Grundmann, *dechomai* etc., *TDNT* II 50–59.
(b). K. Wegenast, *Das Traditionsverständnis bei Paulus und in den Deuteropaulinen*, *WMANT* 8, 1962.

Tax, Tax Collector

λογεία

λογεία (*logeia*), collection (of money), tax.

CL The use of *logeia* in the pre-Christian era is not attested apart from occurrences in the papyri and inscriptions from the 3rd century B.C. on.

NT The two NT examples of *logeia* are found in 1 Cor. 16:1–2. In answer to a question concerning the collection for the Jerusalem saints that had been posed by the Corinthians in their letter to Paul, the apostle repeats instructions he had already given to the Galatian churches (→ Poor, art. *ptōchos* NT 4). Every Sunday each believer was privately to set aside and store up some money in proportion to his gains of the previous week, so that collections would not be needed after Paul arrived.

While it is not impossible that some Jerusalem Christians regarded this collection as a semi-formal levy on Gentile Christians that was the rightful due of the mother-church of Christendom, Paul himself promoted it as an act of service to God (2 Cor. 9:12–13) that would honour Christ (2 Cor. 8:19) and as a spontaneous gesture of brotherly love (cf. Rom. 12:13; 13:8; 15:31; 1 Cor. 16:3; 2 Cor. 9:1, 5; Gal. 6:10) that called for generous, voluntary contributions (2 Cor. 8:7, 24; 9:5–14; *eu-logia* in 9:5 may be a play on words), although he did regard it as a tangible expression by Gentile believers of their spiritual indebtedness to the church at Jerusalem (Rom. 15:19, 27; cf. 1 Cor. 9:11).

M. J. Harris

στατήρ

στατήρ (*statēr*), stater, a silver coin worth four drachmas; δίδραχμον (*didrachmon*), a double drachma, two-drachma piece, worth about half a shekel among the Jews; κῆνσος (*kēnsos*), tax, poll-tax; τελέω (*teleō*), pay; τέλος (*telos*), tax, customs duties (for other meanings of *teleō* and *telos* → Goal); φόρος (*phoros*), tax, tribute.

OT According to Exod. 30:11–16, when the Israelites were subjected to a compulsory census in the wilderness, Moses commanded each man to pay half a shekel as ransom money to prevent the plague spreading among the people. Before the exile there were no real coins; metals were fashioned into lumps of recognized weights. The Heb. *šeqel* derives from a root meaning to weigh, and means a pound. Various forms are mentioned (e.g. the king's weight, 2 Sam. 14:26; the shekel of the sanctuary, Lev. 5:15; cf. Exod. 30:13; 38:26). The money raised by the levy was spent on the sanctuary (Exod. 30:16; 38:24 ff.). During the building of the first temple Solomon raised heavy taxes which were resented (1 Ki. 12:4). 2 Ki. 12:10 describes a collecting box for the upkeep of the temple, but 2 Chr. 24:6, 9 speaks of the tax levied by Moses as something that was to be perpetuated. Neh. 10:32 speaks of it as a third of a shekel, but it was evidently raised to half a shekel later. All Israelites over twenty had to pay, except for women and slaves (though at Elephantine women apparently also paid it). Gentiles and Samaritans were excluded. It was paid as long as the temple stood. The Romans evidently recognized it (cf. Cicero, *Pro Flacco* 28; Josephus, *Ant.* 16, 6, 2 and 4 f.). Jews of the Diaspora contributed, and the bullion trains required strong protection (Philo, *Spec. Leg.* 1, 77 ff.; Josephus, *Ant.* 18, 9, 1). The tax is dealt with in the Mishnah tractate Shekalim. After the destruction of the temple, Vespasian decreed that the tax should still be paid, not to

the Jewish temple, but to Jupiter Capitolinus (Josephus, *War* 7, 6, 6). It is generally assumed that it ceased in the time of Nerva (c. A.D. 96).

NT 1. *The Temple Tax and the Coin in the Fish's Mouth.* The following story is recorded by Matt.: "When they came to Capernaum the collectors of the half-shekel tax [*hoi ta didrachma lambanontes*] went up to Peter and said, 'Does not your teacher pay the tax [*ou telei ta didrachma*]?' He said, 'Yes.' And when he came home, Jesus spoke to him first saying, 'What do you think, Simon? From whom do kings of the earth take toll or tribute [*lambanousin telē ē kēnson*]? From their sons or from others?' And when he said, 'From others,' Jesus said to him, 'Then the sons are free. However, not to give offence to them, go to the sea and cast a hook, and take the first fish that comes up, and when you open its mouth you will find a shekel [*statēra*]; take that and give it to them for me and for yourself' " (Matt. 17:24–27).

H. Montefiore sees a *Sitz im Leben* for this story in the situation between A.D. 70 and A.D. 96 when the church was confronted by the question of whether to pay the tax to Jupiter Capitolinus, since Christians were often thought of as a Jewish sect and therefore liable to the tax ("Jesus and the Temple Tax", *NTS* 11, 1964–65, 60–71, see especially 64 f.). For Matt.'s readers Jesus' words would have been understood as a comparison of the pagan tax with *portoria* and poll-tax (*telē ē kēnson*), payable by foreigners but not by Roman citizens. However, Montefiore rejects the suggestion that the story was specially invented for this situation. On the other hand, he sees parallels to the coin in the fish's mouth in the Hellenistic story of Polycrates' ring (Hdt., 3, 41 f.), rabbinic folk tales of a gem representing all the wealth of a man lost at sea and found again in a fish (Shabbath 119a), and a gem found in a fish by a poor tailor on the day of atonement (Ber. R. II on Gen. 2:3). He suggests that the original saying of Jesus advised payment of the tax in order to avoid offence. In particular, he thinks that Jesus's position cut across the debate between the Pharisees and the Sadducees over the use of revenue for the temple. To refuse the temple tax would give the impression that Jesus disapproved of all temple worship. "What the Pharisees demanded as a legal due, Jesus gave as a free-will offering of the heart" (op. cit., 71). J. M. Allegro has argued that the Essenes maintained the same attitude as Jesus ("An Unpublished Fragment of Essene Halakhah [4Q Ordinances]", *JSS* 6, 1961, 71 ff.).

For further discussion of the background see J. D. M. Derrett, "Peter's Penny", (*NovT* 6, 1963, 1–15; reprinted in *Law in the New Testament*, 1970, 247–65). Derrett claims that Peter could have claimed exemption on the grounds that Jesus and the disciples were fully employed in God's service (cf. op. cit., 250 ff. for rabbinic discussions). The matter would then have been referred to Jerusalem for a ruling. On the other hand, refusal to pay would bring Jesus into direct conflict with the authorities. The collectors were not rabbis who could decide for themselves on the legality of the situation. Although Jesus could claim to be not liable to the tax, he was obliged by the Torah to save the collectors from the sin of compelling him to supply the half-shekel. "*Therefore* it would be a sin to refuse to pay the said half-shekel!" (op. cit., 257). Jesus was concerned for the moral welfare of the collectors, even though he knew that the tax was not due. He could readily have ordered payment from the funds given to the disciples, but these had been given for their maintenance. It would thus have been wrong to misappropriate the funds in order to pay the tax.

The dilemma is resolved by finding the lost stater in the fish's mouth. The coin in question would be a Tyrian shekel which was sufficient for a poor man's payment for himself and his friend. Coins are not identifiable, when found singly. In Jewish law the finder would be allowed to keep the coin; for when an owner had no hope of recovery of an item the property was deemed to be lost (Baba Kamma 10:2; cf. op. cit., 258). "The collectors were doubtless as well satisfied with this coin as they would have been by a coin obtained from a patron: but charity money had not been used, and the important admission had not been made. The earthly king would provide that his servants were not liable to customs duty; but the heavenly king in this case, caring for the souls of the collectors, would provide for the payment of the half-shekel. God enabled the need to be met, but he did *not* admit the liability to the due as such" (ibid.).

The view has been put forward that Jesus' instructions to Peter were a figurative way of telling him to catch a fish and use the money for payment of the tax (cf. F. V. Filson, *The Gospel According to St. Matthew*, *BNTC*, 1960, 196). C. H. Dodd considers that the story was originally a pronouncement story of a parabolic kind which in the course of time was transformed into a miracle story (*Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel*, 1963, 227). But Derrett prefers to see the whole episode as a historical event. The fish in question would be the cat-fish, *Clarias lazera*, known to the Greeks as *korakinos* (Josephus, *War* 3, 10, 8 [519 f.]; cf. C. Kopp, *The Holy Places of the Gospels*, 1963, 174 ff.). It is an omnivorous predator, liking shallow water and scavenging around landing-places. It would be attracted by a bright disc which could easily have stuck in the back of its throat. A scaleless fish, it was prohibited as food by the law, and no Jew would have dreamt of catching it for food. "The vision of the fisherman Peter rushing to fetch up a *Clarias* with a hook is so incongruous that its genuineness seems certified" (op. cit., 259).

If Derrett is correct, we need not look for a *Sitz im Leben* for the story in the life of the later church. It is already present in the life and ministry of Jesus, although it would naturally be of interest to the later church in providing guidance for its own relations vis-à-vis the Jews and the Romans. It is doubtful, therefore whether the story can be used, as G. D. Kilpatrick thinks, to determine the date of Matthew (*The Origins of the Gospel According to St. Matthew*, 1946, 42 f., 129). In the context of Matt. the story illustrates the distinction drawn by Jesus already in his earthly ministry between his followers as the true people of God and the Jewish nation. The disciples are the true sons of God who do not need to pay tribute to aliens. But to avoid giving offence the tax is paid.

2. *The Question concerning Tribute to Caesar.* On this question which is recorded in Matt. 22:15–22 par. Mk. 12:13–17, Lk. 20:20–26 → Caesar, art. *Kaisar* (cf. also for discussion of the background J. D. M. Derrett, "Render to Caesar . . .", *Law in the New Testament*, 1970, 313–38). Here the word *kēnsos*, tax, poll-tax, is used in Matt. 22:17, 19 and Mk. 12:14; Lk. uses *phoros* with the same meaning (Lk. 20:22; cf. 23:2).

3. *Paul.* In Rom. 13:6 f. Paul adopts the same attitude as Jesus with regard to payment of taxes to the Roman state: "For the same reason you must also pay taxes [*phorous teleite*], for the authorities are ministers of God, attending to this very thing. Pay all of them their dues [*apodote pasin tas opheilas*], taxes to whom taxes are due, revenue to whom revenue is due [*tō ton phoron ton phoron, tō to telos to telos*],

respect to whom respect is due, honour to whom honour is due." The premises of Paul's position are that "there is no authority except from God, and those that exist have been instituted by God" (Rom. 13:1; cf. 1 Pet. 2:13 ff.; → Might, art. *exousia* NT), that these have been instituted for the well-being of men (vv. 2 ff.), and therefore to resist what God has appointed is to resist God and thus provoke divine wrath and defile one's own → conscience (vv. 4 f.). Moreover, in submitting and giving, one is actually fulfilling the law (vv. 8 ff.). For "love is the fulfilling of the law" (v. 10). By implication this means that the Christian (whether he be a Gentile or a Jewish Christian) is not breaking the law by submitting to an alien, pagan authority. Rather, the essential meaning of the law (which is concerned with love) requires him to submit in all matters which do not contravene the will of God. Paul's use of *leitourgoi*, "ministers", for the authorities in v. 6 has sacred overtones (cf. M. Black, *Romans*, *New Century Bible*, 1973, 161). Black sees in the closing paraenetic chapters of Rom. several versions of the words of Jesus which Paul has adapted and interpreted (cf. also Rom. 12:14 with Matt. 5:44 par. Lk. 6:28; Rom. 12:17, 21; 13:9 with Matt. 19:18 par. Mk. 10:19; Lk. 18:20; ibid.); → Serve, art. *leitourgeō*.

C. Brown

τελώνιον

τελώνιον (*telōnion*), customs house, tax office; τελώνης (*telōnēs*), farmer of taxes, tax collector; ἀρχιτελώνης (*architelōnēs*), chief tax collector; τέλος (*telos*), toll, customs duty, revenue; τελέω (*teleō*), to pay what is owed (for other meanings of *telos* and *teleō* → Goal).

CL The *telōnēs*, tax farmer, was a notorious figure at Athens from the time of Aristophanes, and is frequently quoted in reproach: "All are tax collectors, all are robbers" (Xen.). The system of farming out sources of government revenue from taxes, tolls, property, land, mines, etc., goes back to the Gk. city states. Their *polis* constitutions did not provide for long-term civil servants. But by the tax-farming system the city was guaranteed a known income without the need for a complex financial administration. The privilege of farming taxes was auctioned annually. The successful individual or group, who had to have acceptable backers underwriting prompt payment, then had to pay a first instalment before being allowed to collect dues from the public. For the actual collection the tax farmers used employees, who in turn had to extract a sum over and above that required by their masters in order to provide an income for themselves. From the public's point of view it was a hateful system, all too easily open to abuse.

A somewhat similar system was operated by the Romans. The corresponding Latin term *publicani*, state contractors, refers to the leading officers, chiefly belonging to the equestrian order, who farmed the Roman revenue (*publicum habebant*), and paid into the public treasury (*in publicum*) a certain definite sum contracted with the government. These *publicani*, who were all wealthy individuals, sublet the tax-collecting to agents (*magistri*), and the agents engaged local officials (*portitores*) to collect the dues. It was these *portitores* who are referred to in the NT as *telōnai*.

The *telōnai* needed to belong to the native population, to be aware of local ways and to run less risk of being deceived. Indeed they themselves almost invariably succeeded in deceiving and fleecing the tax-paying public. By the time Augustus came to

power, the *publicani* had by their greed so damaged state and provincial finances that the emperor and his successors had to re-organize the tax system. Tax-farming cartels were finally abolished in the 2nd cent. A.D.

telōnion means a custom house, tax office (Posidippus), and by the time of Strabo, customs duty. *telos*, which usually means end, fulfilment (→ Goal), can also denote duty for the state, payment of toll or tax (Plato). *teleō* (or *teleioō*) means to carry out (instructions, a sacrifice, a practice), execute a plan; pay what one owes, especially in dues and taxes (Hdt.); pass., to be subject to tax or tribute (Dem.); hence, since in many Gk. cities the citizens were distributed into classes according to their taxable property, to be in a certain social class.

OT In the LXX *telos*, when meaning tax, tribute, toll, translates *meḵes*, tax collected for Yahweh from war booty (Num. 31:28, 37–41). *telos* once renders *miḵ^esâh*, the redemption price of a field in the year of jubilee (Lev. 27:23), and once *mas*, general tribute imposed by king Ahasuerus (Est. 10:1). *telōneō*, to impose taxes, occurs in 1 Macc. 13:39, of tolls exacted from the Jews by the Syrians. *telos*, in the sense of indirect tax, customs duty, is found in 1 Macc. 10:31, 11:35. Josephus uses *telos* with this meaning in *Ant.* 12, 141, and *teleō*, in reference to payment of tribute, in *Ant.* 10, 2, 155; but *teleō* does not appear in the LXX with the meaning of render or pay.

The first reference to tax farming in Palestine dates from the time of Ptolemy II Philadelphus in the 3rd cent. B.C. The collecting of taxes from the Jews during the Seleucid period is narrated by Josephus (*Ant.* 12, 138–53; 13, 49–57). The capture of Jerusalem by Pompey in 63 B.C. led to the imposition of Roman taxation. But in 30 B.C. Augustus remitted the tribute due and Herod the Great was allowed to control his own finances, collecting taxes directly through royal slaves.

Jewish sources distinguish two classes of tax officials, those responsible for income tax and poll tax (Josephus, *Ant.* 18, 4), and customs officers, who were stationed at bridges and canals, and on state roads. The Romans built fine bridges, it was said, simply in order to collect tolls (Shabbath 33b). During the time of Roman rule, taxation remained constant, but at a harsh level. The province of Judea alone had to find 600 talents (*Ant.* 17, 320; *War* 2, 97). Tacitus mentions that in A.D. 17 the provinces of Syria and Judea begged for a reduction in taxes. There was some relief from A.D. 37 when the governor Vitellius remitted the market duty on crops (*Ant.* 18, 90). But it was indicative of public feeling that during the siege of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 the refusal to pay taxes was seriously reckoned to be the only cause of the revolt (*War* 5, 405).

A Jew entering the customs service cut himself off from decent society. He was disqualified from being a judge or even a witness in court, and excommunicated from the synagogue. The members of his family were considered to be equally tarnished (Sanhedrin 25b). Because of their exactions and extortions, customs officials were in the same legal category as murderers and robbers (Baba Kamma 113a), thieves (Tohoroth 7:6), the robbers and money-changers (*Dereḵ 'ereṣ* 2), and counted among the *'am hā-'āres*, the common herd (Bekhoroth 30b). Money handled by tax collectors was tainted and could not be used, even for charity (Baba Kamma 10:1), for to touch the wealth of a man who obtains it unlawfully is to share his guilt.

NT The *telōnai* are mentioned only in the Synoptic Gospels. They themselves are not the holders of the tax-farming contracts, who were usually foreigners, but subordinates hired from the native population. (*dēmosiōnēs*, which normally represents the Latin *publicanus*, does not occur in the NT.)

Herod Antipas adopted the farming system for Galilee and Perea. As an imperial province, Judea paid taxes not through tax farmers but direct to the imperial treasury (Mk. 12:14). The responsibility for collection was imposed upon the Sanhedrin, under the supervision of the procurator. Arrears were collected by force by Roman officials.

The prevailing method of tax collection afforded collectors many opportunities to exercise greed and unfairness. For centuries force and fraud had been constantly associated with the revenue system of Palestine (Nedarim 3:4). Hence *telōnai* were hated and despised as a class. Strict Jews were further offended by the fact that the tax collector was rendered unclean through continual contact with Gentiles, and because his work involved breaking the sabbath. Contemporary public opinion is accurately reflected in the disagreeable associations expressed in the NT: *telōnai* are linked with sinners (Matt. 9:10), heathen Gentiles (Matt. 18:17), harlots (Matt. 21:31), and extortioners, imposters, and adulterers (Lk. 18:11).

Jesus teaches that for Christians to fail to include their enemies and persecutors in their love is to leave themselves on no higher a moral and spiritual plane than the most despised classes. In the eyes of Jews, these would be specifically tax collectors and *ethnikoi*, heathen Gentiles (Matt. 5:46 f.). Luke, writing to a wider audience, has the more general term *hamartōloi*, sinners (Lk. 6:33).

Jesus' summons to a tax collector to join him (Matt. 9:9) must have outraged and bewildered public opinion. For Matthew himself (called Levi by Mark and Luke) the call of Jesus entailed great sacrifice. He left everything (Lk. 5:28). Fishermen could return to their boats (Jn. 21:3), but a *telōnēs* who gave up his occupation had no prospect of another job, even with the skills that he undoubtedly possessed. Of necessity a tax collector would be versed in several languages, experienced in keeping records, and probably know shorthand (G. Milligan, *The New Testament Documents*, 1913, 241–7). A system of shorthand invented by Marcus Tullius Tiro, a freedman of Cicero, in 63 B.C. was widely used.

The toll house (*telōnion*) at Capernaum was an important centre commanding both the sea route from east and north of the lake and also the great land road, the way of the sea (Matt. 4:15), leading from Damascus to the Mediterranean coast. Custom would thus be levied on all goods carried by ship or caravan. In Matthew's case the duty would be collected not on behalf of the Roman government but for the tetrarch Herod Antipas. This fact would however not make his calling or class any the less unpopular. Two inscriptions from the Asian cities of Magnesia and Ephesus mention "those concerned with the toll on fish" (A. Schlatter, *Der Evangelist Matthäus*, 1963⁶, 302), and it is possible that a toll on catches of fish was collected at Capernaum as well. If so, Matthew would have known the fishermen-disciples, and probably Jesus himself, who used Capernaum as his headquarters. This would explain Matthew's immediate and total response to Jesus' call to discipleship.

Jesus' presence at the farewell banquet Matthew arranged for his old associates (Lk. 5:29) inevitably drew criticism from the scribes and Pharisees. In answer to the accusation that by eating with people who were excommunicate he was defiling him-

self, Jesus uses a current proverb to equate tax collectors with the sick. He associates with these people, not for his own sake (because, unlike the Pharisees, they were sympathetic to him and receptive to his message), nor even as his enemies might hint because birds of a feather flock together. Just as a doctor has to get near to his patients in order to treat them, so Jesus is prepared to share the company of the outcasts of society, for he knows that they are spiritually sick (Matt. 9:12; Mk. 2:17; Lk. 5:31).

Apart from the special call to Matthew, Jesus does not suggest that tax collectors should give up their profession. Neither did John the Baptist. In Lk. 3:12 f. John advises tax collectors to carry out their work fairly, neither abusing their position nor extorting excessive sums of money for their own enrichment. The employment is in itself lawful and necessary for the financing of government. But let those engaged in it be honest and just in their duties.

Jesus speaks of the refusal of the Pharisees to respond either to the Baptist or to himself, with their very different approaches. John was criticized for his asceticism and Jesus for exuberance in the company of tax collectors and sinners (Matt. 11:19; Lk. 7:29, 34). Often the spiritual response of the despised put their religious betters to shame (Matt. 8:2, 8 f.; 9:9–13; 15:28; 21:32), but as a type tax collectors could still be referred to as those who were uninterested in spiritual matters. If an offending Christian brother refuses to heed the local congregation, he is to be regarded as putting himself outside the religious community, i.e. joining the same class as Gentiles and tax collectors (Matt. 18:17).

Light is thrown on the parable of the unmerciful servant (Matt. 18:23–35) when it is seen against the background of tax farming. The two debtors and the other servants are ministers (*douloi*) of the king, and engaged in the collection of taxes. The vast sum due to the king from the first minister is not incredible or hyperbolic, as is often assumed: the tax-farmer Joseph son of Tobias contracted for 16,000 talents (Josephus, *Ant.* 12, 176). The minister's plea for time is genuine, and the king releases him from the immediate liability. Then, instead of carrying over the debt to the next year, thus doubling the amount due and probably incurring an intolerable burden for his tax-paying subjects, the king wisely cancels the debt. When later the same minister's own hard-heartedness is exposed, the king delivers him to the torturers (*basanistēs*), who by severe examination would extract information from him about all his personal assets. Meanwhile his relations, friends, and dependants would do all in their power to raise funds to secure his release, or his blood would be upon their heads. See J. D. M. Derrett, *Law in the New Testament*, 1970, 32–47.

Since *architelōnēs* is found only once (Lk. 19:2), Zacchaeus' official position is not clear. Probably he was the equivalent of the Roman *magister*, the intermediary between the *portitores* and the *publicani*. Jericho was a likely post for a tax officer of some standing, and one who would inevitably become rich. The city was an important customs station at the main ford of the Jordan, some 17 miles from Jerusalem on the major route between Judea and lands east of the river. Besides controlling an extensive carrying trade, Jericho produced and exported costly balsams. Zacchaeus' undertaking to recompense anyone he had defrauded (Lk. 19:8) need not imply his own use of extortion or menaces. As the leading member of a company of *publicani*, he was responsible for and tainted by the actions of his subordinates. Conversely, Zacchaeus' declaration of intent was not only binding and an expression of his

change of heart, but in effect purified his property, so that he could now receive Jesus into his home without causing his guest to be ceremonially contaminated. By inviting himself to the house in the first place, Jesus had gently put pressure on his host's conscience. Jesus' initiative accomplished what many people must have regarded as a miracle no less astonishing than any of his supernatural actions (Derrett, op. cit., 278–85).

telōnion, custom house, toll booth, tax office, occurs only in connexion with Jesus' call of Matthew (Matt. 9:9; Mk. 2:14; Lk. 5:27). On toll booths in Palestine, including Capernaum, see A. N. Sherwin-White, *Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament*, 1963, 125 f.

In 1 Cor. 10:11 Paul declares that warnings in Scripture have been recorded for the benefit of Christians, upon whom *ta telē* of the ages have come. *telos* is usually translated as end (→ Goal). The plural used here would then refer to the two ends which form the meeting-point of the two ages, i.e. the close of the old age and the beginning of the new (J. Héring, *The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians*, 1962, 88 f.). But *telos* may have its other meaning: upon whom the (spiritual) revenues of the ages have come (A. Souter, *Pocket Lexicon of the New Testament*, 1916, s.v.). *N. Hillyer*

(a). I. Abrahams, "Publicans and Sinners", in *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels* I, 1917, 54–61; G. Delling, *telos*, in *TDNT* VIII 51 f.; J. D. M. Derrett, *Law in the New Testament*, 1970; C. H. Giblin, " 'The Things of God' in the Question concerning Tribute to Caesar", *CBQ* 33, 1971, 510–27; L. Goppelt, "The Freedom to Pay the Imperial Tax", *StudEv* 2, 1964, 183–94; H. A. Homeau, "On Fishing for Staters: Matthew 17:27", *ExpT* 85, 1973–4, 340–2; P. E. Hughes, *Paul's Second Epistle to the Corinthians, NLC*, 1961, 283 f.; G. Kittel, *logeia, TDNT* IV 282 f.; N. J. McEleney, "Mt. 17:24–27 – Who Paid the Temple Tax?", *CBQ* 38, 1976, 178–92; O. Michel, *telōnēs*, in *TDNT* VIII 88–105; H. Montefiore, "Jesus and the Temple Tax", *NTS* 11, 1964–5, 60–71; K. F. Nickle, *The Collection: A Study in Paul's Strategy, SBT* 48, 1966; S. Safrai and M. Stern (eds.), *The Jewish People in the First Century (Compendium Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum* I), 1974, 330 ff.; A. N. Sherwin-White, *Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament*, 1963; E. Stauffer, *Christ and the Caesars*, 1955.
(b). D. Georgi, *Die Geschichte der Kollekte des Paulus für Jerusalem, ThF* 38, 1965; SB I 377–80, 498.

Teach, Instruct, Tradition, Education, Discipline

διδάσκω

διδάσκω (*didaskō*), teach; διδακτός (*didaktos*), taught; διδακτικός (*didaktikos*), skilful in teaching.

CL 1. *didaskō*, to teach, comes from *di-dak-sko* (root *dek-*, to accept, extend the hand to). The reduplicated stem and inchoative suffix convey the idea of repeatedly extending the hand for acceptance; the word therefore suggests the idea of causing someone to accept something. It occurs frequently in Gk. from Homer onwards, and in the act. means to teach, inform, instruct, demonstrate, prescribe; in the pass. to be instructed, be taught; in the mid. to learn for oneself, to think out, to master. In the act. the word occurs chiefly with the acc. of the person (to teach someone) or with the acc. of the thing (to teach something), but also with the dat. It is clear that the word is used typically for the relationship between teacher and pupil, instructor and apprentice. What is taught may be knowledge, opinions or facts, but also artistic

and technical skills, all of which are to be systematically and thoroughly acquired by the learner as a result of the repeated activity of both teacher and pupil. Herodotus also uses *didaskō* to describe the work of the chorus-master (1, 23; 6, 21). The word is rarely found, however, to describe an activity of the gods. The aim of all teaching is to communicate knowledge and skill with a view to developing the pupil's abilities, but not to force his will in a particular direction.

2. In the sphere of religion the word is rare in Gk., not occurring till the 1st cent. B.C. Thus in the Isis-hymn of Andros it is said that the goddess causes men to be instructed in the things of religion and culture. The inscriptions collected by F. Preisigke show a further use of *didaskō* in the sense of to demonstrate (*Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden*, 1925, 371). Philo's usage, as so often, conforms to that of cl. Gk., so that he regards Moses, for instance, as a teacher in the Gk. sense (*Gig.* 54; *Spec. Leg.* 1, 59), one who makes contact with another's mind, as does the philosopher in Epictetus (*Dissertationes* 1, 9, 12; 2, 21, 10). Hence, *didaskō* can be said to denote the activity of a teacher, whose concern is to develop his pupil's abilities and to impart knowledge and skills.

OT 1. In the LXX *didaskō* occurs about 100 times, including 57 instances where it translates words from the root *lmd* (particularly *limmaḏ*, to teach) which in the LXX are almost always rendered by *didaskō*. The word is found most commonly in the Pss., in Deut., in Jer., and (apart from Sir. and Wis.) in Job and in Eccl., where, however, the LXX uses *didaskō* rarely as a translation of *limmaḏ* and more often as a translation of other words such as the hiph. forms of *yāḏa'* (cause to know, teach) and *yārâh* (teach, instruct). But in its LXX usage (as opposed to that of profane Gk.), the word does not primarily denote the communication of knowledge and skills (e.g. 2 Sam. 22:35), but means chiefly instruction in how to live (e.g. Deut. 11:19; 20:18 and passim), the subject matter being the will of God. God's *dikaiōmata*, ordinances, and *krimata*, judgments, are to be learnt and understood; being learnt, however, they require obedience and an act of the will. They may be taught by God himself (Deut. 4:1, 10, 14 and passim), by the fathers of families teaching their children (Deut. 11:19; Exod. 10:1 f. and passim) or by the godly who know the will of God. The fact that the LXX never uses *didaskō* for the preaching of the prophets may be explained by the close link between teaching and the → law.

didaskō stands for forms of *lāmaḏ* at Deut. 4:1, 10, 14; 5:28(31); 6:1; 11:19; 20:18; 31:19, 22; Jdg. 3:2; 2 Sam. 1:18; 22:35; 1 Chr. 5:18; 25:7; 2 Chr. 17:7, 9; Ezr. 7:10; Job 21:22; Pss. 18(17):34; 25(24):4 f., 9; 34(33) 11; 51(50):13; 71(70):17; 94(93);10, 12; 119(118):12, 26, 64, 66, 68, 99, 108, 124, 135, 171; 132(131):12; 143(142):10; 144(143):1; Prov. 5:13; 30:3(24:26); Eccl. 12:9; Cant. 3:8; Hos. 10:11; Isa. 29:13; Jer. 9:13(14), 19(20); 12:16; 13:21; 31(38):18, 34; 32(39):33; Dan. 1:4. *didaskō* stands for *yāḏa'* in the hiph. at Job 10:2; 13:23; 37:19; 42:4; Prov. 1:23; 22:21. It stands for *yārâh* in the hiph. at Job 6:24; 8:10; 34:32; Prov. 4:4, 11; 6:13; Isa. 9:14(15); Ezr. 44:23. Other equivalents are: *'ālēp* in the piel, to teach (Job 33:33); *bîn* in the hiph., give understanding (Job 32:8); *hāwâh* in the piel, declare, make known (Job 33:4); *yāṣā'* in the hiph., bring forth, i.e. utter (Job 8:10); *sāḵan*, be profitable to (Job 22:2, where the translation is not lit.); *pāraš* in the pual, declare distinctly (Neh. 8:8). It occurs in a free translation of Dan. 12:4, and is without equivalent in Deut. 32:44; 1 Esd. 8:7, 23; 9:48 f., 55; Ps. 18(17):35; Wis.

6:10; 7:22; 9:18; 12:19; Sir. 18:13; 22:7; 30:3, 27(36); 45:17; Isa. 55:12; Dan. 11:4; 4 Macc. 5:24; 18:10, 12, 18.

2. The usage of the Qumran documents largely corresponds to that of the LXX. Words from the root *lmd* occur 10 times, the subject-matter of the teaching being on occasions the requirements of the will of God (1QS 9:13; 1QH 2:17), and the ordinances of the covenant (1QSa 1:7; 1QM 10:10) and requirements for battle (1QM 10:2; 14:6). Here too then the teaching is connected with the will of God and the obedience of men. Only in 1QM 6:12 f. does a derivative of *lmd* denote battle-trained stallions or experienced horsemen. See also 1QS 3:13; 4QM^{a} 4; 1Q28^{a} 1:7.

3. In rabbinic Judaism, as indeed in the later portions of the OT (e.g. 2 Chr. 17:7 ff.), *limmaḏ* denotes the communication of the will of God concerning man's relationship to God or to his fellow-men, this will being discerned through the interpretation of the → law. There are, it is true, passages in rabbinic literature where *limmaḏ* is used in its profane sense, but *limmaḏ* in the strict sense is now a specialized term for the translation of the Torah into concrete directions for the life of the individual (K. H. Rengstorf, *TDNT* II 140). Hence, it is best regarded as pronouncing a scholarly opinion on the basis of scriptural interpretation. It is sometimes claimed that by holding this view of *limmaḏ*, the rabbis were closer to the Hellenistic concept of *didaskō* than they were to that of the LXX. This is unlikely, for despite the intellectual exertions of both expositor and pupil, the rabbi's undoubted concern was not the development of his pupil's abilities but the promotion of obedience to the will of God; this is shown even in such passages as Kiddushin 1:10: "He that has no knowledge of Scripture and the Mishnah and right conduct has no part in the habitable world."

NT In the NT *didaskō* occurs 95 times, of which 38 are in the Synoptic Gospels (14 in Matt., 17 each in Mk. and Lk.) 9 in Jn., and 16 in Acts. The rest are distributed as follows: 15 instances in the Pauline Epistles; 2 in Heb.; 3 in the Johannine Epistles; and 2 in Rev. The meaning is almost always to teach or instruct, though the purpose and content of the teaching can be determined only from each individual context.

1. *Jesus' Teaching Work according to the Synoptic Gospels.* It is the unanimous testimony of all the Synoptic writers, and one that doubtless coincides with historical reality, that Jesus "taught" publicly, i.e. in synagogues (Matt. 9:35; 13:54 par. Mk. 6:2; Mk. 1:21 and passim), in the temple (Mk. 12:35; Lk. 21:37; Matt. 26:55 par. Mk. 14:49, cf. Jn. 18:20) or in the open air (Matt. 5:2; Mk. 6:34; Lk. 5:3 and passim). Only Lk. 4:16 ff. gives details concerning the outward form of his teaching, viz. his standing to read a portion from the prophets, then sitting to expound it, this being the normal Jewish and rabbinic custom (cf. Lk. 5:3; Mk. 9:35; Matt. 5:2; SB II 150; IV 161, 185).

In 13 places in the Gospels *didaskō* is used absolutely as a comprehensive term for Jesus' → preaching (Mk. 2:13; 6:6; 10:1; 12:35; 14:49; Lk. 4:15; 13:22, 26; 19:47; Matt. 4:23; 9:35; 11:1). In addition, the vb. is also used to denote his preaching and teaching in given situations (e.g. Mk. 1:21 f.; 4:1 f.; 8:31; 11:17; Matt. 5:2; 21:23; Lk. 5:3, 17; 6:6; 13:10).

As regards the subjects and aims of Jesus' teaching, one's view depends on whether one takes account of all the synoptic passages containing sayings of Jesus,

or only those where his utterances are specifically called "teaching", or only those passages which the consensus of historical critics consider to be very probably authentic.

What did Jesus teach when on earth? In brief, the answer is → God, his → kingdom and his → will, all themes of contemporary Judaism, which Jesus, in the manner of a → rabbi or a → prophet, spoke about in his conversations with the Jews (→ Israel). He differed from his rabbinic counterparts not in his subject-matter but in the radical way he handled it, consistently applying all he said to concrete situations in man's life with his fellow-man, and involving himself personally in the subjects under discussion. (On Jesus as a teacher, see G. Bornkamm, *Jesus of Nazareth*, 1960, 96 ff.; on Jewish teaching, see W. G. Kümmel, *Heilsgeschehen und Geschichte*, 1965, 15 ff.; K. Wegenast, *Das Verständnis der Tradition*, 1962, 24 ff. and bibliography.) Instead of giving merely theoretical teaching about God, his providence, his grace or his wrath, Jesus shows God's goodness and wrath at work in concrete situations (e.g. Lk. 15:1 ff.). Instead of speculating on the kingdom of God, he announces its nearness (Mk. 1:15) and so issues a call to repentance and to a change of behaviour (Mk. 7:15; Matt. 5:21 ff.). And instead of inculcating the type of legal casuistry which seeks to ensure salvation, he tells his hearers: "Whatever you wish that men would do to you, do so to them" (Matt. 7:12; on the whole subject, see H. Conzelmann, *An Outline Theology of the New Testament*, 1969, 115–27).

(a) Mark. In Mk. 4:2 Jesus' teaching consists of → parables of the → kingdom of God, that kingdom whose nearness has already been summarized as the essence of his preaching (Mk. 1:14 f.). Then in Mk. 2:13 *didaskō* is used to describe his confrontation with contemporary Jewish legalism; in Mk. 10:1 ff.; 12:14 ff. the vb. introduces examples of Jesus giving his ruling on controversial matters; while in Mk. 11:17; 12:35 f. the subject of his teaching is a passage from the OT. It would seem that Mk. attaches importance to the link between teaching and doing (6:2, 34; → Work).

In short, Mk. uses *didaskō* not only in the sense of to teach, i.e. to give practical instructions or rulings on the basis of scriptural interpretation, but also (as in Mk. 1:15) in the sense of to preach the kingdom of God and the gospel, the content of the latter being, as W. Marxsen has shown, Jesus himself (*Mark the Evangelist*, 1969, 126–38). This verse (Mk. 1:15) betrays a marked shift in subject matter compared with the rest of Christ's "teaching" when on earth.

(b) Luke. Lk. frequently adopts Mk.'s use of *didaskō* and, where he does so, uses it in senses barely distinguishable from those of Mk. This applies also to passages where the vb. is peculiar to Lk. (6:6; 11:1; 12:12; 13:26; 23:5). His view of what Jesus taught emerges most clearly from his account of Jesus in the Temple (chs. 20 f.), where the subjects are the → Law, future events (→ goal) and matters concerned with christology. As H. Conzelmann (*The Theology of St Luke*, 1960) has convincingly shown, the main thrust in Lk. is to the nearness of God's kingdom, despite appearances to the contrary in passages like Lk. 17:20 f. In Lk. 4:14 ff. Lk. replaces his original (Mk. 1:14 ff.) by a summary of Jesus' activity up to the start of his last journey to Jerusalem (Lk. 9:51), Lk. 4:16 ff. providing an example of his work during this period: Jesus reads Isa. 61:1 f. and points to himself as the fulfilment of the prophetic promise. Now is the period of salvation, having already been manifested (v.

21) in → miracles; the latter are no longer merely *signs* of the authority inherent in the miracle-worker's teaching, but are part of the teaching itself.

(c) Matthew. Like Lk., this evangelist also interprets his original in some places, but the basic sense of *didaskō* still remains: to teach, preach. As regards content, however, Matt. 5:2, 19 and 28:20 are noteworthy (cf. 22:37). In Matt. 5:2 f. (the beginning of the Sermon on the Mount), Jesus is shown teaching his disciples, hence it is they, not the → scribes, to whom the polemic of v. 21 ff. is addressed; the scribes are the ones whose righteousness must be exceeded (v. 20). This explains the absence of scripture proof normally so typical of Christ's polemic discourses: for Matt., Jesus is the teacher of the *church* who supersedes the Sinaitic revelation and its rabbinic interpretations ("it was said to men of old") in order to lay a new foundation ("but I say to you"). After the death of Jesus, Peter guarantees this foundation (Matt. 16:18), holding the office of the keys (→ Open, art. *kleis* NT 3) which to the Jews meant the office of a teacher. The foundation guaranteed by him is no new law, but the fulfilment of the old, now freed from rabbinic distortions. Only now does the original intention of the law become clear (Matt. 19:8: "from the beginning"). These two verses (Matt. 16:18; 19:8) throw light on Matt. 5:19: he who lives without the Torah is without righteousness. The follower of Jesus is called not to lawlessness but to a superior → righteousness, the foundation of which is the law and Christ's interpretation of it. This is why, after his resurrection, this interpretation must be passed on through teaching (Matt. 28:20). (→ Scripture, art. *graphē* NT; → Redemption, art. *lyō* NT 6 (a).)

(d) It is now clear, in retrospect, that the original teaching of Jesus (made up of discussions on the law, words of wisdom and announcements of God's nearness, i.e. exhortations coupled with commands) has been specifically interpreted in the Synoptic Gospels. In several important passages of Mk. and Lk., the preacher has become the one who proclaims himself; the christology implicit in Jesus' teaching has become the direct and explicit christology of the church's faith. The rabbinic sense of *didaskō* (i.e. that of the Heb. *limmaḏ*) has been replaced by the meaning "to proclaim salvation". Despite this, however, and especially in Matt., the vb. can still mean to teach in the sense of to command, or even to expound. Our investigations have therefore shown that the Synoptics' use of *didaskō* is similar in form to that of the LXX and so in some measure to that of the rabbis: it does not convey the idea of developing a person's abilities but rather of instructing him in how to live; it also involves addressing him personally with commands based on the interpretation and declaration of God's will.

2. *The Disciples' Teaching.* (a) The Synoptic Gospels speak not only of the teaching carried out by Jesus but also of that undertaken by his → disciples (Mk. 6:30; Matt. 28:20 and passim), and of the "human tradition" passed on by the scribes (e.g. Mk. 7:1–23 par. Matt. 15:1–20; → Gift, art. *korban*; → Hand, art. *cheir* NT). In Lk. 12:12 the Holy Spirit is promised as teacher (cf. Jn. 14:26).

(b) In the Acts of the Apostles *didaskō* is by no means restricted to the teaching of Jesus. Even the subject-matter of the teaching indicates this: in Acts 4:2 it is the → resurrection from the dead; in Acts 5:42 and 15:35 "Christ Jesus" or "the word of the Lord"; and in Acts 4:18; 5:28, 39 (cf. 18:25) the whole message of the disciples, as is clearly indicated by the following phrases linked with *didaskō*: *epi tō onomati tou Iēsou*, in the name of Jesus; *epi tō onomati toutō*, in this name; *ta peri tou kyriou*

Iēsou Christou, the things concerning the Lord Jesus Christ. Then in Acts 15:1 there is a reference to some who were "teaching" → circumcision, and in Acts 21:21 (cf. v. 28) Paul is said to have been charged with teaching apostasy from → Moses; in both cases the teaching arises from the normal Jewish practice of discussing the law.

In Acts 4:2 and passim *didaskō* is linked with *katangellō*, to preach, proclaim; similarly in Acts 15:35 with *euangelizomai*, which has the same meaning. However, if only because of the rhetorical character of these pairs of words, any distinction here between "teaching" and "preaching" would seem to be inadmissible, and particularly as in Acts 18:11, 25, 28; 28:31 *didaskō* involves adducing scriptural proofs. The background of these passages is the post-resurrection message of salvation (cf. Acts 1:1; 4:18; 5:21, 25, 28, 42; 11:26; 15:1, 35; 20:20), and it is, therefore, salvation as understood by the post-resurrection church which forms the subject-matter of *didaskō* in Acts. Conversely Paul is accused of teaching the Jewish people to forsake Moses, the customs of the Jews, the temple, the people and the law (Acts 21:21, 28). Luke regards the essence of this salvation as having become manifest in Jesus (Lk. 4:16 ff.; Acts 1:21 f.).

(c) In the Johannine writings the word occurs in the Gospel 10 times (Jn. 6:59; 7:14, 28, 35; 8:2 *v.l.*, 20, 28; 9:34; 14:26; 18:20) and in 1 Jn. once (2:27). Apart from Jn. 8:28; 14:26, 9:34 Jesus himself is the subject of the vb., while the theme of the teaching is always the message of Jesus as the one who reveals God; it is a message which demands → faith and is recognized as the true message from God only by him who believes. The same is true in 1 Jn. 2:27, where the author encourages the church and alludes to their "anointing" (on *chrisma*, anointing, cf. R. Bultmann, *The Johannine Epistles*, *Hermeneia*, 1973, 41). This anointing bestows upon them the Holy → Spirit, who according to 1 Jn. 3:24 (cf. Jn. 14:25) is the source of all knowledge. Hence those who have the anointing need no further instruction: they know the → truth already (cf. 1 Jn. 2:21). One of the two instances in the NT of *didaktos*, taught, occurs in Jn. 6:45 in the quotation from Isa. 54:13, where those who come to Jesus are seen as fulfilling the prophecy, "And they shall all be taught by God." It is God himself who draws men to Jesus.

(d) Paul uses *didaskō* only 5 times in Rom., 1 Cor. and Gal. (Rom. 2:21; 12:7; 1 Cor. 4:17; 11:14; Gal. 1:12), which is not surprising when one considers the weight of associations it must have brought to his mind after his conversion. His whole life had been governed by the *paradoseis patrikai*, the traditions of the fathers (Gal. 1:14), which were "taught". In Rom. 2:21 he uses *didaskō* entirely in the traditional sense of Heb. *limmaḏ*, when he asks the Jew: "You then who teach others, will you not teach yourself?" Rom. 12:7 refers to the office, within the church, of the → *didaskalos*, teacher, whose task it is to expound the principles of the faith (cf. 1 Cor. 4:17, where Paul says that Timothy reminds the church of the apostle's "ways in Christ" – probably meaning his principles – and teaches them). In Gal. 1:12 *didaskō* means to hand on a tradition. Paul's language is noteworthy in 1 Cor. 11:14, where he speaks of → nature teaching; this idea may well have a Stoic background (cf. Epictetus, *Dissertationes* 1, 16, 10). The use of *didaktos* in 1 Cor. 2:13 is similar to the other occurrence in Jn. 6:45 (see above, (c)), where God himself is the teacher: "And we impart this in words not taught by human wisdom but taught by the Spirit, interpreting spirit and truths to those who possess the Spirit."

(e) The situation is somewhat different in those epistles which some scholars

regard as Deutero-Pauline. In 2 Thess. 2:15 ("hold to the traditions which you were taught by us, either by word of mouth or by letter") the reference is to 1 Thess. and to (more or less fixed) oral traditions. Here, therefore, "to be taught" no longer means "to hear the message in a concrete situation", but "to receive and keep the teaching handed down" – reminiscent of the teaching methods employed by the rabbis. *didaskō* also occurs in the pass. in Eph. 4:21, where the phrase *en autō edidachthēte*, "you were taught in him", like the previous phrase *manthanein Christon*, to "learn Christ", refers to the conversion of those who are being addressed (cf. Col. 2:7).

It is difficult to determine the meaning of *didaskō* in Col. 1:28 and 3:16. But the reference is probably to the practical exhortation required of all members of the church. The phrase *en pasē sophia*, in all wisdom, which qualifies *didaskō* in both passages, probably has to do with the manner rather than the content of the teaching.

In these epistles, therefore, the use of *didaskō* lacks all uniformity and is altogether different from that of the Gospels.

(f) In the Pastoral Epistles, it is Timothy's right and duty to teach (1 Tim. 4:11; 6:2); in 2 Tim. 2:2 teaching is the task of those who meet certain requirements, while in 1 Tim. 2:12, women are debarred from teaching. In all these passages what is taught is assumed to be "good" or "sound" doctrine (*didaskalia*), which is passed on and preserved (i.e. taught). It is interesting that teaching is now restricted to specific persons, and is no longer for all Christians as in Col. 1:28. In Tit. 1:11 *didaskō* refers to heretics who, for the sake of gain, are teaching Jewish myths and commands of men. But invariably "to teach" involves passing on a tradition which is more or less fixed, as is stressed in the Pastorals by the phrase *pistos ho logos*, "the saying is sure" (1 Tim. 1:15; 3:1; 4:9; 2 Tim. 2:11; Tit. 3:8). The emphasis falls on handing it on. The sole instances of *didaktikos*, skilful in teaching, occur in 1 Tim. 3:2 and 2 Tim. 2:24, where it is listed among the qualifications of → bishops and God's servants.

(g) Closely related to the usage of the word in the Pastoral Epistles is that of the Epistle to the Hebrews. In Heb. 5:12 the author reproaches his readers with the fact that, although they might already have been teachers, they still need to be taught afresh the first principles of God's word (i.e. those basic Christian doctrines indicated in Heb. 6:1 ff.). In Heb. 8:11 the word occurs in the quotation of Jer. 31:31 ff., where the knowledge of God, which doubtless is also knowledge of his will, seems to be the subject of the teaching.

(h) The two occurrences of *didaskō* in Rev. (2:14, 20) refer to the activity of false teachers in Pergamum and Thyatira respectively.

3. To summarize: the NT uses *didaskō* in the following two senses:

(a) (mainly in the Gospels and Acts) to proclaim, call for a decision, address men in the sense of teaching them those things which God requires of the whole man;

(b) (mainly in the Pastorals and 2 Thess.) to teach in the sense of handing down a fixed body of doctrine which must be mastered and then preserved intact. The only passage not conforming to this usage is Eph. 4:21. *K. Wegenast*

διδάσκαλος

διδάσκαλος (*didaskalos*), teacher, master; νομοδιδάσκαλος (*nomodidaskalos*), teacher of the law; καλοδιδάσκαλος (*kalodidaskalos*), teaching what is good; ψευδοδιδάσκαλος

(*pseudodidaskalos*), false teacher; ἑτεροδιδασκαλέω (*heterodidaskaleō*), teach a different, i.e. heretical, doctrine.

CL *didaskalos*, derived as a *nomen agentis* from the present stem *didask-*, is widely used in Gk. in the sense of teacher or tutor, from Homer onwards (e.g. Homer, *Hymnus ad Mercurium* 554 ff.; Aesch., *PV* 110 f.; Plato, *Prt.* 326c; Epictetus, *Enchiridion* 17; on the Gk. usage see E. Reisch, *didaskalos*, Pauly-Wissowa V 401 ff.). The term covers all those regularly engaged in the systematic imparting of knowledge or technical skills: the elementary teacher, the tutor, the philosopher, also the chorus-master who has to conduct rehearsals of poetry for a public performance. Since the teacher's activity is confined to specific areas (reading, writing, the art of war, a trade, etc.), the word *didaskalos* is often more closely defined by the subject he teaches. In this connexion it is interesting that Socrates did not want to be known as a teacher, for virtue was not something that could be taught (cf. Plato, *Ap.* 33a). Epictetus, on the other hand, actually recommended himself as a teacher for those striving after perfection (*Dissertationes* 1, 9, 12)).

Philo's usage conforms to that of cl. Gk. Hence, he uses the term "teacher" not only of Moses (*Gig.* 54) but also of God himself (*Rer. Div. Her.* 102 and passim). In both cases he regards a teacher as one who imparts knowledge, not as one who lays ethical demands before others.

OT 1. In the LXX *didaskalos* occurs only twice: in Est. 6:1 where the meaning is "reader" and in 2 Macc. 1:10 to denote Aristobulus, the head of the Egyptian Jewish community, who, having dedicated an exposition of the Pentateuch to King Ptolemy Philometor, is called a teacher clearly for this reason. The usage of 2 Macc. 1:10, where *didaskalos* means a teacher of the law, is in striking contrast with those translations of the word so far discussed. Its roots lie neither in familiar Gk. usage nor in Philo (where *didaskalos* means either one who imparts knowledge, or a tutor), but in Palestinian Judaism and in the Heb. vb. *lāmaḏ*, to learn (piel form *limmaḏ*, to teach). The reason for the rare occurrence of the word in the LXX may be not merely that the translators of the Heb. Scriptures did not regard the Gk. title *didaskalos* as adequate for a teacher of the law; the Heb. equivalent of *didaskalos*, *môreh*, is also rare and is rendered only once (Prov. 5:13) by the participle *didaskōn*, teaching. Elsewhere it is translated by other words such as *planōntes*, seducers (twice in Isa. 30:20); *plasas*, sculptor (Hab. 2:18); *brōmata*, food (Joel 2:23). It is clearly not just the word but the whole idea of "teacher" which is foreign to the OT since the latter is more concerned with obedience than with the imparting of information.

2. The situation is different in the Qumran texts, where *môreh* occurs more frequently, though usually with some qualifying phrase like *ha ṣaddiq*, the righteous one; *ṣᵉḏāqâh*, righteousness; *yaḥaḏ*, union or community; so e.g. 1QpHab 1:13; 2:2; 5:10; 7:4; 8:3; 9:9; 11:5; CD 1:11; 20:32; for *ha yaḥîḏ* CD 20:1 and 14). These titles probably refer to the founder of the sect, who taught the true understanding of the Torah (cf. G. Jeremias, *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit*, *StUNT* 2, 1963, 109, 168–267, 319–353; cf. also F. F. Bruce, *The Teacher of Righteousness in the Qumran Texts*, 1957). Other Heb. terms used are *maśkîl*, instructor (e.g. 1QS 3:13; 9:12, 21; cf. CD 12:21; 13:22) and *raḇ*, teacher of the law (cf. E. Lohse, art. *rhabbi*, TDNT VI 961–65; → Rabbi). A *raḇ* or *rabbî* in the Judaism of the time of Christ had

the task of expounding the Torah and of giving rulings in matters of the law. He had pupils (*talmiḏîm*) who studied his exposition and his rulings and were in duty bound to respect and obey their teacher. The pupil normally addressed his teacher as *rabbî*, my teacher, and it was this suffixed form which, in the 1st cent. A.D., became the exclusive term for an officially appointed teacher of the law.

NT In the NT *didaskalos* occurs 59 times, the vast majority of which are in the Gospels (12 times in Matt. and Mk. respectively; 17 times in Lk. and 9 times in Jn.). The word refers to Jesus on 41 occasions of which 29 represent a direct form of address. In the Gospels *didaskalos* also applies to John the Baptist (Lk. 3:12), Nicodemus (Jn. 3:10) and the scribes (Lk. 2:46). Elsewhere in the NT, it denotes the "teachers" of the church (Acts 13:1; 1 Cor. 12:28; Eph. 4:11; Jas. 3:1). In 1 Tim. 2:7 and in 2 Tim. 1:11 the author of these Epistles calls himself *didaskalos*, a term which he uses alongside *kēryx*, herald (→ Proclamation, art. *kēryssō*) and *apostolos* (→ Apostle).

1. *Jesus as Teacher.* The vocative form *didaskale*, master, applied to Jesus (e.g. Mk. 9:17, 38; Matt. 8:19; Lk. 10:25 and passim) or to John the Baptist (Lk. 3:12) is merely the translation of the Heb. *rabbî* (cf. Jn. 1:38; 20:16, where this is made explicit). *rhabbi* also occurs in the Gospels as a Gk. transliteration (e.g. Mk. 9:5; 11:21). Although the meaning of the two words largely coincides, viz. "master" in the sense of a teacher of the law in Israel, it should be noted that their semantic history is quite different. The use of "Rabbi" as a form of address to Jesus may be historically authentic, for according to the tradition he had all the marks of the Rabbi: he is asked to give rulings on disputed questions of the law (Lk. 12:13 f.), and on doctrinal issues (Mk. 12:18 ff., concerning the resurrection); he also has pupils. The later conditions for bearing the title rabbi, namely study and ordination, were not yet binding in the time of Jesus (cf. E. Lohse, *Die Ordination im Spätjudentum und im Neuen Testament*, 1951, 50 ff.).

It is, therefore, all the more interesting that in some passages Matt. has discarded the vocative *didaskale* which he found in his original text, and has used it only when it comes from the lips of his opponents or of outsiders, while Lk., generally speaking, adopts the usage of his original and even inserts *didaskalos* in 4 other passages (Lk. 7:40; 11:45; 12:13; 19:39). Only in 3 places (Lk. 8:24, 45; 9:49) does Lk. replace the original *didaskale* by *epistata*, teacher, master. The reason why Matt. largely discards the title *rhabbi* is clear: being in sharp conflict with the rabbis, he wishes to avoid the too-frequent ascription of their title to Jesus. The term *rhabbi* may also be displaced in favour of titles which are christological in content (cf. Matt. 8:25 with Mk. 4:38). Lk., on the other hand, uses *didaskalos* for the most part quite spontaneously and, like Mk., without attaching to it any christological significance.

In addition to its use in the vocative, *ho didaskalos* is very often used absolutely in the Gospels to denote Jesus: outsiders use it without any special emphasis (Matt. 9:11; 17:24 and passim). It occurs in the saying which Jesus applies to himself: "a disciple is not above his teacher" (Matt. 10:24 f.), describing the relationship existing between Jesus and his followers (→ Disciple), and then in Matt. 23:8 (a passage exclusive to Matt.), where Jesus admonishes his disciples: *hymeis mē klēthēte rhabbi; heis gar estin hymōn ho didaskalos* (but you are not to be called rabbi, for you have one teacher). As F. Hahn has shown, here and also in Mk. 14:14 *didaskalos* is to be

interpreted christologically: Jesus, above all others, is *the* Teacher, whose authority continues even after his death (cf. Jn. 3:2; 11:27 f.; 13:13 f., where *didaskalos* is used together with other christological titles; F. Hahn, *The Titles of Jesus in Christology*, 1969, 77 ff.).

2. *The Teaching Office in the Early Church.* In 1 Cor. 12:28 *didaskalos* is mentioned as the third charismatic office of a triad (alongside → apostles and → prophets). Men holding this office had the task of explaining the Christian faith to others and of providing a Christian exposition of the OT. It is true that these three offices receive the addition of a fourth – that of the *euangelistēs*, evangelist – in Eph. 4:11, but in both cases the teacher is appointed to a particular church (cf. Acts 13:1, where the *didaskaloi* are mentioned together with the prophets; also *Did.* 13:2; see H. Greeven in *ZNW* 44, 1952–53, 1 ff.). Jas. 3:1, warning against too strong an influx into the teaching office (an office which the writer himself appears to hold), points out that the failures of teachers will incur severe penalties in the judgment. Heb. 5:12 refers to Christians who ought long since to have been "teachers", but who still need to be taught the first principles of the faith. In 2 Tim. 4:3 the word appears to be applied ironically to heretics.

To summarize: in its use of *didaskalos* as a form of address to Jesus and others, the NT follows Jewish usage. The latter may have had some influence, too, on the remaining NT usage, apart from that in Matt. 23:8 and Mk. 14:14, where the word has christological force.

3. The following compounds may be noted. *nomodidaskalos*, teacher of the law, is found only in Christian writings. In 1 Tim. 1:7 it is used of false teachers who desire to be teachers of the law, but are without understanding and have fallen into vain discussion. They evidently occupied themselves with → myths and endless → genealogies (v. 4). In Acts 5:34 the term describes the Pharisee, Gamaliel, who was "held in honour by all the people" and who urged the other leaders to leave the apostles alone, "For if this plan or undertaking is of men, it will fail; but if it is of God, you will not be able to overthrow them. You might even be found opposing God!" (vv. 37 f.). In Lk. 5:17 it denotes the Pharisees. *kalodidaskalos*, teaching what is good, is found only in Tit. 2:3, where it is a description of what the older women ought to be. *pseudodidaskalos*, false teacher, occurs only at 2 Pet. 2:1 where such men are seen as counterparts to the false prophets of old. They will secretly bring destructive heresies and even deny the Master who bought them; but they will bring swift judgment upon themselves. *heterodidaskaleō* means to teach a different, i.e. heretical, doctrine. It occurs only twice. Timothy is urged to remain at Ephesus and "charge certain persons not to teach any different doctrine" (1 Tim. 2:3). These people were evidently the same as those who aspired to be *nomodidaskaloi* in v. 7. In 1 Tim. 6:3 the test of such a teacher is whether he agrees with "the sound words of our Lord Jesus Christ and the teaching which accords with godliness". The character of those who do not is delineated in the following verses. *K. Wegenast*

διδασκαλία *διδασκαλία* (*didaskalia*), teaching, instruction; *διδαχή* (*didachē*), teaching.

CL & OT 1. Derived from *didaskalos* is the noun *didaskalia*, which denotes the ac-

tivity of one who is a teacher in the Gk. sense. This active meaning is found in profane Gk. from Pindar onwards, but the word also occurs with a passive meaning, viz. doctrine (i.e. that which is taught) or tuition (i.e. being taught) (for references, see E. Reisch, Pauly-Wissowa V 394 ff.). Philo, and Judaism in general, display the same usage (*Jos.* 1; *Deus Imm.* 54; *Op. Mund.* 79; cf. *TDNT* II 160).

In the LXX the word occurs only 4 times (in Prov. 2:17 as a translation of *'allâp̄*, companion; and in Sir. 24:33; 39:8; Isa. 29:13 as a translation of *m^{e}lummāḏâh*, that which is taught). In the first 3 passages mentioned, *didaskalia* means "the law" considered as the will of God, but in Isa. 29:13, where the LXX changes the underlying sing. to plur., it means "doctrines of men", which by their very multiplicity are to be distinguished from the one will of God. The reason for the rarity of *didaskalia* in the LXX lies in the fact that its primary meaning in profane Gk. is intellectual teaching with a view to knowledge, whereas Israel saw teaching as meaning the law of God, to which the only appropriate response was obedience.

2. On the other hand, *didachē*, derived directly from the verbal stem, occurs in Gk. from Herodotus and Thucydides onwards in the sense of instruction, or of doctrine imparted by teaching; similarly in Plato and (sporadically) in Philo and Josephus. In the LXX it is found only in Ps. 59:1 in the phrase *eis didachēn*, for instruction, which translates the Heb. *l^{e}lammēḏ*. The Heb. equivalent of *didachē* would in fact be *talmūḏ*, as found, e.g. in Aboth 6:2, "thou findest no freeman excepting him who occupies himself with the study of the Law."

NT In the NT *didachē* occurs 30 times, of which 13 are in the Synoptic Gospels and the Acts, and 9 in the Johannine writings including Rev. In contrast to this relatively wide spread, out of 21 instances of *didaskalia*, 15 alone are found in the Pastoral Epistles, with 2 more in Eph. and Col. In other words, it is only in the later writings of the NT that *didaskalia* comes into its own.

1. In relation to *didachē*, the following details emerge:

(a) In Mk. 1:22, 27 it is Jesus' preaching which is called *didachē*, without any further details being given as to its content (cf. Mk.'s use of → *didaskō*). It is worthy of note that Mk. sees this teaching as having a close connexion with Jesus' → miracles, since these are proof, so to speak, of the divine authority behind the teaching. In Mk. 11:18 his authoritative teaching is given as the reason for the scribes' plotting to kill him, while in Mk. 12:38 the term *didachē* is extended to cover his polemic against the scribes.

(b) Matt. uses *didachē* editorially in Matt. 7:28 to describe the foregoing passage, namely the Sermon on the Mount, a portion of Christ's message characterized by exposition of the → law (cf. 22:33). However, he does not confine the term exclusively to the teaching of Christ, but uses it also for that of the Pharisees and Sadducees (Matt. 16:12).

(c) The usage in Acts is similar. Here *didachē* is used for the early Christian preaching, and appears in a variety of phrases: "the apostles' teaching" (Acts 2:42); "the teaching of the Lord" (Acts 13:12); "new teaching" (Acts 17:19); all these expressions, in the mind of Luke, denote the testimony of the apostles to Jesus Christ (cf. Acts 1:21). Exposition of the law, which Matt, could still describe as *didachē*, is no longer considered part of the teaching.

(d) Jn.'s use of *didachē* in Jn. 7:16 f. (cf. 18:19) points in the same direction. The

Johannine message in the mouth of Jesus is described as teaching which comes from the Father. This message of "Jesus" becomes in 2 Jn. 9 f. the *didachē Iēsou Christou*, but the content of both is identical.

(e) Paul uses *didachē* only in the gloss Rom. 6:17, and again in Rom. 16:17, referring in both cases to the whole of his apostolic teaching. In 1 Cor. 14:6, 26 the word denotes one of several types of "edifying speech", all contrasted with speaking in tongues (→ Word, art. *glōssa*).

(f) Paul's use of *didachē* in Rom. and 1 Cor. may be contrasted with the usage found in the Pastoral Epistles. In the former epistles the scope of the word is left undefined, whereas in the Pastorals (cf. 2 Tim. 4:2; Tit. 1:9) *didachē* has probably become a given body of doctrine which is to be inculcated as such. This is indicated elsewhere by the fact that "teaching" is referred to as *parathēkē*, that which is entrusted (1 Tim. 6:20; 2 Tim. 1:12, 14), and *didaskalia*, doctrine. The situation in Heb. is probably similar: Heb. 6:2 mentions *baptismōn didachē*, a doctrine of ablutions, while in Heb. 13:9 the writer describes the teachings of his opponents as *didachē* (cf. Rev. 2:14, 15, 24).

(g) To summarize, therefore: in the NT *didachē* denotes Christ's message (with his call to repentance and faith) and the early Christian preaching in the widest sense. It is striking that no explicit distinction is made between a fixed body of doctrine (handed down by tradition) and the message preached at any given time. The fact that the early church, at a relatively early stage, possessed a more or less fixed body of doctrine, is indicated by the brief confessions of faith quoted by Paul, even though he himself may not yet have viewed them as sacrosanct. The material collected in the Sermon on the Mount points in the same direction. Such compilations lead on to the *Didachē of the Twelve Apostles* (*Did.* 2:1; 6:1; 11:2) and to that of Barnabas (9:9), which were regarded as authoritative teaching. (For further discussion → Proclamation, art. *The Structure and Content of the Early Kerygma.*)

2. This development can be observed still more clearly in the use of *didaskalia*, as already indicated by the statistics given above.

(a) The phrase *didaskalias anthrōpōn*, precepts of men, is applied to the teachings of the scribes and Pharisees in Mk. 7:7; Matt. 15:9, quoting Isa. 29:13 (LXX). The same quotation from Isa. is used in Col. 2:22 to describe the doctrines of Judaizing Christian gnostics (cf. G. Bornkamm, "Die Häresie des Kolosserbriefes", in *Das Ende des Gesetzes*, 1952, 138 ff.). Similarly 1 Tim. 4:1 refers not only to the spirits of seduction and error but also to the doctrines of → demons.

(b) Wherever else it occurs in the NT, *didaskalia* is in the sing. In Rom. 12:7 it means the teaching office, and in Rom. 15:4 it describes the function of Ps. 69:9, quoted in v. 3, namely to provide Christians with instruction. In Eph. 4:14 Christians wavering in spiritual discernment are said to be *peripheromenoi panti anemō tēs didaskalias*, carried about with every wind of doctrine.

(c) The Gospels and Paul, with their limited use of *didaskalia* (6 times only) form a contrast with the Pastoral Epistles, where it occurs no less than 15 times. In 1 Tim. 1:10; 2 Tim. 4:3; Tit. 1:9; 2:1 the word is qualified by *hygiainousa*, → sound, and means that relatively fixed "orthodoxy" which the churches have received and which it is their duty to preserve against heresy. The same fixed doctrinal tradition is called in 1 Tim. 6:3 *hē kat' eusebeian didaskalia*, the teaching which accords with godliness, in 1 Tim. 4:6 *kalē didaskalia*, good doctrine, and in 1 Tim. 4:16 simply

didaskalia (cf. 2 Tim. 3:10). The word denotes an activity in 1 Tim. 4:13 (cf. Tit. 2:7; 1 Tim. 5:17). In 2 Tim. 3:16 we learn that the Scripture inspired by God (i.e. the OT) is profitable for teaching; and finally in Tit. 2:10 slaves are told that their behaviour should "adorn the doctrine" (cf. 1 Tim. 6:1).

The frequent use of *didaskalia* in the Pastoral Epistles shows a freedom from the inhibitions of the LXX translators (see above CL & OT 1). There is no hesitation in calling Christian preaching *didaskalia*, and likewise *parathēkē* and *didachē*. No tension is felt between the gospel, constantly preached afresh, and doctrine to be learnt, kept pure and defended against heresies. *K. Wegenast*

κατηχέω

κατηχέω (*katēcheō*), inform, instruct; κατήχησις (*katēchēsis*), instruction; κατηχούμενος (*katēchoumenos*), pupil; κατηχῶν (*katēchōn*), teacher.

CL This word, rare in profane Gk. and found only at a late date, meant originally to sound from above, and so denotes the action of poets or actors who speak down from a stage (see Lucian, *Juppiter Tragoedus* 39; cf. Philostratus, *Imagines* 1, 19). In Plutarch (*de Fluviis* 7, 2 (II, 1154a)) the word occurs with a double acc. in the very general sense of to give information about something, report something. It is also found with the meaning to instruct, teach. The noun *katēchēsis* is used in Stoic literature (e.g. Diogenes Laertius, 7, 89).

OT The word is absent from the LXX, and its usage in Philo and Josephus conforms to that of profane Gk. Its Heb. equivalent is the hiph. of *yārâh*, to show, to instruct, with the acc. (cf. Isa. 28:9; 1 Sam. 12:23).

NT The noun *katēchēsis* occurs nowhere in the NT, and the vb. only in Paul and Lk. (4 times each). Lk.'s usage covers both normal meanings (to report something, Acts 21:21, 24; to instruct someone, Acts 18:25; the meaning of the word in Lk. 1:4 is disputed). On the other hand, Paul uses the word exclusively in the sense of to instruct someone regarding the content of the faith (see 1 Cor. 14:19; Gal. 6:6; in Rom. 2:18 the law is the subject of instruction), so that *katēcheō* may even be regarded as a technical term for "to instruct in the faith". This meaning seems particularly appropriate in 1 Cor. 14:19, where Paul asserts that he would rather speak five intelligible words "in order to instruct others" than ten thousand words in tongues, which after all may merely encourage self-glorification on the part of the speaker.

In Gal. 6:6 Paul enjoins that he who is taught (*katēchoumenos*) should supply the material needs of his teacher (*katēchōn*). This is probably the earliest evidence we have for a "full-time" teaching office in the early church (cf. 1 Cor. 9:3–18), and it is even possible that Paul himself introduced the term *katēchōn* for the teacher of the gospel, a term as rare in Hellenistic Judaism as elsewhere in the NT.

The use of *katēcheō* as a technical term also occurs in Acts 18:25, if "the way of the Lord" refers to God's redemptive work in Christ and in history. There is dispute as to the meaning of the phrase in Lk. 1:4 *hina epignōs peri hōn katēchēthēs logōn tēn asphaleian* (that you may acknowledge the certainty of those things which you have been taught). With many others, the present writer inclines to the view that the

logoi of this verse are to be identified with the *pragmata* (events) of v.1, by which Lk. means the life, death and resurrection of Jesus as recorded in pre-Lucan literature. If such is the case, this would be yet another instance of the technical use of *katēcheō* in the early church. By the time 2 Clem. 17:1 came to be written, the word had already become the normal term for baptismal instruction given to catechumens.

katēcheō, therefore, supplied the early Christians with a specific word for an essential aspect both of their evangelistic work and of their church life: teaching the saving acts of God. *K. Wegenast*

παραδίδωμι

παραδίδωμι (*paradidōmi*), to hand down, pass on, transmit; παράδοσις (*paradosis*), tradition.

CL 1. *paradidōmi* is found in Gk. from Plato onwards, meaning to hand down, pass on instruction from teacher to pupil (e.g. *Theaet.* 36, 198b). (For its other meanings, to hand over, deliver up, see → Judgment, art. *paradidōmi.*) In the sense of handing down instruction *paradidōmi* is also found in Aristotle, Polybius, Plutarch and others. In the Hellenistic mysteries the word is used in connexion with the delivery of a *hieros logos* (holy teaching) (cf. *Theon Smyrnaeus*, ed. E. Hiller, 1878, 14; Strabo, 10, 3, 7; Diodorus 5, 48, 4: *Corp. Herm.* 1, 32; 13, 15 and passim; and the Lat. equivalent *tradere* in Cicero, *Tusculanae Disputationes* 1, 13, 29 and Apuleius, *Met.* 9, 21). It is significant that Philo uses the word in similar fashion (e.g. *Vit. Mos.* 1, 23 and passim).

2. The noun *paradosis* is found from Thucydides onwards meaning, actively, handing down (e.g. in Plato, Epictetus) and, passively, that which is handed down (e.g. in *Corp. Herm.* 13, 22b and many gnostic writings. On the gnostic view of tradition see K. Wegenast, op. cit., 123 ff. It is possible that *paradosis* acquired its technical sense of "tradition" only through gnosticism.

OT 1. The handing down of sagas, narratives, laws and lists of names occurred even in pre-historic Israel, but tradition properly so called, with its own terminology and self-awareness, came into being only when Judaism was confronted with aggressive Hellenism in the last two centuries B.C. and with Christianity in the 1st century A.D. Part of the new terminology was the Heb. equivalent of *paradidōmi*, the important word *māsar*, which referred to the strictly regulated process of handing down received expositions of the law (cf. Aboth 1:1 "Moses received the Law from Sinai and committed it to Joshua"; similarly Peah 2:6 and passim).

2. Philo and Josephus, in common with profane Gk., use the noun *paradosis* to mean both "handing down" and "that which is handed down", and Josephus characteristically uses the term *tēn paterōn paradosin*, the tradition of the fathers, for the scribes' oral exposition of the Torah (*Ant.* 13, 409; cf. 10, 51; 13, 297; Philo, *Spec. Leg.* 4, 150). The LXX, however, confines the word to its pass. sense (2 Esd. 7:26; Jer. 32[39]:4; 34[41]:2), the act. sense always being expressed by the vb. The Heb. equivalent is *māsōreṯ*, which occurs in the OT only in Ezek. 20:37 f. (Theodotion translates it here by *paradosis*), where it probably means a bond, obligation to the covenant.

In the period of the Tannaim *māsōreṯ* carries a double meaning: (a) the tradition

which safeguards the integrity of the biblical text; (b) non-halachic tradition. Aboth 3:14 gives a characteristic description of the function of tradition in the Jewish sense: "The tradition is a fence around the Law."

NT 1. In the NT the vb. *paradidōmi*, besides meaning to hand over, deliver up (→ Judgment), also conveys the idea of handing down tradition.

(a) In Mk. 7:13, "you make void the word of God through your tradition which you hand on", the obj. of *paradidōmi* is the rabbinic halachah (exposition of the law); i.e. the vb. is used here in its normal Jewish sense. Similarly, it occurs in Acts 6:14 in the witnesses' testimony against Stephen who is alleged to have said that Jesus would change the customs which Moses had delivered. In Acts 16:4 Luke uses *paradidōmi* in connexion with the *dogmata*, decisions, of the apostolic council which Paul delivered to the churches in Lycaonia and elsewhere.

The use of *paradidōmi* in Lk. 1:2 is significant. Here its obj. is the oral *diēgēsis* or the account of those who "from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word", the account being that of the events of Jesus' life. (On the relationship between Lk. himself and the eyewitnesses, the "many", who before Lk. had undertaken to compile a narrative of these matters, see G. Klein, "Lk. 1, 1–4 als theologisches Programm", in E. Dinkler, ed., *Zeit und Geschichte*, 1964, 193 ff.) The *historia Jesu* has now taken the place of the exposition of the law as a tradition to be handed down.

(b) In Paul *paradidōmi* occurs 4 times in the sense of to deliver, commit (Rom. 6:17; 1 Cor. 11:2, 23; 15:3). Of these passages Rom. 6:17 is probably a gloss (cf. Wegenast, op. cit., 179); the subject of *paradidōmi*, here used in the pass., is not a teaching, but by contrast men who are "committed" to a form of doctrine. This use of the word has its roots in the mystery religions.

On the other hand, in 1 Cor. 11:2, 23 and 15:3 the obj. of the vb. is Christian doctrines. 1 Cor. 11:2 refers to instructions "delivered" by Paul at an earlier time, but since these instructions are not explicitly named, it is uncertain whether Paul means that he has passed on to the Corinthians instructions which he himself has received, or whether he is referring to his own commands as being particularly important and binding, in which case Paul himself would have to be regarded as the source of the tradition. In the two other Cor. passages, however, he explicitly states that he himself has received the tradition before passing it on.

In 1 Cor. 11:23 he names the "Lord" as the source of the tradition: *egō gar parelabon apo tou kyriou, ho kai paredōka hymin*, "for I received from the Lord what I also delivered to you." The phrase "from the Lord" is not a reference to an immediate revelation, nor an abbreviation for a continuous tradition; rather it expresses Paul's belief that as the ensuing "words of institution" of the Lord's Supper are handed down, the Lord himself speaks; and to Paul, *his* word is of supreme authority (cf. 1 Cor. 9:14). Any allusion here to a continuity of tradition in the rabbinic sense is unlikely, since Paul nowhere makes use of any such idea. He who can boast of a private revelation (Gal. 1:16 and passim) can appeal to a current tradition if it will help to further the gospel or if the unity of the gospel is to be stressed, but he certainly has no need to plead the authority of any continuous tradition.

In 1 Cor. 15:3 *paredōka* is not qualified by any reference to the source of the tradition, but linguistic evidence points to at least v. 3 ff. as stemming from the

earliest church tradition (cf. H. Conzelmann in *Interpretation* 20, 1966, 15 ff.).

The fact that in these passages Paul not only quotes the existing tradition but in each case interprets and modifies it (cf. Wegenast, *Das Verständnis der Tradition*, 1962, 52 ff. 93 ff.), shows how distinct his view of tradition was from that of the rabbis, who regarded it as of fundamental importance that the received tradition be passed on unchanged. To Paul, therefore, *paradidōmi* does not mean "to pass on unchanged", but to pass on in a sense which permits the tradition to be modified to meet present needs. ([Ed.] Opinions differ on Paul's use of tradition. For fuller discussions → Proclamation, art. *The Structure and Content of the Early Kerygma.*)

(c) The situation is different in 2 Pet. 2:21: *hē paradotheisa . . . entolē*, the commandment delivered, and Jude 3: *hē paradotheisa tois hagiois pistis*, the faith which was delivered to the saints; here → commandment and → faith are to be seen as tradition which, being fixed once and for all, must be preserved intact.

(d) There are, then, 3 types of tradition in the NT expressed by *paradidōmi*; the following are said to be handed down: (i) the Jewish Halachah (Mk. 7:13; Acts 6:14; cf. Acts 16:4); (ii) early Christian narratives about Jesus (Lk. 1:2); (iii) confessions of faith and rules for the conduct of the church's life (1 Cor. 11:2, 23; 15:3 ff.; 2 Pet. 2:21; Jude 3).

The difference between Paul's usage and that of the rabbis (also that of 2 Pet. and Jude) is that for Paul tradition is not sacrosanct; this adj. can be applied only to the → gospel, which is anterior to all tradition and which he received by revelation (cf. Gal. 1:6 ff.). Thus the nuances in the meaning of *paradidōmi* reflect the development of Christianity from a charismatic movement to a church safeguarding its own tradition. An ever-increasing time-lag occurred between, on the one hand, the events which inaugurated Christianity, namely Christ's life, death and resurrection, and, on the other hand, the actualities of the church's life. It is of course true that preaching interpreted the past, but the church still had to face the immense problem of how to keep in touch with her origins. Hence "tradition" came to play a vital rôle, and in this context the following vbs. should also be noted: first, the vb. corresponding to *paradidōmi*, namely *paralambanō*, to receive; then *kēryssō*, to proclaim; *homologeō*, to confess; *didaskō*, to teach; and *euangelizomai*, to preach the gospel.

2. The noun *paradosis* is used in the NT, as in the LXX, only in the sense of "that which is handed down", i.e. teaching, doctrine. It occurs only in Mk. 7, Matt. 15 and 5 Pauline passages.

(a) In Mk. 7:3, 5 (par. Matt. 15:2), as in Josephus, the phrase *paradosis tōn paterōn/presbyterōn* (tradition of the fathers/elders) means the fathers' tradition of the law which is not laid down in the Bible, and which Jesus in the same context (7:8) calls "the tradition of men" (cf. SB I 691 ff.). According to Mk. 7, this rabbinic exposition of the law is in conflict with God's will (cf. Gal. 1:14). In 1 Cor. 11:2; 2 Thess. 2:15 Paul's instructions are called *paradoseis*. Before 2 Thess. 2:15 is seen as a classic proof-text for the Roman Catholic principle of tradition (namely both written and oral tradition), it should be borne in mind that *paradoseis* here does not consist of a fixed canon of writings handed down and supplemented by oral tradition, but refers to the apostle's written and oral admonitions to the church, which the church has duly accepted (cf. 2 Thess. 3:6).

(b) The passages dealt with so far probably show the influence of Jewish "tradition"-terminology, but this is not so in Col. 2:8. Here the phrase *paradosis tou*

anthrōpou does not mean Jewish exposition of the law as in Mk. 7:8, but is a polemical way of referring to the "traditions" which his Colossian opponents regard as revelations of the elemental spirits of the universe (→ *stoicheia*). The Colossian believers are not to receive such "traditions", since they have already "received" Christ Jesus (v. 6). *K. Wegenast*

παιδεύω

παιδεύω (*paideuō*), bring up, instruct, train, educate; παιδεία (*paideia*), upbringing, training, instruction, discipline; παιδευτής (*paideutēs*), instructor, teacher; παιδαγωγός (*paidagōgos*), custodian, guide, the man, usually a slave, whose task it was to conduct boys and youths to and from school and superintend their conduct generally.

CL The underlying root is *pais*, → child, boy. *paideuō* thus lit. means to be together with a child (the verbal ending *-euō* denotes a state); hence, to bring up, educate, instruct, teach, accustom. Derived from this is the noun *paideia*, which is found as early as the 6th cent. B.C. in the sense of education, and which connotes the process of education, development of culture, which the Sophists of the 5th cent. declared to be the chief aim of their work. Later the word was extended to cover adult education as well, and used generally of scientific training. Other derivatives are *paidagōgos*, one in charge of boys, custodian, tutor (usually referring to slaves), and *paideutēs*, teacher, educator.

The word *paideuō* is unknown to Homer, although education and ideals of education were certainly in existence, in the form of introducing the new generation, through example and imitation, to moral and legal traditions. In Homer the object is preparation for taking one's place in the aristocratic community, which is based on competition (*Il.* 11, 784: "always to strive for distinction, and surpass the others"). Sparta and Athens were the two extremes. Sparta required above all, despite the idea of competition, that its citizens should be totally subordinated to the state; while the Athenians had as their aim in education the training of the individual citizen, by means of competition, to develop a physical and spiritual maturity in keeping with the ideal of the *kalos kagathos* (→ Good, art. *kalos* CL 2), who was then able to serve the state.

The Sophists were probably the first to emphasize consistently the equality and hence educability of all men. They therefore held courses of lectures, which anyone who paid might attend. In contrast to the formal principle of the Sophists, Socrates maintained the concrete principle of the *agathon*, the good, which can be brought to light by the individual's study and growth in knowledge (in this respect the method is the same as that propounded by the Sophists). The didactic principle here is that of not-knowing, and the method employed is the mind-guiding conversation, which arouses knowledge and is thus able to guide a person along the way to wisdom and with it to correct behaviour. In Plato education is the only possible way to overcome present injustice and to create a true, i.e. just, state. The basis for this is education in music and gymnastics (*Rep.* 2, 376e ff.). School should be compulsory, since children belong to the state rather than to their parents (*Laws* 804d). For the élite who are fit to govern there is in addition a gradual introduction to philosophical thinking (*Rep.*

7, 521c–534), the object of which is to arouse in the individual the memory, already present, of the ideas, the archetypes of reality, which he has seen before his existence here on earth (*Meno* 81c ff.; *Rep.* 7, 514 ff.). Aristotle took as his aim in education the aesthetically and ethically cultured citizen (*Eth. Nic.* 5, 5, p. 1130b, 26 f.; cf. *TDNT* V 598 for further details). Exhortation and habit are both to play their part in training up the man of moderation, who is in a position to further both his own life and that of the community. Unlike the élite in Plato's state, Aristotle no longer includes the sciences as a part of education. In the Hellenism of the NT period, the Stoic ideal of the leader who is responsible to himself and to reason, standing above the people, is of crucial importance in cultured circles.

To sum up, we may say that wherever the concept of education prevailed, the central position was occupied by man, since he is a creature endowed with reason and therefore basically capable of being educated. The aim of education is the complete man, i.e. the man who exercises sensible mastery over his specific quality (*aretē*). Only the Sophists advocated recklessness as a programme. With the exception of Plato's state, the Greeks never understood the principle of education in a perfectionist sense. Concepts like fate, deity, and later, chance and personal freedom had too much influence on Gk. thought for that.

OT *paideuō* (84 times in the LXX, 52 of which render recognizable Heb. equivalents) is used 41 times in the LXX for the Heb. *yāsar* (mostly piel), to chastise, discipline, correct. The noun *paideia* (103 times in the LXX, 47 of which for recognizable Heb. equivalents), is used 37 times for *mûsār*, chastisement, discipline; "but it can also take on a more intellectualized sense, and stand for 'culture', in the sense of the possession of wisdom, knowledge, and discernment" (G. Bertram, *TDNT* V 604).

The words are found especially often in Prov. (vb. 12 times; noun 29 times), in the Pss. (vb. 13 times; noun 5 times), and in Sir. (vb. 15 times; noun 35 times), and rarely outside the prophetic and Wisdom literature.

The OT bears witness to God's self-revelation to Israel and intervention in his life. In response to his love and care for the chosen people, he expects in turn trust and obedience. The priestly nation is to be stamped with God's nature, and to become increasingly fitted for the sphere of his holiness. The trouble that God has with his people forces him to severe disciplinary measures, or chastening (*yāsar/mûsār*). But God does not educate in order to achieve an ideal; he watches over his people's faithfulness, which he intends should flow from trust (in inter-human relations) and from that constant readiness to hear and truly listen which arises from obedience (to the prophetic message). Originally it was Israel as a whole, as a nation, that was seen as being subject to God's discipline (Deut. 4:36; 8:5; Hos. 7:12; 10:10); but later, in proverbial wisdom, it is more a matter of God's education of the individual (Prov. 3:11; 15:33; Sir. 18:14). This education by God, which Israel is ever trying to escape, although it is for his own good, is shared equally by all members of the nation. There is no special religious education of the young. It is God who educates, and the upbringing of children takes place within the sphere of this God who instructs in love and punishes because of the recalcitrance of his own.

The Heb. expressions refer primarily to the chastisement which a father has to inflict upon his son (Deut. 21:18; Prov. 13:24; 19:18; 23:13; 29:17), and which God

allows to be inflicted upon his servant for the sake of his people's salvation (Isa. 53:5). Thus in Deut. 11:2 *mûsar* YHWH is the guidance of God, his educational dealings with Israel in history. Because of sin he chastises (Lev. 26:18, 28), but "in just measure" (Jer. 10:24; 46:28). Man is able to accept or despise, love or hate this education (Jer. 5:3; Prov. 12:1; Ps. 50[49]:17). In the wisdom of Proverbs there is a gradual change from the process of discipline to the effect of it, viz. "instruction", which has to be learned (Prov. 1:2), bought and kept (Prov. 23:23). But it is always God, not the child, or an ideal, who is central and forms its content. The educational aim of God is to lead his people to the realization that they owe their existence to the saving will of Yahweh alone, and therefore owe obedience to their divine instructor (Deut. 8:1–6).

How then does the education of the young proceed in Israel? God commands that they obey their parents, who are next to him in importance. The father acts like a priest to the family. He hands on the tradition to the family; he does so in answer to the questions of his children (Exod. 12:26 f.), and his answer is a confession of God's saving activity towards Israel. The children are told of this not only in words, but also by means of impressive signs in the form of monumental stones (Jos. 4:6 f., 21 ff.). Education takes place in the execution of justice (Deut. 21:21), and in the teaching of the law. There is no theory of education, no special institutions; but the young become accustomed to the life of the nation, which stands under the loving discipline of God. Watching and listening, they enter into the inheritance of their forefathers. For he who hears aright will obey.

It is in the Wisdom literature that we first find a moralizing and humanizing tendency. The aim of education is now → wisdom (Prov. 1:7; 8:33), which recognizes at the bottom of things a prevailing order, to which the wise man submits. The message of the OT is seen to some extent in an educational light, or the Gk. concept of education is given a theological slant: faith and reason are united. In the LXX the vb. *paideuō* remains nearer in meaning to the OT "chasten"; the noun *paideia* tends more in the direction of the Hellenistic idea of culture, instruction. But even though here in a certain sense an educational ideal has developed in Israel, the point of reference remains, even for this human culture knowledge about God, his revelation and commandments (G. von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, I, 1962, 441–53). In summoning Israel to keep God's commandments, as he enters the promised land, Deut. 11:2 calls upon Israel to reflect on Yahweh's past dealings, and in so doing provides the expression (so important in Eph. 6:4), *paideia kyriou*, discipline of the Lord (Heb. *'et mûsar* YHWH): "And consider this day (since I am not speaking to your children who have not known or seen it), consider the discipline of the LORD your God, his greatness, his mighty hand and his outstretched arm."

In Palestinian Judaism education was still very closely associated with the OT: the aim of all education was to produce the man who lived in obedience to the will of God. A deep-rooted change may however be observed in the fact that the standard by which God's will is determined is the → law. In the period following the exile, this had become more and more an absolute, standing over Israel as a timeless demand, not affected by history, and forming the basis of her relationship to God. This Judaistic concept of education had its classic expression in the rabbinic schools, where the Torah, together with its casuistic interpretation, was taught and learnt. In Hellenistic Judaism, on the other hand, education was more strongly influenced by

Greek ideas. Typical of this are the philosophical schools of Alexandria with Philo as the outstanding representative.

NT Words of this group are found altogether 23 times in the NT. 8 of these occurrences are found in Heb. 12 alone, another 10 in Paul, including 5 in the Pastorals, 4 in Luke, and 1 in Rev. The OT sense prevails. Where reference is made to *paidagōgos*, custodian, it is impossible to be certain of the exact meaning.

1. (a) The vb. is used twice in the sense of to teach, instruct: Moses was instructed in Egyptian wisdom (Acts 7:22), and Paul was educated by Gamaliel (Acts 22:3).

(b) *paideuō* is used twice in the sense of scourge, whip, thrash or chastise (Lk. 23:16, 22). It is no longer possible to determine whether here, as in so many parts of the passion narrative, allusion is being made to an OT prophecy (Isa. 53:5), or whether *paideuō* is taken simply from popular Gk. usage in the sense of thrashing (G. Bertram, *TDNT* V 621).

2. The concept of education by God underwent decisive further development in Judaism, with the idea that God's teaching and therefore loving hand was to be experienced in suffering (e.g. Jud. 8:25–27; 2 Macc. 6:12–17; Pss. Sol. 3:4; 13:9). Hints of this idea are found even in the OT (e.g. Deut. 8:5; 11:2; 2 Sam. 7:14 f.). This view of chastening as God's loving action, to preserve men from the final judgment, is taken over in one or two significant passages in the NT (cf. O. Michel's excursus, *Der Brief an die Hebräer*, *KEK* 13, 1965 [12], 297).

In Heb. 12:5 f. there is a citation from Prov. 3:11 f. The discipline of the Lord is a sign of his love, and not therefore any ground for losing courage. The scriptural quotation is followed by a discussion of the point in vv. 7–11. God is the one who educates his people. God's method of education is illustrated by reference to human upbringing, which is a weak reflection of the former. God is the Father; he chastens because he loves, in order to keep men in the status of being children of God, and to cause his children to turn round and come home. Man resists this discipline, defies God and doubts his fatherly love (v. 6), although in doing so he is rejecting divine sonship; for it is precisely in discipline that God's fatherly activity is experienced. If even in the bringing up of a family the status of a true son is to be recognized by the fact that his father educates and "chastens" him, how much more so with regard to God. Human fathers exercise discipline without ultimate insight, and are open to mistakes, but the Lord does so with the ultimate object of making man share in his holiness (v. 10). The aim of this discipline is peace with God (v. 11), which is also the starting point for God's educative activity, education in divine sonship. Although the Stoics talked in similar terms, the peak of their education is found in the self-perfection of man.

Heb. 12:9 uses the comparatively rare word *paideutēs*, instructor, teacher, one who disciplines, in opposition to fathers. The same word is also found in Rom. 2:20 of the Jew who sets himself up as a teacher of the law, oblivious to his own failings in the light of the law.

The thought, that it is precisely in chastening that God's love becomes visible, is found also in Paul, in connexion with his exhortations about the Lord's Supper (1 Cor. 11:32). Christians are not spared illness and death as a result of their sins. Here discipline overlaps with God's judgment. But since this judgment has the nature of

discipline, believers are graciously spared because of it the final judgment of God over the world, and thus saved from damnation (v. 32b; see also here Rev. 3:19). Paul knows from his experience in carrying out his apostolic commission (2 Cor. 6:9) that chastening is not a contradiction of God's love, but is rather to be understood on the basis of it.

The NT view of education through discipline is, however, fundamentally different, not only from the Gk. concept of education (i.e. towards an ideal), but also from the rabbinic teachings which accord to suffering as a result of chastening an expiatory power. In the NT discipline at God's hand is a practical necessity, in order that believers can recognize that they are in a proper position of sonship.

A different kind of education is brought about by God's word in the OT (2 Tim. 3:16). Since here too God himself is really the one who is speaking, the NT church finds in the OT Scriptures instruction as to God's will, and is thus trained up to live a life pleasing to God. Tit. 2:11–13 speaks even more directly of God's educative grace: everything flows together into the message of the cross (vv. 13 f.). Here too education is an outworking of grace; the language in both passages – 2 Tim. 3:16 and Tit. 2:11–13 – is Hellenistic, but the basic thought belongs to the OT. The words "sober, upright and pious" are ideals of the Gk. world; but what is being said here is that man is justified by grace and led by it into sanctification.

Finally, Paul also speaks of the educative function of the law (Gal. 3:24 ff.). The law is the *paidagōgos*, custodian or taskmaster, to lead us to Christ. The *paidagōgos* and the *didaskalos* were differentiated (Xen., *Respublica Lacedaemoniorum* 3, 2; Plato, *Lysis* 208c; cf. J. S. Callaway, "Paul's Letter to the Galatians and Plato's Lysis", *JBL* 67, 1948, 353 ff.; Diog. Laert., 3, 92; Philo, *Leg. Gai.* 53; cf. Arndt, 608). Whether Paul was thinking of the slave to whom boys were entrusted (cf. Plut., *Mor.* 4a, b), and who beat them, or whether he was thinking in more positive terms, can no longer be certainly determined. But in any case he means the person who keeps the boys in order. The word was common as a loanword in rabbinic writings (S. Krauss, *Griechische und lateinische Lehnwörter im Talmud*, II, 1899, 421). To uphold God's order, and to reveal human disobedience ("to make sin exceeding sinful") – this was the purpose of the law, which in itself was good and holy (Rom. 7:12). With the coming of Christ, who introduces and brings in the new age, this function has ended (Gal. 3:25). Through faith in Christ the child has become a mature son of God (Gal. 4:1). The apostle is here speaking in terms of salvation history. Man in his sinful state cannot keep the God-given law; when he recognizes the validity of the commandment, and thus too his own guilt, he is driven to Christ. But he who is in Christ is free from the law, for he is under the law of the love of Christ (Rom. 13:10b; cf. Rom. 10:4; → Goal, art. *telos* NT 1 (a)).

3. 1 Tim. 1:20 speaks of men who have been delivered to → Satan to be punished by him. What we have here is an act of church discipline (probably excommunication), in which Satan embodies the wrath of God, afflicting with illness and death those who are destroying the church of God. Even this chastening, however, is not directed towards the final destruction of the sinner, but rather towards bringing him to his senses and to repentance (v. 20b).

4. Education is also a human activity. Paul's exhortation to children, that they should respect their parents, is followed in Eph. 6:4 by a word to fathers, that they should bring up (*ektrephete*) their children in the discipline (*paideia*) and instruction

of the Lord (*kyriou*). How should this genitive, *kyriou*, be taken? "Education for the Lord" (Luther) is scarcely possible. "Of the Lord", in the sense that God is behind human upbringing, is a possibility, as is the interpretation of W. Jentsch, who holds that the reference is to education which has to do with the Lord (genitive of quality; *Urchristliches Erziehungsdenken*, 1951). In any case the Christian who declares with Paul that "Jesus is Lord" (1 Cor. 12:3) must renounce the demands of all other lords to his total allegiance. Like all other aspects of life, the sphere of education is, for the believer, under the lordship of Jesus, and can proceed in the faith which overcomes the world (1 Jn. 5:4 f.). *D. Fürst*

→ Proclamation, → Prophet, → Rabbi, → Remember, → Rule, → Scribe, → Scripture, → Word

(a). P. Asveld, "Tradition", *EBT* III 915–23; F. A. G. Beck, *Greek Education, 450–350 B.C.*, 1964; and "Education", *OCD*, 369–73; G. Bertram, *paideuō* etc., *TDNT* V 596–625; H. W. Beyer, *katēcheō*, *TDNT* III, 638 ff.; G. Bornkamm, *Jesus of Nazareth*, 1960; C. Brown, "The Teaching Office of the Church", *The Churchman*, 83, 1969, 184–96; F. F. Bruce, *Tradition Old and New*, 1970; F. F. Bruce and E. G. Rupp, eds., *Holy Book and Holy Tradition*, 1968; F. Büchsel, *paradidōmi* etc., *TDNT* II 169–73; R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, I, 1955, 119–42; J. S. Callaway, "Paul's Letter to the Galatians and Plato's Lysis", *JBL* 67 1948, 353 ff.; B. S. Childs, *Memory and Tradition in Israel*, *SBT* 37, 1962; C. N. Cochrane, *Christianity and Classical Culture*, 1940; H. von Campenhausen, "Tradition and Spirit in Early Christianity", in *Tradition and Life in the Church: Essays and Lectures in Church History*, 1968, 7–18; and *Ecclesiastical Authority and Spiritual Power in the Church of the First Three Centuries*, 1969; Y. M.-J. Congar, *Tradition and Traditions: An Historical Essay and a Theological Essay*, 1966; H. Conzelmann, *An Outline Theology of the New Testament*, 1969; O. Cullmann, "Scripture and Tradition", in D. J. Callahan, H. O. Obermann, and D. J. O'Hanlon, eds., *Christianity Divided: Protestant and Roman Catholic Theological Issues*, 1962, 7–33; F. V. Filson, "The Christian Teacher in the First Century", *JBL* 60, 1941, 317 ff.; B. Gerhardsson, *Memory and Manuscript: Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity*, *Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis* 22, 1961; and *Tradition and Transmission in Early Christianity*, *Coniectanea Neotestamentica* 20, 1964; J. R. Geiselmann, *The Meaning of Tradition*, *Quaestiones Disputatae* 15, 1966; and "Scripture, Tradition and the Church: An Ecumenical Problem", in D. J. Callahan, H. O. Obermann and D. J. O'Hanlon, eds., op. cit., 39–72; R. P. C. Hanson, *Tradition in the Early Church*, 1962; M. D. Hooker, "Were there False Teachers in Colossae?", in B. Lindars and S. S. Smalley, eds., *Christ and Spirit in the New Testament. In Honour of Charles Francis Digby Moule*, 1973, 315–32; D. Jenkins, *Tradition and the Spirit*, 1951; E. Käsemann, "The Canon of the New Testament and the Unity of the Church", in *Essays on New Testament Themes*, *SBT* 41, 1964, 95–107; R. C. Lodge, *Plato's Theory of Education*, 1947; E. Lohse, *rhabbi, rhabbouni*, *TDNT* VI 961–65; H. I. Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity*, 1956; W. Marxsen, *Mark the Evangelist*, 1969; H. T. Mayer, "Scripture, Tradition and Authority in the Life of the Early Church", *Concordia Theological Monthly* 38, 1967, 19–23; K. Rahner, "Scripture and Tradition", in *Theological Investigations*, VI, 1974, 98–112; K. H. Rengstorf, *didaskō* etc., *TDNT* II 135–65; E. Schweizer, "Scripture – Tradition – Modern Interpretation", *Neotestamentica*, 1963, 203 ff.; D. J. Theron, *Evidence of Tradition: Selected Source Material for the Study of the History of the Early Church, Introduction and Canon of the New Testament*, 1957; J. J. Vincent, "Didactic Kerygma in the Synoptic Gospels", *SJT* 10, 1957, 262–73.

(b). G. Bertram, "Der Begriff der Erziehung in der griechischen Bibel", *Imago Dei, Festschrift Gustav Krüger*, 1932, 35–51; H. Bacht, "Die Rolle der Tradition in der Kanonbildung", *Catholica* 12, 1958, 16 ff.; W. Bacher, *Tradition und Tradenten in den Schulen Palästinas und Babyloniens*, 1914; P. Barth, *Die Geschichte der Erziehung in soziologischer und geistesgeschichtlicher Beziehung*, 1916[2]; H. R. Balz, *Methodische Probleme der neutestamentlichen Christologie*, *WMANT* 25, 1967, 176 ff.; R. Bohren, *Kirchenzucht im Neuen Testament*, 1952; P. Bonnard, "La Tradition dans le Nouveau Testament", *Revue d'Historie et de Philosophie Religieuses* 40, 1960, 20 ff.; H. von Campenhausen, "Glaube und Bildung nach dem Neuen Testament", *Studium Generale* 2, 1949, 182–94; and "Die Begründung kirchlicher Entscheidungen beim Apostel Paulus", *Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 1957, 2 (reprinted in *Aus der Frühzeit des Christentums*, 1963, 30 ff.);

L. Cerfaux, "Die Tradition bei Paulus", *Catholica* 9, 1953, 94 ff.; H. Conzelmann, "Was von Anfang war", in *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann*, 1954, 195 ff.; O. Cullmann, *Die Tradition als exegetisches, historisches und theologisches Problem*, 1954; E. Dinkler, "Tradition und Urchristentum", *RGG*[3] V 970 ff.; L. Dürr, *Das Erziehungswesen im Alten Testament und antiken Orient*, 1932; G. Eichholz, "Verkündigung und Tradition", *EvTh* 24, 1964, 565 ff. (reprinted in *Tradition und Interpretation. Studien zum Neuen Testament und zur Hermeneutik*, *ThB* 29, 1965, 11 ff.); E. Fascher, "Jesus der Lehrer", *TLZ* 79, 1954, 324 ff.; H. Flender, "Lehre und Verkündigung in den synoptischen Evangelien", *EvTh* 12, 1965, 701 ff.; S. Funk, *Die Entstehung des Talmud*, 1919; O. Glombitza, "Die Titel *didaskalos* und *epistatēs* für Jesus bei Lukas", *ZNW* 49, 1958, 275 ff.; L. Goppelt, "Tradition nach Paulus", *KuD* 4, 1958, 213 ff.; H. Greeven, "Propheten, Lehrer, Vorsteher bei Paulus", *ZNW* 44, 1952–53, 1–43; W. Jaeger, *Paideia*, I–III, 1954; W. Kamlah, "Sokrates und die Paideia", *Archiv für Philosophie* 3, 1949, 277–315; W. Jentsch, *Urchristliches Erziehungsdenken*, *BFChTh* 45, 3, 1951; H.-J. Kraus, "Paedagogia Dei als theologischer Geschichtsbegriff", *EvTh* 8, 1948–49, 15 ff.; W. G. Kümmel, "Jesus und der jüdische Traditionsgedanke", *ZNW* 33, 1934, 110 ff. (reprinted in *Heilsgeschehen und Geschichte*, 1965, 15 ff.); P. Lengsfeld, *Überlieferung*, 1960; J. L. Leuba, "Der Zusammenhang zwischen Geist und Tradition nach dem Neuen Testament", *KuD* 4, 1958, 234 ff.; E. Liechtenstein, "Die älteste christliche Glaubensformel", *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 63, 1950, 1 ff.; E. Lohse, "Katechismus im Urchristentum", *RGG*[3] III 1179 ff.; U. Luck, "Kerygma, Tradition und Geschichte Jesu bei Lukas", *ZTK* 57, 1960, 51 ff.; J. Mayer, *Geschichte des Katechumenats und der Katechese in den ersten sechs Jahrhunderten*, 1968; F. Müller, "Kerygma und Paideia", in E. Dinkler, ed., *Zeit und Geschichte. Dankesgabe an Rudolf Bultmann zum 80. Geburtstag*, 1964; M. P. Nilsson, *Die hellenistische Schule*, 1955; J. Ranft, *Die Traditionsmethode als älteste theologische Methode des Christentums*, 1934; H. Schlier, "Kerygma und Sophia. Zur neutestamentlichen Grundlegung des Dogmas", in *Die Zeit der Kirche*, 1956, 206 ff.; K. E. Skydsgaard und L. Vischer, eds., *Schrift und Tradition*, 1963; K. G. Steck, "Tradition", *EKL* III 1471 ff.; J. Stenzel, *Platon, der Erzieher*, 1928; F. Vogel, "Zu Lk. 1, 4", *Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift* 44, 1933, 203 ff.; K. Wegenast, *Das Verständnis der Tradition bei Paulus und in den Deuteropaulinen*, *WMANT* 8, 1962; O. Willmann, *Aristoteles als Pädagog und Didaktiker*, 1909; E. Ziebarth, *Aus dem griechischen Schulwesen*, 1914[2].

Temple

Two words are used to denote the temple, *naos*, which refers more specifically to the sanctuary, and *to hieron*, which is the neut. form of the adj. *hieros*, holy, used as a noun and is used to denote the collection of buildings which comprised the temple at Jerusalem. In the following article a history and description of the temple is given under *to hieron*, and particular aspects of the temple are discussed separately under the appropriate key words. For other related concepts → Feast, → Priest, → Reconciliation, → Redemption, → Sacrifice, → Prophet, → Tent, Tabernacle. For the attitude of the Samaritans → Samaritan.

ναός — *naos* (*naos*), temple, shrine, sanctuary.

CL 1. The noun *naos* is derived from *naiō*, to dwell, and is attested since Mycenean Gk. Originally it meant simply a dwelling, particularly the dwelling of a god, temple (Homer *Il.* 1, 39; *Od.* 6, 10; 12, 346), or the innermost area of such. In the Hellenistic period → heaven, as the dwelling of the gods, could also be described as *naos*. Originally it refers to a (magnificent) building for the gods.

naos must consequently be distinguished from the term *temenos* (cf. Lat. *templum*, Eng. *temple*) which is older in terms of religious history, but not found in the NT.

This latter means a space fenced in, or at least clearly marked, as being an area where a theophany has once occurred and is expected again on the ground of tradition. It is usually a place marked out by nature: the grotto of Zeus on Crete, the rock cleft at Delphi, the holy grove at Olympia, the oaks of Mamre, the rock of Zion. In the special place, not made by human hands, the god appears as the revealer, the healer, or the giver of fertility; but he does not dwell there. In many ways the *temenos* resembles our churchyard (cf. the archaic "God's acre").

2. For the sake of clarity *naos* is therefore translated temple. Such temples are found at first, in the very earliest days of human buildings, in many and varied forms, such as temple-towers (Mesopotamia, Central America), pillared temples, round temples, and even in portable form (Hdt., 2, 63; cf. O. Michel, *naos TDNT* V 880).

OT 1. In the LXX *naos* is used 55 times (out of a total of 61 instances) to translate the Heb. *hêḵāl*, palace, temple, which in turn corresponds to the Babylonian *egallu*, great house. As a building constructed as a dwelling for the gods, it is used for → sacrifice, worship of the gods (idols), and oracles, and hence requires of necessity a local priesthood (in contrast to *temenos*, see above CL 1). In addition there are 5 instances where it is used for *'ûlām*, temple porch (only in the writings of the Chronicler: 1 Chr. 28:11; 2 Chr. 8:12; 15:8; 29:7, 17). Otherwise it is used very much as a purely technical rendering of *hêḵāl*, as may be seen from such passages as 2 Ki. 18:15 f. and 24:13, where the LXX slavishly follows variant expressions for temple which are here used for stylistic reasons, without distinguishing the actual meaning of the terms.

Even in the OT one may observe a distinct reserve in the use of the term *hêḵāl*. Neither the tower of Babel (Gen. 11), nor the places where the Philistines sacrificed (Jdg. 16:23 ff.), nor even the shrines at Bethel and Dan, are ever called *hêḵāl* in the OT; here we may trace no doubt the effects of the Deuteronomic reform. In any case the OT refers much more often to the temple by means of the simple Heb. term *bayiṯ* (Gk. *oikos*), → house, than by using the Sumerian-derived word *hêḵāl* (Gk. *naos*), temple. Only Solomon's edifice in Jerusalem (1 Ki. 6 f.), and before that the temple at Shiloh (1 Sam. 1 ff.), from which the ark of the covenant was finally brought to Jerusalem (2 Sam. 6), are described as *hêḵāl*. In the Pentateuch the term is never once used.

2. Whereas the OT thus uses its terminology to distinguish true worship from false, the LXX cuts out all passages where *hêḵāl* means palace, by rendering it in such instances simply by house (e.g. 1 Ki. 21:1; 2 Ki. 20:18; Isa. 13:22). The result of this limitation is that *naos* becomes a purely cultic term, referring exclusively to the true temple of God. This is shown also by the fact that after the desecration of the temple in Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar it is never called *naos* (cf. Ezr. 6:5); indeed, the LXX sometimes even appears to avoid calling the post-exilic temple by this name (Zech. 6:9 ff.). The one exception, in Ps. 45(44):15, where the king's palace is called *naos*, seems to indicate that the LXX has adopted a symbolic interpretation of this ancient love-song: the community is Yahweh's bride.

Corresponding to this is a certain spiritualization (von Rad), which may be observed in the Psalms. Attention is focused on the temple not so much as a place of sacrifice and hence of the priesthood, but as the place above all others that is longed for (Ps. 27[26]:4), the place to which a cry for help (28[27]:2) or the individual's

worship is directed (5:7; 138[137]:2), and hence also the place of comfort (65[64]:4), of God's response (18[17]:6), of God's might (68[67]:28 f.; cf. 29[28]:9). The term is not found in the Psalms of joy over Zion (46; 48; 76), or in those which aim at some reform of the cult (40; 50; 51), but in those which are concerned with the relationship of the individual in need to his God.

Post-exilic spiritualization clearly has as its background the realization that the prophets were right in their radical opposition to the cult (Jer. 7:4). It is to their influence that the carrying out of Josiah's cultic reforms should probably be attributed (2 Ki. 23), but it should nonetheless be noted that the prophets never used the term *hêḵāl* (*naos*) in their criticism of the cult (cf. Amos 5:21 ff.; Isa. 1:10 ff.). The term occurs in Ezek. 8:16; 41:1, 4, 15, 21, 23, 25; 42:19).

3. In contrast to the pre-exilic period, when there was always a Jewish state in existence (even if a very small one), we may observe in the post-exilic and Judaistic period a considerable change in the significance of the temple. David's son → Solomon, who reigned *c.* 961–*c.* 922 B.C., had erected the first temple in close proximity to the palace, in the previously Jebusite and therefore heathen city of Jerusalem (1 Ki. 6–7; 2 Chr. 3–4), which his father had made into a political capital of the united kingdom, a location without significance in the Yahweh religion. It was primarily a national sanctuary, with priests employed by the state and royal sacrifices. The Deuteronomic reforms of Josiah (*c.* 639–609 B.C.; 2 Ki. 22:1–23:30; 2 Chr. 34:1–35:27), however, centralized worship of the one God of Israel with the temple as the focal point of his presence. This is why in the exile, which was seen as a catastrophe for national independence and for the Yahweh religion alike, the temple, or Zion, acquired such great importance (Ps. 137; cf. also Ezek. 40–43). Since it combined within it the ancient splendour of the nation and the new, reformed faith, it gained a new significance for the prayers of the faithful, and as the symbol of the nation's longing it became also the sign of the new thing promised by God.

It should not be supposed, however, that this development was clear-cut or unilateral. Before the exile, too, the temple was used for the prayers of the faithful, and after the exile sacrifices were offered there. And just as in pre-exilic times the temple fulfilled a complex function, so its post-exilic history was many-sided also. On the one hand, this is marked by the high estimation of the house of God, to which the design of the new temple in Ezek. 40–43, the work of Haggai and the books of Maccabees bear witness. The splendour of the new building erected by Herod the Great mainly between 19 and 9 B.C. was also an object of pride. Josephus records that "these structures seemed incredible to those who had not seen them, and were beheld with amazement by those who set eyes on them" (*Ant.* 15, 416).

On the other hand, as early as the 2nd cent. B.C. a group of priests separated themselves from the temple because they regarded it as being polluted by sin (CD 1:5–11). In doing so they clearly continued the prophetic tradition of criticism of the cult, and they founded in the wilderness of the Dead Sea at Qumran a community which regarded itself as the true sanctuary of God (cf. 1QS 8:5; 9:6). The place of the Jerusalem cultus was now taken by the chosen community (→ Elect; → Church), which lived in strict obedience to the Torah, awaiting the revelation of God's righteousness (cf. R. J. McKelvey, *The New Temple: The Church in the New Testament*, 1969, 36 ff., 46–53; B. Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in*

Qumran and the New Testament, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 1, 1965).

NT In the NT *naos* is found most frequently in Rev. (16 times) and Paul (7 times; neither use the word *to hieron*). The Synoptic Gospels use it almost only in the passion narrative (Mk. 3 times, Matt. 9 times, Lk. 7 times; Lk. prefers *hieron*, 39 times), and the Johannine writings (apart from the saying in Jn. 2:19–21, which comes from the Synoptic tradition), like the other writings of the NT, do not use it at all.

1. Paul stands quite clearly on the basis of Jewish tradition when he speaks of the *naos*: the redeemed community is the temple of God (1 Cor. 3:16 f.), and God's → Spirit dwells in her (1 Cor. 6:19; cf. 1 Ki. 8:16 f., where God's → name dwells in the temple). If, however, the church allows itself to be led astray, the adversary dwells within her (2 Thess. 2:4). To be the community in which God makes his dwelling implies separation from the ungodly (2 Cor. 6:16: the terminology in this section is particularly close to that of the Qumran texts e.g. 4QFlor; cf. Ezek. 37:27; Lev. 26:11 f.; Gärtner, op. cit., 52 ff.). In Eph. 2:21 this concept is developed further and in more detail (→ Rock).

In Acts 17:24 Paul declares to the Athenians that "The God who made the world and everything in it, being the Lord of heaven and earth, does not live in shrines [*naois*] made by man." Acts 19:24 refers to "Demetrius, a silversmith, who made silver shrines of Artemis" which brought no little business to Ephesus and who accused Paul of turning many people away "saying that gods made with hands are not gods" (v. 26).

2. The return to the language of the OT and Judaism is still more evident in the Revelation of John. Those who conquer are to be preserved and to adorn the heavenly temple (Rev. 3:12; cf. Ps. 144[143]:12); indeed just as Ezekiel's temple is measured (Ezek. 40 ff.), so the eschatological community will be (Rev. 11:1 f.). The Apocalypse speaks often of the heavenly temple (Rev. 7:15; 11:19; 14:15 ff.; 15:5–8; 16:1, 17), clearly on the basis of Ps. 11:4. Yet in Rev. 21:22 it is expressly stated that in the new Jerusalem there will no longer be a temple, since God himself will be the temple for the community. God himself is the dwelling place of his people; the community and the temple are co-extensive. "Behold, the dwelling of God is with men. He will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself will be with them" (Rev. 21:3). Thus the central idea of the covenant promise "I will be your God, and you shall be my people" will be fulfilled (→ Covenant, art. *diathēkē* OT 5).

3. (a) In contrast to Paul and Rev., the Synoptic Gospels use *naos* to describe the Jerusalem temple, which they see as a matter of principle to be subject to eschatological criticism (the destruction of the temple in A.D. 70: Mk. 11:15 ff., in the setting of verses 12–25), or which is at least in need of purification (Lk. 19:45 f. and 47 f.). The synoptic writers speak mostly of the *hieron*, but in several passages which reveal the influence of the OT they also use *naos*, temple. In Mk. special importance is attached to a saying attributed to Jesus, which only Jn. records on his lips (Jn. 2:18 ff.) and which goes back to Hos. 6:1 f. (Matt. [26:61; 27:40], but not Lk., records it). In Mk. 14:58 it is used as false evidence against Jesus during his trial: his alleged disrespect for the temple, which was regarded as the expression of God's presence and holiness, is adduced in order to demonstrate his sacrilegious attitude (for

discussion see D. R. Catchpole, *The Trial of Jesus: A Study in the Gospels and Jewish Historiography from 1770 to the Present Day*, 1971, 126 ff.). In Mk. 15:29, however, the saying is taken up by the mockers at the foot of the cross, and its secret meaning is revealed: it is not a matter of saving the physical body of Jesus, but rather of God's new creation, before which the old must pass away – a matter of → death and → resurrection. In keeping with this Matt., in his polemic against the Pharisees, attacks with particular severity the Jewish practice of swearing by the temple (Matt. 23:16 ff.; → Swear): God does not want casuistry, but honesty and obedience.

(b) Luke places the temple in the setting of the history of salvation. The period before Jesus was also a period of priestly service in the temple, as Lk. 1 illustrates with its narrative about Zechariah. It is true that Jesus repeatedly went to the temple (cf. Lk. 20–21) in order to teach there; but he kept to the outer courts which were open to all Israelites, as did also the early Christian church at first. Lk. uses *naos* only at Lk. 1:9, 21 f. (cf. Acts 17:24; 19:24). Elsewhere he prefers → *to hieron*, the general word for a holy place (as in Acts 3:1 ff. etc.). Similarly Jesus taught in the synagogue (Lk. 4:15 f., 20, 28, 33, 38, 44; 6:6; 7:5; 8:41; 11:43; 12:11; 13:10; 20:46; 21:12; cf. Matt. 4:23; 6:2, 5; 9:35; 10:17; 12:9; 13:54; 23:6, 34; Mk. 1:21, 23, 29, 39; 3:1; 6:2; 12:39; 13:9; Jn. 6:59; 18:20). It is thus Lk. among the evangelists who gives most prominence to Jesus' teaching in the synagogues. This practice was continued in Acts, in so far as the apostles always began their preaching (even outside Palestine) in the synagogue, since that is the place where the Jews meet (Acts 6:9; 9:2, 20; 13:5, 14, 43; 14:1; 15:21; 17:1, 10, 17; 18:4, 7, 19, 26; 19:8; 22:19; 24:12; 26:11). Only twice does the term *naos* occur there (Acts 17:24 and 19:24), in both cases in the course of polemic against heathen temple worship (see 1, above; cf. Acts 2–5). Stephen's speech stresses that "the Most High does not dwell in houses made with hands; as the prophet says, 'Heaven is my throne, and earth my footstool. What house will you build for me, says the Lord, or what is the place of my rest? Did not my hand make all these things?' " (Acts 7:48 ff.; cf. Isa. 66:1 f.; Paul's preaching at Athens in Acts 17:24; on Stephen's attitude to the cult → Sacrifice, art *thyō* NT 1, cf. OT 5). *W. von Meding*

τὸ ἱερόν

τὸ ἱερόν (*to hieron*), temple.

CL The expression *to hieron* contains the neut. form of the adj. *hieros*, holy, used as a noun. In cl. Gk. *to hieron* and its plur. *ta hiera*, the holy things, can denote sacrifice (Homer, *Il.* 1, 147; Hdt., 8, 54; cf. Philo, *Spec. Leg.* 3, 40; Josephus, *Ant.* 2, 275; G. Schrenk, *TDNT* III 231). The plur. can also refer to cultic objects. *to hieron* (Ionic *hiron*) can mean the consecrated grove (Hdt., 5, 119), or any place of sacrifice, or the inner part of the place of worship, the *temenos* (→ *naos* CL). Hdt. uses *hiron*, *nēos* and *temenos* interchangeably (2, 170, cf. 155). Polybius uses *to hieron* of the Jerusalem temple, and both Jewish and Christian writers frequently use it of pagan shrines (Ezek. 27:6; 28:18 LXX of Tyre; Josephus, *Ant.* 6, 374 of the temple of Astarte; 1 Macc. 10:84; 11:4 of Dagon; Josephus, *Ant.* 18, 65; *War* 7, 123 of Isis; further examples in *TDNT* III 233).

OT 1. *Terminology.* In the LXX translation of the canonical writings of the OT *to hieron* occurs only rarely to denote the Jerusalem temple. Apart from a mis-

translation in Ezek. 45:19, it occurs in this sense only in Chr. (1 Chr. 9:27; 29:4; 2 Chr. 6:13). However, it does occur in 1 Esd. 1:8; 5:43; 8:18, 64 etc.; 1 Macc. 15:9; 2 Macc. 2:9; 3 Macc. 3:16; 4 Macc. 4:3. The reason for its general absence from the canonical writings is doubtless its associations with idolatry, coupled with the fact that the Heb. OT uses more general terms to denote the temple.

The terms used by the Heb. OT for the temple include the following.

(a) *bayiṯ* is the ordinary word for → house including both the family and the building. *bayiṯ* can be used for the temple of a god (Dagon, 1 Sam. 5:2), the house of God (Exod. 23:19; 34:26), in Shiloh (Jdg. 18:31; 1 Sam. 1:7), and at Jerusalem (1 Ki. 6:5; 1 Chr. 9:23; Isa. 2:2; 6:1; Dan. 1:2; Mic. 3:12; Hag. 1:8; Amos 7:13; etc.), and Ezekiel's vision of the temple (Ezek. 41:7 ff.).

(b) *hêḵāl* is derived from the Sumerian, meaning a great house, and used for a palace (e.g. 2 Ki. 20:18; Isa. 39:7; Prov. 30:28) and also the temple, the building at Shiloh (1 Sam. 1:9; 3:3), Yahweh's abode (2 Sam. 22:7), and the temple at Jerusalem (1 Ki. 6:3, 5, 33; 7:21; 17:7, 50; 2 Ki. 18:16; 23:4; 24:13; 2 Chr. 26:16; 27:2; 29:66; Ezr. 3:6, 10; Neh. 6:18; Pss. 18:6[7]; 27:4; 29:9; 48:9[10]; 65:4[5]; 68:29[30]; Isa. 6:1; 44:28; 66; Jer. 7:4; 24:1; 50:28 MT; 51:11 MT; Hos. 8:16; Hag. 2:15, 18; Zech. 6:12–15; 8:9; Mal. 3:1). It is used of Ezekiel's vision (Ezek. 41:1), of the temple buildings generally (2 Chr. 3:17; 4:7 f., 22). The expression *hêḵal qoḏšᵉḵā*, "thy holy temple" occurs in Jon. 2:4(5), 7(8); Pss. 5:7(8); 79:1; 138:2; and *hêḵal qoḏšô*, "his holy temple" in Mic. 1:2; Hab. 2:20; Ps. 11:4.

(c) The word *qōḏeš* means → holiness, and as such is used in a wide variety of connexions. In particular, it can mean the holy place, especially in the tabernacle or → tent of meeting (Exod. 26:33; 28:29, 35, 43; 29:30; 31:11; 35:19; 39:1, 41; Lev. 4:6; 6:23; 20:4, 18; 16:2 f., 16 f.; 20:23, 27; Num. 4:12, 15 f., 20; 8:19; 28:7; cf. also Exod. 36:1, 3 ff.; 38:27; Lev. 4:6; 10:17; 14:13; Num. 3:28, 31 f.; 4:15; 7:9; 18:3, 5; 31:6; 1 Ki. 8:4; 1 Chr. 9:29; 23:32; 2 Chr. 5:5). The holy place of the temple corresponds to that in the tabernacle (1 Ki. 8:8, 10; Ezek. 41:21, 23; 42:13 f.; 44:19, 27; 45:2; 46:19; Pss. 68:17[18], 24[25]; 74:3; 108:7[8]; 150:1; Dan. 8:13; 9:26; 2 Chr. 5:11; 29:5, 7; 35:5). In some of these passages and Dan. 9:24 the holy place may stand for the temple as a whole.

(d) The related word *miqdāš* means sacred place, sanctuary: in Moab (Isa. 16:12); Bethel (Amos 7:9, 13); Jerusalem (Lam. 1:10); the tabernacle (Exod. 25:8; Lev. 12:4; 21:12; Num. 3:38; 10:21; 18:1); the temple (Ezek. 45:3 f., 18; 47:12; Dan. 11:31; 2 Chr. 20:8; 26:18; 29:21). The expression *miqdaš YHWH*, "sanctuary of Yahweh", occurs at Num. 19:20; Jos. 24:26; Ezek. 48:10; 1 Chr. 22:19); *miqdaš ʾᵃḏōnay*, "sanctuary of the Lord" (Lam. 2:20); *miqdaš ʾᵉlōhâw*, "sanctuary of his God" (Lev. 21:12); *miqdāšî*, "my sanctuary" (Lev. 19:30; 20:3; 21:23 plur.; 26:2; Ezek. 5:11; 8:6; 9:6, 23, 38 f.; 25:3; 27:26, 28; 44:7 ff., 11, 15 f.). Further references are given in Koehler-Baumgartner, 559.

(e) *māqôm* means place. In particular, it is used of God's place (Isa. 26:21; Jer. 7:12; Hos. 5:15; Mic. 1:3); Jerusalem as God's special place (1 Ki. 8:30; 2 Ki. 22:16; Jer. 7:3; 19:3); Shechem where God appeared to Abraham promising to give the land to his descendants (Gen. 12:6); holy places (Gen. 22:3 f.; 28:11, 19; 2 Sam. 7:16; pagan holy places, Deut. 12:2); the place of the name of the Lord of hosts (Isa. 18:7); the place which Yahweh chooses (Deut. 12:5; 14:23, 25; 1 Ki. 8:29); *mᵉqôm miqdāšî*, "the place of my sanctuary" (Isa. 60:13); *mᵉqôm qoḏšô*, "his holy place"

(Ps. 24:3; Ezr. 9:8); *māqôm qāḏôš*, "a holy place" (Exod. 29:31; Lev. 6:9, 19 f.); *mᵉqôm haqqōḏeš*, "the holy place" (Lev. 14:13).

2. *Background.* The OT refers to numerous holy places and shrines before the building of Solomon's temple. The tower of Babel suggests the existence of some form of temple (Gen. 11:4). In Mesopotamia each city had a temple dedicated to its deity, the local ruler acting as a steward for the god. The patriarchs encountered Yahweh at various places, building an altar or pillar to commemorate the occasion (cf. Gen. 22:9; 28:22). During the period of wanderings the tabernacle provided a meeting-place for Yahweh and his people (Exod. 33:7–11; → Tent). In general structure and function the temples of Israel corresponded to the structure and function of the tabernacle. Various local shrines were recognized in the period of the judges, such as Shechem (Jos. 8:30 ff.; 24:1 ff.) and Shiloh (1 Sam. 1:3). The Canaanite deities had their own temples, such as the "house of Dagon" (1 Sam. 5:5) and the "house of Ashtaroth" (1 Sam. 31:10).

David was conscious of a discrepancy between his own life style, having built a palace for himself, and the provision for the worship of Yahweh. He said to Nathan the prophet, "See now, I dwell in a house of cedar, but the ark of God dwells in a tent" (2 Sam. 7:2). David had succeeded in consolidating the kingdom. But Yahweh told him through Nathan that it was Yahweh who had brought about the achievement. Yahweh himself does not need a building erected by men, for he is the one who enables them to do things. Nevertheless, Yahweh would provide a house (2 Sam. 7:11). Because David was a man of blood he was not permitted to build the temple; this fell to his son → Solomon (2 Sam. 7:12–17), though David collected material and treasure and bought the site, the threshing floor of Araunah the Jebusite (2 Sam. 24:18–25; 1 Chr. 21:25; 22:8, 3).

3. *Solomon's Temple.* The building began in Solomon's fourth year and was completed seven years later. The precise location is uncertain, though it evidently stood in the area now covered by the Moslem shrine known as the Dome of the Rock. The building and dedication of Solomon's temple are described in 1 Ki. 6–8 and 2 Chr. 3–5. Phoenician craftsmen were employed in its building (1 Ki. 5:10, 18; 7:13 f.), and it shared architectural features common to Phoenician and Canaanite buildings. In attempting to reconstruct Solomon's temple, scholars have drawn on Ezekiel's vision of a new temple (Ezek. 40–43; see 4, below) which was a more elaborate building, though based on the same lines. It would seem that there was an inner and outer courtyard (cf. 1 Ki. 6:36; 7:12; 2 Ki. 23:12; 2 Chr. 4:9). The bronze altar for burnt offerings stood in the inner court (1 Ki. 8:22, 64; 9:25; → Sacrifice). It stood 20 cubits square and 10 cubits high (2 Chr. 4:1). Between this and the porch was the bronze laver or basin 10 cubits in diameter (1 Ki. 7:23–26; cf. 2 Ki. 16:17). West of the porch, behind bronze doors, stood the "holy place" (Heb. *hêḵal*, temple; see above 1 (b), but cf. also (c)–(e)) which was 40 cubits long, 20 wide and 30 high. It was here that the ordinary rites were performed. It had latticed windows (1 Ki. 6:4) and contained the golden incense-altar, the table for the showbread, the five pairs of lampstands and the instruments of sacrifice.

The inner sanctuary was a perfect cube of 20 cubits, containing the ark of the covenant. The latter was a receptacle for the decalogue, the law, the manna and Aaron's rod (Exod. 25:16, 21 f.; 40:20; Deut. 10:1–5; 30:9; Jos. 24:26; Heb. 9:4 f.). It served as the meeting place in the inner sanctuary where Yahweh revealed his will

(Exod. 25:22; 30:36; Lev. 16:2; Jos. 7:6). It was here that the high priest appeared on behalf of the people with the sacrificial → blood in the annual day of atonement ritual (Lev. 16; → Reconciliation, art. *hilaskomai*). According to Exod. 37:1 ff., the ark was made at Sinai by Bezalel to the pattern given to Moses. It played a crucial part in the crossing of the Jordan (Jos. 3 f.), the fall of Jericho (Jos. 6), the ceremony remembering the covenant at Mt. Ebal (Jos. 8:30 f.), and subsequent history in the conquest of Canaan (Jdg. 2:1; 20:27; 1 Sam. 1:3; 3:3). Its loss to the Philistines signalized the loss of Yahweh's presence but also plagues for the Philistines (1 Sam. 4; 1 Sam. 5:1–7:2). David brought it to Jerusalem (2 Sam. 6; cf. 15:24–29). It was placed in Solomon's temple with great ceremony (1 Ki. 8:1 ff.; cf. 2 Chr. 35:3). Jeremiah anticipated an age without its presence (Jer. 3:16). It was evidently destroyed with the fall of Jerusalem at the hands of the Babylonians in 587 B.C., and was not replaced in the second temple (Josephus, *War* 5, 5). At the dedication of Solomon's temple the shekinah glory issued from the inner sanctuary and filled the house of the Lord (1 Ki. 8:10 f.).

Shishak of Egypt plundered the temple in the reign of Solomon's son, Rehoboam (1 Ki. 14:26), and later kings, including Hezekiah who had beautified the temple (2 Ki. 18:15 f.), used its treasure to purchase allies and pay tribute to invaders (1 Ki. 15:18; 16:8). Idolatrous kings introduced the symbols of pagan deities (2 Ki. 16:17; 21:4; 23:1–12). By the time of Josiah (*c.* 640 B.C.) the temple had fallen into considerable disrepair (2 Ki. 22:4 ff.), and restoration was financed by collection of money from worshippers. Jeremiah warned against abuse of the temple and false reliance upon it as a guarantee of the divine presence (Jer. 7:4, 11; cf. Matt. 21:13 par. Mk. 11:17; Lk. 19:46; → Rob). It was looted and sacked by Nebuchadnezzar (2 Ki. 25:9, 13–17; cf. Dan. 5:2 ff., 23 and the judgment on Belshazzar), though Israelites continued to offer sacrifices there even after its destruction (Jer. 41:5).

4. *Ezekiel's Vision of a Temple.* During the exile the prophet Ezekiel received a vision of a new temple which is described in some detail in Ezek. 40–43. The dimensions are somewhat different from those of Solomon's temple, and the vision includes a description of the surrounding area with gates fortified to prevent the inclusion of non-Israelites.

5. *The Second Temple.* The returning exiles brought with them vessels looted by Nebuchadnezzar and authorization from Cyrus of Persia to rebuild the temple (*c.* 537 B.C.; cf. Ezra 1; 3:2 f., 8 ff., 12). It had store-places and priests' rooms (Neh. 13:4–9). 1 Macc. 1:21 and 4:49 ff. give details of its furnishing. There was no ark. Instead of Solomon's ten lampstands a seven-branched candelabrum stood in the holy place with the table for the showbread and incense altar. These were taken as spoil by the Seleucid king of Syria Antiochus IV Epiphanes (*c.* 175–164 B.C.) who set up a pagan altar or statue, the → "abomination of desolation", on 15 December 167 B.C. (1 Macc. 1:54). Some three years later the Maccabees removed the pollution and replaced the temple furniture (1 Macc. 4:36–59). They also turned the temple into a fortress which for three months withstood the siege of Pompey in 63 B.C.

6. *Herod's Temple.* In an attempt to conciliate the Jews to their Idumaean king, Herod's temple was begun in 19 B.C. The main structure was finished within ten years, but work went on until A.D. 64 (cf. Jn. 2:20). The temple area was dominated by the fortress of Antonia at the north-west corner, which formed the residence of the procurator and also housed the Roman garrison (cf. Lk. 13:1; Acts 21:31–35;

Josephus, *Ant.* 15, 403 ff., who notes that the high priests' robes were kept there as a token of subjection). The outer court was surrounded by a portico (Josephus, *Ant.* 15, 410–16). Solomon's porch (Jn. 10:23; Acts 3:11; 5:12) was on the east side. In the colonnades the scribes held their schools and debates (Lk. 2:46; 19:47; Mk. 11:27), and the merchants and money changers had their stalls (Jn. 2:14 ff.; Lk. 19:45 f.). The inner area was surrounded by a balustrade which separated it from the Court of the Gentiles "with an inscription prohibiting the entrance of a foreigner under threat of the penalty of death" (Josephus, *Ant.* 15, 417; see the edition of R. Marcus and A. Wikgren, *Loeb Classical Library*, VIII, 1963, 202 f. n. for details of this inscription from other sources). This inner area contained three courts (Josephus, *Ant.* 15, 118 ff.): the Court of Women, which contained chests for gifts towards expenses of the services (Mk. 12:41–44), the Court of Israel and the Priests' Court in which stood the altar outside the temple proper (cf. Matt. 23:35). At the Feast of Tabernacles men could enter the latter. The altar was of unhewn stone. The temple was destroyed in the Jewish War in A.D. 70 (cf. Josephus, *War* 6, 4 ff.; cf. 5, 5 for a description of the temple). The Triumphal Arch of Titus in the Forum Romanum in Rome, erected in the time of Domitian or Trajan, bears a bas relief depicting the plundering of the golden candelabrum, the table of showbread and other objects (cf. M. Kon, "The Menorah on the Arch of Titus", *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 82, 1950, 25 ff.; E. R. Goodenough, "The Menorah among the Jews in the Roman World", *Hebrew Union College Annual* 23, 1950–51, 449 ff.). The Mishrah tractate Middoth ("Measurements") gives a description of the proportions of the temple before its destruction.

7. *Attitudes to the Temple.* (a) The Samaritans had their own rival temple on Mount Gerizim (cf. Jn. 4:20; → Samaritan, Samaria).

(b) Josephus had a high regard for the temple. It embodied the worship of the one true God by the people of God (*Ap.* 2, 193). It was God's dwelling place, into which God had sent a portion of his Spirit (*Ant.* 8, 114 and 131; cf. 8, 102, 106 and 117; 3, 100, 202 and 290). Like Philo, Josephus had a cosmological interpretation of the temple (Ant. 3, 123 and 180 ff.; *War* 5, 212–17). The *kosmos* is God's eternal house (*Ant.* 8, 107). For discussion see G. Schrenk, *TDNT* III 241.

(c) Philo criticized those who adorned the temple but polluted worship and service (*Det. Pot. Ins.* 20; cf. *Cher.* 94 f.). Philo allegorized the temple, seeing it as a picture of the cosmic house of God (*Vit. Mos.* 2, 101–104; cf. *Plant.* 126). But the soul and the mind are also the divine abode (*Som.* 1, 149; 2, 248; *Virt.* 188; cf. *Op. Mund.* 137; *Deus. Imm.* 135). For further discussion see G. Schrenk, *TDNT* III 241 f.; R. J. McKelvey, *The New Temple: The Church in the New Testament*, 1969, 38 ff.

(d) For the attitude of the Essenes → *naos* OT 3. Eth. Enoch. gives a picture of the heavenly temple (Eth. Enoch 14:16–20; 26:1 f.; 25:3; and especially chs. 37–71 and 85–90; cf. R. J. McKelvey, op. cit., 28 ff.). Other pictures are given in Test. Lev. 3:4 ff.; 5:1 f.; Syr. Bar. 4:2–6 (cf. McKelvey, op. cit., 31–34). In some instance the heavenly temple has come down to earth, and this was the view of some of the later rabbis (Bet ha-Midrash 1, 55, 23; 3, 67, 29; SB III 796; cf. McKelvey, op. cit., 34 ff.).

NT As the focal point of Jewish religion, the temple figures prominently in the NT, especially in the light of Jesus' associations with it. It is the place of God's presence,

glory, revelation and meeting with his people. Jesus' actions in connexion with the temple have a parabolic character signifying the presence of God with his people for those who have eyes to see. The destruction of the temple epitomizes God's judgment on the Jewish people in their rejection of himself in the person of Jesus. At the same time it signifies the end of the old covenant and its supersession by the new.

1. *The Infancy Narratives in Lk.* Lk. 2:22–52 preserves two groups of stories which centre on the temple as the focal point of the divine presence. The parents of Jesus brought him to the temple to make the customary offering which, as it turned out, took the form permitted for the poorest sections of the community (Lk. 2:24; cf. Lev. 12:2–8; → Bird). In so doing, they showed as devout Jews due reverence for the law and respect for the temple. Corresponding to this, Simeon and Anna represent the godly remnant of Israel who seek Yahweh in the temple and who are granted a revelation of Christ in the temple. Simeon is described as "righteous and devout, looking for the consolation of Israel, and the Holy Spirit was upon him. And it had been revealed to him that he should not see death before he had seen the Lord's Christ" (Lk. 2:25 f.). On seeing the infant Jesus he utters the psalm known as the *Nunc Dimittis* (Lk. 2:29–32). Similarly the prophetess "coming up at that very hour . . . gave thanks to God, and spoke of him [i.e. Jesus] to all who were looking for the redemption of Jerusalem" (Lk. 2:38). It should also be noted that the same collection of infancy narratives preserved by Lk. contains a detailed account of the circumstances attending the birth of John the Baptist (Lk. 1:5–80). His father, Zechariah, was a priest, and the revelation of God's purposes in giving him a son came as he was burning → incense in the temple (Lk. 1:8–23). In the Lucan infancy narratives the temple is the place where the godly remnant of Israel wait upon God, and where they receive revelations of God's saving purposes first in the birth of John the Baptist and then in the birth of Jesus. (For further discussion of the narratives see R. Laurentin, *Structure et Théologie de Luc I–II*, 1964⁴.)

2. *The Temple as the Scene of Jesus' Ministry.* (a) Lk. presents the temptation to make a spectacular display by casting himself from the top of the temple as the climax of the temptations of Jesus (Lk. 4:9–12 par. Matt. 4:5 ff. which places the temptation second; → *pterygion*; → Tempt). The temptation is based on a perverted interpretation of Ps. 91(90):11 f., and is met with a quotation from Deut. 6:16, the negative form of the commandment to worship Yahweh alone: "You shall not tempt the Lord your God" (→ Tempt, art. *peirazō* OT 2, NT 4). Whether this refers to Jesus as the one being tempted (and thus implying divine claims) or whether it means putting God to the test by creating a situation aimed at forcing God's hand by rescuing his servant cannot be answered with certainty. However, the fact that Jesus answers the temptation by describing it as a temptation directed at God himself indicates that for Jesus there is no need to vindicate his divine vocation in this way. He is conscious of his divine calling, and that is sufficient. He can trust the Father to vindicate him in whatever way the Father chooses.

(b) Throughout the public ministry, the temple remains to Jesus the focal point of meeting God and worshipping him. The contrasting attitudes of Judaism are epitomized in the temple. The → Pharisee and the → tax collector both prayed in the temple, the former pleading his own → righteousness and the latter confessing his need and crying out for mercy (Lk. 18:10–14). Here again it is Lk. who preserves the story. A similar contrast in Jewish piety is exhibited in the story of the widow's mite

(Mk. 12:41–44 par. Lk. 21:1–4; → *gazophylakion*). The two *lepta* are worth more than the gifts of the rich: "For they all contributed out of their abundance; but she out of her poverty has put in everything she had, her whole living" (Mk. 12:44). The incident occurs in the final week of Jesus' ministry which is deliberately set in the temple as the place of revelation and worship; it is immediately followed by Jesus' prophecy of the destruction of the temple which is occasioned by the disciples' remark about the "wonderful stones" and "wonderful buildings" (Mk. 13:1 par. Matt. 24:1; Lk. 21:5).

(c) Jesus' messianic entry into Jerusalem (Matt. 21:1–9 par. Mk. 11:1–10, Lk. 19:28–38; Jn. 12:12–19) leads directly to Jesus' entry into the temple and his cleansing of it (Matt. 21:10–17 par. Mk. 11:15–19; Lk. 19:45–48; cf. Jn. 2:13–17). Jesus did not go there simply because Jews happened to be gathered there or because he wanted to do things openly (G. Schrenk, *TDNT* III 242; cf. Jn. 18:20). This is not merely a prophetic denunciation of commercialism (Mk. 11:17 par. cf. Jer. 7:11; → Rob, art. *spēlaion*), or even an expression of the universal hope that the temple will be a place of prayer for all the nations (cf. Isa. 56:7 LXX; Isa. 2:2 f.). Jesus did not only speak out; he acted in judgment as God himself would act, driving out the money changers (i.e. those who changed Greek and Roman coins into temple currency) and those who sold animals and birds for sacrifice (cf. J. Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus: An Investigation into Economic and Social Conditions during the New Testament Period*, 1969, 18, 33, 48 f.). It was an attempt to restore the true function of the temple as a house of prayer and place where God would be known. This last point is made clear by the fact that Jesus proceeded to teach daily in the temple (Matt. 26:55 par. Mk. 14:49, Lk. 22:53; cf. Lk. 19:47; 21:37 f.). But Jesus' attempt to force the issue of God confronting his people, in his own person by coming to them in this way, resulted in the decision of the authorities to destroy him. Their action is thus an implicit repudiation of the summons of God.

In Jn. the cleansing of the temple is placed at the beginning of Jn.'s account of Jesus' public ministry. Some have suggested that Jesus cleansed the temple twice. But it should be noted that in both the Synoptics and Jn. the event is located at the Passover. Apart from this, Jn. does not give a more precise indication of the timing. It seems more likely that Jn.'s placing of the story here represents a thematic ordering of his material rather than a chronological one. It is followed by a discussion of the sign of Jesus' authority – the destruction and raising of the temple of Jesus' body (Jn. 2:18–22), the believing response of some (Jn. 2:23 ff.), the discussion on rebirth with Nicodemus (Jn. 3:1–15), and the teaching on coming to the light so that one's deeds may be seen to have been wrought by God (Jn. 3:16–21). It is preceded by the Johannine prologue (Jn. 1:1–18), the witness of the Baptist (Jn. 1:19–34), the call of the disciples revealing Jesus as the messianic Son of God (Jn. 1:35–51), and the miracle at Cana (Jn. 2:1–11) revealing the transforming power of Jesus. All this would suggest a thematic orientation for the narrative that follows.

(d) The Synoptic accounts of Jesus' ministry in the temple in the last week of his life show him as challenging those who confront him with claims to Davidic sonship and lordship (Mk. 11:27; 12:35; Matt. 21:23; Lk. 20:1). In Matt. and Mk. there is a juxtaposition of the question of the great commandment (Matt. 22:34–40 par. Mk. 12:28–34; cf. Lk. 10:25–28) with the claim that there is only one Lord to be worshipped and the question of David's son (Matt. 22:41–46 par. Mk. 12:35 ff., Lk.

20:41–44), who in the light of Ps. 110(109):1 is also David's *Lord.* How can he be at one and the same time David's son and Lord? Moreover, how can there be another Lord in addition to the Lord who is to be loved with all one's heart, soul and mind? All this follows Jesus' teaching on the important questions of authority (Matt. 21:23–27 par. Mk. 11:27–33, Lk. 20:1–8), tribute to Caesar (Matt. 22:23–33 par. Mk. 12:18–27, Lk. 20:27–40). In Jn. the temple is also the scene of solemn self-declarations and pronouncements (Jn. 7:14, 28; 8:20, 59; 10:23; 11:56). It is the scene of the healing of the lame man on the sabbath (Jn. 5:14), and the story of the woman taken in adultery (Jn. 8:2). Matt. 21:14 speaks of the healing of the lame and the blind in the temple. The following vv. in Matt. provide an ironic commentary on the contrast of attitudes to Jesus in the temple: "But when the chief priests and the scribes saw the wonderful things that he did, and the children crying out in the temple, 'Hosanna to the Son of David!' they were indignant; and they said to him, 'Do you hear what these are saying?' And Jesus said to them, 'Yes; have you never read, "Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings thou hast brought perfect praise"?' " (Matt. 21:15 f.; cf. Ps. 8:2).

(e) Earlier Jesus had described the tabernacle as "the house of God" (Matt. 12:4 par. Lk. 6:4) in answering the Pharisees on the legality of plucking ears of corn on the → sabbath (cf. 1 Sam. 21:2–7; Lev. 24:7 ff.; Num. 28:9 f.; Hos. 6:6). In the course of his reply Matt. records Jesus as saying, "I tell you, something greater than the temple is here" (Matt. 12:6). T. W. Manson suggests that this "something" is the community of the disciples who with Jesus constitute the corporate Son of man (v. 8; cf. *BJRL* 32, 1949–50, 191). E. Lohmeyer identifies it with the kingdom of God effectively present in the eschatological community or remnant within the historical people of God (*Lord of the Temple*, 1961, 67 ff.). D. Hill draws attention to the fact that Matt. says "greater than the temple" and not "greater than the law" (*The Gospel of Matthew*, *New Century Bible*, 1972, 211; cf. G. Bornkamm, G. Barth and H. J. Held, *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew*, 1963, 35). The point of contrast is not between the authority of the law and the authority of Jesus. Rather, vv. 3–7 appeal to the law as a witness for Jesus, validating the Son of man as Lord of the sabbath.

(f) In his final week of public ministry Jesus also denounced the practice of swearing (Matt. 23:16–22; cf. 5:33–37; → Swear, art. *omnyō* NT 1 (a)). To swear by any part of the temple (which in rabbinic teaching was less binding than swearing by God himself) is in fact to introduce duplicity into one's dealings. On the one hand, one's word should be binding and, on the other hand, God who sanctifies the temple sanctifies its several parts. Therefore, any such oath is tantamount to swearing by God himself. G. Schrenk sees in this an allusion to the shekinah of God, located in the temple, but sanctifying everything in the temple (*TDNT* III 243).

(g) On the question of the temple tax (Matt. 17:24–27) → Tax, art. *statēr.*

3. *The Destruction of the Temple.* In two groups of passages Jesus speaks of the destruction of the temple. In the first group he is referring to the temple of his body (Matt. 26:61; 27:40; Mk. 14:57 f.; 15:29 f.; Jn. 2:18–22; cf. Acts 6:14; → *naos*). Already his own person is superseding the material temple as the dwelling place of God, where God and man meet. In the second group Jesus prophesies the destruction of the Jerusalem temple (Matt. 24:1, 15; Mk. 13:2 f., 14; cf. 11:11; Lk. 21:5 f., 20). The immediate occasion is the remark of the disciples about the impressive

buildings. But the cause of the destruction is the rejection by the Jewish leaders and the people as a whole of God's summons to them in the person of Jesus. For Jesus' coming to Jerusalem and visitation of the temple has failed to find the response of penitence, faith and commitment. God's people have rejected God, and the destruction of the temple will be the judgment on the nation and at the same time visible termination of the divinely appointed covenant relationship and worship. It is anticipated by Jesus' cursing of the fig tree (Matt. 21:18 f. par. Mk. 11:12 ff.; → Fruit, art. *sykē*). The sign will be the → abomination of desolation (Matt. 24:15–22 par. Mk. 13:14–20, Lk. 21:20–24). For further discussion → Present, art. *The Parousia and Eschatology in the NT* 2 (a).

G. Schrenk sees two further incidents which "bear witness to the conviction that the death of Jesus makes possible a transformation of the cultus. The fact that Judas casts the rejected pieces of silver into the temple (Mt. 27:5) indicates the permanent defilement of the sanctuary by the death of Jesus. The symbolism of the rending of the temple veil on the death of Jesus (Mk. 15:38; Mt. 27:51; Lk. 23:45) shows us that access to God is now by the death of Christ and not by the former ministry" (*TDNT* III 245 f.).

4. *The Temple in Acts.* The death and resurrection of Jesus did not mean for the early church a repudiation of the temple or of Israel. The sermons of Acts addressed to Jews lay the guilt for Jesus' death squarely with the Jewish leadership (cf. Acts 2:24; 3:13 f.; 4:10 ff.; 5:30; 7:52; 10:39; 13:27 ff.), but they all hold out the invitation to repentance, faith and a return to God. God has not yet finally rejected his ancient people. Similarly, the temple is still the divinely appointed place of worship, though now in the context of Christian fellowship (Acts 2:46; 3:1–10; cf. Lk. 24:52 f.). As late as Acts 22:17 Paul has a revelation of the risen Lord while praying in the temple. The apostles taught there as Jesus did (Acts 5:12, 20 f., 25:42). As a Jew, Paul respects the rites and customs of the temple, bringing the offering of Nazirite purification (Acts 21:26; 24:6, 12, 18; 25:8; 26:21; cf. Num. 6:1–21; E. Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 1971, 610 ff.). In this connexion Paul was falsely accused of profaning the temple. Paul's attitude is to be understood in the context of his determination to be all things to all men, in order to save some, though not being in bondage to any (1 Cor. 9:19–23). So long as the temple stood, judgment had not fallen upon the nation which remained constituted as the people of God. Indeed, the church in the first instance was essentially Jewish Christian. Only after Peter's vision was the church opened up to Gentile believers (Acts 10). Even so, the Jewish cultus was not immediately superseded for Jewish Christians. On the other hand, a note of criticism begins to be heard in Stephen's speech (Acts 7:44–50) and indirectly in Paul's Areopagus address (Acts 17:24). With regard to the tabernacle and thus to the Jerusalem temple and citing Isa. 66:1 f., Stephen points out that the Most High does not dwell *en cheiropoiētois*, "in houses made with hands" (Acts 7:48). With regard to pagan shrines Paul points out that God *ouk en cheiropoiētois naois katoikei*, "does not live in shrines made by hand" (Acts 17:24).

5. *The Temple in the Epistles.* Where the community is regarded as the temple of God the word → *naos* is used. *to hieron* occurs only in 1 Cor. 9:13 in an argument which appeals to Deut. 18:1 claiming support by the church for Christian workers: "Do you not know that those who are employed in the temple service [*hoi ta hiera ergazomenoi*] get their food from the temple [*ta ek tou hierou esthiousin*], and those

who serve at the altar share in the sacrificial offerings? In the same way the Lord commanded that those who proclaim the gospel should get their living by the gospel" (1 Cor. 9:13 f.; cf. Matt. 10:10; Lk. 10:7 f.). Heb. uses the expression *ta hagia* for the sanctuary in connexion with its discussion of the day of atonement ritual as a type of Christ's priestly work (Heb. 9:24 f.; cf. 13:11; Lev. 16; → Holy, art. *hagios*). *oikos theou*, house(hold) of God, is used in 1 Tim. 3:15; 1 Pet. 4:7; Heb. 3:6; 10:21; cf. above OT 1 (a). *C. Brown*

τὸ ἐσώτερον

τὸ ἐσώτερον (*to esōteron*), the inner shrine; *ἐσώτερος* (*esōteros*), inner.

CL & OT *esōteros* is an adj. in the comparative state used to describe things as being farther in the interior, more inward, or more intimate.

In the LXX *esōteros* is used for three different Hebrew words: *mibbêṯ l*^{e} (as a preposition), within, *esōteros tou katapetasmatos* designates the inner shrine of the tabernacle, "within the curtain" (Exod. 26:33; Lev. 16:2, 12, 15); *p*^{e}*nîmî*, (an adj.) describing doors, gates, porches, etc. in the palace-temple complex (e.g. 2 Chr. 4:22; Ezek. 8:3); *b*^{e}*yark*^{e}*ṯê* (a preposition), innermost part, the innermost part of the cave where David and his men hid (1 Sam. 24:4).

NT The substantive form with the article is used metaphorically for the heavenly holy of holies which Jesus entered for us. It corresponds to the inner shrine of the tabernacle, the place of the invisible presence of the God of Israel (Heb. 6:19). As an attributive *esōteros* describes the inner cell of the prison in Philippi where Paul and Silas were kept (Acts 16:24). *D. H. Madvig*

τὸ καταπετάσμα

τὸ καταπέτασμα (*to katapetasma*), covering, veil, curtain.

CL & OT *katapetasma* seems to have been a technical term for a temple curtain. With few exceptions *katapetasma* is used in the LXX for Heb. *pārōḵeṯ* and designates the curtain which separated the holy place and the holy of holies in the tabernacle (Exod. 26:31, 33 ff.; 27:21; 30:6; 35:12; 36:35[37:3]; 38:27[39:4]; 40:3; 40:22, 26; Lev. 4:6, 17; 16:2, 12, 15; 21:23; 24:3; Num. 4:5; 18:7; 2 Chr. 3:14; Sir. 50:5). It stands for *māsāḵ*, screen, at Exod. 26:37; 35:12; 36:37[37:5]; 38:18[37:16]; 39:40[39:20]; 40:5, 21; Num. 3:26. It is without Heb. equivalent at Exod. 36:36[38:18]; Num. 3:10; 4:32; 1 Ki. 6:36; 1 Macc. 1:22; 4:51. Though *katapetasma* is used sometimes for the curtain at the entrance of the tabernacle, the regular word for that is *kalymma* which stands for 6 different Heb. words (Exod. 4:24; 15:13; 1 Sam. 1:18; 9:22; 2 Sam. 7:6; 1 Chr. 17:5; 28:12; Sir. 14:25; Jer. 25[32]:38; 33[40]:12; Ezek. 23:21; 1 Macc. 3:45).

This inner curtain was made of fine linen interwoven with blue, purple and scarlet wool; on it were the figures of two → cherubs. It was symbolic of the separation between God and man. The high priest alone could enter and only once a year to offer the atoning blood in the presence of God.

NT It is debated whether "the curtain of the temple" that was torn at the time of the crucifixion was the inner or outer curtain (Matt. 27:51; Mk. 15:38; Lk. 23:45). If it was the inner one it symbolized the reality that Jesus' death opened the way for man to God. This, however, would not have been a public sign. The Gospel of the Nazarenes states that the upper lintel was split (Henn.-Schn., I, 153), and the early church fathers saw it as a sign prophetic of the destruction of the temple.

The writer to the Hebrews finds great assurance in knowing that Jesus, as the forerunner of all believers, entered the presence of God within the inner curtain in the heavenly sanctuary (Heb. 6:19, 20). He also reports that Jesus opened the way for us through this inner curtain (Heb. 10:20). This may be an allusion to the tearing of the curtain when Jesus died; no explicit reference is made to it. *kalymma* is used in the NT only of Moses' veil (2 Cor. 3:7–18; cf. Exod. 34:33 ff.; → Hide, art. *kalyptō* NT 3). *D. H. Madvig*

τὸ μεσότοιχον

τὸ μεσότοιχον (*to mesotoichon*), dividing-wall.

Josephus (*Ant.* 8, 71) uses the separate words *to meson toichon* to refer to the partition between the holy place and the holy of holies. *mesotoichon* is found only a few times outside the NT and it refers to a partition or barrier.

mesotoichon occurs in the NT only in Eph. 2:14 where it has been thought to refer to a barrier between Jew and Gentile that was removed by Jesus through his death. It is seen as an allusion to the balustrade in the temple courtyard which separated the court of the Gentiles from the more sacred precincts (→ *to hieron* OT 6). No document is known where *mesotoichon* is used to refer to that wall. Such an allusion may not have been clear to Gentile readers in Asia Minor. Another suggestion is that it refers to the wall of separation between God and man (→ Redemption, art. *lyō* NT 6 (b)). M. Barth suggests that it may even refer to the barrier between God and man, constituted by angels and other principalities and powers (cf. Eph. 1:21; *The Broken Wall: A Study of the Epistle to the Ephesians*, 1959, 36). *D. H. Madvig*

στῦλος

στῦλος (*stylos*), pillar, support.

CL & OT *stylos* is a very common word used for many kinds of pillars, columns, and other supports. In the LXX *stylos* is used for 5 Heb. words, especially *'ammûḏ*, pillar (e.g. Exod. 27:10–17; 36:36; 1 Ki. 7:15–45), and *qereš*, an upright board or studding in the tabernacle (e.g. Exod. 26:15–29).

NT *stylos* is used with reference to the temple in Rev. 3:12 where the Spirit of Jesus promises the overcomer that he will become a pillar in the temple of God. This metaphor probably refers to the two pillars which adorned the porch of Solomon's temple. It is used fig. of the leaders of the Jerusalem church, James, Cephas and John (Gal. 2:9; → Rock), and of the foundation of truth (1 Tim. 3:15).
D. H. Madvig

γαζοφυλάκιον

γαζοφυλάκιον (*gazophylakion*), treasure room, treasury.

OT *gazophylakion* is used a number of times in LXX for *liškâh*, a room or chamber (2 Ki. 23:11; 2 Esd. 10:6; Neh. 10:38[37], 39[38]; 13:4 f., 8 f.; Ezek. 40:17), and three times for its synonym *niškâh* (Neh. 3:30; 12:44; 13:7), and once for *g^{e}nāzim*, royal treasury (Est. 3:9). It is without equivalent at 1 Macc. 3:28; 14:49; 2 Macc. 3:6, 24, 28, 40; 4:42; 5:18; 4 Macc. 4:3, 6. See also Josephus, *War* 5, 200; 6, 282; *Ant.* 19, 294. In the Apocrypha it refers either to the sacred or the royal treasury.

NT There are no references in the NT to the temple treasury where valuables were stored. In Mk. 12:41, 43 and Lk. 21:1 *gazophylakion* refers to one of the thirteen trumpet-shaped collection boxes in the temple. These were marked to indicate the use to which the funds were put. When Jesus stood teaching in the treasury (*gazophylakion*) in the temple precincts, he was probably standing in the Court of the Women where the collection boxes were placed (Jn. 8:20). *D. H. Madvig*

νεωκόρος	νεωκόρος (*neōkoros*), temple keeper.

neōkoros is derived from *neōs* the Attic form of *naos*, temple, and *koreō*, to sweep. From "temple-sweeper" it came to mean "temple-keeper" and then became a title designating cities in Asia Minor which had built a temple in honour of their patron-god or the emperor. In Acts 19:35 the title is ascribed to Ephesus where a temple was built in honour of the goddess Artemis. *D. H. Madvig*

πτερύγιον	πτερύγιον (*pterygion*), end, edge.

CL *pterygion* is the diminutive of *pteryx*, wing, and serves to designate the tip or extremity of anything. On a building *pterygion* may designate a turret or battlement or a pointed roof.

NT The devil took Jesus to the *pterygion* of the temple and urged him to jump, to demonstrate that he was protected by divine power (Matt. 4:5 ff. par. Lk. 4:9–12; → *to hieron* NT 1 (a)). Probably this refers to the South-East corner of the temple area where one could look straight down from the roof of Solomon's Porch into the Kidron Valley far below. J. Jeremias suggests, however, that it was the lintel or superstructure of a gate of the temple ("Die 'Zinne' des Tempels (Mk. 4, 5; Lk. 4, 9)", *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 59, 1936, 195–208). Eusebius preserves a story of Hegesippus which tells how the scribes and Pharisees set James, the brother of Jesus upon the pinnacle of the temple "that from thy lofty station thou mayest be evident, and thy words may easily be heard by all the people" (*HE* 2, 23, 11). The purpose was to persuade the Passover crowds not to go astray after Jesus. But when James testified to Jesus, the scribes and Pharisees cast him down and stoned him. N. Hyldal suggests that this was the place of execution from which victims were thrown down and stoned ("Die Versuchung auf der Zinne des Tempels", *StTh* 15, 1961, 113–27). Perhaps this was why the woman taken in adultery was brought to the temple (Jn. 8:2).

B. Gerhardsson sees here a play on words between *pterygion* and the non-

diminutive *pteryx*, both of which are used in the LXX to translate the Heb. *kānāp*, wing (*The Testing of God's Son (Matt. 4:1–11 & Par), Coniectanea Biblica, New Testament Series* 2:1, 1966, 59). The word occurs in the Psalm quoted by Satan: "he will cover you with his pinions, and under his wings you will find refuge" (Ps. 91:4). The writer of the temptation narrative "wants us to see the associations of this word. What could be a more appropriate setting for tempting the Son to misuse God's promise of protection?" (ibid.). *D. H. Madvig*

For various aspects of the temple, its cultus and furnishings → Priest, → Reconciliation, → Redemption, → Sacrifice, → Tent. Other related subjects include → Abomination of Desolation, → Animal, → Bird, → David, → Firm, → Foundation, → Jerusalem, → Prophet, → Rock.

For details of specialist studies on the archaeology and features of the various temples see the bibliographies in the reference works listed below.

(a). Y. Aharoni, "Temples, Semitic", *IDB Supplementary Volume*, 1976, 874 f.; K. Baltzer, "The Meaning of the Temple in the Lukan Writings", *HTR* 58, 1965, 263–77; C. K. Barrett, "Paul and the 'Pillar' Apostles", in J. N. Sevenster and W. C. van Unnik, eds., *Studia Paulina*, 1953, 1–19; and "The Eschatology of the Epistle to the Hebrews", in W. D. Davies and D. Daube, eds., *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology. In Honour of Charles Harold Dodd*, 1956, 363–92; G. A. Barrois, "Temples", *IDB* IV 560–68; M. Barth, *The Broken Wall: A Study of the Epistle to the Ephesians*, 1959; and *Ephesians*, I–II, *Anchor Bible*, 1974; J. M. Baumgarten, "Sacrifice and Worship among the Jewish Sectarians of the Dead Sea (Qumrân) Scrolls", *HTR* 46, 1953, 141–59; M. Ben-Dov, "Temple of Herod", *IDB Supplementary Volume*, 1976, 870 ff.; J. Blenkinsopp, "Kiriath-jearim and the Ark", *JBL* 88, 1969, 143–56; R. Brinker, *The Influence of Sanctuaries in Early Israel*, 1946; I. Buse, "The Cleansing of the Temple in the Synoptics and John", *ExpT* 70, 1958–59, 22 ff.; A. Caldecott, "The Significance of the 'Cleansing of the Temple' ", *JTS* 24, 1953, 382–86; L. Cerfaux, *The Church in the Theology of St. Paul*, 1959; R. E. Clements, *God and Temple*, 1965; A. Cody, *Heavenly Sanctuary and Liturgy in the Epistle to the Hebrews: The Achievement of Salvation in the Epistle's Perspectives*, 1960; A. Cole, *The New Temple: A Study of the Origins of the Catechetical 'Form' of the Church in the New Testament*, 1960; Y. M.-J. Congar, *The Mystery of the Temple*, 1962; W. D. Davies, *The Gospel and the Land: Early Christianity and Jewish Territorial Doctrine*, 1974; M. Delcor, "The Courts of the Church of Corinth and the Courts of Qumran", in J. Murphy-O'Connor, *Paul and Qumran: Studies in New Testament Exegesis*, 1968, 69–84; W. Förster, *Palestinian Judaism in New Testament Times*, 1964; E. D. Freed, "The Entry into Jerusalem in the Gospel of John", *JBL* 80, 1961, 329–38; B. Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament: A Comparative Study in the Temple Symbolism of the Qumran Texts and the New Testament, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series* 1, 1965; L. Gaston, "The Theology of the Temple: The New Testament Fulfilment of Old Testament Heilsgeschichte", in *Oikonomia. Festschrift O. Cullmann*, 1967, 32–41; and *No Stone on Another: Studies in the Significance of the Fall of Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospels, Supplements to NovT* 23, 1970; T. Hannay, "The Temple", *SJT* 3, 1950, 278–87; M. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, I–II, 1974; R. H. Hiers, "Purification of the Temple: Preparation for the Kingdom of God", *JBL* 90, 1971, 82–90; J. E. Jennings, "Temples", *ZPEB* V 656–69; J. Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus: An Investigation into Economic and Social Conditions during the New Testament Period*, 1969; S. Kennard, *Jesus in the Temple*, (Dissertation, Strasbourg) 1935; A. F. J. Klijn, "Stephen's Speech – Acts vii. 2–53", *NTS* 4, 1957–58, 23–31; W. Kornfeld, "Temple", *EBT* III 899–903; W. L. Lane, *The Gospel of Mark, NLC* 1974; H. Lignée, *The Temple of Yahweh*, 1966; E. Lohmeyer, *Lord of the Temple*, 1961; R. J. McKelvey, *The New Temple: The Church in the New Testament*, 1969; T. W. Manson, "The Cleansing of the Temple", *BJRL* 33, 1951, 271–82; H. G. May, "The Ark – A Miniature Temple", *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature* 52, 1936, 215–34; O. Michel, *naos*, *TDNT* IV 880–90; J. C. Meagher, "John 1:14 and the New Temple", *JBL* 88, 1969, 57–68; A. R. Millard and R. J. McKelvey, "Temple", *NBD* 1242–50; C. F. D. Moule, "Sanctuary and Sacrifice in the New Testament", *JTS* New Series 1, 1950, 29–41; A. Parrot, *The Temple of*

Jerusalem, Studies in Biblical Archaeology 5, 1955; R. Patai, *Man and Temple in Ancient Myth and Ritual*, 1947; J. Quellette, "Temples, Semitic", *IDB Supplementary Volume*, 1976, 872 ff.; G. von Rad, " 'Righteousness' and 'Life' in the Cultic Language of the Psalms", in *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays*, 1965, 243–66; T. H. Robinson, "The Den of Thieves", *The Expositor*, 9, *Eighth Series*, 1915, 459–67; C. Schneider, *katapetasma*, *TDNT* III 628 ff.; and *mesotoichon*, *TDNT* IV 625; G. Schrenk, *to hieron*, *TDNT* III 230–47; M. Simon, "Saint Stephen and the Jerusalem Temple", *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 2, 1951, 127–42; and *St. Stephen and the Hellenists in the Primitive Church*, 1958; R. A. Stewart, *Rabbinic Theology*, 1961; H. G. Stigers, "Temple, Jerusalem", *ZPEB* V 622–56; W. F. Stinespring, "Temple, Jerusalem", *IDB* IV 534–60; J. T. Townsend, *The Jerusalem Temple in New Testament Thought*, (Dissertation, Harvard) 1958; R. de Vaux, *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions*, 1961, 312–30; D. H. Wallace, "The Essenes and Temple Sacrifice", *ThZ* 13, 1957, 335–38; G. E. Wright, "The Significance of the Temple in the Ancient Near East", *BA* 7, 1944, 41–88 in three parts: I. H. H. Nelson, "The Egyptian Temple", 44–54; II. A. L. Oppenheim, "The Mesopotamian Temple", 54–63; III. G. E. Wright, "The Temple in Palestine-Syria", 65–88; J. C. de Young, *Jerusalem in the New Testament: The Significance of the City in the History of Redemption and in Eschatology*, 1960; M. Haran, *Temples and Temple-Service in Ancient Israel*, 1978.

(b). O. Betz, "Die Vision des Paulus im Tempel von Jerusalem – Apg. 22, 17–21 als Beitrag zur Deutung des Damaskuserlebnisses", in O. Böcher and K. Haacker, eds., *Verborum Veritas. Festschrift für Gustav Stählin zum 70. Geburtstag*, 1970, 113–24; G. Billerbeck, "Ein Tempelgottesdienst in Jesu Tagen", *ZNW* 55, 1964, 2 ff.; and "Ein Synagogengottesdienst in Jesu Tagen", ibid., 143 ff.; J. Bonsirven, *Le Judaïsme palestinien au Temps de Jésus-Christ*, 1950; and *Textes rabbiniques des deux premiers Siècles chrétiens*, 1955; W. Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter*, ed. H. Gressmann, 1926; T. A. Busch, *Der Tempel von Jerusalem*, 1970; J. Daniélou, *Le Signe du Temple ou la Présence de Dieu*, 1942; and "Le Symbolisme cosmique du Temple de Jérusalem", in *Symbolisme Cosmique et Monuments Religieux*, 1953, 61 ff.; J. W. Doeve, "Purification du Temple et Dessèchement du Figuier", *NTS* 1, 1954–55, 297–308; M. Fraeyman, "La Spiritualisation de l'Idée du Temple dans les Épîtres Pauliniennes", *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 23, 1947, 378–412; K. Galling, "Das Allerheiligste in Salomon's Tempel", *Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society* 12, 1932, 43–46; and "Tempel", *RGG*^{3} VI 681 ff.; J. Jeremias, "Die 'Zinne' des Tempels", *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 59, 1936, 195–208; W. Kornfeld, "Der Symbolismus der Tempelsäulen", *ZAW* 74, 1962, 50–57; E. Lohse, "Tempel und Synagoge", in H. J. Schultz, ed., *Kontexte*, III, 1966, 66 ff.; S. Mender, "Die Tempelreinigung", *ZNW* 47, 1956, 93–112; N. Poulsson, *König und Tempel im Glaubenszeugnis des Alten Testaments*, 1967; M. Schmidt, *Prophet und Tempel. Eine Studie zum Problem der Gottesnähe im Alten Testament*, 1948; M. Simon, "Le Discours de Jésus sur la Ruine du Temple", *RB* 56, 1949, 70–75; and "Retour du Christ et Réconstruction du Temple dans la Pensée Chrétienne Primitive", in *Aux Sources de la Tradition Chrétienne. Mélanges M. Goguel*, 1950, 247–57; E. Trocmé, "L'Expulsion des Marchands du Temple", *NTS* 15, 1968–69, 1–22; L. H. Vincent, "Le Caractère du Temple de Salomon", *Mélanges A. Robert*, 1957, 137–48; L. H. Vincent and A. M. Stève, *Jérusalem de l'Ancien Testament*, II–III, 1956, 373–610; N. Walter, "Tempelzerstörung und synoptische Apokalypse", *ZNW* 57, 1966, 38 ff.; H. Wenschkewitz, "Die Spiritualisierung der Kultusbegriffe Tempel, Priester und Opfer im Neuen Testament", *Angelos* 4, 1932, 77–230; C. Westermann, "Tempel", *EKL* III 1324 ff.

Tempt, Test, Approve

πειρασμός

πεῖρα (*peira*), attempt, trial, experiment; πειρασμός (*peirasmos*), test, trial, tempting, temptation; πειράω (*peirao*), try, attempt, endeavour; πειράζω (*peirazo*), try, test, put on trial, tempt; ἐκπειράζω (*ekpeirazo*), put to the test, try, tempt; ἀπείραστος (*apeirastos*), without temptation, untempted.

CL The noun *peira*, attempt (Pindar), and the vb. *peirao*, to test, try (Homer, *Il.* 8, 8), together with the intensive form (rare in cl. Gk.) *peirazo*, to tempt someone, put

to the test (Homer, *Od.* 9, 281), come from the root *per* (cf. Lat. *per*). They are related to *peraō*, to drive across, pass through, to strive to get through or over, and express an intention which includes a certain element of resolution. Thus *peirao* and *peirazō* convey the general meaning of to try, and in view of the effort required, to exert oneself, strive, undertake. Through the aspect of carrying through the desire, and the method of doing so, *peirazō* acquired the meaning of to try out, make trial of, test, investigate, look into. Referring to competition against other persons, *peiraō*, usually in mid. or passive, means to measure oneself against someone, to try one's luck, to strive for someone's favour, to woo someone, to lead into temptation (especially in the sense of unchastity), to venture an attack on someone; then, to get to know by experience, to experience.

Similarly to the vbs., the noun *peira* means attempt, trial, test, attempt at, attack, risk, experience, knowledge. *peirasmos* means a medical test (first used by Dioscorides, *De Materia Medica*, Preface 5, in the 1st cent. A.D.). *ekpeirazō*, to tempt, and *apeirastos*, untempted, are lacking in cl. Gk.

OT 1. In the LXX *peirazō* and *peiraō* stand exclusively for *nasâh* in the piel form of the vb. (Gen. 22:1; Exod. 15:25; 16:4; 17:2, 7; 20:20; Num. 14:22; Deut. 4:34; 8:2; 13:4[3]; 33:8; Jdg. 2:22; 3:1, 4; 6:39; 1 Sam. 17:39; 1 Ki. 10:1; 2 Chr. 9:1; 32:31; Pss. 26[25]:2; 78[77]:41, 56; 95[94]:9; 106[105]:14; Eccl. 2:1; 7:23[24]; Isa. 7:12; Dan. 1:12, 14). It also occurs in the apocryphal books and some canonical writings without Heb. equivalent (Tob. 12:14; Jud. 8:12, 25 f.; Ps. 35[34]:16; Prov. 26:18; Wis. 1:2; 2:17, 24; 3:5; 11:9; 12:26; 19:5; Sir. 18:23; 34[31]:10; 37:27; 39:4; Dan. 12:10; 1 Macc. 1:15; 12:10; 2 Macc. 2:23; 10:12; 11:19; 3 Macc. 1:25; 2:32; 4 Macc. 9:7; 12:3; 15:16). Similarly *ekpeirazō* stands exclusively for *nāsâh* in the piel (Deut. 6:16; 8:2, 16; Ps. 78[77]:18). *peirasmos* stands for the equivalent noun *massâh* (Exod. 17:7; Deut. 4:34; 6:16; 7:19; 9:22; 29:2[3]; Ps. 95[94]:8). It is also found for *'inyân*, occupation, task (Eccl. 3:10; 4:8; 5:2, 13; 8:16), and without equivalent in non-canonical writings (Sir. 2:1; 27:5, 7; 33[36]:1; 1 Macc. 2:52).

2. The terms are found in their purely secular senses: to try to do something (Deut. 4:34; 28:56; Jdg. 6:39; 1 Sam. 17:39); to make a test of, try something out (Eccl. 2:1; 7:23; Dan. 1:12); to test, put to the proof (1 Ki. 10:1; 2 Chr. 9:1; Wis. 2:17); and the noun *peirasmos* in the sense of trial (Deut. 7:19; 29:2[3]).

3. In the OT, especially in Deut. and writings reflecting the outlook of Deut., the ideas of tempting and putting to the test become religious concepts. Unbelief and presumption, disobedience and murmuring among the people constitute a challenge to Yahweh, putting him to the test. Conversely, Yahweh may put his people to the test. B. Gerhardsson points out that the vb. *nāsâh* "seems to imply primarily *a testing of the partner in the covenant to see whether he is keeping his side of the agreement*. . . . It is important to note that JHWH is not said to test heathen people, but only his own, the people of his own possession. When the term is used of an individual, it is always a pious man, never an ungodly one. Conversely, when Israel is the subject of the verb, it is always JHWH and not the Baals who are tested. The covenant means that JHWH will be the God of his covenant people, will be 'near them', 'in their midst', 'with them' and will fulfil all the obligations that pertain to divinity; giving to his people all that belongs to the divine blessing (*brkh*): life, health, power, food, fertility, riches, protection, victory etc. (Exod. 6:7; 19:3 ff.; 29:49 ff.;

Lev. 26:11 f.; Deut. 28:1–14; Ezr. 37:2 ff. etc.). The people's obligations are defined in such words as to fear and love God, to worship and honour him, to be faithful to him, to listen to his voice, and to obey his word, to walk after his commandments, to live in his law etc. 'Faith' is a vital element here; faith meaning to 'treat JHWH as reliable' (*h'myn, pisteuein*), to trust him, to believe that he will faithfully and lovingly keep his promises and honour his 'obligations'. What is required of the people in general is also required of each member individually" (*The Testing of God's Son (Matt. 4:1–11 & Par): An Analysis of an Early Christian Midrash, Coniectanea Biblica, New Testament Series* 2:1, 1966, 26 f.).

Thus Gerhardsson argues that when the OT speaks of Yahweh testing his covenant son, it means that God arranges a test to find out whether his son is true to the covenant (op. cit., 27). The classic example is the testing of → Abraham by commanding him to offer the covenant son of promise, Isaac (Gen. 22). In Exod. 16:4 Yahweh tells → Moses of his decision to let → bread rain down from heaven for the people who are to gather only enough for each day "that I may prove them, whether they will walk in my law or not" (cf. Exod. 20:20). Connected with this testing or proving, Gerhardsson sees the formula that God tests "that he might know" (*ld't*) whether his chosen one is true or not (ibid.). Thus Deut. 8:2 gives the injunction: "And you shall remember all the way which the LORD your God has led you these forty years in the wilderness, that he might humble you, testing you to know what was in your heart, whether you would keep his commandments, or not." Deut. 13:1–5 recognizes the possibility of false prophets performing wonders in order to lead the people astray (→ Miracle; → Magic). The people are to test such men not by questioning whether the wonder has actually occurred but by asking whether their teaching agrees with the commandments that Israel has received. In all this Yahweh "is testing you, to know whether you love the LORD your God with all your heart and with all your soul" (Deut. 13:3). In Jdg. Yahweh tests Israel that he may know "whether they will take care to walk in the way of the LORD as their fathers did, or not" (Jdg. 2:22; cf. 3:1, 4 ff.). In 2 Chr. 32:31 Yahweh tests his covenant son, king Hezekiah, "to know all that was in his heart." For other instances of testing see Deut. 33:8 (Levi); Jud. 8:26 (Isaac); Pss. 26[25]:2; 35[34]:16; Wis. 3:5; 11:9; Sir. 33:1 (the godly and righteous man).

The vb. *nāsâh* does not actually occur in Job, but the theme is present now making use of → Satan. "Satan has received permission from God to take away from righteous Job all that he had received from God. The test was to reveal whether Job would stand fast by his innocence, honesty and faith, or whether in such a situation he would reveal himself unrighteous by breaking out into curses against God" (B. Gerhardsson, op. cit., 28).

On the other hand, Israel, God's covenant son, is also said to tempt God. "Tempting God" is the inexplicable way for God's people to behave. Nevertheless it occurred and is described in Ps. 78(77):40 f. "How often they rebelled against him in the wilderness and grieved him in the desert! They tested him again and again, and provoked the Holy One of Israel" (cf. Num. 14:22; Ps. 106[105]:14; Isa. 7:12; Mal. 3:15). The classic instance for the tempting of God was at Massah (which the LXX translates by *peirasmos*, testing), a place from the period of wandering in the → wilderness (Deut. 6:16; 9:22; 33:8; Ps. 95[94]:8; in the last two instances Massah being linked with Meribah). This brings in a link with the testing of God in Exod.

17:2, 7, where the name Massah is identified with Meribah as titles of the same place. "You shall not put the LORD your God to the test" is the negative form of the commandment to worship the one God and him alone (Deut. 6:16; cf. also Sir. 18:23). God allows himself to be found by those who are obedient to this commandment (Wis. 1:2).

4. Testing is one of the means by which God carries out his saving purposes. The person concerned often does not know until afterwards whether or why God has been testing him, when he is enabled to come out of tribulation strong in faith, having been preserved, proved, purified, disciplined and taught. Abraham later became an oft-quoted example of the man kept through great testing (Apc. Abr.; Jub. 17–19). Israel also knew about defeat, when the testing caused people to be led astray and to fall away from God. God is the one who works in everything, and therefore he is the one who tests. This was required by the strongly monotheistic idea of God. In his activity within history the one God reveals himself by various attributes. The man who belongs to God's people strives to know these attributes, to acquire the knowledge of God in grace and in judgment.

This idea of God was later softened by dualistic influences, but was not removed. Permitted by God, taken into his service, let loose for a while, an opposing power comes into play, whose object is to cause man to fall away from God (Gen. 3:1 ff.; Job 1:11 f.; 2:6 f.; → Satan).

5. (a) Rabbinic literature exhibits a further development of the tendency of Satan to become independent in his rôle as tempter. He is depicted as the head of a kingdom opposed to God, which tries to frustrate God's saving purposes by leading man into sin and accusing him before God (Tanh. 40b; Deut. R. 11; Gen. R. 55 f.; Sanhedrin 89b). In this he makes use of the evil impulse already present in man, which now becomes the gate through which temptation makes its inroads (Baba Bathra 16; Num. R. 20).

(b) In the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha the independence of the evil one is still more strongly marked. Suffering and evil are now felt to be so oppressive and devilish that it is felt inappropriate to attribute them any longer to God. The Satanic tempter can even cause angels to fall away (Eth. Enoch 6 and 19), incite God against Abraham (Jub. 17), and take revenge on God by tempting his creatures (Life Adam 11–16). In Test. XII seven evil spirits are engaged in tempting. If man makes the right decision in the battle between light and darkness, he can defend himself against temptation.

(c) In the Qumran texts the world is depicted as the sphere of the dominion of Belial, the angel of darkness. Believers live here under constant temptation and trial, especially through affliction and persecution (1QS 3:24). In such contexts the terms chiefly used are *tā'āh*, to lead astray (hiph.) (1QpHab 10:9; 1QS 5:4, 11; 11:1; 1QH 4:12, 25; 1Q14 11:1; 4QpHos 2:5; 6QD 3:3; CD 1:15; 2:13, 17; 3:1, 4, 14; 4:1; 5:20; 12:3; and the noun form in 1QS 3:21; 1QH 2:14; 4:12, 16, 20), and *kāšal*, to cause to stumble (hiph.) (1QpHab 11:8; 1QS 3:24; 11:12; 1QM 14:5; 1QH 5:28, 36; 8:36; 16:5; 17:23; 4Qflor 1:8; CD 2:17).

NT In the NT the intensive form *peirazō*, to try, test, put on trial, tempt, is used 36 times (12 times in the Synoptic Gospels exclusively for the temptation of Jesus by Satan or Jesus' opponents, cf. Heb. 2:18; 4:15; once in Jn.; 5 times in Acts; 7 times

in Paul; 6 times in Heb.; 4 times in Jas. and 3 times in Rev.). It occurs in a non-religious sense and also for the temptation of Christians. *ekpeirazō* is used four times in the same sense (Matt. 4:7 par. Lk. 4:12; Lk. 10:25; 1 Cor. 10:9); and once *peiraomai*, to try (Acts 26:21). New is the verbal adj. *apeirastos*, incapable of temptation (Jas. 1:13). The use of the noun *peirasmos*, temptation, trial, is even more frequent (21 times) than in the LXX (6 times in Lk.; 4 in Paul; twice each in Matt., Jas. and 1 Pet.; once each in Mk., Acts, Heb., 2 Pet. and Rev.). But *peira*, attempt, trial, is found only in Heb. 11:29 and 36.

1. Examples of the secular sense are: to make an attempt (Heb. 11:29), to get experience of (Heb. 11:36), to attempt (Acts 9:26; 16:7; 24:6), to test (2 Cor. 13:5; Rev. 2:2), trials, hostilities (Acts 20:19). For statements about the opponents of Jesus wanting to put him to the test see 4, below. Four passages contain the OT ideas of testing God (1 Cor. 10:9; cf. Ps. 78[77]:18; Heb. 3:8 f.; cf. Ps. 95[94]:8 f.; Acts 5:9; 15:10). Matt. 4:7 par. Lk. 4:12 cite Deut. 6:16.

2. The world of ideas behind *peirasmos*, temptation, trial, as it is used in the NT in the religious sense, is generally dependent on the OT. It also has much in common with the views of the Essenes, although the cosmic dualism of Qumran is not to be found in the NT. Here, as at Qumran, believers are constantly being tempted to → fall away from God. They must protect themselves with spiritual armour (Eph. 6:10–17) against the attacks of the "prince of this world" (Jn. 12:31; 14:30; 16:11; cf. Matt. 9:34; 12:24; 1 Cor. 2:6, 8; Eph. 2:2), and stand firm, sober, watchful (1 Pet. 5:8) and in prayer (Eph. 6:18 ff.). In this way the willing → spirit can keep control of the weak → flesh, so that the beleaguered entry gate for Satanic temptations may remain closed (Mk. 14:38). The weakness of the flesh is also described as → desire (*epithymia*), which entices man into temptation (Jas. 1:14), so that the power of the evil one closes over him like a trap (*pagis*, 1 Tim. 6:9). A new element, as against the OT, is the constant danger of falling into sin: Satan can use all sorts of things to lead us into temptation (1 Cor. 7:5; 1 Thess. 3:5). Anything can become a temptation (Gal. 6:1). In Gal. 4:14 two thoughts are intertwined: "and though my condition was a trial to you, you did not scorn or despise me, but received me as an angel of God, as Jesus Christ." The meaning is: You have overcome the temptation which my illness presented to you, and have not rejected me contemptuously in my illness. The illness may have been connected with Paul's eyes (Gal. 4:15; cf. 6:11) and may have been his "thorn in the flesh" (2 Cor. 12:7; → Fruit, art. *skolops*). The temptation which threatens the church at Corinth has hitherto been such as man can bear (1 Cor. 10:13). It lies in apparently innocuous association with pagans, which can however lead to idolatry and immorality (cf. vv. 7 f. and the earlier discussions of immorality in chs. 5–7 and eating meat offered to idols in ch. 8).

3. To have to suffer as a Christian is a form of testing. But it can also be a mark of true discipleship and therefore a ground for joy (1 Pet. 1:6; 4:12), especially when one knows, by looking for instance back to the great examples of Abraham and Job, that it is possible to emerge from temptation approved and preserved in → patience (Jas. 1:2). At the end of the testing God never turns out to be an enemy, but one who rewards (Jas. 1:12).

In stark contrast to any attempt to hold God responsible for human failures, Jas. maintains that God, himself *apeirastos*, incapable of being tempted by the evil one, tempts no one (Jas. 1:13). Rather, does he help and rescue from temptation (2 Pet.

2:9; 1 Cor. 10:13). The question of the origin of temptation is left open.

Jesus commanded his disciples to pray against temptation (Mk. 14:38), and taught them to ask the Father, "Lead us not into temptation [*kai mē eisenenkēs hēmas eis peirasmon*], but deliver us from evil" (Matt. 6:13). The par. in Lk. 5:4 omits the second clause. Here God, having been asked for the forgiveness of sins, is asked not to allow his church to come into the kind of Satanic temptation which would lead them to fall away, but to rescue them from the power of the evil one and so let his → kingdom come. The ultimate coming of God's rule cannot be separated from the present fight against the kingdom of the tempter. Everyday temptations (Lk. 8:13) as well as the eschatological tribulations and temptations to go astray (Mk. 13:22; Rev. 2:10), which will come upon all the inhabitants of the earth (Rev. 3:10), are summed up in the prayer: "Lead us not into temptation."

J. Jeremias argues that we are not to think of God as the source of the temptation (*The Prayers of Jesus*, *SBT* Second Series 6, 1967, 104) and that Jas. 1:13 is a rejection of this misunderstanding. He sees the petition in the light of an ancient Jewish evening prayer: "Lead my foot not into the power of sin, And bring me not into the power of iniquity, And not into the power of temptation, And not into the power of anything shameful" (b. Ber. 60b; cf. op. cit., 105). The prayer has in view God's permission which allows things to happen. It is not a prayer to be preserved *from* temptation but to be preserved *in* temptation. Jeremias finds corroboration of this in an extra-canonical saying of Jesus allegedly uttered on his last evening prior to the prayer in Gethsemane: "No one can obtain the kingdom of heaven who has not passed through temptation" (Tertullian, *De Baptismo* 20, 2; cf. J. Jeremias, *Unknown Sayings of Jesus*, 1964 ², 73 ff.). This accords with Jeremias's interpretation of *peirasmos* which "does not mean the little temptations or testings of everyday life, but the final great Testing which stands at the door and will extend over the whole earth – the disclosure of the mystery of evil, the revelation of the Antichrist, the abomination of desolation (when Satan stands in God's place), the final persecution and testing of God's saints by pseudo-prophets and false saviours. What is in danger is not moral integrity, but faith itself. The final trial at the end is apostasy! Who can escape? The concluding petition of the Lord's Prayer therefore says, 'O Lord, preserve us from falling away, from apostasy' " (op. cit., 105 f.; cf. E. Lohmeyer, *The Lord's Prayer*, 1965, 191–208). As such, Jeremias claims, it has no parallels in the OT (op. cit., 106). If, on the other hand, we view the petition in the light of the OT teaching on the testing of God's sons within the covenant relationship, there is a sense in which God may be said to be the one who tests (cf. above OT 3). Moreover, it could be said to be a plea to be spared the rigour of a test which could lead to apostasy (cf. Matt. 24:21 f. par. Mk. 13:19 f.; Lk. 21:24; cf. Dan. 12:1; Zech. 12:3). Perhaps the kind of temptation envisaged is that described in Lk. 22:28–34: " 'You are those who have continued with me in my trials [*peirasmois*]; as my Father appointed a kingdom for me so do I appoint for you that you may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel. Simon, Simon, behold, Satan demanded to have you, that he might sift you like wheat, but I have prayed for you that your faith may not fail; and when you have turned again, strengthen your brethren'. . . . He said, 'I tell you, Peter, the cock will not crow this day, until you three times deny that you know me' " (cf. on Peter's denial Matt. 26:30–35 par. Mk. 14:26–31; Matt. 26:57–75 par. Mk.

14:53–72; Lk. 22:54–71; Jn. 18:17, 25 ff.). Whereas Peter was spared, Judas was not, although paradoxically he sought to save his life by his betrayal (Matt. 26:20–25 par. Mk. 14:17–21, Lk. 22:14, 21 ff.; Jn. 13:2 ff.; Matt. 27:3–10; cf. B. Gärtner, *Iscariot*, *Facet Books*, Biblical Series 29, 1971). The sifting (*siniasai*) by → Satan may be compared with the winnowing of the wheat by Jesus foretold by John the Baptist (Matt. 3:12 par. Lk. 3:17). But in Satan's case the end is destruction, whereas in Jesus' it is the gathering of the wheat into the granary and the destruction of the chaff.

4. Jesus was the subject of temptation throughout his life. This is brought out particularly by Lk. (4:13; 22:28) and Heb. (2:18; 4:15). For this very reason he can help his disciples in their temptations. Because he is without sin, the power of Satan is constantly provoked to attack him in many forms. When his opponents tried to take him in with trick-questions, it was only a covering action (Mk. 10:2; 12:15; Matt. 22:35; Lk. 10:25; Jn. 8:6). Because of false, human expectations among the people, the Pharisees and the disciples were ever seeking to appropriate Jesus. They thus represent temptations and hindrances for the messiah, who is obedient to God (Mk. 8:11 par. Matt. 16:1; 16:22 f.; Lk. 11:16). In the struggle in Gethsemane Jesus even prays the Father to remove the cup from him (Mk. 14:35 ff.).

The nature of the constant temptations in the life of Jesus is epitomized in the story of the temptations which preceded Jesus' public ministry (Matt. 4:1–11 par. Mk. 1:12 f.; Lk. 4:1–13). All three evangelists point out that it was the → Spirit which led Jesus into the → wilderness where he was tempted by → Satan. Matt.'s infinitive clause suggests that this was the purpose of the Spirit's leading; Matt. and Lk. use the word *diabolos* (→ Accuse); Mk. has *Satanas*.

The scene of the temptation recalls the testing of Israel as God's son in the wilderness wanderings prior to entry into the promised land (cf. Deut. 6–8). Indeed, B. Gerhardsson sees the story as a Christian midrash, composed very early on by a Christian scribe versed in Pharisaic exegesis (op. cit., 79 ff.; cf. Acts 15:5). This, however, must remain a piece of speculation. On the other hand, there is a parallel between the forty years of wilderness wandering and the forty days of Jesus in the desert (cf. the forty years of wandering with the forty days of spying out the land in Num. 14:34; cf. also Deut. 8:2; 9:18; Ezek. 4:5 f.; and Elijah's forty days without food, 1 Ki. 19:8). Gerhardsson sees the forty days as "a set phrase from the traditional vocabulary of fasting" (op. cit., 43). But it may also be seen in the light of the OT precedents of testing and preparation in the service of God. Jesus' action is a recapitulation of the OT precedents and as such is a fulfilment comparable with the other instances of fulfilment noted by Matt. (→ Fullness, art. *plēroō* NT).

The first temptation is not merely an invitation to perform a spectacular miracle for selfish ends by turning stones into → bread. It is to be seen against the background of OT promises of how Yahweh provides food for his children (cf. Pss. 23:1; 33:18 f.; 34:10; 37:19; 104:27 f.; 145:15; 146:7; Deut. 2:7; 28:1–14; Neh. 9:21). Yahweh gave his people manna and quails, but they resented what they had been given once their immediate needs were satisfied (Exod. 16:2 ff.; Num. 11:4 ff., 33 f.; 21:4 ff.; Deut. 8:2 ff.; 9:22; 29:5; Ps. 78:18 ff., 26 ff.). Jesus' reply to this temptation is taken from a passage which recalls the wilderness wanderings and Yahweh's provision of manna: "And he humbled you and let you hunger and fed you with manna, which you did not know, nor did your fathers know; that he might make

you know that man does not live by bread alone, but that man lives by everything that proceeds out of the mouth of the LORD" (Deut. 8:3; cf. Matt. 4:4 and Lk. 4:4). Gerhardsson sees the temptation as "a test designed to discipline the Son of God and to reveal what lies in his heart. Israel did not withstand this temptation; the people were seized with craving, discontent, doubt and unbelief, and grumbled because they wanted a different kind of food to the divine sustenance God was giving them. They showed that their heart was divided by craving and unbelief; the evil inclination had gained supremacy over their heart, to use the late Jewish terminology. The tempter desires to entice Jesus into this sin" (op. cit., 51). It is not without significance that the Sermon on the Mount records the saying: "Or what man of you, if his son asks him for a loaf, will give him a stone?" (Matt. 7:9).

The second temptation in Matt.'s account and the third in Lk.'s is set on the pinnacle of the temple. As its background Gerhardsson sees the promises of divine protection in the wilderness wanderings (op. cit., 54 ff.). God set before his son Israel a blessing and a curse (Deut. 11:26 ff.; 27:14–30:20; cf. 8:14 ff.). To the blessing belonged protection from all kinds of danger. If Israel kept the covenant, this protection was his. Deut. 32:10 ff. and Exod. 19:4 ff. speak of Yahweh bearing Israel on eagles' wings. His foot is said not to have swollen during the forty years (Deut. 8:4; 29:4; cf. Neh. 9:21). Yahweh is said to have borne his people as a man bears his son (Deut. 1:31; cf. Num. 11:12 f.; Isa. 46:3 f.; Hos. 11:3). But the protection was not confined to the wilderness generation. "*The temple* is the place par excellence where this protection is effective, for it is there that the divine presence is concentrated. We may notice here that the role played by the temple is foreshadowed in the wilderness passages, particularly in Deuteronomy. The object of all the journeyings is to reach Canaan, and in particular 'the place which JHWH your God will choose' as his resting place (cf. Deut. 12:18, 21; 14:23 ff.; 15:20; 16:2, 6, 11, 16; 17:8, 10 etc.)" (B. Gerhardsson, op. cit., 56).

The temple was an inviolable place of sanctuary (cf. M. Löhr, *Das Asylwesen im Alten Testament*, 1930; N. M. Nicolsky, "Das Asylrecht in Israel", *ZAW* 7, 1930, 146–75; M. Greenberg, "The Biblical Conception of Asylum", *JBL* 78, 1959, 125–32). Yahweh's protection is a recurrent theme of the Pss. (cf. Pss. 17:8; 57:2; 61:5; 63:8), and this is often expressly related to the temple as the focal point of holiness, health and power (cf. Pss. 36:8 f.; 61:5). This is particularly true of Ps. 91 which was associated with both the temple and the wilderness wanderings by the rabbis (Midrash Teh. 91; cf. Deut. 6–8). It is on the basis of Ps. 91:11 f. that Satan issues the temptation to Jesus to cast himself from the "wing" of the temple: "For he will give his angels charge of you to guard you in all your ways. On their hands they will bear you up, lest you dash your foot against a stone" (cf. Matt. 4:6; Lk. 4:10 f.). There is probably a play on words between the "wing" (*pterygion*) of the temple and the clause "under his wings [*pterygas*] you will find refuge" (Ps. 91:4; → Temple, art. *pterygion*). This temptation is not simply a demand, like that of the Pharisees, for a spectacular sign. "Satan wants Jesus to *tempt God*, i.e. demand from God a token that he is going to keep his covenantal promises. . . . Satan exhorts Jesus to endanger himself by his own act, so as to challenge God to save his life in accordance with the covenant promises" (B. Gerhardsson, op. cit., 60). But the temptation is rejected by a quotation, which like the previous one, is taken from Deut.: "You shall not tempt the Lord your God" (Matt. 4:7 par. Lk. 4:12, citing Deut. 6:16 in the sing.

instead of the MT plur.). The Deut. passage adds "as you tested him at Massah" (cf. above, OT 3). The command is in fact the negative form of the great commandment which is stated in the same chapter of Deut.: "Hear, O Israel: The LORD our God is one LORD; and you shall love the LORD your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your might" (Deut. 6:4 f.; → Command; → Love). To have put God to the test in this way would have been to break the great commandment. On the other hand, the power of the disciples over the → demons is itself a sign that the promises of Ps. 91 are being honoured by God. Ps. 91:13 is quoted at Lk. 10:19, where the disciples' power over the enemy is seen as a fulfilment of the Ps. and evidence of the fall of Satan. However, as Gerhardsson argues, Jesus' reluctance to tempt God is itself the expression of the fact that "he is ready, in obedience to God, to lose his life" (op. cit., 61).

In the third temptation in Matt. "the devil took him to a very high mountain, and showed him all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them; and he said to him, 'All these I will give you, if you will fall down and worship me' " (Matt. 4:8 f. par. Lk. 4:5 f., where it is the second temptation). The passage is rich in OT associations. In Deut. 34:1–4 Moses went up from the plain of Moab to Mount Nebo, to the top of Pisgah, where Yahweh showed him the promised land and said: "This is the land of which I swore to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob, 'I will give it to your descendants.' I have let you see it with your eyes, but you shall not go over there" (v. 4). Earlier Moses was given a similar view of the land but forbidden to go over the Jordan (Deut. 3:27). This is followed by Moses' speech depicting the riches awaiting the Israelites in the promised land and commanding them not to allow the riches to cause them to forget Yahweh and worship other gods (Deut. 6 and 8). D. Daube has drawn attention to the ancient legal custom on conveying property, particularly land, for the vendor to take the buyer to some vantage point, to assure him of his desire to transfer it, letting the buyer see it and receive it with his eyes (*Studies in Biblical Law*, 1947, 24–39). In other contexts mountains could be the scene of revelation, as in the case of Sinai (Exod. 19:3 ff.; 34:2 ff.), but also the scene of idolatrous worship (Deut. 12:1 ff.).

In Deut. there is also the theme of the riches of the promised land and the warning not to forget Yahweh on this account and follow other gods. Such a warning immediately follows the Shema and precedes the command not to put Yahweh to the test (Deut. 6:16) which Jesus quoted in repulsing the temptation to cast himself from the temple and also the command by which he rejects the present temptation (Deut. 6:13). A parallel passage occurs in Deut. 8 (see especially vv. 8, 11, 14, 19). Deut. 13:1–5 warns against prophets and dreamers of dreams who perform miracles in order to lead the people away from Yahweh to worship other gods. Israel is not to be deceived by the miracles; he should keep to the commandments of Yahweh and put such men to death. Despite these warnings Israel did in fact go astray in the manner foreseen (Deut. 9:16; 31:20; 32:15 ff.; cf. Exod. 32 and 1 Cor. 10). Idolatry and demon worship are linked in Deut. 32:17; Ps. 106:37 f.; Eth. Enoch 99:7; Mart. Isa. 2:3 ff.

The fact that this background lies behind the temptation is confirmed by the fact that Jesus resists it by citing a passage which is directly concerned with this danger to Israel: "Then Jesus said to him, 'Begone, Satan! for it is written, "You shall worship the Lord your God and him only shall you serve" ' " (Matt 4:10 par. Lk.

4:7; cf. Deut. 6:13). Whereas Israel as the son of God had succumbed to this temptation, Jesus as the Son of God overcame it by living by God's word, just as Israel should have done. By rejecting the false promise of the riches of the promised land, Jesus could enter into his true inheritance as the Son of God, though this was by the way of the cross. In this sense Jesus was living by the third beatitude, "Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth" (Matt. 5:5; → Inheritance; → Humility, art. *prayÿs* NT 2). The fulfilment of the promise lay in a way very different from that envisaged by Satan. The promises of Satan are empty promises, for nothing can be secured by serving him. This may be compared with the suggestion of Peter that Jesus should not go to Jerusalem which is met with the reply, "Get behind me, Satan! You are a hindrance to me; for you are not on the side of God, but of men" (Matt. 16:23; cf. Mk. 8:33). In both cases the rejection of the temptation led to hardship and suffering. But ultimately it led to the defeat of Satan. The evangelist's comment, "The devil left him, and behold, angels came and ministered to him" (Matt. 4:11) has a parallel in Test. Naph. 8:4 (cf. also Test. Iss. 7 and Test. Ben. 5 and 6).

The temptations of Jesus recapitulate, in his individual life as the Son of God, the temptations of the nation of Israel in their corporate life as the son of God. The three forms of the temptation focus on the three areas of life which were vital to Israel as the covenant pilgrim people seeking the promised land: sustenance, protection and all that the land symbolized in terms of prosperity and security. In rejecting the temptations Jesus proved to be the true Son of God, for he not only rejected them but he did so by appealing to the word of God. In short, he lived by the word of God (cf. Matt. 4:4 with 5:17 f.). It was precisely at this point that Israel had failed (cf. Matt. 15:7 ff. with Isa. 29:13). The temptation stories thus vindicate the declaration of the "voice from heaven" heard directly after the baptism of Jesus, which immediately precedes the temptation narratives: "This is my beloved Son, with whom I am well pleased" (Matt. 3:17 par. Mk. 1:11; cf. Isa. 42:1; 44:2; Lk. 3:22 cf. Ps. 2:7). By so doing Jesus gains the victory over Satan and makes it possible for his people to inherit the promises of God. By placing the temptation concerning the kingdoms of the world at the climax of the temptations, Matt. sees the victory here in the light of the triumph of the → kingdom of heaven over the kingdom of this world which in turn supersedes the promises to Israel concerning the land. His Gospel ends with the words of the risen Christ showing that Jesus now has the authority legitimately which Satan promised deceitfully: "All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me. Go therefore and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you; and lo, I am with you always, to the close of the age" (Matt. 28:18 ff.). In Lk. the temptation set in the temple comes at the climax. Perhaps this is to be explained in the light of the significance of the temple in the Gospel of Luke, where it is particularly prominent as the place of revelation (→ Temple, art. *to hieron* NT).

With regard to Mk., E. Best observes: "For Mark the Devil is defeated so far as the life of Jesus is concerned at the Temptation; in this conclusive contest Satan is bound and Jesus is thereafter able to reduce to obedience evil-spiritual powers, the demons which possess men and evil-cosmic forces met in sea storms. This encounter with the Devil in the Temptation is the decisive meeting of the forces of light and darkness, of order and chaos, of good and evil; this struggle which lay behind so much of the Old Testament and of the religion of the Near East of the period has

now had its issue" (*The Temptation and the Passion: The Markan Soteriology, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series* 2, 1965, 190).

W. Schneider, C. Brown

δόκιμος

δόκιμος (*dokimos*), tested, approved, genuine, esteemed; δοκιμάζω (*dokimazō*), test, accept as proved, approve; δοκιμασία (*dokimasia*), test; δοκίμιον (*dokimion*), testing, means of testing, adj. genuine; ἀδόκιμος (*adokimos*), not standing the test, worthless, disqualified, unfit, reprehensible; ἀποδοκιμάζω (*apodokimazō*), reject, declare useless; δοκιμή (*dokimē*), the quality of being approved, hence character.

CL The root *dek-*, *dechomai*, accept, gives two verbal derivatives *dokeō* and *dokaō*. The former means (intrans.) to appear, have the appearance, (trans.) to think, believe, consider right; the latter means expect. Derivatives of the former are: (a) *dokimos*, trustworthy, reliable, tested, recognized, used as a technical term for genuine, current coinage, but also applied to persons enjoying general esteem; (b) *adokimos*, untested, not respected; (c) indirectly also *dokimion*, test, probation; (d) from *dokimos* are also derived *dokimazō*, test, pronounce good, establish by trial, recognize, and *apodokimazō*, disapprove of, reject, blame; *dokimasis* and *dokimasia*, investigation, testing (preparatory to installing in an office); *dokimē*, approved character, trial.

OT The LXX uses *dokimos* only to recognize coins as valid currency (Prov. 25:4; Isa. 1:22 for Heb. *sîg̃*, dross). Hence worthless money or metal is called *adokimos*. *dokimazō* most often represents Heb. *bāḥan*, test for genuineness by fire. It is transferred to God, who tests men. In the Pss. the prayer that God may test the one who is praying (17[16]:3; 26[25]:2; 139[138]:1, 23 *ḥāqar*) is an expression of complete trust. In the prophets, however, God's threat of testing becomes equivalent to judgment (Jer. 9:6[7]; Zech. 13:9, RSV "refine"). There is always a consciousness of the connexion with testing by fire. The same usage is found in the writings of late Jud. Other instances of *dokimazō* are Jdg. 7:4; 1 Esd. 9:40; Pss. 66(65):10; 68(67):30; 81(80):7; 95(94):9; Prov. 8:10; 17:3; 27:21; Wis. 1:3; 2:19; 3:6; 11:10; Sir. 2:5; 24:12; 27:5; 31(34):10, 26; 39:34; 42:8; Zech. 11:13; Jer. 6:27; 11:20; 12:3; 17:10; 20:12; 2 Macc. 1:34; 4:3; 3 Macc. 2:6; 4 Macc. 17:12.

NT In the NT *dokimos* is used mostly by Paul in the sense of recognized, approved, accepted (Rom. 14:18; 16:10; 1 Cor. 11:19; 2 Cor. 10:18); correspondingly *adokimos* means worthless, rejected, not in the sense of that which is seen from the first to be unsuitable (not even in Heb. 6:8), but meaning that which has not stood the test, that which has been shown to be a sham, and has therefore been rejected (Rom. 1:28; 1 Cor. 9:27; 2 Cor. 13:5; 2 Tim. 3:8; Tit. 1:16). *dokimazō* is used as in secular Gk. It is used, mostly by Paul, with the meaning: (a) interpret, test (Lk. 12:56; 1 Cor. 3:13), oneself (1 Cor. 11:28; 2 Cor. 13:5; Gal. 6:4), what is important (Rom. 2:18; 12:2; Eph. 5:10; Phil. 1:10), all things (1 Thess. 5:21), the spirits (1 Jn. 4:1), for the office of deacon (1 Tim. 3:10) with the same force as *peirazō* (2 Cor. 13:5) and *epiginōskō* (2 Cor. 6:9); (b) the result of testing is either *dokimazō*, recognize, ap-

prove (Rom. 14:22; 1 Cor. 16:3; 2 Cor. 8:22; 1 Thess. 2:4) or *apodokimazō*, repudiate, reject (Matt. 21:42 par. Mk. 12:10, Lk. 20:17 citing Ps. 118:22 f.; → Rock; 1 Pet. 2:4; Heb. 12:17; Mk. 8:31 par. Lk. 9:20 of the Son of Man). *dokimē* is found with the act. meaning of a test by means of instructions or tribulations (2 Cor. 2:9; 8:2), and with the pass. meaning of the result of the testing of faith (Rom. 5:4; 2 Cor. 9:13; 13:3; Phil. 2:22). *dokimion* is used for the means of testing (which is how → *peirasmoi* are considered) in Jas. 1:3. 1 Pet. 1:7 thinks rather of the preservation of the Christian, whose faith is purified like gold in the fire.

1. Everyone to whom God's grace has been entrusted must keep himself in it (cf. also Lk. 19:12–27). The passages of Scripture which speak of testing, trial, recognition and rejection are addressed only to members of the church. Heb. 6:8 speaks of those who by their complete falling away from God have become incapable in themselves of returning and hence of bearing the fruit of repentance and faith. They are thus *adokimos*, without fruit, rejected (cf. also Heb. 12:17). Hence the soil which bears thorns and thistles (Heb. 6:8) is a picture of those "who have been enlightened, who have tasted the heavenly gift, and have become partakers of the Holy Spirit and have tasted the goodness of the word of God and the powers of the age to come", and yet in conscious sin "have crucified the Son of God afresh and hold him up to contempt" (Heb. 6:4 ff.). The church member is *adokimos*, not having passed the test, unfit, unusable in God's eyes, for out of incomprehensible, irresponsible doubt and disobedience he refuses the fruit of faith which God expects. We find almost the complete reversal of this in passages like Matt. 21:42 par. Mk. 12:10, Lk. 20:17 citing Ps. 118:22 f., and 1 Pet. 2:4, in all of which *apodokimazō* is used. The stone (Jesus), which the builders (the people of God, the spiritual leaders) found unsuitable and rejected (crucified), in God's eyes was found worthy to become the corner-stone (→ Rock).

2. What matters in testing is that we use God's gifts aright. Timothy, to whom the word of truth had been entrusted, was to show himself as an approved worker (2 Tim. 2:15) by faithful preaching. On the other hand, those who do not honour God according to the knowledge granted them, who reject (*ouk edokimasan*) knowing him, are given over to a base mind (*adokimon noun*, Rom. 1:28) and to improper conduct as a punishment. Here we see how closely linked *dokimazō* is with → *peirazō*. Both groups of words are concerned with testing. With *dokimazō* the stress falls on a positive result in which that which is tested passes and is recognized as genuine, but *peirazō* tends to be more negative and means a temptation to evil, in which lusts (Jas. 1:14), want and affliction (1 Cor. 10:13), or Satan himself (1 Thess. 3:5) through temptation entice one to fall. Hence *peirasmos* is temptation rather than testing; *apeirastos* refers rather to the innocent than the untested, and *ekpeirazō*, tempt, is not used of the testing undergone by men but of the hostile intentions of Satan (Matt. 4:7) or of man (1 Cor. 10:9) to tempt God.

3. God himself tests and passes judgment on the day of judgment. Paul declares in 1 Cor. 3:13 that all service for the church and all the fruit borne by it are subjected to God's testing and verdict in the fire of judgment. The determining factors will be whether faith was created (v. 5) and the church built up (v. 16). He who has stood the test in faith (Jas. 1:12) will receive eternal life as the victor's crown.

4. This test is taking place already in this life. God even now shows himself as the tester of men's hearts (1 Thess. 2:4). So the whole of a Christian's life is subject to

the testing scrutiny of God. All depends on our being found as "approved in Christ" (Rom. 16:10). Paul submitted himself to the judgment of God, not to that of man (1 Cor. 9:27; 4:3 ff.), even though men can and should recognize when someone has stood the test (2 Cor. 13:3; Phil. 2:22). The content and goal of Paul's pastoral care of the individual and community is that they should be found obedient (2 Cor. 2:9).

5. That one has stood the test is manifested in various ways. (a) By a serious effort to know the will of God. The gift of the Holy Spirit enables a man to recognize God's will (Rom. 12:2) and to test what is well-pleasing to God (Phil. 1:10; Eph. 5:10) and what is best (1 Thess. 5:21). The gift of testing and distinguishing of the spirits (1 Jn. 4:1) is also part of the Christian's duty.

(b) By one's loyalty to God. The terms *peirazō*, *dokimazō* and *epiginōskō* are used side by side in 2 Cor. 13:5, so as to move the Corinthians to the crucial task of testing their own faithfulness. If Christ dwells in us, we cannot and may not be *adokimos*; for if we are, our being Christians is futile.

(c) By one's love to one's neighbour. At the end of the section on the collection (2 Cor. 8:9) Paul writes that because of their "testing" in this service many praise God; thereby he shows that such service which is concerned with the needs of the brethren is part of the testing of faith working in love (→ Poor, art. *ptōchos* NT 4 (a)).

(d) By holding fast to hope in the midst of tribulation. The church is exposed to attacks from within and without, from Satanic powers and godless men. It lives by faith, not by sight. In this position willed by God it maintains its living hope by remaining under God's hand, by the "overflowing" of the riches given by God and of the goodness created by the Spirit to others (2 Cor. 8:2), by patience (Jas. 1:2 f.) and by overcoming temptations (1 Pet. 1:6 f.). *H. Haarbeck*

→ Demon, → Evil, → Fall, → Lead Astray, → Offence, → Satan, → Sin, → Son, → Temple, → Wilderness

(a). J. B. Bauer, "Temptation", *EBT* III 903 ff.; E. Best, *The Temptation and the Passion: The Markan Soteriology*, *Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series* 2, 1965; D. Bonhoeffer, *Temptation*, 1953; W. D. Davies, *The Gospel and the Land: Early Christianity and Jewish Territorial Doctrine*, 1974; P. Doble, "Temptations", *ExpT* 72, 1960–61, 91 ff.; W. J. Foxell, *The Temptation of Jesus*, 1920; B. Gerhardsson, *The Testing of God's Son (Matt. 4:1–11 & Par.)*, *Coniectanea Biblica, New Testament Series* 2:1, 1966; W. Grundmann, *dokimos* etc. *TDNT* II 255–60; C. B. Houk, "The Lord's Prayer and the Massah Tradition", *SJT* 19, 1966, 216–25; B. van Iersel, *The Bible on the Temptations of Man*, *St. Norbert Abbey Series* 12, 166; J. Jeremias, *The Prayers of Jesus*, *SBT* Second Series 6, 1967; J. A. Kirk, "The Messianic Role of Jesus and the Temptation Narrative: A Contemporary Perspective", *EQ* 44, 1972, 11–29, 91–102; E. Lohmeyer, *The Lord's Prayer*, 1965; U. W. Mauser, *Christ in the Wilderness: The Wilderness Theme in the Second Gospel and its Basis in the Biblical Tradition*, *SBT* 39, 1963; C. F. D. Moule, "An Unresolved Problem in the Temptation Clause in the Lord's Prayer", *Reformed Theological Review* 33, 1975, 65–75; P. Pokorny, "The Temptation Stories and their Intention", *NTS* 20, 1973–74, 115–27; H. Riesenfeld, "The Messianic Character of the Temptation in the Wilderness", in *The Gospel Tradition*, 1970, 75–94; J. A. T. Robinson, "The Temptations", in *Twelve New Testament Studies*, *SBT* 34, 1962, 53–60; H. Seesemann, *peira* etc., *TDNT* VI 23–36; M. H. Sykes, "And Do Not Bring Us to the Test", *ExpT* 73, 1961–62, 189 f.; G. H. P. Thompson, "Called – Proved – Obedient: A Study in the Baptism and Temptation Narratives of Matthew and Luke", *JTS* New Series 11, 1960, 1–12.

(b). J. Carmignac, "Fais que nous n'entrions pas dans la tentation", *RB* 72, 1965, 218 ff.; and *Recherches sur le "Notre Père"*, 1969, 236 ff.; H. Clavier, "Tentation et Anamartésie dans le Nouveau Testament", *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses* 47, 1967, 150–64; J. Dupont, "L'Arrière-fond biblique du Récit des Tentations de Jésus", *NTS* 3, 1956–57, 287–304; "L'Origine du Récit des Tentations de Jésus", *RB* 73, 1966, 30–76; and *Les Tentations de Jésus au Désert*, 1968; G. Eichholz,

"Bewahren und bewähren des Evangeliums", in *Hören und Handeln*, Wolf-Festschrift, 1962; E. Fascher, *Jesus und der Satan. Eine Studie zur Auslegung der Versuchungsgeschichte*, 1949; A. Feuillet, "Le Récit lucanien de la Tentation (Lc 4, 1–13)", *Biblica* 40, 1959, 613–31; H. Hyldal, "Die Versuchung auf der Zinne des Tempels", *StudTheol* 15, 1961, 113–27; A. Köberle, "Versuchung", RGG[3] VI 1385 ff.; K.-P. Köppen, *Die Auslegung der Versuchungsgeschichte unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der alten Kirche*, 1961; J. H. Korn, *PEIRASMOS. Die Versuchung des Gläubigen in der griechischen Bibel*, *BWANT* 4. Folge 20, 1937; K. G. Kuhn, "peirasmos – hamartia – sarx im Neuen Testament und die damit zusammenhängenden Vorstellungen", *ZTK* 49, 1952, 200 ff.; E. Lohmeyer, "Die Versuchung Jesu", *ZSTh* 14, 1937, 619–50; A. Mayer, "Die evangelischen Berichte über die Versuchung Christi", in *Festgabe H. Blümmer*, 1914, 434–68; R. Schnackenburg, "Der Sinn der Versuchung Jesu bei den Synoptikern", *ThQ* 132, 1952, 297–326; M. Steiner, *La Tentation de Jésus dans l'Interprétation patristique de Saint Justin à Origène*, 1962; H. J. Vogels, "Die Versuchungen Jesu", *BZ* 17, 1925–26, 238–55.

Tent, Tabernacle

σκηνή

σκηνή (*skēnē*), tent, tabernacle, dwelling; σκῆνος (*skēnos*), tent; σκήνωμα (*skēnōma*), tent, dwelling; σκηνοποιός (*skēnopoios*), leather-worker, tent-maker; σκηνόω (*skēnoō*), live, dwell, encamp.

CL In secular Gk. *skēnē* originally denoted a tent-covering made of branches or poles with a matted roof and sides constructed from straw, leaves or skins. The term was also used of the raised stage of a theatre, the cover of a wagon or the cabin of a ship. Naturally it came to signify transitoriness, so that Democritus could say: "The world is a tent, and life is a passing by; one comes, sees and departs" (Diels[8], II, 165, 7 f.).

OT 1. In the LXX *skēnē* and *skēnōma* are used synonymously, although the former word is found five times more frequently than the latter (about 430:80). Generally they render *'ōhel* (a pointed tent), sometimes *miškān* (dwelling), and on occasion *sukkâh* (a matted booth, shed or hut). The tabernacle (LXX, *skēnē*, *skēnōma*) is never called *sukkâh* but *'ōhel* or *'ōhel mô'ēḏ* ("tent of meeting", the appointed place where God meets his people, cf. Exod. 36:26; Jos. 6:24) or sometimes *miškān* (the place where God resides). It was also called the "tent of testimony" (Heb. *'ōhel 'ēḏûṯ*; Gk. *skēnē tou martyriou*, Acts 7:44; cf. Rev. 15:5) because it contained the covenant tablets. As a result of the LXX equation of *miškān* with *skēnē*, the Gk. word could, surprisingly, refer to what was permanent (cf. Lk. 16:9; Heb. 8:2) rather than impermanent. *skēnos* is found only in Wis. 9:15: "A perishable body weighs down the soul and this earthy tent oppresses the meditative mind."

At all times in human history the tent has been the customary dwelling of nomadic or semi-nomadic peoples. The Hebrew patriarchs were tent-dwellers (e.g. Gen. 12:8; 13:3; 25:27), as were the Israelites during their wilderness wanderings (Num. 19:14). Subsequently, in celebrating the Feast of Tabernacles each year, the Israelites lived in tents for seven days to recall these journeyings from Egypt to Canaan (Lev. 23:34, 42–43). During the time of Jeremiah the simplicity and independence of the nomadic tent-life was idealized by the Rechabites (Jer. 35:6–10; but see Ps. 84[83]:10). Even when sedentary life became normative (cf. Heb. 11:9–10), tents were used by shepherds (Isa. 38:12) or herdsmen (Jdg. 6:5) and by armies (2 Ki. 7:7–8; Jer.

37:10). For Philo and Josephus see W. Michaelis, *TDNT* VII 373 f. The Mishnah Tractate Sukkah deals with the Feast of Tabernacles. For a description of the Feast of the Tabernacles see N. Hillyer, "First Peter and the Feast of Tabernacles", *TB* 21, 1970, 39–51. *M. J. Harris*

2. The tabernacle continued to be used long after the entry into Canaan. Under the judges it was at Shiloh (Jos. 8:1) and in Saul's reign at Nob (1 Sam. 21; cf. Mk. 2:25 f.) and Gibeon (1 Chr. 16:39). According to 1 Ki. 8:4, Solomon had it laid up in the → temple. The structure and contents are described in Exod. 25 ff. and 35–38. The two interior compartments were divided by a veil. The first called "the holy place" was 20 cubits deep; the second or "holy of holies" or "holy place" (Lev. 16:2 f.; cf. Heb. 9:12; 10:19) was entered by the high priest on the annual day of atonement (Lev. 16; → Blood; → Reconciliation, art. *hilaskomai*). In the holy place stood the ark (Heb. *'ārôn*, LXX *kibōtos*) (Exod. 25:10–22; 27:1–8; → Temple, art. *to hieron* OT 3), a slab of gold with a → cherub at each end resting on top. The slab was termed the *kappōreṯ* (LXX *hilastērion*) and ET "mercy seat". It was sprinkled with blood by the high priest in the day of atonement ritual. In the holy place, in front of the veil was the altar of incense or golden altar (Exod. 30:1–10; 37:25–28) and on the north side the table of the presence bread or showbread (Exod. 25:23–30) together with various vessels and instruments. On the south side stood the lampstand (Exod. 25:31–40; 37:17–24; 40:24). The tabernacle stood in a courtyard 100 by 50 cubits with its door facing east (Exod. 27:9–19; 38:9–20). On the eastern side of the court stood the altar of burnt offering, so called after the chief sacrifice offered on it (Exod. 27:1–8; 38:1–7), and between the altar and the tabernacle door stood the laver (Exod. 30:17–21; 38:8; 40:29–32), which held water for the priests' ablutions. For details of the sacrifices and altars → Sacrifice, art. *thyō* OT. The → temple and the tabernacle had the same essential function and structure, the chief difference being that the temple was a permanent building. *C. Brown*

NT 1. *The Lucan writings.* In Lk. 16:9 Jesus encourages the diplomatic use of wealth so that when it collapses (at the individual's death or the end of the world), God (or possibly his angels or those who have been befriended) may welcome the benefactor into the "eternal habitations" (RSV; Gk. *aiōnious skēnas*, which here certainly does not refer to "permanent huts") (→ Possessions, art. *mamōnas*). At the → Transfiguration Peter offered to construct three *skēnai* for Jesus and the two heavenly visitors, Moses and Elijah (Lk. 9:33 par.). What he sought to perpetuate was his experience of the unveiled glorious personal presence of God in Christ.

As he summarized the findings of the Jerusalem council (Acts 15:13–21), James appealed to Amos 9:11–12 (LXX). He recognized the rebuilding of David's fallen dwelling (*skēnē*, possibly alluding to a matted hut in which he lived or held audience when on military expeditions) in the resurrection and exaltation of Christ and the rise of the church as the new Israel. Precisely because of this restoration, Gentiles were seeking the Lord (Acts 15:17–18); the Gentile mission was therefore not illegitimate (Acts 15:19).

Acts 18:3 indicates that Aquila and Paul were *skēnopoioi* by trade. While this term originally meant "tent-maker", it came to be used of the "leather-worker" (= *skytotomos*) in general (cf. the use of *lectarius* in Latin and "saddler" in English). The

articles that Paul made for sale probably included furnishings (perhaps woven from Cilician haircloth, *cilicium*, the principal export of Paul's native province) as well as tents (which in antiquity were often made of leather). By such manual labour Paul avoided being dependent on any congregation in which he was currently ministering.

The vb. *kataskēnoō* is used intrans. in the NT for live, settle, dwell, to nest (of birds; cf. Ps. 104[103]:12; Matt. 13:32; Mk. 4:32; Lk. 13:19; cf. also *kataskēnōsis*, a place to live, a nest in Matt. 8:20; Lk. 9:58). In Acts 2:26 it occurs in the quotation from Ps. 16(15):9c which is seen as finding its fulfilment in the → resurrection of Jesus: "moreover my flesh will dwell in hope."

2. *The Johannine Literature. skēnoō* is found only in the Johannine *corpus*. Whereas in the body of the Fourth Gospel Jesus is pictured as the new temple (Jn. 2:19–22), in the Prologue he is the tabernacle (*eskēnōsen*, Jn. 1:14), the locus of God's presence among men on earth (cf. Exod. 25:8–9). Where Christ is, there is God's dwelling. Rev. 7:15 pictures one of the elders before God's throne informing John that God would "encamp" (*skēnōsei*) over those who had come out of the great tribulation; he would "shelter them with his presence" (RSV), dwell with them continuously within his temple. With the arrival of the new Jerusalem "prepared as a bride adorned for her husband", God will dwell with men (Rev. 21:3, where both *skēnē* and *skēnoō* are used). He himself will be personally and permanently present in the midst of his people who will witness the final fulfilment of the oft-repeated promise of Yahweh to his covenant people: "I shall be their God and they shall be my people" (see Exod. 6:7; Lev. 26:12; Jer. 32:38; Ezek. 37:27; Zech. 8:8; 2 Cor. 6:16). Elsewhere in Rev. (12:12; 13:6) the vb. *skēnoō* is used of the permanent inhabitants of heaven. *M. J. Harris*

skēnopēgia is found almost exclusively as a technical term in Jewish religion for the building of tents or booths, i.e. the Feast of Booths or Tabernacles, especially with *heortē*, → feast (Deut. 16:16; 31:10; Zech. 14:16, 18, 19; 1 Esd. 5:50; 2 Macc. 1:9; Josephus, *Ant.* 4, 209; 8, 100 and 123; 11, 154; 13, 242 and 372; 15, 50; *War* 2, 515). It was celebrated in the month of Tishri 15–21 (i.e. October), when booths were made from branches of trees. According to Josephus, it was the most important Jewish festival (*Ant.* 15, 50; cf. 8, 123). In the NT it is mentioned in Jn. 7:2: "Now the Jews' feast of Tabernacles was at hand." Jesus rejected his brothers' plea to perform works there and win popular acclaim (Jn. 7:3–9). However, he went during the middle of the feast (Jn. 7:14). His appearance caused men to think about his teaching (Jn. 7:15–36). On "the last day of the feast, the great day" Jesus stood up and issued his invitation: "If any one thirst, let him come to me and drink. He who believes in me, as the scripture has said, 'Out of his heart shall flow rivers of living water' " (Jn. 7:37 f.). In the light of Isa. 58:11; cf. Prov. 4:23; 5:15; Isa. 55:1; Ezek. 47:1 ff.; Joel 3:18; Zech. 13:1; 14:8, Leon Morris comments: "The meaning of our passage then, in accordance with such Old Testament prophecies, appears to be that when any man comes to believe in Jesus the scriptures referring to the activity of the Holy Spirit are fulfilled" (*The Gospel according to John*, *NLC*, 1971, 424). The evangelist explains: "Now this he said about the Spirit, which those who believed in him were to receive; for as yet the Spirit had not been given, because Jesus was not yet glorified" (Jn. 7:39; → Pentecost).

There may have been a significant connexion between Jesus' utterances and the

feast. On the seven days of the feast a golden flagon was filled with water from the pool of Siloam and used for libations (Sukkah 4:9). Although this rite is not mentioned in the OT or Josephus it was probably carried out before the destruction of the temple (cf. C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel according to John*, 1955, 270). Jesus may well have been contrasting this water with the living water which he gives. Similarly, his pronouncement about being the light of the world (Jn. 8:12) may be an allusion to the lights used in the feast (Sukkah 5:2–5; cf. Barrett, op. cit., 277).

C. Brown

3. *Paul.* The two NT uses of *skēnos* are in 2 Cor. 5:1, 4 where the believer's earthly body is described as a temporary tent, in contrast to his heavenly body which will form his eternal dwelling (*oikētērion*). Throughout 2 Cor. 5:1–7 this *skēnos*-concept remains in or near the foreground of the apostle's thought. As used by Paul, *skēnos* suggests the impermanence and frustrating limitations of mortal embodiment (2 Cor. 5:2, 4, 6) and the Christian's pilgrimage of faith to the promised land of Christ's immediate presence (2 Cor. 5:6–8). Although no deprecation of the physical body is implied (as in Wis. 9:15), Paul was painfully aware of its inadequacy as an organ for either the human spirit or the Holy Spirit when compared to the resurrection body. In 2 Cor. 12:9 Paul uses *episkēnoō*, take up one's abode with, in his declaration that, "I will all the more gladly boast of my weaknesses, that the power of Christ may rest upon me." The passage concludes his discussion of his "thorn in the flesh" (→ Fruit, art. *skolops*).

4. *Hebrews.* Ten of the 20 NT uses of *skēnē* are in Heb., eight occurring in Heb. 8–9. The author contrasts the heavenly and true *skēnē* pitched by God (Heb. 8:1–2; 9:11) with the earthly tabernacle erected by → Moses at divine direction (Heb. 8:5; 9:24; cf. *to hagion kosmikon*, "the earthly sanctuary", 9:1). From Exod. 25:40 (cited in Heb. 8:5) it is clear that the earthly tabernacle was a precise model of a heavenly prototype visible to Moses. In Heb. 9:2–3, 6–8 a distinction is drawn between a front or outer ("first") *skēnē* and a rear or inner ("second") *skēnē*, between the Holy Place and the Holy of Holies, by which the writer highlights the severe restrictions placed on access into the Holy of Holies under the old economy.

M. J. Harris

Heb. 9:2–5 mentions various features of the tabernacle which stood in the holy place. The lampstand (*lychnia*) was made of gold (Exod. 25:31 ff.; 37:17 ff.); the later seven-branched ones were apparently more elaborate than the original one in the tabernacle. The table and the showbread (*hē trapeza kai hē prothesis tōn artōn*) is a hendiadys for the table of showbread. The latter means lit. the setting forth of the loaves. They were twelve freshly baked cakes placed there each sabbath. The Heb. expression *leḥem happānîm*, means "bread of the face", i.e. bread set before the face or presence of God (Exod. 25:30; 35:13; 39:36; cf. *leḥem hamma ʿarekeṭ*, "bread of setting in order", 1 Chr. 9:32). The old cakes went to the priests; no layman might eat them because they were "most holy" (Lev. 24:9; but cf. 1 Sam. 21:1–6 with Mk. 2:25 f.). The curtain separating the holy place from the outer sanctuary is here called *to deuteron katapetasma*, "the second curtain", distinguishing it from the screen by which one entered from the court (Exod. 26:36 f.; 36:37 f.; → Temple, art. *katapetasma*). On the golden altar of incense (*chrysoun thymiatērion*) → Sacrifice, art. *thyō* (on the precise meaning here see F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, *NLC*, 1964, 184–87). Bruce observes: "On the day in the year when the holy of

holies was entered the incense-altar played a significant part; not only was the holy of holies never entered without incense from the incense-altar (Lev. 16:12 f.), but the blood of the sin-offering on the Day of Atonement was sprinkled on the horns of the incense-altar as well as on the mercy-seat (Ex. 30:10; Lev. 16:15)" (op. cit., 187). The original ark of the covenant (*kibōtos tēs diathēkēs*) vanished from history with the destruction of Solomon's temple in 587 B.C. It was not replaced in the post-exilic temple. When Pompey forced his way into the holy of holies in 63 B.C. he found it empty (Josephus, *War* 1, 152 f.; *Ant.* 14, 71 f.; Tacitus, *History* 5, 9; cf. Pss. Sol. 2:1 f., 30 f.). On the golden urn holding manna see Exod. 16:33 f., on Aaron's rod Num. 17:1 ff., 10, and on the tables of the covenant, Exod. 25:16, 21 f. see Bruce, op. cit., 188 f. According to 1 Ki. 8:9 at the dedication of Solomon's temple, "There was nothing in the ark except the two tables of stone which Moses put there at Horeb, where the LORD made a covenant with the people of Israel, when they came out of the land of Egypt." On the "mercy seat" (*hilastērion*) (v. 5; cf. 4:16) see Reconciliation, art. *hilaskomai* OT 3 (c) and NT 4. However, as the argument of Heb. 9:6–10 goes on to show, the tabernacle and its day of atonement ritual is only temporary. It has all been superseded by Christ the "high priest of the good things that have come" (Heb. 9:11). *C. Brown*

Later in the book (Heb. 11:9, 13), tent-nomadism is associated with being strangers and exiles. Finally, in Heb. 13:10 "those who serve the tabernacle" probably does not refer to Christian believers, as if their worship were focused on some figurative altar in the heavenly sanctuary, but to all the worshippers belonging to the old order to whom the sacrifice of Christ (= "an altar," by metonymy) seemed superfluous.

5. *Peter.* In 2 Pet. 1:13 f. mortal existence and physical embodiment are equated with dwelling in a tent (*skēnōma*), death with the laying aside (or perhaps dismantling) of that tent (cf. Job 4:21 MT). However, because the idea of "laying aside" or "putting off" (*apothesis*, v. 14) refers more appropriately to a body than to a tent or dwelling, some prefer to render *skēnōma* in both these verses by "body" (so RSV text). This *apothesis* marks departure from earthly life (v. 15) and entrance into the eternal kingdom of Jesus Christ (v. 11). Note also that in Stephen's speech (Acts 7:46) *skēnōma* is applied to the habitation that David wished to build for the house (or God) of Jacob. *M. J. Harris*

→ Priest, → Sacrifice, → Temple

(a). C. K. Barrett, "The Eschatology of the Epistle to the Hebrews", in W. D. Davies and D. Daube, eds., *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology. In Honour of Charles Harold Dodd*, 1954, 363–93; J. Blenkinsopp, "Kiriath-jearim and the Ark", *JBL* 88, 1969, 143–56; J. O. Boyd, "What was in the Ark?", *EQ* 11, 1939, 164 ff.; F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, *NLC* 1964, 161 ff., 181 ff., 398 ff.; W. S. Caldecott, *The Tabernacle: Its History and Structure*, 1904; B. S. Childs, *Exodus*, 1974; F. M. Cross, Jr., "The Tabernacle", *BA* 10, 3, 1947; C. L. Feinberg, "Tabernacle", *ZPEB* V 572–83; G. H. Davies, "Tabernacle", *IDB* IV 498–506; and "The Ark in the Psalms", in F. F. Bruce, ed., *Promise and Fulfilment: Essays Presented to S. H. Hooke*, 1963, 51–61; D. W. Gooding, *The Account of the Tabernacle*, 1959; M. L. G. Guillebaud, "Tent over the Tabernacle", *EQ* 31, 1959, 90–96; M. Haran, "The Nature of the *'ōhel mô'ēḏ* in Pentateuchal Sources", *JSS* 5, 1960, 50–65; and "Shiloh and Jerusalem: the Origin of the Priestly Tradition in the Pentateuch", *JBL* 81, 1962, 14–24; A. H. Hillyard, *The Tabernacle in the Wilderness or the Reality of God in the Physical World*, 1965; J. P. Hyatt, *Exodus*, *New Century Bible*, 1971; A. Jacob, *God's Tent*, 1961; A. R. S. Kennedy, "Taber-

nacle", *HDB* IV 653–68; W. Michaelis, *skēnē* etc. *TDNT* VII 368–94; G. von Rad, "The Tent and the Ark", in *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays*, 1965, 103–24; C. W. F. Smith, "Tabernacles in the Fourth Gospel and Mark", *NTS* 9, 1962–63, 139–46; J. Strong, *The Tabernacle of Israel in the Desert*, 1888; J. Swetnam, "The Greater and More Perfect Tent: A Contribution to the Discussion of Hebrews ix, 11", *Biblica* 47, 1966, 91–106.
(b). J. Bovet, "Sur le Tabernacle", *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses* 21, 1933, 277–80; M. Haran, "*mhwṯw šl h'hl mw'd* (The Tent of Meeting)", *Tarbiz* 25, 1955, 11–20 (English summary, iii–v); R. Hartmann, "Zelt und Lade", *ZAW* 37, 1917–18, 209–44; M. H. Segal, "*lmhwṯw šl 'hl mw'd* (On the Tent of Meeting)", *Tarbiz* 25, 1956, 231 ff. (English summary, viii–ix); G. Wagner, "Le Tabernacle et la Vie 'en Christ'. Exégèse de 2 Corinthiens 5:1 à 10", *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses* 41, 1961, 379 ff.

Thank, Praise, Eucharist

αἰνέω

αἰνέω (*aineō*), to praise; *αἶνος* (*ainos*), praise; *ἐπαινέω* (*epaineō*), praise; *ἔπαινος* (*epainos*), praise.

CL In secular Gk. *aineō* meant: (a) to mention, especially mention honourably, and so praise; (b) to vow, to promise, and so simply say. The noun *ainos* meant a saying which is particularly pregnant with meaning, cleverly phrased, or needing explanation. So it developed the meanings: (a) proverb, story, fable; (b) praise, eulogy. The compound verb *epaineō* meant in popular speech: (a) to approve, sanction; (b) to praise, give a public mark of esteem. The corresponding noun *epainos* meant praise, approval, sanction, agreement, song of praise (about a man; for a deity *hymnos*, → song, hymn, was used).

OT The LXX uses *aineō* to translate the Heb. *hālal*, chiefly in the piel: Jdg. 16:24A; 1 Chr. 16:4, 10, 36; 23:5; 29:13; 2 Chr. 8:14; 20:19, 21; 23:12; 2 Esd. 3:10 f.; Neh. 5:13; 12:24; Pss. 18(17):3; 22(21):23, 26; 35(34):18; 56(55):10; 63(62):5; 69(68):30, 34; 74(73):21; 84(83):4; 102(101):18; 107(106):32; 109(108):30; 113 (112):1, 3; 115:17 (113:25); 117(116):1; 119(118):164, 175; 135(134):1, 3; 145 (144):2; 146(145):1 f.; 147(146):1; 147:12(1); 148:1–4, 7, 12; 149:3; 150:1–6; Prov. 31:28, 30 f.; Cant. 6:8; Joel 2:26; Isa. 62:9; Jer. 4:2; 20:13; 38:7. Other vbs. translated by *aineō* are: *bārak̲*, bless (Ps. 100[99]:4); *yāḏâh*, confess (Gen. 49:8; 1 Chr. 16:7, 35, 41; 23:30; 2 Chr. 5:13; 7:3; 31:2; Isa. 38:18); *rûa'*, shout (Job 38:7); *šāḇaḥ*, praise, laud (Ps. 117[116]:1 S; Dan. 2:23; 5:23); *šîr*, sing (Ps. 106[105]:12). It occurs in circumlocutions at Neh. 12:37 and 2 Chr. 20:21. It is without equivalent at Neh. 12:36; Tob. 13:11, 18; Jud. 13:14; Est. 4:17; Job 33:30; 35:14; Wis. 10:20; 19:9; Sir. 17:10, 27 f.; 21:15; 24:1; 30:2; 39:9, 14; 47:6; 51:6; Jer. 31(38):5; Bar. 2:32; 3:6 f.; 1 Macc. 4:33; 3 Macc. 2:8; 5:13, 35; 6:32). The vb. *epaineō* also chiefly stands for *hālal*: Gen. 12:15; Jdg. 6:20; Pss. 10:3 (9:24); 34(33):2; 44(43):8; 56(55):3; 63(62):11; 64(63):10; 102(101):8; 105(104):3; 106(105):5. It also stands for *šāḇaḥ*: Pss. 63(62):3; 117(116):1; 145(144):4; 147:12(1); Eccl. 4:2; 8:15. It is without Heb. equivalent at Eccl. 8:10; Sir. prol. 3; 9:17; 27:7; Dan. 5:1; 3 Macc. 4:16; 4 Macc. 1:10; 2:2; 4:4; 13:3, 17.

The noun *ainesis* which is infrequent in the NT is relatively common in the LXX standing for 8 different Heb. words (e.g. Lev. 7:12–15[2–5]; Pss. 9:14; 26[25]:7).

ainos is rare (e.g. 2 Chr. 23:13; Ps. 8:2), as is *epainos* (e.g. 2 Chr. 16:27; Pss. 22[21]:3, 25; 35[34]:28).

The LXX uses *aineō* only in sense (a) above, i.e. to praise. There is, however, a striking variation as regards the Heb. We find *hillēl* used in secular contexts (e.g. in Gen. 12:15 of a beautiful woman and in 2 Sam. 14:25 of a handsome man; in Prov. 27:2 in condemnation of self-praise; in Ps. 10:3 of praise by the wicked; in Jdg. 16:24 of the praise of Dagon). The LXX tries as far as possible to avoid *aineō* in its rendering of such passages (cf. the renderings of the *v.l. hymnēsan* in Jdg. 16:24 B, S), and to keep it for the regular praise of God in proper worship, especially in Pss. 146; 150. Correspondingly *ainos* renders the infin. *hallēl* (cf. 2 Chr. 23:13). *epaineō* and *epainos* are used for the praise of God by his people, and also for the praise of the righteous by God and man.

NT 1. *aineō* is found 8 times in the NT, 6 of which are in the Lucan writings (Lk. 2:13, 20; 19:37; Acts 2:47; 3:8, 9), and in addition Rom. 15:11 (quoting Ps. 117:1) and Rev. 19:5. *ainos* is found only in Lk. 18:43 and Matt. 21:16 (quoting Ps. 8:2[3] according to the LXX, where strangely the Gk. translates Heb. *ʿōz*, strength, by *ainos*). We find the usage of the LXX carried through rigorously; both vb. and noun are used only of the praise of God. The compounds *epaineō* and *epainos* are used for both God and man.

2. In contrast to secular Gk., the word-group in the NT does not mean praise for a special achievement; it is applied to the whole man, and not merely to acts (cf. → Glory, arts. *timē, doxa*). The manner in which *epainos* and *epaineō* in particular are used shows clearly that ultimately only God can give this recognition (Rom. 2:29) in his saving verdict on the day of judgment (Rom. 2:29; 1 Cor. 4:5; 1 Pet. 1:7). At the present time, however, a man may receive praise from those who have authority from God, from the church (2 Cor. 8:18), the apostle (1 Cor. 11:2, 17, 22) and from the authorities appointed by God (Rom. 13:3 f.; 1 Pet. 2:14).

3. This word-group is preferred (*aineō* and *ainos* are exclusively so used) where it is a question of the formal praise of God in thanksgivings, prayers and hymns (Matt. 21:16; cf. Ps. 8:2[3]; Lk. 2:13, 20; 18:43; 19:37 f.; Acts 2:47; 3:8, 9; Rom. 15:11; Eph. 1:3–6; Phil. 1:11). This praise is given in the present, but reaches its full development in the new creation (Phil. 1:11; Rev. 19:5). *ainesis* occurs in the expression "sacrifice of praise" (Heb. 13:15), where the Christian's → sacrifice is contrasted with Jewish sacrifices (cf. Lev. 7:12 f., 18 with Heb. 13:10 ff.). *H. Schultz*

εὐχαριστία *εὐχαριστία* (*eucharistia*), thanksgiving; *εὐχαριστέω* (*eucharisteō*), be thankful, thank; *εὐχάριστος* (*eucharistos*), thankful.

CL The noun comes from the root *chair-/char-*, the main words of which express the feeling of → joy; it is a derivative of *charis* (everything about which one rejoices; → Grace) compounded with *eu*, well, rightly, properly, very (adv.). It means: (a) thankful attitude; (b) its expression in the showing of gratitude, expression of gratitude, thanksgiving (from Hippocrates, 5th cent. B.C. on). The adj. *eucharistos* is equally old and means: (a) pleasant, well-behaved, witty; (b) thankful. The vb.

eucharisteō is found with the meaning: (a) be thankful, owe thanks, from Dem. 4th cent. B.C. on; (b) give thanks, from Polyb., 2nd cent. B.C. on. Naturally these words are often found in inscriptions.

OT The word-group is only once represented in the canonical books of the OT, viz. Prov. 11:16 where the adj. translates Heb. *ḥēn* (generally otherwise rendered), charming, graceful, well-mannered. In the apocryphal books of the LXX the verb is found 6 times (Jud. 8:25; Wis. 18:2; 2 Macc. 1:11; 10:7; 12:31; 3 Macc. 7:16), the noun 4 times (Est. 8:13; Wis. 16:28; Sir. 37:11; 2 Macc. 2:27). Both are used for thanks from man to man and from man to God.

1. In 2 Macc. 12:31 the Maccabeans thank certain heathen for the kindness shown the Jews living in Scythopolis. In Ad. Est. 16:4 certain officials withhold the gratitude that they owe to their benefactor, the Persian king. In Sir. 37:11 experience shows that one should not consult with a grudging man about gratitude. The writer of 2 Macc. says that he took upon himself the task of evaluating his sources "to secure the gratitude of many" (2:27 *v.l.*: "for the benefit of readers in general" NEB).

2. Reasons for thankfulness to God are salvation from oppression by enemies and persecution (2 Macc. 1:11; 3 Macc. 7:16), victory won (2 Macc. 10:7 *v.l.* RSV), but also being put to the test, which is welcomed and accepted as an opportunity for God to work out his salvation in preservation (Jud. 8:25). Wis. 18:2 records the thanks of the holy ones for their preservation from guilt towards those who abuse them (but RSV, NEB see it as the thanks of their enemies for their forbearance). Wis. 16:28 advises men to begin the day before dawn with thanksgiving. There is hence no indication that the word received any specific theological colouring from the OT.

NT In the NT the words are most used by Paul (the vb. 24 times; noun 12 times). Only the vb. is found in the Gospels, 11 times; Acts has the vb. twice and the noun once; Rev. has the vb. once, the noun twice. The Catholic Epistles do not use the words at all. The adj. is found only in Col. 3:15.

1. *eucharisteō* and *eucharistia* are almost exclusively reserved in the NT for thanksgiving to God. Only 3 times (Lk. 17:16; Acts 24:3; Rom. 16:4) are they used for thanks to men, but the first and last instances are to be understood in the context of spiritual action, while in Acts 24:3 we have an example of respectful Jewish speech.

2. These words are very common in the introductions to the Pauline letters. Whatever detailed admonition and criticism may follow, the apostle frequently writes in his introductory greeting of his thankfulness to God for those to whom he is writing; for their faith and its influence "in all the world" (Rom. 1:8, note the thanks through Jesus Christ; cf. also 2 Cor. 1:11); for the harmony between faith and love in action (Eph. 1:15 f.; Col. 1:3 f.; 1 Thess. 1:3, here because both gifts were growing; Phlm. 4 f.); for the grace given to the church (1 Cor. 1:4); for sharing in the gospel (Phil. 1:5); for God's work of election (2 Thess. 2:13); for steadfastness in hope (1 Thess. 1:2 f.). We should note that Paul did not use a standard form, but moulded his thanksgiving to lead up to the theme of his letter.

3. When Paul summoned his readers to thanksgiving amidst his exhortations he normally used the noun. The term is always used absolutely; this marks out thanksgiving and the showing of gratitude as basic and lasting elements of the Chris-

tian life. This is explicit in Eph. 5:20 ("giving thanks in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ"); Col. 3:17; 1 Thess. 5:18; Col. 3:15 (the adj.). No petition and intercession can be made without simultaneous thanksgiving (Phil. 4:6; Col. 2:7; 4:2; 1 Tim. 2:1). A life based on thanksgiving (Eph. 5:4) is the converse of an evil life.

4. The vb. is found in Matt. 15:36 par. Mk. 8:6; Acts 27:35; Rom. 14:6; 1 Cor. 10:30; and the noun in 1 Tim. 4:3 (the general feeling of thankfulness is not to be excluded in the last 3) in the technical sense of the benediction before a meal, according to Jewish custom, beginning with the words, "Blessed art Thou, LORD [i.e. Yahweh], our God, King of the universe ..." (cf. SB I 685 ff.). The vb. is found also in the words of institution of the → Lord's Supper, with both bread and wine in Lk. 22:17, 19, with the bread only in 1 Cor. 11:24 (but v. 25 "in the same way" implies it for the wine), with the wine only in Mk. 14:23; Matt. 26:27 (but the use of "blessed" with the bread is an equivalent; → Bless). Hence, during the 2nd cent., *eucharistia* became the general name for the whole service of the Lord's Supper, as may be seen in the minor textual variant, *eucharistias* instead of *eulogias*, in 1 Cor. 10:16. We have prayers of thanksgiving quoted in Lk. 18:11 f. (the self-satisfied Pharisee) and Jn. 11:41 f. (Jesus at the tomb of Lazarus). The term is used absolutely in 1 Cor. 14:16 f. for a prayer of thanksgiving in a tongue.

5. Apart from the introductions of his letters (see above, 2) Paul frequently mentions praise for general and specific gifts of grace, for increasing grace (2 Cor. 4:15), for a share "in the inheritance of the saints in light" (Col. 1:12), for the reception of the word preached by man as the word of God (1 Thess. 2:13), for the gift of tongues (1 Cor. 14:18). For all that, in 1 Cor. 14:18 (cf. 1:14) there is a depreciatory note, when he speaks about his thanksgiving, so as to deflect the interest of his readers to the true building up and unity of the church. The collection received would awaken thanksgiving to God among those who received it (2 Cor. 9:11 f.).

6. 1 Thess. 3:9 f. shows Paul planning to put thanksgiving into practice. On 2 Thess. 1:3 see R. D. Aus, "The Liturgical Background of the Necessity and Propriety of Giving Thanks According to 2 Thes. 1:3", *JBL* 92, 1973, 432–38. The failure of any such activity shows the inadequate knowledge of God among the heathen (Rom. 1:21).

7. Both noun and vb. can mean the thanksgiving of the doxologies in the apocalyptic hymns (Rev. 4:9; 7:12; 11:17). *H.-H. Esser*

→ Blessing, → Curse, → Grace, → Lord's Supper, → Prayer

(a). R. D. Aus, "The Liturgical Background of the Necessity and Propriety of Giving Thanks according to 2 Thes. 1:3", *JBL* 92, 1973, 432–38; G. H. Boobyer, *"Thanksgiving" and the "Glory of God" in Paul*, 1929; H. Conzelmann, *eucharisteō* etc., *TDNT* IX 407–15; J. Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, 1966[2]; and *The Prayers of Jesus*, *SBT* Second Series 6, 1967; B. A. Mastin, "Jesus said Grace", *SJT* 24, 1971, 449–56; H. Schlier, *aineō*, *ainos*, *TDNT* I 177 f.; P. Schubert, *Form and Function of the Pauline Thanksgivings*, *BZNW* 20, 1939; A. Stöger, "Thanksgiving", *EBT* III 906–10; G. P. Wiles, *Paul's Intercessory Prayers: The Significance of the Intercessory Prayer Passages in the Letters of St. Paul, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series* 24, 1974.

(b). H. Greeven, *Gebet und Eschatologie im Neuen Testament*, *Neutestamentliche Forschungen*, 3, 1, 1931; G. Harder, *Paulus und das Gebet*, *Neutestamentliche Forschungen*, 1, 10, 1936; J. Jeremias, "Das Gebetsleben Jesu", *ZNW* 25, 1926, 123 ff.; P. Joüon, "Reconnaissance et Action de Grâces dans le Nouveau Testament", *RSR* 29, 1939, 112 ff.; E. Mocsy, "De Gratiarum Actione in Epistolis Paulinis", *Verbum Domini* 21, 1941, 193–201; J. M. Nielen, *Gebet und Gottesdienst im Neuen*

Testament, 1937; T. Schermann, "*eucharistia* und *eucharistein* in ihrem Bedeutungswandel bis 200 n. Chr.", *Philologus* 69, 1910, 375–410; J. Wobbe, *Der Charisgedanke bei Paulus*, *NTAbh* 13, 3, 1932.

Think, Mean, Consider, Reckon

διαλογίζομαι

διαλογίζομαι (*dialogizomai*), ponder, consider, reason; διαλογισμός (*dialogismos*), thought, opinion, reasoning, consideration, argument; διαλέγομαι (*dialegomai*), discuss.

CL The meaning of *dialegomai* in cl. and Hellenistic Gk. is expressed by our loan-word dialogue; it means hold a conversation, chat. It was used by the poets with a neutral sense, but in the philosophers it came to mean conversation with teaching as its object: one debates and learns in so doing. The vb. *dialogizomai*, calculate, consider, think through, is closely linked with it, and similarly the noun *dialogismos*, weighing, consideration, thought, discussion.

OT The LXX uses *dialegomai*, when it translates *dāḇar*, speak, mainly with the meanings of speak, say, both of God and man; it is also used with the meanings of negotiate with someone, make a speech, and sometimes also dispute. It translates *dāḇar* at Exod. 6:27; Isa. 63:1; and *rîḇ*, strive, contend, at Jdg. 8:1. It is also found without Heb. equivalent at 1 Esd. 8:46; Est. 5:2; and 2 Macc. 11:20. The related *dialogizomai* chiefly translates *ḥāšaḇ*, think, account, and is found at 2 Sam. 14:14; 19:20(19); Pss. 10:3 (9:23); 21(20):11; 35(34):20; 36(35):4; 77(76):5; 119(118):59; Prov. 16:30; Jer. 50(27):45. It stands for *zāmām*, consider, purpose, devise at Ps. 140(139):9. It is without Heb. equivalent at Prov. 17:12; Isa. 19:10; 1 Macc. 11:8; 2 Macc. 12:43; 4 Macc. 8:11. The noun *dialogismos* stands chiefly for *maḥᵃšāḇâh*, thought, device, plan, purpose: Pss. 40(39):5; 56(55):5; 92(91):5; 94(93):11; Isa. 59:7; Jer. 4:14; 50(27):45; Lam. 3:60 f.; Dan. Theodotion 11:24. It stands for *rēa'*, purpose, aim at Ps. 139(138):2, and *ra'yôn*, longing, striving in Theodotion's version of Dan. 2:29 f.; 4:16; 5:6, 10; 7:28; 11:24. It is also found at Ps. 139(138):20 (for *mᵉzimmâh*, purpose, direction, device); Ps. 146(145):4 (for *'eštōnôṯ*, thoughts); and at Wis. 7:20; Sir. 9:15; 13:26; 27:5; 33(26):5; 40:2, 29; Dan. 7:15; 1 Macc. 2:63.

dialogizomai is used with a neutral connotation for consider, think over (e.g. Ps. 77:5), but more often with the depreciatory sense of harbour ill designs, intrigue (Pss. 10:2; 35:20; 36:4). The noun *dialogismos* also often means the perverse, vain thinking which contemplates destruction (Ps. 94:11), and is turned against God (Jer. 4:14; Isa. 59:7) and against the pious (Ps. 56[55]:5). We see this particularly clearly in Ben Sira's picture of the fool's *dialogismos* as the cart-wheel constantly turning round its axle (Sir. 33:5). But the word is also used for God's profound (Ps. 92[91]:5) and wonderful (Ps. 40[39]:5) thoughts.

NT 1. In the NT also, *dialogizomai* and *dialogismos* are always used with a slightly depreciatory connotation. The thoughts of the human heart do not necessarily lead, as the Greeks thought, to a knowledge of the truth (cf. 1 Cor. 1:21–25), but are evil (Mk. 7:21; Matt. 15:19), full of doubt and suspicion (Mk. 2:6, 8; Lk. 5:22; 6:8), moved by the passing moment (Lk. 3:15), full of greed (Lk. 12:17; 20:14), always concerned with the superficial (Mk. 8:16 f.; Matt. 16:7 f.) and full of sly calculation

(Matt. 11:25; Mk. 11:31). The decision made by men about Jesus shows what men really are and think (Lk. 2:35; cf. v. 34). Even the man who has decided for Jesus cannot be certain that he will not fall back into his old ways of thought. But Jesus unmasked the ambitious thoughts of his disciples (Lk. 9:46 f.; Mk. 9:33 f.) and brought the attitude of faith to light through the example of the child (cf. v. 48).

In Rom. 1:21 Paul says that, as a result of rejecting God, men "became futile in their thinking"; in Rom. 14:1 he speaks of "disputes over opinions" which arise from lack of faith. In 1 Cor. 3:20 we find "the thoughts of the wise are futile"; in Phil. 2:14 we have the questioning (*dialogismos*) which is the germ of apathy. In 1 Tim. 2:8 we find the word used without an adj. for "quarrelsome thoughts" (NEB).

2. *dialegomai* means in Mk. 9:33 f. and Jude 9 to argue, fight with words; but in Heb. 12:5 it is used of God's speaking through fatherly discipline. This usage is derived from the LXX. The other examples of *dialegomai* in the NT are found in Acts 17–24 (17:2, 17; 18:4, 19; 19:8 f.; 20:7, 9; 24:12, 25). The word here has become a technical term for Paul's teaching in the synagogue and approaches the meaning of give an address, preach. It refers to the reading and exposition of the OT, which were, in theory at least, permitted to every adult man in the synagogue (cf. Lk. 4:16–21). The RSV rendering "argue" is justified in so far as the audience was permitted to ask questions (→ Teach, art. *didaskō*). *D. Fürst*

δοκέω

δοκέω (*dokeō*), trans. think, believe, suppose, consider; intrans. seem, appear.

CL *dokeō* (from Homer on): 1. trans. (a) believe, accept the opinion, think, hold, assume, (b) conclude; 2. intrans. assume an appearance, appear and hence: (a) give an impression, pass for; (b) pose as, act as; 3. impersonal *dokei mou*, it seems to me, it seems best, I decide.

OT *dokeō* which occurs some 50 times in the LXX remained uninfluenced by the change of meaning given there to *doxa*, → glory. It stands for 8 different Heb. expressions: *'āmar*, say (Prov. 28:24); *hāyâh k^e*, it was as if (Gen. 19:14); *ḥāšaḇ*, think, account (Gen. 38:15; Prov. 27:14); *ṭôḇ*, good (Est. 1:19; 3:9; 5:4; 8:5), and *ṭôḇ b^e'ênê*, good in the eyes of (Est. 8:8); *yāšār*, right (Jer. 27[34]:5) and *yāšār b^e'ênê*, right in the eyes of (Job 9:25); *nāḏaḇ* and *nāḏîḇ*, be willing (Exod. 25:2; 35:21 f.); *nāśā'*, lift up (Exod. 35:26); and *ṣ^eḇā'* (Theodotion's version of Dan. Sus. 4:14, 22, 29; 5:21). But in the majority of the references in the LXX it occurs in the non-canonical writings, especially 2 and 3 Macc., or passages where it does not translate a Heb. equivalent: 1 Esd. 8:11; Tob. 3:15; Jud. 3:8; Job 1:21; 15:21; 20:7, 22; Prov. 2:10; 14:12; 16:25; 17:28; 26:12; Wis. 3:2; 12:27; Sir. prol. 14; Dan. Sus. 5; and 4:34; 1 Macc. 8:26, 28; 15:20; 2 Macc. 1:13, 20; 2:29; 5:6; 7:16; 9:8, 10; 14:14, 40; 3 Macc. 1:26, 29; 5:5 f., 22, 40, 49; 6:30; 4 Macc. 5:6, 9; 9:30; 11:5, 16; 13:14.

The meanings are the same as in secular Gk., except that we occasionally find the sense of desire, wish (e.g. Jud. 3:8). The most usual meaning is to seem, appear. It is used by LXX to interpret the subjective element in Heb. narrative: e.g. in Gen. 38:15 Judah's reaction is more strongly stressed, while in a passage like Job 15:21 it goes beyond the Heb. text.

NT *dokeō* is found 62 times in the NT. 32 instances are found in the Gospels: Matt. 3:9; 6:7; 17:25; 18:12; 21:28; 22:17, 42; 24:44; 26:53, 66; Mk. 6:49; 10:42; Lk. 1:3; 8:18; 10:36; 12:40, 51; 13:2, 4; 19:11; 22:24; 24:37; Jn. 5:39, 45; 11:13, 31, 56; 13:29; 16:2; 20:15. There are 8 instances in Acts: Acts 12:9; 15:22, 25, 28, 34; 17:18; 25:27; 26:9; 27:13. Paul uses the vb. 18 times: 1 Cor. 3:18; 4:9; 7:40; 8:2; 10:12; 11:16; 12:22 f.; 14:37; 2 Cor. 10:9; 11:16; 12:19; Gal. 2:2, 6, 9; 6:3; Phil. 3:4. It is also found in Heb. 12:11; and Jas. 1:26; 4:5. The following senses may be distinguished.

1. (a) In Lk. 8:18 Jesus warns: "Take heed then how you hear; for to him who has will more be given, and from him who has not, even what he thinks he has [*ho dokei echein*] will be taken away" (cf. Mk. 4:24). The phrase expresses the illusory state of the man who thought that he had a tangible and permanent security. Jn. 5:45 conveys the challenge to give up an existing opinion, while 2 Cor. 11:16 speaks of an opinion which cannot yet be reached. There is a conflict of opinion as to how *mē doxēte* in Matt. 3:9 is to be understood. It is generally taken to mean "do not presume", in the sense "do not think out a way to escape the wrath of God." It is more likely, however, that the passage means that John had already read the objections of his hearers in their hearts and reveals them, "Do not suppose . . ." or "Do not think that. . . ." In that case *mē doxēte*, like *mē arxēsthe*, "Do not begin to . . ." (Lk. 3:8) are two different reproductions of Aram. *ʿanā* (so E. Lohmeyer, *Das Evangelium des Matthäus*, ed. W. Schmauch, *KEK* 1/1, 1967 [4], ad loc.).

(b) The meaning to conclude is found especially in Acts (e.g. 15:22, 25, 28, RSV "seem good") (→ Command, art. *dogma*).

2. (a) In Gal. 2:2, 6, 9 Paul calls the Jerusalem apostles *hoi dokountes*, i.e. those who matter, the recognized authorities; in v. 9 the *dokountes styloi einai*, those recognized as pillars, the leaders, i.e. James, Peter, John, are specially mentioned. This is not necessarily an ironic point here against the other apostles, for this expression is often found of a recognized authority in extra-biblical literature. But on this passage see further C. K. Barrett, "Paul and the 'Pillar' Apostles", in J. N. Sevenster and W. C. van Unnik, eds., *Studia Paulina*, 1953, 1–19.

(b) On the other hand, in passages like 1 Cor. 8:2, "any one imagines", it means an opinion based on self-deception.

3. Noteworthy is the question formed with the impersonal *dokei*, i.e. *ti dokei hymin*, "What do you think?", found in Jn. 11:56 and various passages in Matt. (e.g. 18:12; 21:28; 22:42). It demands an answer which will commit the one questioned, unlike all mere opinions. This is also the question put by the high priest to the Sanhedrin (Matt. 26:66, where RSV gives a paraphrase) so as to provoke them to pass a judgment on Jesus. *D. Müller*

λογίζομαι

λογίζομαι (*logizomai*); reckon, think, credit; *λογισμός* (*logismos*), thought.

CL *logizomai* (from Aristoph. and Thuc.) is derived from *legō* (→ Word), count, collect, reckon. Its root *log-*, put together, collect, harvest, suggests a regulated perception and an acceptance of given facts. Hence, *logizomai* means: (a) reckon, credit, rank with, calculate; (b) consider, deliberate, grasp, draw a logical conclusion,

decide. Accordingly *logismos* means: (a) counting, calculation; (b) reflection, argument, thought, plan; (c) the ability to draw a logical conclusion. The concept implies an activity of the reason which, starting with ascertainable facts, draws a conclusion, especially a mathematical one or one appertaining to business, where calculations are essential. Plato uses it for thought unaffected by the emotions, which seeks to grasp objective facts and apply them (*Phd.* 65c; cf. H. W. Heidland, *TDNT* IV 284).

OT *logizomai* translates chiefly *ḥāšaḇ*, think, account: Gen. 15:6; 31:15; Lev. 7:18(8); 17:4; 25:31; 27:23; Num. 18:27, 30; Deut. 2:11, 20; 1 Sam. 1:13; 18:25; 2 Sam. 4:2; 14:13 f.; 19:20(19); 1 Ki. 10:21; 2 Chr. 9:20; Neh. 6:2, 6; 13:13; Job 41:21(20), 24(23); Pss. 32(31):2; 35(34):4; 36(35):4; 41(40):7; 44(43):22; 52(51):2; 106(105):31; 140(139):2, 4; 144(143):3; Prov. 16:9(1), 30; 17:28; Hos. 7:15; 8:12; Amos 6:5; Mic. 2:1, 3; Nah. 1:9; Zech. 8:17; Isa. 5:28; 10:7; 13:17; 29:16 f.; 32:15; 33:8; 40:15; 53:3 f.; Jer. 11:19; 18:8, 11, 18; 23:27; 50(27):45; 49(29):20; 49(30):30; 48(31):2; 26(33):3; 29(36):11; 36(43):3; Lam. 4:2; Ezek. 11:2; 38:10; Dan. Theodotion 4:32; 11:24 f. The other terms which it translates are found only rarely: *hāyâh*, to be (2 Sam. 19:44[43]); *mānâh* in the niphal, to count (Isa. 53:12); *qārā'*, niphal, call (Deut. 3:13); and *šûḇ*, return, consider (Isa. 44:19). It is also found without Heb. equivalents, particularly in Wis. and Macc.: Tob. 3:10; 10:1; 14:4; Job 31:28; 34:37; Ps. 119(118):119; Prov. 24:7; Eccl. 10:3; Wis. 2:1, 16, 21; 3:2, 10, 17; 5:4; 7:9; 8:17; 9:6; 14:20; 15:2, 12, 15; 17:13; Sir. 29:6; 40:19; Nah. 1:11; 1 Macc. 2:52; 3:52; 4:35; 6:9, 19; 10:38; 2 Macc. 6:12; 11:2; 3 Macc. 4:4; 5:16; 4 Macc. 3:15; 8:16, 19.

logismos translates various nouns formed from *ḥāšaḇ*: 2 Sam. 14:14; Est. 1:1; Ps. 33(32):10 f.; Prov. 6:18; 12:5; 15:22, 26; 19:21; Eccl. 7:27(28), 29(30); 9:10; Mic. 4:12; Nah. 1:11; Isa. 66:18; Jer. 4:14; 11:19; 18:11, 18; 50(27):45; 51(29):20; 49(30):30; 29(36):11; Ezek. 33:10; Dan. 11:24 f. But the vast majority of instances occur in the non-canonical books of the LXX especially Macc.: Jud. 8:14; Wis. 1:3, 5; 9:14; 11:15; 12:10; 17:12; 19:3; Sir. 27:4 f., 7; 40:29; 43:23; 1 Macc. 11:8; 2 Macc. 6:23; 7:21; 3 Macc. 5:12; 4 Macc. 1:1–35; 2:2–34; 3:1–19; 5:10, 31, 38; 6:7, 30–35; 7:1–24; 9:17, 30; 10:19; 11:25, 27; 13:1, 3, 16; 14:2, 11; 15:1, 11, 23; 16:1, 4; 18:2.

ḥāšaḇ occurs in the Dead Sea Scrolls at 1QpHab 1:9; 1QS 3:1, 4; 5:11, 17 f.; 11:21; 1QM 5:5, 14; 7:11; 1QH 2:32; 3:6, 24; 4:8 f., 14, 23; 5:26, 38; 8:11, 14; 10:5; 18:26; 4Qflor 1:9; CD 19:35; 20:19 (cf. F. Nötscher, *Zur theologischen Terminologie der Qumrantexte*, 1956, 52 f.).

logizomai receives a new and personal slant in the LXX, for it mainly represents Heb. *ḥāšaḇ*, regard as, reckon as, respect, think out, think, care for, plan, intend, which is also represented occasionally by *eulabeomai*, *phrontizō*, *epistrephō*, etc. The objective reckoning of the intellect is replaced in the meaning of this word by the feeling of the heart conditioned by individual personality (e.g. Isa. 10:7; Ps. 140:2; Zech. 8:17; Mic. 2:3; Nah. 1:9 ff.). The personal element is seen also in the reckoning of → guilt or → righteousness (e.g. Gen. 15:6; 2 Sam. 19:19), and often in the Pss. (e.g. Ps. 32:2) and in the cultic imputation of guilt or purification (e.g. Lev. 7:18; 17:4). This is clearest when the thinking is directed against another person (e.g. 2 Sam. 14:13 f.; Hos. 7:15; Jer. 11:19).

While *logizomai* originally denoted a non-religious, human activity, in the LXX,

consistently with Heb. *ḥāšaḇ*, it is sometimes used for man's relationship to God, and very often for God's purposes with men, whether they are thoughts of → peace (Jer. 29:11 [LXX 36:11]; 2 Sam. 14:14) or punitive judgments (Jer. 49:20 [LXX 30:14]; 50:45 [LXX 27:45]), or whether he will change them, if his people will only repent (Jer. 26:3 [LXX 33:3]; 36:3 [LXX 43:3]). Hence, the concept, which in Heb. expresses the emotional and personal, and in Gk. the objective understanding of calculation and evaluation, can express both sides of the biblical message. God's personal, righteous dealings with his people on the basis of his law alone enable them to believe and to count on God. God does not act in an arbitrary and incalculable fashion; he has revealed his purpose and plan of salvation through the prophetic word (→ Covenant).

NT *logizomai* occurs 40 times in the NT of which 34 are in Paul (Rom. 2:3, 26; 3:28; 4:3 quoting Gen. 15:6; 4:4, 5, 6, 8 quoting Ps. 32:2; 4:9 ff., 22 ff.; 6:11; 8:18, 36 quoting Ps. 44:23; 9:8; 14:14; 1 Cor. 4:1; 13:5, 11; 2 Cor. 3:5; 5:19; 10:2, 7, 11; 11:5; 12:6; Gal. 3:6 quoting Gen. 15:6; Phil. 3:13; 4:8; 2 Tim. 4:16). It also occurs in Mk. 15:28 par. Lk. 22:37 quoting Isa. 53:12; Jn. 11:50; Acts 19:27; Heb. 11:19; Jas. 2:23; 1 Pet. 5:12; *logismos* occurs only at Rom. 2:15 and 2 Cor. 10:5.

1. Paul uses *logizomai* and *logismos* in relating the foundation of faith to the → righteousness of God. Since he associated it with the facts of the cross and resurrection of Jesus, he never separated the concept of *logizomai* from the personal activity of God in Jesus Christ. For him, faith was not an objective observing from a neutral vantage point, but being conquered by the crucified and risen Lord.

(a) When Paul in Rom. 2:15 mentions the thoughts (*logismoi*) which bring arguments of mutual accusation, he is not thinking of unemotional, philosophical thought, but of that reckoning and deduction which separates the good from the evil in a man's conscience and in the process stands before God. Popular philosophy speaks of → conscience, but the apostle says that it is the living God who so bears testimony in the heart. For behind all the strivings of the heathen there lies a standard, which God has fixed and fixes, the work of the law written on their hearts. Failure to reach this standard is recognized as guilt by the conscience, and the thoughts of the heart reckon in practice with God's judgment, as is shown by the conflicting thoughts accusing and defending. (On this passage see C. E. B. Cranfield, *The Epistle to the Romans*, *ICC*, I, 1975, 155–63; → God, art. *theos* NT 4 (b).)

Man, however, uses his thoughts to fortify himself against the knowledge of the true God and his claims to obedience (2 Cor. 10:4 f.). Hence, Paul was concerned in his missionary work to reveal the divine purpose and act in Christ, and in the full authority of God to take men's clever thoughts prisoner (2 Cor. 3:5), so that their proud arrogance (*hypsōma*) should bow to Christ in conquered and liberated freedom (cf. 2 Cor. 10:5). Even so, this obedient *logismos* remains partial until it is perfected in eternity (1 Cor. 13:11).

(b) When the *noēma*, the mind (→ Reason), is so conquered, it grasps God's purpose and action in the cross; when it grasps this, it is glad to acknowledge itself as conquered. Paul expresses this divine reckoning in 2 Cor. 5:19: "God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself, not counting their trespasses against them" (→ Reconciliation, art. *katallassō* NT 4). This does not mean that God does not take sin seriously. The reverse is true; but he reckons and deals with it in Christ otherwise

than human reckoning would have expected. Since he does not impute it, sin has been really removed (cf. Col. 2:13), for God has entirely attributed it to Christ. Indeed, "he made him to be sin" for us (2 Cor. 5:21). God's non-attribution (*mē logizomenos*) and reconciliation are not a weak forbearance but his complete settlement with sin on the cross.

This completely trustworthy attitude of God, in which he acts in just this way and in no other for the sake of his → righteousness, has its background in the prophetic oracle "He [i.e. the servant of the Lord] was numbered with the transgressors" (Isa. 53:12), where the suffering of the servant of the Lord is foretold. The passive ultimately implies God and his will; he bruised or crushed him not because of his sin, but because of ours. He laid the punishment on him, that we might have peace. That is how Lk. 22:37 understands this passage. Paul understands the exchange, this strange action by God, when he writes of the non-imputation of sin.

The converse of this statement is the reckoning of faith as righteousness in the Pauline letters, linking it with Gen. 15:6 in Rom. 4:3–6, 8, 10, 22 ff., and Gal. 3:6 (cf. Jas. 2:23 with different context) (→ Righteousness, art. *dikaiosynē* NT 5(b), 7). The rabbis' thinking was purely human; for them faith was a merit. Paul wished to reckon as God did, who reckoned salvation and righteousness to Abraham, who trusted in him and his word. God reckons on the basis of his promise (Rom. 9:8), and what he promises he performs. This reckoning of righteousness is effected in the delivering up and resurrection of Jesus and so it is effective for us also (Rom. 4:23 ff.).

(c) Because God reckoned in the way described in Gen. 15 and Isa. 53 and proclaimed by Paul in Rom. 4 and 2 Cor. 5, the man reconciled through Christ and believing in him may and should so reckon and think. Hence, Paul draws clear theological (Rom. 3:28) and practical conclusions for himself and his readers (2 Cor. 10:7; cf. Rom. 2:3). The standard for our *logizesthai* is therefore, because of the cross, not a principle but a fact, to which every act and thought should conform (cf. H. W. Heidland, *TDNT* IV 288).

Paul, therefore, in Rom. 8:18 already reckons with the glory which at some time will be revealed, and which will reduce all present suffering with Christ to insignificance. As Christ's sufferings, death and resurrection have led to glory, so the church's suffering with him will lead to being glorified together with him. Thus we also may count confidently upon the coming → glory.

The sharing of the *logizesthai* through faith is not a case of merely holding something to be true but is also an inspiration and activity, as in the OT *ḥāšaḇ*. Phil. 4:8 and 1 Cor. 13:5 are to be expounded in the light of Zech. 8:17, and not of 2 Tim. 4:16 (where *mē logistheiē* means "may it not be charged"). This kind of thinking is not solely an intellectual construction, but can arrive at factual conclusions which demand corresponding actions (Rom. 14:14), just as the word and the act are one with God. Hence, we should evaluate others and ourselves rightly, not by false standards, but as they and we stand in God's sight (1 Cor. 4:1; Phil. 3:13; 2 Cor. 10:2; 11:5; 12:6).

2. John also writes of God's act on which faith is based (1 Jn. 1:1) and of the love revealed in this act (Jn. 3:16). But his purpose was not the same as Paul's. The latter was involved in conflict with Judaism, and the unity of judgment and grace in the divine saving activity was the focus of his teaching. John's witness centres on the testimony that truth and life, about which the gnostics also spoke, are to be found in

Jesus Christ, who had come in the flesh, had died and had risen. Hence, John found no use for the concept *logizomai.* He uses the word only in Jn. 11:50, in reporting the high priest Caiaphas's unconscious prophecy: "You do not understand [*logizesthe*] that it is expedient for you that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation should not perish."

We find the term further in Lk. 22:37 (cf. Isa. 53:12; see above 1 (c)); Acts 19:27; and 1 Pet. 5:12. Heb. 11:19 uses it in its full theological sense, as does Paul in Rom. 4. Jas. 2:23 uses the quotation from Gen. about the reckoning of faith as righteousness in his own way by pointing to Abraham's active obedience (→ Righteousness, art. *dikaiosynē* NT 7). *J. Eichler*

→ Glory, → Knowledge, → Mind, → Reason

(a). H. W. Heidland, *logizomai, logismos, TDNT* IV 284–92; G. Kittel, *dokeō, TDNT* II 232 f.; G. Schrenk, *dialegomai, dialogizomai, dialogismos, TDNT* II 93–98; W. H. G. Thomas, "Apostolic Arithmetic: A Pauline Word-Study", *ExpT* 17, 1905–6, 211–14.
(b). F. Flückiger, "Die Werke des Gesetzes bei den Heiden (nach Röm. 2, 14 ff.)", *ThZ* 8, 1952, 17–42; H. W. Heidland, *Die Anrechnung des Glaubens zur Gerechtigkeit, BWANT* IV, 18, 1936; F. Nötscher, *Zur theologischen Terminologie der Qumrantexte*, 1956, 52 f.; W. Schottroff, *ḥšb, THAT* I 641–46.

Time

Time and eternity are two complementary categories for comprehending the historical process. The Gk. language has a wealth of various terms with which to express the experience of time. The most extensive one is *aiōn* which is primarily a designation for a long period of time. When such an age refers to the past, it denotes remote antiquity, the dim and distant past; when it is directed to the on-going future *aiōn* can take on the meaning of eternity. Eternity is thus not necessarily a timeless concept, but the most comprehensive temporal one which the experience of time has produced. Theologically speaking, lasting time is a property of God the Creator, whereas passing time belongs to man as creature. *chronos* chiefly denotes the quantitive, linear expanse of time, a space or period of time, and is thus a term of the formal and scientific conception of time. In this connexion there are several terms which comprehend a particular span of time: especially *eniautos*, year; *mēn*, month, *hēmera*, day and *hōra*, hour. By contrast, the characteristic stress of *kairos* draws attention to the content of time, negatively as crisis and positively as opportunity. Since the adverbs *nyn*, now, and *sēmeron*, today, which relate to the present, and are also fundamentally claimed for the linear conception of time (in this case marking a present point of time) are chiefly used in the NT in a qualificatory sense, they are incorporated in the art. *kairos*. It is instructive for the whole NT understanding of time that it is not the formal concept of *chronos*, but that of *kairos*, qualifying the content of the time of Jesus, which stands in the foreground. For the concepts of day, maranatha and parousia → Present.

αἰών

αἰών (*aiōn*), aeon, age, life-span, epoch, long time, eternity; *αἰώνιος* (*aiōnios*), without beginning or end, eternal, for ever; *ἀΐδιος* (*aidios*), eternal.

CL The Gk. word *aiōn*, which is probably derived from *aei*, always, is distinguished from its Indo-European parallels (Lat. *aevum* and Eng. *aye* are cognate) in that it is thought of not so much from the point of view of an abstract period of time as from the point of view of the time in which one has lived. In Hom. *aiōn* is often parallel with *psychē*, → soul, life (e.g. *Il.* 16, 453); in Hesiod (*Frag.* 161, 1) it denotes a life-span, and in Aeschylus (*Sept.* 742) a generation. Thence it can mean the time which one has already lived or will live, i.e. it can relate to past as to future. It thus appeared appropriate to later philosophers to use the word both for the dim and distant past, the beginning of the world, and for the far future, eternity (e.g. Plato, *Tim.* 37d).

In Plato the term is developed so as to represent a timeless, immeasurable and transcendent super-time, an idea of time in itself. Plutarch and the earlier Stoics appropriate this understanding, and from it the Mysteries of Aion, the god of eternity, could be celebrated in Alexandria, and gnosticism could undertake its own speculations on time.

In Hellenistic philosophy the concept of aeons contributed towards a solution of the problem of the world-order. The aeons were assumed to be mediating powers which bridge the infinite qualitative distinction between God and the world. They are an emanation of the divine *plērōma*, the fullness of the divine Being (→ Fullness, art. *plēroō* NT 5 (b)). As differing levels of being of the divinity, they rule the various world-historical periods, which follow one another in a perpetual circular movement. The thought of personal, divine aeons was widespread in the speculation of the ancient orient, e.g. in Parseeism, in the Zoroastrian religion and in Philo. In gnosticism is found the doctrine of the two ages (aeons), representing on the one hand the eternal and supratemporal, and on the other the temporal and transient world. (For literature on gnosticism → Knowledge.)

OT 1. (a) *aiōn* became (over 450 times, including 150 in the Apocrypha and over 100 in the Pss.) the LXX equivalent for Heb. *ʿôlām*, a long time or duration, which is also used as an adv. meaning for ever, for all time. This fact is not, however, due to this later speculative development in the meaning of the word, but to the primary meaning of life-span. This is clearly shown by the way in which the LXX uses the two adjs. *aiōnios* (c. 160 times) and *aidios*, both meaning eternal. The latter word, a term of steadiness and unalterability, stemming intellectually from the syncretism of Hellenistic, Egyptian and Oriental thought, is found in the Apocrypha only in Wis. 7:26 as a predicate of wisdom, and then in 4 Macc. 10:15. By contrast with this, the frequent occurrence of *aiōnios* in both OT and NT shows that we are concerned here with a characteristically biblical concrete idea which must be understood in relation to the whole duration of a man's life. OT *ʿôlām*, duration, is therefore always to be distinguished from moment, for which *regaʿ* is used (→ *chronos*; cf. Isa. 54:7 f.). For the point of time of a unique event the word *ʿēṯ* (→ *kairos*; cf. Mic. 5:3[2]) is available. If *ʿôlām/aiōn* in the OT thus denotes the time of life, one cannot begin to explain it from those passages where it is remote antiquity that is regarded as *ʿôlām*. Rather, it is a case, in the first instance, of an extent of time, e.g., for which a slave is obligated (Deut. 15:17; Exod. 21:6), for which Samuel is consecrated to the temple service (1 Sam. 1:22), and for the priestly service of the sons of Aaron (Exod. 29:9). In all these cases it extends throughout a man's whole

life, but is also limited to it. This is so even in cases of a promise of life-long kingship (1 Sam. 13:13), of the people's trust in Moses as long as he lives (Exod. 19:19), or of a life-long vassal-relationship (1 Sam. 27:12). It goes without saying that all this comes to an end with the death of the person concerned.

(b) This is naturally also the case when such statements are made, not of individual men but of generations (e.g. Exod. 40:15; 32:13; Ps. 18[17]:51) or of the whole nation (Jos. 4:7; Jdg. 2:1). With the decline of these entities the time here indicated is also ended, without this of course appearing as a particularly noticeable break since it was indeed "their" time.

This provides us with the simplest credible means of explanation of the so-called eternity-formulae: "Praised be Yahweh the God of Israel, from eternity to eternity [MT *min hā'ôlām w^e'ad hā'ôlām; apo tou aiōnos kai heōs tou aiōnos*]" (1 Chr. 16:36). Israel is summoned to constant thanksgiving and praise (v. 34); the continuing of the praise is thus linked with the continuing of the nation in its generations. In fact, "eternal" and "for a thousand generations" stand in parallel in v. 15. The formula "from eternity to eternity" is thus best derived from the other formula "from generation to generation [MT *'ôlām l^edōrōṯām*; LXX *eis ton aiōna eis tas geneas autōn*]" (Exod. 40:15; cf. Isa. 13:20). The formula thus regains its true sense, in that even here it is not a question of an eternity conceived of in abstract and infinite terms, but of one's life and praise in relation to God. 1 Sam. 2:30 and 3:13 f. show clearly enough that the content of God's eternal promises is never an abstract unchangeability, but a mutual relationship with men: as long as it is intact it is eternal, but it can fall to pieces.

(c) Even the great → promises, which are established for ever, are not simply timelessly and irrevocably valid. They remain bound to their living point of reference in the living God (1 Ki. 9, the eternity of the → temple is bound to God's living presence; 2 Sam. 7, the eternity of the monarchy). Human life is limited (Gen. 6:3); it cannot therefore be the ground of endless duration. But because God lives (the eternal God is the living God, cf. the polemic against the dead inactive idols in Isa. 40 and 44), his action and his salvation are eternal (Isa. 45:17), his → covenant endures (Isa. 55:3), and his will is incontestable (Exod. 12:14 ff.; 27:21).

(d) This explains why *'ôlām* is able not only to designate subsequent and future time (Gen. 13:15; Exod. 14:13, Deut. 13:16; 23:3, 6; 29:29; Jos. 8:28; Mic. 4:7) but also remote antiquity (Gen. 6:4; Deut. 32:7; Amos 9:11 with reference to the future day of Yahweh; Mic. 5:2[1]). All time is related to the action in history of the living God (Joel 2:1 ff.). It is true that there are tendencies in the later portions of the OT towards abstract concepts of eternity (Pss. 9:6; 21[20]:5; cf. Sir. 1:2), and there are even passages in the Apocrypha which speak of an eternity entirely removed from time (with Prov. 8:23 as the point of departure). But it remains significant that in the OT the terms *'ôlām* and *aiōn* always retain the relatedness of time to → life. The idea that the time in which one lives is not eternity, and that eternity is the time in which God lives, does not correspond with the OT conception.

2. This sense of the word is also continued in the older apocalyptic writings of Judaism (e.g. Eth. Enoch) and into the Dead Sea Scrolls (e.g. 1QS 2:1, 3 f., 8; 2:15, 17, 25; 1QM 4:1, 3, 7 f.; 1QH 1:3, 7 f.) and after. The word *'ôlām*, of course, pales increasingly until it becomes an epithet for everything connected with God and his

heavenly world – → angels the final judgment, the blessings of salvation, even the pious themselves.

It is only in the rabbinic Judaism at the turn of the era and in the apocalyptic of the 1st cent. A.D. (e.g. 2 Esd.) that one finds a quite new use of *'ôlām*, which exhibits a spatial significance as well as a temporal one. Clearly under the influence of Persian thought, the OT statements concerning primal and final time (Isa. 24–27; Joel 2) are here systematized into a doctrine of the two worlds (aeons), whose only remaining common factor is that God is the Lord of this world as of that, and the Lord of this age as of that. They are related antithetically, for this age is the time of unrighteousness, sin and pain. When the age to come supersedes this one, all this will come to an end, since there will then be a new earth where the → righteous will live. The NT affinity of the terms *aiōn*, aeon, and *kosmos*, world, is also based on this idea. The expected messiah either brings in the future age himself, or "the days of the messiah" are thought of as an interim period, which are followed by the new age. This is reflected in the terms "this age" (Gk. *ho aiōn houtos*; Heb. *hā'ôlām hazzeh*) and "the age to come" (Gk. *ho mellōn aiōn*; Heb. *ha'ôlām habbā'*) (cf. Arndt, 27).

NT 1. In the NT the noun *aiōn* occurs over 100 times (29 times in the Johannine literature; 22 in the Synoptics and Acts; 19 in Paul; 13 in Heb.; 20 scattered throughout the rest of the NT letters); the adj. *aiōnios*, eternal, 70 times; *aidios*, eternal, only twice (Rom. 1:20 of the unchangeable power and deity of God; and Jude 6 of the eternal chains of the fallen angels). The noun is found with the following meanings:

(a) A long time, duration of time, where both a specifically limited period of time as well as an unlimited period can be meant; chiefly linked with a preposition. The meaning "eternity" is only appropriate with certain qualifications, in that the OT idea of time, which predominantly conditions the NT, does not regard eternity as the opposite of temporality.

(b) An age, epoch, era (of the world), especially in Matt. with reference to the end of the world (Matt. 13:39; 28:20). This denotes the course of world-events, world history. It is also used in the plural with this meaning (e.g. Heb. 9:26; 1 Cor. 10:11). The underlying idea is that the world runs its course in a series of successive ages.

(c) Occasionally there occurs the meaning of world in the spatial sense, probably going back to the influence of Jewish apocalyptic (e.g. Mk. 4:19; 1 Cor. 2:6; especially (plur.) Heb. 1:2; 11:3).

2. The simple grammatical evidence of the use of *aiōn* in the NT points back to two sources: OT and Judaism coloured by Parseeism. The fact that *'ôlām* in the OT "only ever occurs in prepositional expressions or their grammatical equivalents" (E. Jenni, "Das Wort *'ôlām* im Alten Testament", *ZAW* 64, 1952, 222) is reflected in the prepositional use of *aiōn*, aeon (more than 60 times) in the NT.

The prepositional use of the word in the NT does not elucidate the connexion between *aiōn*, time, and → life for the reader quite so well as its use in the OT. It is true that even here one can scarcely deny the connexion (*eis ton aiōna*, "never", in 1 Cor. 8:13 and Jn. 13:8; "from generation to generation", Lk. 1:55; cf. Matt. 21:19), but, in so far as a preposition precedes it, one can only consider the designation of "antiquity" or the "far future" as the essential NT use of the word.

(a) The meaning of antiquity (with prepositions *apo*, from, *pro*, before, *ek*, from) is

relatively rare. It occurs in Lk. (never in Mk. and Matt.) always in the context of statements that God has from of old spoken through the prophets (Lk. 1:70; Acts 3:21; 15:18), and – as all three passages make clear – through the primal prophet → Moses (Lk. 24:27). It is also found similarly in Jn. 9:32 in the sense of "never since the world began [*ek tou aiōnos*]". In 1 Cor. 2:7; Eph. 3:9; Col. 1:26 and especially in Jude 25 the meaning verges on pre-temporal eternity.

(b) The same shift of meaning is also to be seen in the far more widely attested statements about the future which are, however, uniformly linked only with *eis*, into (and generally with the sing. of *aiōn*). It is further clear that passages such as Matt. 21:19; Mk. 3:29; Lk. 1:55; Jn. 13:8; and 1 Cor. 8:13 are speaking of a future within time which is linked with the duration of that to which reference is made. On the other hand, the statements of the Johannine writings, which cannot always be pinned down with absolute certainty of meaning (Jn. 4:14; 6:51, 58; 8:35, 51 f.; 10:28; 11:26; 12:34; 13:8; 14:16; 1 Jn. 2:17; 2 Jn. 2), Heb., where the meaning is quite clear (1:8, quoting Ps. 110:4; 5:6; 6:20; cf. 1:2; 6:5; 7:17, 21, 24, 28; 9:26; 11:3; 13:8, 21) and naturally those cases where *aiōn* is used in the plural, all reveal a strong inclination to conceive of a timeless, because post-temporal, eternity. For these it is typical throughout that they stand in theological (Jn.), christological (Heb.) or doxological contexts (plur. statements, e.g. Rom. 1:25; 11:36). As in the OT, these statements reveal the background conviction that God's life never ends, i.e. that everything belonging to him can also never come to an end. So it comes about that even where the conception of the age (in the doxologies of the Pauline letters and those closely related to Paul, and also those of Rev.) is intensified (*eis tous aiōnas tōn aiōnōn*, lit. "to the eternity of eternities"), the connexion with the basic meaning of *aiōn* as life-span is still not lost. What appertains to the living God is "eternal". But one must not forget that this God is also the final Judge, so that even perdition must be called *aiōnios*, eternal (Matt. 18:8; 25:41, 46; Mk. 3:29; 2 Thess. 1:9; Heb. 6:2; Jude 7).

3. It is quite a different matter with the use of the word *aiōn*, aeon, age, epoch (occurring in this sense 40 times) as a noun. This must be seen against the background of Jewish apocalyptic. The word serves as the principal term for the NT's understanding of its history and eschatology. If this also reaches back to Jewish apocalyptic, the apocalyptic, at any rate, is not developed along speculative lines. Used as a noun *aiōn*, age, occurs scattered throughout the NT but never (and this is characteristic) in the Johannine writings.

(a) For the Synoptics, the most important fact is that the kingdom of God has dawned. If details are taken over from apocalyptic, then it is only in order to say, with its linguistic and conceptual material, that the present age is approaching its end because the → kingdom of God has come.

The contrast between the two ages is scarcely discernible; it merely serves to throw into relief the different nature of the course of the world under the reign of Christ. His return and the → resurrection of the dead follow on his own resurrection. The new time, the new age has dawned with Jesus. The period until the parousia enables the Christian community to proclaim the gospel.

Matthew displays the fullest and most vivid conception of the aeons in the sense of distinguishing between two successive worlds of space and time, for here alone is found the typical distinction between the *aiōn houtos*, this age, and the *aiōn mellōn*,

the age to come (Matt. 12:32). In answer to the question concerning the time of the end of the world and the signs of the messianic future (Matt. 24:3), Matt. is able to give a clear and realistic reply, not only in the subsequent apocalypse (Matt. 24 f., here without the word *aiōn*), but even more clearly in the interpretation of the parable of the wheat and the tares (Matt. 13:36–43, cf. v. 49). But this is vastly different from (e.g.) the conceptions in Qumran: there is no final battle and no dualism at all of different worlds, rulers and subjects (cf. Y. Yadin, *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness*, 1962; H. Ringgren, *The Faith of Qumran: Theology of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 1963). The Son of man is Lord; the devil may well be able to bring ruin, but he is no real counterpart to the Son of man (→ Son, art. *hyios tou anthrōpou*). The world is not subject to the conflict between two powers; it is and remains God's → creation. All this makes it clear that the aeons are not, as in gnosticism, authorities in their own right; nor are they emanations of God or his delegates.

(b) Paul also makes use of apocalyptic concepts in his eschatology (→ Present, art. *The Parousia and Eschatology in the NT* 2 (c)). He uses the word *aiōn* to designate the course of the world apart from Christ and under the control of sin (Gal. 1:4, Christ "delivered us from this present evil age"; cf. Rom. 12:2). → Satan is admittedly the god of this age (2 Cor. 4:4), and the present world is dominated by evil demonic powers. But against the power of → darkness (art. *skotos*) is ranged the victorious kingdom of Christ (Col. 1:13).

It is clear from Paul's confrontation with his opponents in Corinth that he understands the course of the world from the perspective of Jewish apocalyptic. The enthusiast group believed that, with → baptism, i.e. through sacramental realism (similar to the Hellenistic mystery cults), they had already reached the goal of redemption and the resurrection from the dead (1 Cor. 15:12 ff.; cf. 2 Tim. 1:18). The Corinthian pneumatists replaced future eschatological expectation with a present eschatology: final salvation in its final definitiveness had already come to them. Paul, too, could stress that the fullness of time (Gal. 4:4) and the new creation has already begun (2 Cor. 5:17), in which Christ has delivered his church from the present evil age (Gal. 1:4). But in 1 Cor. 15:20 ff., by contrast, his starting-point is that the rule of Christ has not yet achieved its final goal; and later Eph. 1:21 can maintain that this age still persists and that the future one is still awaited. Thus Paul does not develop any systematic doctrine of aeons; neither does the rest of the NT. The ages are interlocked: eschatology is determined solely by the revelation of Christ: Christ is the turning-point of time. With him, and not through any inevitable historical processes, the *now* of salvation has arrived (cf. *nyn*, Col. 1:26; *nyni*, Rom. 3:21). For the believer, the present age (1 Cor. 1:20; 3:18; 10:11) belongs to the past. But "the correlative of 'this world', and 'this age' is properly not 'that aeon', and never 'that other world', but 'the sovereignty of God', and the 'eternal life' " (G. Dalman, *The Words of Jesus*, 1902, 148). "The proper antithesis to this age is thus God himself, his righteousness, the kingdom of Christ, the *pneuma* or the eschatological blessings of salvation" (F. J. Schierse, *LTK* I 682).

(c) In Hebrews this age is called *ho kairos ho enestēkōs*, "the present time" (Heb. 9:9), and the new age *kairos diorthōseōs*, "the time of reformation" (Heb. 9:10) (→ *kairos*). The equation of aeon and cosmos (Heb. 1:2; 9:26; 11:3) probably originates in Jewish linguistic usage (cf. SB III 671 ff.), but it can also be evidenced in

gnosticism. The frequent plur. *aiōnes*, meaning world (in the spatial rather than the temporal sense), goes back to the conception of the various layers of the world-frame or of a multiplicity of world systems, which can be understood as a gnostic interpretation of the world. Four and even seven aeons can be found in Jewish writings. Despite the adoption of many Hellenistic linguistic and conceptual elements, Heb. holds fast to the primitive Christian (Jewish-determined) eschatological proclamation. It knows the sequence of two ages (which in Heb. are christologically defined), for the end of the ages (Heb. 9:26) has come, because Christ has appeared in order to abolish sin by the sacrifice of himself. The present age is defined by sacrifice and the first → tent, while the new age is concerned with the working of God in the heavenly sanctuary. There Christ has already instituted the priestly ministry, and the Christian community is already on the way there (Heb. 9:8 ff.; cf. 10:19; 13:14). The new age reaches out from the heavenly world into the present time. Even if hidden, it is already present (Heb. 6:5).

(d) 2 Peter, by contrast, develops a distinctly futurist eschatology. Even though the mighty parousia of Jesus Christ (2 Pet. 1:16) and entrance into his eternal kingdom (2 Pet. 1:11) are expressly mentioned, interest is directed rather to the future blessings of salvation, the reward of the righteous, participation in the divine → nature (2 Pet. 1:4). The dialectic of present and future salvation, which can be found above all in Paul, here merges into a latter-day view of the future. The letter concentrates on the proclamation of the end-time, the certainty of judgment (2 Pet. 2:4–10; 3:5–10), the dissolution of the existing order (2 Pet. 3:11 f.) and the promise of "new heavens and a new earth in which righteousness dwells" (2 Pet. 3:13). The letter closes with the doxology: "To him be the glory both now and to the day of eternity. Amen" (2 Pet. 3:18).

4. The expression "eternal life" (*zōē aiōnios*), corresponding to the basic meaning of *aiōn*, lifetime, as defined by the OT, is to be understood primarily as life which belongs to God. From the Book of Daniel onwards "eternal life" is an expression of the longed-for eschatological blessings of salvation, life in the age to come (cf. Dan. 12:2). In the major Pauline Letters (e.g. Rom. 2:7; 5:21; 6:22 f.; 16:25 f.; Gal. 6:8; cf. 2 Cor. 4:17 f.; 5:1; 2 Thess. 1:9; 2:16; Phlm. 15; Acts 13:46, 48), Synoptic Gospels (Matt. 18:8; 19:16 par. Mk. 10:17, Lk. 18:18; Matt. 19:29 par. Mk. 10:30, Lk. 18:30; Matt. 25:41, 46; cf. Mk. 3:29; Lk. 10:25; 16:9), the Pastoral Epistles (e.g. 1 Tim. 1:16; 6:12, 16; 2 Tim. 1:9; 2:10; Tit. 1:2; 3:7) and Jude 21 there is a temporal understanding of eternal → life (art. *zōē* NT 1 and 2). This is a life that is awaited in the future along with the → resurrection of the dead, just as the term can be used in Judaism alternately with *basileia tou theou*, the → kingdom of God (cf. Matt. 25:34; 1 Cor. 6:9 f.) to denote salvation.

John understands eternal life in relation to Christ through faith, love and in keeping the commands of Christ (Jn. 3:15 f., 36; 4:14, 36; 5:24, 39; 6:27, 40, 47, 54, 68; 10:28; 12:25, 50; 17:2 f.). The word "eternal" here indicates a definite quality: it is a different life from the old existence typified by hate, lack of love, sin, pain and death. Eternal life does not therefore just begin in the future, it is already the possession of those who have entered upon fellowship with Christ. Thus Jn. 3:15 speaks of having eternal life in the present. But there is also a temporal sense, so that eternal (*aiōnios*) indicates the quantity of this life: because it belongs to Christ, who himself is the Life (Jn. 14:6), it has no end. It will not even cease at death (Jn. 8:51; 11:25 f.). One must

also observe that the NT does not speak of an eternal → death, because the idea of eternity is so closely connected with life that the negation of eternal life can also only be understood as the experience of ruin. Even here, eternity remains time in and through which one lives (on the other hand → *chronos*).

5. Surveying the usage of the word *aiōn*, aeon, and the connected eschatology, one can establish that, with all the varied accentuations, the NT speaks of eternity in the categories of time. Any dualism between two world-systems is thus foreign to it. The world is and remains God's creation, and Christ is the Lord of the worlds, even if his lordship is hidden. The expression *ho mellōn aiōn*, the future age, is used only with the greatest caution. It is the Today that stands in the centre of the statements and that which is coming is only relevant in view of the respective present. Everywhere the NT exercises conscious discretion in the face of events of which knowledge is forbidden (1 Thess. 5:1 ff.; Matt. 24:37 ff.); it does not go into rapturous speculations about the nature and time of the coming aeon. This is also a warning to every Christian today against speculating about God's mystery.

J. Guhrt

καιρός

καιρός (*kairos*), time, especially a point of time, moment; εὐκαιρέω (*eukaireō*), have opportunity; εὐκαιρία (*eukairia*), favourable opportunity, the right moment; εὔκαιρος (*eukairos*), opportune; εὐκαίρως (*eukairōs*), when convenient; ἀκαιρέομαι (*akaireomai*), have no time, no opportunity; ἄκαιρος (*akairos*), untimely, ill-timed, inopportune; πρόσκαιρος (*proskairos*), temporary, transitory, passing; σήμερον (*sēmeron*), today; νῦν (*nyn*), νυνί (*nynî*), now; ἄρτι (*artî*), now, just, immediately; εὐθύς (*euthys*), at once, immediately; εὐθέως (*eutheōs*), at once, immediately.

CL 1. (a) The noun *kairos* (first in Hesiod, *Works* 694) originally denoted right measure, correct proportion, that which is convenient, appropriate or decisive. As well as the material and temporal, lexical content, *kairos* can have a locative sense, meaning the right spot, the suitable place. Used in the material and temporal sense, *kairos* characterizes a critical situation, one which demands a decision, one into which man is perhaps led by fate. Positively, it implies opportunity (cf. Aristotle, *Eth. Nic.* 1, 4, p. 1096a) or advantage; negatively, danger (Plato, *Leg.* 12, 945c). Among the material meanings belongs *kairos* as importance, norm (e.g. Aesch., *Ag.* 787), wise moderation (Soph., *OT* 1516). In the temporal sense, *kairos* describes a suitable time, the right moment (e.g. Soph., *El.* 1292), a favourable moment. But then *kairos* can also appear synonymously with other temporal concepts and denote quite generally time (→ *chronos*), season of the year (e.g. Plato, *Leg.* 4, 709c), hour (→ *hōra*) or the present moment (like *nyn*, now, and *sēmeron*, today).

(b) The following words are derived from *kairos*: *eukairein* (e.g. Phrynichus 125), to have a good time, to have an opportunity; *eukairia* (e.g. Plato, *Phdr.* 272a), a favourable opportunity; *eukairos* (first in Soph., *OC* 32), suitable, opportune, seasonable; *eukairōs* (first in Xen., *Agesilaus* 8, 3), when convenient; *akairōs* (Aesch. onwards) inopportunely, and *proskairos* (e.g. Strabo 7, 3, 11), lasting only a while, passing, momentary, fickle.

(c) *sēmeron* (Homer onwards, e.g. *Il.* 11, 431), today, on this day is also included in this article dealing with words expressing points of time.

(d) Further, mention must be made of the adv. *nyn* (Homer onwards e.g. *Od.* 2, 239; *Il.* 2, 14, 284, 435) and the synonymous intensive form *nyni* (e.g. Thuc. 4, 92), now (cf. Lat. *nunc*), at the present moment. But the time shortly before or shortly after the immediate present can also be meant: just now, forthwith. Not infrequently *nyn* has a more material meaning as well as the temporal, viz. in accordance with the present situation, as matters now stand (e.g. Hom. *Od.* 1, 166). *nyn* is also frequently used adjectivally, meaning present (e.g. Plato, *Rep.* 6, 506d, *to nyn einai*, "present existence"; Aristotle, *Phys.* 6, 6 p. 237a, *ho nyn chronos*, "the present time") or substantivally, as in *to nyn*, "the present time" (e.g. Aristotle, *Phys.* 4, 10 p. 218a) or as plur. *ta nyn* "present-day events" (Tragedians, Plato).

(e) Synonymous with *nyn* is the temporal adv. *arti* (Pindar onwards; root *ar*; cf. Lat. *artus*, tight, close), now, just, forthwith (e.g. Hippocrates, *Epidemiae* 9, 2). With the prepositions *heōs*, until, and *apo*, away from, *arti* turns the attention from the present moment to the past or future (e.g. Plut., 388).

(f) Finally, reference must be made to the adj. *euthys* (in Hom. *ithys*), straight, direct (e.g. Thuc., 2, 100, 2 of a road) which, in both the adv. forms *euthys* (Pindar onwards) and *eutheōs* (Soph. onwards) has the temporal meaning of straightaway, forthwith.

2. The presence of the two etymological groups, associated respectively with *chronos* and *kairos* for the concept of time, suggests that the Greeks distinguished individual periods or points of time which can be effected by human decisions (*kairos*) from the stream of time, whose progress is independent of any possible human influence (*chronos*).

The will to seize the moment, which can naturally also grasp the wrong thing (*kairos*-thinking), counteracts the danger of fatalism, which could grow out of *chronos*-thinking. "*chronos* encompasses . . . all possible *kairoi*, and, being the larger, more exclusive term, may often be used where *kairos* would have been equally suitable, though not the converse. . . . Thus it is possible to speak of the *kairos chronou*, and Sophocles (*Elect.* 1292) does so . . . but not of the *chronos kairou*" (R. C. Trench *Synonyms of the New Testament*, [1880⁹] 1953, 210; cf. Lk. 1:57; Gal. 4:4).

(a) *kairos*, *nyn* and *sēmeron* mark for the Greek those points of time which were of the greatest importance for his individual life in the infinite onward flow of the stream of macrocosmic time (→ *chronos*). Where there was an interest, like that of Aristotle in his *Physics*, in the exploration of tangible reality, reflection on time led to particular prominence being given to smaller units of time. Thus, for instance, the Now is defined: "The Now [*nyn*] is the limiting factor: that which lies between the respective points of Now is time [*chronos*]" (*Phys.* 6, 6 p. 237a). *Eth. Nic.* 1, 4 p. 1096a indicates the high estimation of *kairos*: "that which is good in time is called *kairos*."

(b) It is against the background of the swift passing of time (→ *chronos*) that the point of time which demands action, whether it is given by gods or by fate, gains its importance. In later times Kairos could even temporarily be worshipped as a god. It is the space of time in which many decisions are made for the individual and which one must dare to exploit. "Today [*sēmeron*] is either your day of glory . . . or else you lose your life transfixed by my spear" (Homer, *Il.* 11, 431; cf. also Eur.,

Fragment 745). Anyone who misses or evades his *kairos* destroys himself: "Can there be any doubt that a work is spoilt when it is not done at the right time?" (Plato, *Rep.* 2, p. 370b). That which has been received *para kairon*, inopportunely, also has unhappy consequences in the end (Theognis in *Griechische Lyrik*, 108/115). It is therefore important to take to heart the call *kairon gnōthi*, recognize the moment (Pittacus, Diels-Kranz, I, 64), and in all one's activity to find the right moment (in public speaking Democ., *Frag.* 226; in charitable acts, *Frag.* 94).

(c) Seizing the right moment (*kairon lambanein* or *chrēsthai*) plays an important rôle in Stoic ethics (Epictetus and later Seneca). In active obedience to what is perceived to be rational (Epictetus, *Dissertationes* 1, 1, 6) moral necessity (cf. *Dissertationes* 2, 7, 3) one seeks to get hold of time and so to escape from its oppressive imprisonment. "The Stoics live only for those present duties which develop out of man's timeless destiny. They have as little concern for historical sense as they do for worry about a far-off future" (M. Pohlenz, *Die Stoa*, I, 1954², 47). For the Stoic, who looks upon time (*chronos*) as a matter of entirely secondary importance (*adiaphoron*), the historical viewpoint of the *kairos* ultimately disappears; there is only the *kairos* as a timeless moment (cf. R. Bultmann, *Primitive Christianity in its Contemporary Setting*, 1956, 144 f., 153, 180–88).

OT In the OT, where time is essentially understood qualitatively from the point of view of the encounter between God and man, the use of a term to denote the right moment was important. It is therefore not surprising that *kairos* with c. 300 occurrences in the LXX occurs about three times as often as *chronos*. It is primarily used to render the Heb. word for time *ʿēṯ* (198 times). 31 times it stands for *môʿēḏ*, point of time, six times for *qēṣ*, and three times for *yôm*, day. *kairos* often appears more or less synonymously with other words for time (with *chronos*, e.g. Dan. 2:21; 7:12; Eccl. 3:1; Wis. 7:18; 8:8; with *hēmera*, e.g. Jer. 50:27, 30; Ps. 37:19; with *hōra*, e.g. Num. 9:2 in comparison with 9:7, 13).

1. While *kairos* frequently serves simply for precise (e.g. Gen. 17:23, 26; 18:10, 14; 21:22; 29:34; 2 Chr. 9:25) or more general (e.g. Jdg. 11:26; 14:4; 1 Ki. 11:4; Ps. 71[70]:9; 2 Chr. 15:5) temporal designations, in other passages it helps to illustrate particularly well the characteristic aspect of the OT understanding of time. For time is not an anonymous destiny. The creator, Yahweh, has created the whole of time and fills it in accordance with his will, and also fixes the individual *kairoi* (cf. Gen. 1:14). He does this as the Lord of nature who guides the heavenly bodies (Job 38:32; Ps. 104[103]:19), directs the → weather (Lev. 26:4; Deut. 28:12, rain) and allots times and seasons for the biological growth of plants (Job 5:26; Ps. 1:3; cf. Hos. 2:9) and animals (Job 39:1; Jer. 8:7; cf. Gen. 30:41). The → feasts and festivals in the context of the yearly cycle are special times and moments of joy and rest given by Yahweh (Exod. 23:14 ff.; cf. Exod. 34:18 ff.; Num. 9:3, 7, 13; Deut. 16:16), which are of course "not only stamped by the events of agriculture. . ., but increasingly by the especial dealings of God with his people" (G. Delling, *Das Zeitverständnis des Neuen Testaments*, 1940, 16).

As Lord of man, God also apportions his life-span (Sir. 17:2), in that he determines the hour of birth (Mic. 5:3; Eccl. 3:2) and of death (Eccl. 7:17). All the elements of human existence in their tension-laden diversity are times from and in God's hands (Ps. 31[30]:15), as the "song in praise of time" (Eccl. 3:1 ff.) stresses.

In times of affliction it is not easy to hold to this confession of Yahweh as the giver of times, but even then the Israelite who remains with the covenant does not allow his relationship with God to be broken (cf. Pss. 32[31]:6; 37[36]:19, 39). It is precisely in times of distress that he hopes for a time of pardon (Ps. 102[101]:4), for the *kairos* of God's help and redemption (cf. Jud. 13:5 "now is the time to recover your heritage" [JB]; Isa. 33:2; Jer. 14:8, 19; 15:11).

2. Such a trust in the particular moment (*kairos*) of a saving act of Yahweh is founded on the historical experiences of the people of Israel. Again and again in the stereotyped phrase *en tō kairō ekeinō*, "at that time", attention is directed to the events of salvation history in the past, in the first instance to the time of → Moses and the exodus from Egypt (cf. Deut. 1:9, 16, 18; 2:33 f.; 3:3; 4:14; 6:6; 9:19), but also to the prophetess Deborah (Jdg. 4:4), the reign of → David (1 Chr. 21:28 f.) or the time of the building of → Solomon's → temple (2 Chr. 7:8). Especially in the historical books of the OT, the term *kairos* is frequently found with this function of drawing attention to God's activity in the history of the Israelite nation. The strong historical interest is also shown in the fact that in the same writings great store is laid by chronological details (cf. G. von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, II, 1965, 99–125).

3. "Within the OT a unique attitude to the reality of time may be seen in classical prophecy" (G. Delling, op. cit., 58). Here and in later apocalyptic circles of Judaism, there is a change from the thought of the fulfilled time of earlier generations and the patriarchal traditions to the expectation and hope of judgment and fulfilment in the future, which now achieves the same significance for life in the present as past history had done before, and even replaces it. Since the prophets see an unjustified assurance of salvation as having arisen out of a trust in the past, they speak emphatically of the judging but also redeeming future of God. The phrase *en tō kairō ekeinō*, "in that time", now takes on a future reference (Isa. 18:1; Jer. 3:17; 4:11; 8:1; 27[50]:20; Dan. 12:1; Joel 3:1; Amos 5:13; Mic. 3:4; Zeph. 3:16, 19 f.) and points to an intervention by God in the near or far-off future which will have the character of a comprehensive judgment. For the godless in and around Israel, the time of the end (*kairou peras*, Dan. 11:27; 12:9; *kairos synteleias*, Dan. 12:1) or "the day of the Lord" will be a time of visitation (*kairos episkopēs*, Jer. 6:15; 10:15; 27[50]:27; 28[51]:6; Wis. 3:7), of wrath (*kairos orgēs*, Sir. 44:17; cf. Ezek. 7:7, 12; Jer. 18:23) and of punishment (*kairos ekdikēseōs*, Jer. 26[46]:21; Sir. 5:7; 18:24). But Zion and those who remain obedient (cf. Ps. 81[80]:16) and practise righteousness (cf. Ps. 106[105]:3) await everlasting salvation (Zeph. 3:16, 19 f.; cf. Isa. 60:20 ff.; Jer. 27[50]:4, 20; Dan. 12:1 f.). Right up to the final day of judgment, however, Yahweh gives time for repentance (cf. Sir. 18:21) and for acting uprightly. This comes about by a right use of the present *kairos* at any given time (cf. Sir. 51:30).

4. (a) In later Judaism both the chronological interest (especially Jub.) and the expectation of an *eschatos kairos*, a final space of time, are powerfully elaborated. The Israelite prepared for an early end to the present time, and hoped for a new age, conceived – apart from exceptions like Enoch (Sl.) 65:7 f. – in temporal terms.

(b) The conception of time in the Dead Sea Scrolls has the strong imprint of deterministic thought. The command of the present "ordering of time" guaranteed by Yahweh is obedience to God's will (1QS 9:12 ff.), which consists in being separate from men in order to prepare the way for the last days (1QS 9:18 ff.). For God has

preordained the moment of visitation (1QS 3:18), when an end will be put to wickedness and truth will come to light in the world for ever (1QS 4:18 ff.).

NT The terms of the word-group are found in the NT as follows: *kairos* 85 times (30 times in Paul; 22 times in the Lucan historical writings); *eukaireō* 3 times; *eukairia* twice (in the Gospels); *eukairos*, *eukairōs* and *akairōs* twice each; *proskairos* four times; *sēmeron* 41 times (Lk. and Acts 20 times; Heb. 8 times); *nyn* 148 times (Paul 52 times; Lk. and Acts 39 times; Jn. 28 times); *nyni* 18 times (Paul 15 times); *arti* 36 times (Jn. and Paul 12 times each, Matt. 7 times); *euthys* as adj. 8 times, as adv. 54 times (Mk. 42 times; other Gospels 11 times); and *eutheōs* 33 times (Lk. and Acts 15 times; Matt. 11 times). The main emphasis of the word-group thus falls on the one hand in Paul, and on the other in the Lucan historical writings.

1. The OT understanding of time also stamps the NT use of the word-group. In a whole range of passages *kairos* is used to mean the same or nearly the same as other terms for time, denoting quite generally a particular time (e.g. in the phrase "at that time", Matt. 11:25; 12:1; Lk. 13:1; Acts 7:20; 12:1; 19:23). This should not be understood merely as a short point or moment of time (except in Lk. 8:13). *kairos* clearly often means a longer or shorter time-span (e.g. Mk. 10:30; Lk. 18:10; 21:24, "the times of the Gentiles"; Eph. 2:12; Rom. 8:18; 11:5; 2 Cor. 8:14; 1 Thess. 2:17; 1 Cor. 7:5, a limited time of sexual abstinence). Frequently it means the times in the life of nature established in creation (Matt. 13:20; 21:34; Mk. 12:2; Lk. 20:10; Mk. 11:13), but any kind of nature-idolatry is specifically repudiated (Gal. 4:9 ff.) and the confession of God as the giver of fruitful times is given added strength (Acts 14:17; cf. Matt. 24:45).

2. The decisively new and constitutive factor for any Christian conception of time is the conviction that, with the coming of Jesus, a unique *kairos* has dawned, one by which all other time is qualified. Mk. 1:15 makes this clear in programmatic fashion. The keynote of Jesus' proclamation is, "the hour of fulfilment has dawned, the reign of God is already being manifested here and now; soon the catastrophe introducing its definitive coming will arrive. Make use of the time before it is too late: it is a matter of life or death" (J. Jeremias, *New Testament Theology* I, 1971, 139). The time of grace for which the prophets hoped has now been realized with Jesus Christ (cf. Rom. 3:21; 1 Pet. 1:10 ff.; Rom. 16:25 f.; Eph. 3:8 ff.; Col. 1:26). Anyone who listens to him now in faith and obedience will have eternal life (Jn. 5:25; cf. 3:36; 10:27 f.). With the life and especially the suffering and death of Jesus, the old age has passed away, and with the *nyn kairos*, the present time of true divine righteousness (Rom. 3:26), a new epoch, the fulfilment of the times, has dawned (for *kairos* used to denote the time of suffering cf. Matt. 26:18; Jn. 7:6 f.; Rom. 5:6, "at his appointed moment Christ died for sinful men", JB). "Salvation has sought out its own time and its own place in the world, in order from there to transform time and space, the essential characteristics of the world, by qualifying them anew as the time and the space of Jesus" (E. Fuchs, *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, I, 1959, 19). But time also presents the church with the opportunity to serve one another, as may be seen in Paul's use of the vb. *akaireomai*, have no time, no opportunity. "I rejoice in the Lord greatly that now at length you have revived your concern for me; you were indeed concerned for me, but you had no opportunity" (Phil. 4:10).

3. (a) As the physical presence of Jesus plunged every concrete Today into the

light of divine salvation (Lk. 13:32; 19:5, 9; 23:43; cf. 2:11), so his redeeming power can become effective in men's lives from now on through their relationship of faith with the Exalted One (cf. Lk. 22:69). Jesus' suffering and death is no mere fact of the past; it is present time (cf. R. Bultmann, *Faith and Understanding*, 1969, 174 f., 202; similarly G. Delling, op. cit., 35). From Easter onwards, it is proclamation that counts: "Behold, now is the acceptable time [*kairos euprosdektos*]; behold, now is the day of salvation" (2 Cor. 6:2; cf. Isa. 49:8). This gospel the church of Jesus Christ has to proclaim without any false deference, whether "convenient or inconvenient [*eukairōs akairōs*]" (2 Tim. 4:2 NEB). By passing on Jesus' "message of the *kairos*" (Stauffer), the Now of the offer of salvation keeps on becoming afresh the reality which demands a decision. "Thus to the *now* of the coming of the Revealer there corresponds exactly the *now* of the proclamation of the Word, as the *now* of a historical fact of a definite time, the *now* of the opportunity, the *moment* . . . Jesus is the Revealer in the preaching of the Word as a concrete event at a given time" (Bultmann, op. cit., 175). As once the disciples obeyed when Jesus called them (Matt. 4:20, 22; Mk. 1:18), so each person is summoned to respond to the missionary proclamation without delay, and to begin to follow Jesus. All are asked whether they "believe that the time and place of man's encounter with God is the time of love and the place of the suffering of this love" (Fuchs, op. cit., 21). They are not to evade the decision by delaying the Today until Tomorrow (cf. Philo, *Sacr.* 69), and certainly not to "harden" their hearts, i.e. to reinforce their will for an existence without God (cf. Heb. 4:7; 3:7, 15), lest they find themselves, like Jerusalem, standing under the verdict of a "Woe" (cf. Lk. 19:44).

(b) If, therefore, *kairos* must be used initially for the fundamental decision of faith, those who are now reconciled (cf. Rom. 5:11; 13:11) must henceforth live by faith. The Then of idolatry is to be superseded by the Now of true worship of God (Eph. 5:8 f.; Gal. 4:8 f.; cf. Rom. 12:1). Faith brings release from being the servile victim of time; it brings freedom from the burdensome past through the acceptance of the gift of forgiveness; but it does not absolve one from the ethical responsibility to make sensible use of the time at one's disposal (Gal. 6:10; Col. 4:5). Indeed, the opposite is true. Believers are assigned historical time with the imperative to "buy up the time" (Eph. 5:16). The new life of faith is not, of course, without affliction. This time (*ho kairos houtos*, Mk. 10:30; Lk. 12:56), and therefore also the time of the church, is not a time of blessedness free from temptation but a time of struggle (cf. 1 Cor. 9:24 ff.; Eph. 6:12; 1 Tim. 6:11 ff.; cf. H. Conzelmann, *The Theology of St Luke*, 1960, 231–34) and of suffering (Rom. 8:18). In this time, Christians must encourage each other to prevent a falling away (Heb. 3:12 f.; cf. 1 Tim. 4:1) in the moment of temptation (Lk. 8:13).

4. The → fullness of divine glory will dawn only with the *kairos eschatos*, the last time (1 Pet. 1:5), the precise date of which is unknown (Mk. 13:33; Acts 1:7; 1 Thess. 5:1 ff.) and which is sometimes expected as imminent (1 Cor. 7:29; Rev. 1:3; 22:10) and sometimes as possibly remote (2 Thess. 2:1 ff.; cf. Lk. 21:8). The NT is always pointing to this *telos* of final time (→ Goal; → Present, art. *The Parousia and Eschatology in the NT*). By contrast with the apocalyptic expectations of Judaism, the eschatological *kairos* is now understood christologically as the time of Christ's return in glory (1 Tim. 6:14) and as the time of the last and final judgment (1 Cor.

4:5; 1 Pet. 4:17 f.; Rev. 11:18; cf. Jn. 5:28 f.), when the godless are punished and those who trust in God are rewarded (cf. Mk. 10:30; Gal. 6:9).

Thus with the pattern "once" (pagans in vice and darkness) and "now" (Christians and sons of light: cf. Rom. 7:5 f.; Gal. 4:3 ff.; Eph. 5:8) there corresponds the other, viz. "already" (confident in faith and hope) and "not yet" (full blessedness, 1 Pet. 1:5 f.; cf. 5:6; Rom. 8:18; Heb. 11:25 f.). Jesus' lordship is still not completely visible or perceptible (Heb. 2:8). Satan is still allowed a period of time for his diabolical intrigues (Rev. 12:12). The Christian still comes up against the harsh realities of life (cf. 2 Cor. 4:18), especially those of bad times (cf. Eph. 5:16; 2 Tim. 3:1; 4:3). The time between the appearance of the earthly Jesus and the parousia therefore remains a tension-laden time, which requires vigilant concentration (cf. Lk. 21:36; Eph. 6:18, by prayer) on the part of Christians for their apostolic (cf. Tit. 1:3) and diaconal duties (cf. Rom. 13:11). Such a time of probation, of course, stands clearly within the sign of the promise which embraces all times: "Jesus Christ is yesterday and today and for ever the same" (Heb. 13:8; cf. Rev. 1:17). "Openness to the future is what quite simply and necessarily characterizes the understanding of time in the NT. The goal of the eschatological event is God 'all in all' (1 Cor. 15:28). In him is described the goal of all times. The time which follows the final predictable event is necessarily unlimited on the basis of that which is said about its content – that from which it gains its quality and by which it is defined: it is simply and solely filled by God ('God all in all' can have no temporal limits). It alone is thus utterly and completely filled time, utterly and completely God's time and thus – eternity" (G. Delling, op. cit., 56).

H.-C. Hahn

χρόνος

χρόνος (*chronos*), time, period of time; χρονίζω (*chronizō*), take time, linger, delay; χρονοτριβέω (*chronotribeō*), spend, lose or waste time.

CL 1. (a) The noun *chronos* denotes from Homer onwards a space of time, whose duration is not as a rule precisely determined, but at most is characterized by additional adjs. as longer (e.g. *polys*, much; *hikanos*, sufficient) or shorter (e.g. *oligos*, little; *mikros*, small, thus Odysseus is to wait a little while for Nausicaa, Hom. *Od.* 6, 295). On the other hand, the amount of time that the hero spends during his wanderings while kept far from his homeland may be considerable (*Od.* 11, 161; 14, 218).

In the face of wasted time, *chronos* takes on the meaning of loss of time. Time which others are allowed is translated by "period" (e.g. Josephus, *War* 4, 188). With reference to people, *chronos* often means age, years, time of life and thus comes quite close to *bios*, → life.

chronos is also frequently used adverbially. In the gen. it means for some considerable time; in the dat. in (the course of) time, gradually, late; in the acc. for a set time (e.g. in the phrase, *ton aei chronon*, for ever). *chronos* is also often found with preps. such as *dia*, through; *en*, in; *eis*, into; *ek*, out of; *epi*, towards, etc.

(b) The older vb. *chronizō*, derived from *chronos* and used from Aeschylus onwards, means (i) not to come for a long time, be a long time coming, fail to appear (e.g. Thuc., 8, 16, 3); (ii) to linger, remain (Hdt., 3, 61); and (iii) (with infin.) to hesitate, fail, put off doing something.

Later, via the contraction of *chronos* and *tribō*, to rub, wear away, expend, the rare vb. *chronotribeō* (Aristot., *Rhet.* 3, 3, 3p 1406a) was formed, meaning spend, lose or waste time (also used with negative undertones).

2. (a) Gk. man experienced time as a power which inescapably determined his life. On the one hand, time appeared to him to be an endless quantity, which "in its course ... gives birth to endless nights and days" (Soph., *OC* 617 f.). On the other hand, he was painfully aware that the time allotted to the individual was only all too short (Simonides, *Athen.* 10, 456). One felt the advance of time (Soph., *Phil.* 285), whose "omnipotence" overthrows all but the gods (Soph., *OC* 609), to be always threatening to life. Time's growing old as quickly as a shadow (Critias, *Frag.* 26 in Diels-Kranz, II, 389, 7) warned man of his transience. If youth was able to overlook this, man knew as he grew old that "fair youth disappears; life's sweet joy endures but a short time" (Anacreon, *Griechische Lyrik*, *RK*, 140–142; 142/139; cf. Mimnermos, op. cit., 84 f.; Simonides, op. cit., 44, 47 f.).

(b) "All-seeing time" was further felt to be a kind of judge, bringing everything to light (Soph., *Aj.* 648 f.; *Frag.* 832). Time reveals the truth (Pindar, *Ol.* 10, 55), particularly in respect of a man's real worth (Soph., *OT* 606 ff.). If there are already echoes here of positive functions of time, this is even more clearly the case where time is spoken of as that which gives healing forgetfulness (Soph., *Aj.* 714, it erases everything; cf. *Frag.* 868a; Pindar, *Pyth.* 1, 46).

(c) But even time, the healer of wounds, cannot save anyone from → death. In various ways, the Greek sought to take up a position with regard to the knowledge, given with his temporality, of the necessity of his own death. One way was the intensive aspiration to make the fullest possible use of time (cf. Bacchylides in *Griechische Lyrik*, op. cit. 162/158) as "the most costly commodity for consumption" (Antipho, *Frag.* 77 in Diels-Kranz II, 367, 14; also *RK* 10, 139). Another way of breaking through the limitations of time and achieving an existence which would transcend death was the hope of posthumous fame – the popular expectation, for instance, of the doctor because of his profession of the Hippocratic Oath (→ Swear, art. *omnyō* CL). Memorials to heroes like that at Thermopylae, cannot be eradicated by "all-destroying time" (Simonides, op. cit., 133/129; cf. Theognis, 112/119).

3. Particularly meaningful for the Greeks, as later for the Romans, was the endeavour to surmount the problems posed by time by means of intellectual schematization.

(a) Thus the thought of the Pre-Socratics continually circles around the phenomenon of time, which Democritus, for example, views as an eternal, uncreated entity (Diels-Kranz II, 102, 3). Time also appears as infinite (*apeiros*) in Anaximander (ibid. I, 85, 22) and Zeno (ibid. I, 253, 25).

(b) Reflection on the nature and origin of time reached its first great peak in Plato. *chronos* was created at the same time as the starry heavens, and time will also pass away again, together with them (*Tim.* 38b). In the world of finitude it became "an image of the eternal and infinite One in the form of a ceaseless sequence of particulars" (*Tim.* 37d). Whereas immutable Being can grow neither older nor younger, temporal concepts such as past, present and future help to describe sequences of movement which present an image of imperishability. In having come to be, being and becoming, time corresponds to the incessant circular movement of the planets. It thus describes in turn cycles of natural becoming and passing. In accordance with this

cosmological point of view, the year is called "the perfect round of times" (*Tim.* 39d). Corresponding with this image-thinking, "the arrangement of the seasons so beautifully divided into years and months" can be adduced in *Leg.* 886a as a kind of proof of the existence of God.

(c) Aristotle's analytic formulation of the question, conditioned by the extraordinary force of his own personal gifts and by his recognition that Plato's thought assumed a strong speculative character, shifted the interest from the problem of Being to the analysis of existents, i.e. reality. Aristotle saw in change (perceptible as movement) the sole possibility of discovering reality. The sequence of movement can be measured by → number. He could thus define time as the continuous quantity of successive movement (*Phys.* 4, 20a, 25 f.), i.e. time is deduced from place and movement, a process typical of the Greek way of expressing things visually.

Thus in Aristotle, as in Plato, time is regarded "as something vastly inferior to space.... This contempt for time ... tells us more about the difference between Greek and Hebrew conceptions of time than all attempts to understand the Greek concept of time philosophically. For this reason, too, everything pertaining only to space, e.g. geometry, was so highly regarded, and the Greek gods and the divine world had to be conceived as exempt from all time, transitoriness, and change because time, change and transitoriness are all synonymous terms" (T. Boman, *Hebrew Thought Compared with Greek*, 1960, 128).

OT The Bible, unlike philosophy since Plato and Aristotle at the latest, has scarcely reflected on time. There is therefore no unified biblical word or term for time, but instead several conceptions which are expressed in the Heb. (or Gk. equivalents of) words such as day, hour, eternity, age, end, instant, decisive moment, now, today, festival time etc. (cf. P. Neuenzeit, *EBT* II 911 ff.). After words for time such as *hēmera*, day (some 1600 times), *nyn*, now (some 400 times), *aiōn*, age, *kairos*, point of time (each some 300 times), *sēmeron*, today (some 150 times), comes *chronos*, time, but relatively rarely in the LXX (about 100 instances; *eniautos*, year, is found equally often). Most often it serves to render *yôm*, day (29 times), whereas it is only found four times for *ʿēṯ*. Distributed through the books of the LXX, the instances of *chronos* are especially concentrated in Macc., Isa., Dan. and Job.

chronos may sometimes be used synonymously with *hōra* and *kairos*, and denote a point of time (e.g. Jer. 45[38]:28; cf. Neh. 10:34; 13:31). In general, however, it means a greater expanse of time, a span or course of time. This is shown in the frequent combination of *pas*, whole, with *chronos* (e.g. Deut. 12:19; 22:19, 29) and especially in the formula *eis ton aiōna chronon*, into eternal time (e.g. Exod. 14:13; Isa. 9:7). The thought is here partly of the whole human life-span, partly of an inconceivably long period of time, but never of a timeless, other-wordly eternity.

1. (a) For the Israelite, time and history were inseparably connected. Time interested him only in so far as it was qualified by a particular event. This is the case above all with regard to Yahweh's dealings with his people or their representatives. Certain periods of salvation history are accordingly described as the time of the fathers (1 Esd. 8:76), or the time of → Noah (Isa. 54:9), of → Abraham (Gen. 25:1, 15), of Joshua (2 Macc. 12:15) or of Samuel (1 Esd. 1:20).

Fundamental is the faith that the eternal, i.e. the "lasting" God (cf. Exod. 15:18; Ps. 90[89]:1; Isa. 40:28; Dan. 12:7) is the Lord of time and that he gives all human

time its content and meaning. If it was customary in ancient Israel to look more to the saving occasions of the past, the prophets fixed their eyes on future times. In Isa. this occurs through the use of the concept of *chronos*. Isaiah saw that for long periods of time the enemies of Zion would be exposed to divine → punishment (→ 13:20; 14:20; cf. 23:15; 34:10). Zion on the other hand, without being spared "times of visitation" (a notion derived from Jer. 29[49]:8; Isa. 54:7), will stand firm for all time (Isa. 33:20; cf. 34:17; 51:8). For Yahweh will establish an everlasting kingdom of peace (Isa. 9:7; cf. Bar. 3:13).

(b) The whole problematic of the elapse of man's life-span, which so oppressed the Greeks, also comes up in the later strata of the OT. In Job, for example, the fact that man has only a short life (Job 14:1; cf. 10:20), although he would like to live for a long time (Job 29:18), becomes a real source of temptation. But he and others find comfort in the knowledge that God prescribes the individual's allotted times (Job 14:5; cf. 14:13). Hence, even one who dies early can fill long spaces of time in a way that pleases the Lord (Wis. 4:13). All the same, from the perspective of this outlook, an extension of one's life-span is regarded as a particular grace of God (Isa. 38:5; cf. 65:20; Prov. 9:11, 18; 28:16).

(c) In the Wisdom literature one finds the beginnings of a philosophical treatment of the question of time. But it is supported by the belief that it is God who, through → wisdom (Eccl. 8:8), amongst other things, gives insight into "the beginning, end and middle of the times." Therefore, the net result here, too, is that God, who prepared the earth for eternal times (Bar. 3:12) and created the constellations to mark the time (Sir. 43:6), allots everything its time in nature, individual life and national history (Eccl. 3:1). This is particularly true of times and opportunities for repentance (Wis. 12:20), which are to be used to prevent the eschatological "day of the Lord" leading to disaster (→ Present, art. *hēmera* OT).

2. Times of repentance with clearly defined limits played an important rôle in the Qumran community (1QS 7), whose consciousness of time was clearly formed by eschatological and apocalyptic ideas. Great emphasis was laid on the observance of special festive seasons (1QS 1:14 f.; 10:1 ff.). In every period of time members of their fellowship were "to praise their Creator" (1QS 9:26). For it is only thus that they would survive the fires of wrath of the last days (1QH 3:36; cf. 1QS 3:1) and the raging of the angel of darkness (1QS 3:23; cf. 4:12 f.) as times of purification, before "the day of judgment" (1QpHab 12:14; 13:2 ff.) and the "consummation of time" (1QpHab 7:2, 13) breaks and God "creates the new" (1QS 4:25).

3. In his reflections on the nature of time, Philo takes over Plato's cosmic understanding of time (see above CL 3 (b)). He thus concludes: "For since time [*chronos*] is the measured space determined by the world's movement, and since movement cannot be prior to the object moving, but must of necessity arise after it or simultaneously with it, it follows of necessity that time also is either coeval with or later born than the world" (*Op. Mund.* 26).

Philo seeks to combine a philosophical view of the origin of time (one of the ten categories in *Decal.* 30 f.) with OT faith in God the Creator. It is he who has created (*Leg. All.* 3, 98 f.) out of nothing (cf. *Vit. Mos.* 267), the heavenly bodies with their harmonic movement without thereby standing in need of time (*Decal.* 101; *Leg. All.* 1, 20). Everything goes back to his creativity, including the cycle of the four seasons, which can be worked out from the constellations (cf. *Cher.* 88). In this connexion

Philo uses the concept of → *kairos* with emphasis, meaning "nothing other than the time of happy execution." Also important for the Alexandrines is the fact that, with the creation of the constellations and the yearly cycle, the concept of number made its appearance, as time revealed it (*Op. Mund.* 60). Thus in Philo Platonic, OT and Pythagorean thought merge together.

NT In the NT *chronos* occurs 54 times (24 in the Lucan historical writings and 9 in Paul). The derivatives *chronizō* and *chronotribeō* are found respectively 5 times (Matt. 24:48; 25:5; Lk. 1:21; 12:45; Heb. 10:37 = Isa. 26:20) and once (Acts 20:16).

1. Like the other temporal terms, *chronos* serves initially for the formal designation of a space or point of time. Thus the longer or shorter duration of a condition or an activity is frequently described by phrases with *chronos* (cf. Jn. 5:6; Lk. 8:27, 29, a long illness; Matt. 25:19; Lk. 20:9 f., long absence; Lk. 23:8, a long-entertained wish; Heb. 11:32, a considerable amount of time for recounting). Often, especially in Acts, the details of any actual or projected length of stay at various places are given by *chronos* (Acts 19:22, "he himself stayed in Asia for a while"; cf. Acts 14:3; 15:33; 18:20, 23; 20:18; 27:9; 1 Cor. 16:7). *chronos* is found in Acts 13:18 to denote a period of forty years of salvation history. As in the OT, *chronos* can also denote a man's life-time (Acts 1:21; 1 Cor. 7:39). Parts of one's life-time can also be envisaged (Gal. 4:1; cf. Acts 7:23). Finally, *chronos* can also describe a short time-span (Jn. 7:33; 12:25), and it can even be found with the meaning of *kairos* and *nyn*, in a moment (Lk. 4:5).

2. Theologically more significant than the general indications of time are those passages which speak of *chronos* in connexion with a specific event. Such passages occur particularly in the Lucan historical writings. Lk. 1:57 mentions the *chronos* of Elizabeth's delivery. *chronos* occurs again in the salvation-history formula describing God's forty years of bearing his people in the wilderness (Acts 13:18; cf. Exod. 16:35; Num. 14:34; Deut. 1:31). The climax of the *chronos*-pronouncements is reached in a whole series of christological statements. For with Jesus Christ, something new and unique has happened in time. Nevertheless, the NT writers are not interested in speculative questions about the origin and nature of time. Their thoughts centre on Jesus Christ who has given time and history a new significance. This is expressed by Paul in the following terms: "But when the time had fully come [*hote de ēlthen to plēroma tou chronou*], God sent forth his Son, born of woman, born under the law, to redeem those who were under the law, so that we might receive adoption as sons" (Gal. 4:4 f.). H. Schlier interprets the phrase *to plēroma tou chronou* (lit. "the fullness of time") as meaning "the moment in which the *chronos* is complete, in which time (in the sense of the passing of time) reached its full measure, i.e. came to its end" (*Der Brief an die Galater*, *KEK* 7, 1965[13], 194).

(a) One can of course speak of an end of time only against the background of the eschatological and apocalyptic messianic expectations of contemporary Judaism. With the coming of Christ this time of expectation has come to an end for the NT (cf. 1 Pet. 1:20). His appearance means the end of the old age (→ Goal).

(b) On the other hand, Jesus opens up a new epoch, for with him begins the christocratic reign of God over the world. In the light of the incarnation of God in his son, and his entering into historical time, several theologians speak of the "centre of

time" in relation to the Lucan perspective. Of course the term "centre" must not be related in the quantitative sense to two equally long halves, but is rather to be apprehended in the sense of a decisive incision (cf. O. Cullmann, *Christ and Time: The Primitive Christian Conception of Time and History*, 1951, 131 ff.; cf. H. Conzelmann, *The Theology of St Luke*, 1960; → Present, art. *The Parousia and Eschatology in the NT* 1(e), 2(b)). For with the appearance of Jesus, the → kingdom of God has come among men (Lk. 17:21). The Christ-event becomes the criterion of all historical time, both backwards and forwards. Now that "the times of ignorance" are past (Acts 17:30), one can accordingly, in the light of "the revelation of the mystery which was left secret for long ages" (Rom. 16:25), understand the past as a time of preparation. In retrospect it can be seen as standing under the sign of the promise and the "grace which he gave us in Christ Jesus ages ago [*pro chronōn aiōniōn*]" (2 Tim. 1:9; cf. Tit. 1:2; 1 Pet. 1:20).

The centre is above all the time in which the "bridegroom" lingered among his own people (Mk. 2:19), in which Jesus "went in and out" (Acts 1:21) among them, and in which the Now and the Today, the *kairos* and the hour were qualified by his physical presence.

3. (a) But with the death of Jesus the time of salvation was by no means past. Jesus himself had spoken clearly of the coming end of the world (e.g. Mk. 13; Matt. 24 f.) and thus assigned the believers into an interim period which would stretch from Easter to the parousia (→ Present, art. *The Parousia and Eschatology in the NT* 2 (a)). Again and again the authors of the NT concerned themselves with the remainder of the time (1 Pet. 4:2) and the events of the end. It is characteristic of the Christian understanding of time that astrological calculations, in the sense for example of Matt. 2:7, 16, were excluded *a priori* (→ Magic, art. *mageia* NT 2 (b)). Certain "signs of the time", such as the appearance of heretics and scoffers (Jude 18), are mentioned, but this was doubtless intended to serve as an encouragement to Christians to be watchful rather than as an invitation to speculate about dates. God is the Lord of time; it is his privilege to decide on the final hour for the consummation of his kingdom (cf. Acts 1:6 f.). Neither the angels nor Jesus himself knew when the eschatological day of the Lord would break (Mk. 13:32). It will come suddenly, like a thief in the night (1 Thess. 5:1 ff.). Many early Christians were initially of the opinion that it would probably be only a short while until the parousia; gradually, however, they adjusted themselves to a longer expanse of time.

(b) For all those who have not yet encountered God in Christ, who avoid him or who – like the false prophetess Jezebel – resist him, this interim period is a "time to repent" (Rev. 2:20 f.). But this time of decision, declares John the seer, will not be prolonged indefinitely. At the consummation of the divine mysteries time will cease to exist (Rev. 10:6). Those who in faith recognize Christ as Lord are to use the time given them in the interim period for growing and maturing in their knowledge of the faith (cf. Heb. 5:12 f.). 1 Pet. stresses further the ethical accountability of Christians, who are no longer to behave as they used to in earlier times in the manner of the heathen, but "to live for the rest of the time in the flesh no longer by human passions but by the will of God" (1 Pet. 4:2; cf. the example of Paul, who, throughout the whole length of his stay in Asia Minor, sought to serve the Lord in many different ways, Acts 20:18 ff.). Finally, in 1 Pet. 1:17, the interim period is defined as a "time of exile" (*chronos tēs paroikias*), which leads through much darkness, hours of

temptation and persecution. Comfort in this time of exile is granted, for example, by the hope of God's future, from which one awaits the final fulfilment of all movements of time and thus "a restoration of the original order of creation" (E. Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 1971, 208). *H.-C. Hahn*

ὥρα

ὥρα (*hōra*), hour, time, point of time; *ὡραῖος* (*hōraios*), at the right time, seasonable, ripe, hence beautiful, fair, pleasant.

CL 1. The noun *hōra* occurs in Homer and others in the Ionic form *hōrē*. It denotes a particular division of time, especially an hour. But *hōra* can also mean year, day and moment, or designate a season, or also (of human beings) a stage of life, such as youth (cf. Mimnermos in *Griechische Lyrik*, *RK* 140–142, 84). In Homer and other poets *hōra* marks the customarily appropriate time for certain activities, e.g. the evening meal (Homer, *Od.* 21, 428), going to sleep (Homer, *Od.* 11, 330 and 373) or sexual enjoyment (Orpheus, *Frag.* 5a, Diels-Kranz, I, 8).

hōra is readily used to describe the seasons (e.g. Heraclitus, *Frag.* 100, Diels-Kranz, I, 173; Diog. Laert. 9, 10; Plato, *Leg.* 889b), above all spring (Homer, *Il.* 2, 468 and 471; 6, 148) and summer (Simonides in *Griechische Lyrik*, *RK* 140–142, 45), but also winter (Xen., *Frag.* 22, Diels-Kranz, I, 134). Finally, there is the personification of the Horae, the goddesses of the seasons, who guard the heavenly gates of Olympus (Homer, *Il.* 5, 749; 7, 393 and 433; 21, 450).

Contemplation of nature and specifically of spring can arouse one's consciousness of transience and direct one's thoughts to "the last hour" (cf. Soph., *OC* 103; cf. Mimnermos in *Griechische Lyrik*, *RK* 85, "Like the leaves on the trees matured by the bloom of spring . . . we too are only permitted the blossoms of youthful joy for a short time"). In contrast to this, there is the summons to act in conformity with one's age and so to make use of the given "hour" (cf. Timon of Phlius: *hōrē erān, hōrē de gamein, hōrē de pepausthai*, "kiss in good time, marry in good time and give up in good time," *Anthologia Graeca*, X, 38).

hōra comes relatively near our notion of hour, when the cock which announces the hour is spoken of (Diog. Laert., 8, 34). On the whole, however, the "hour" (in the sense of a measurement of chronological time) does not play any part in early Greek thought.

With the prepositions *en* and *eis*, *hōra* means at the right time, early, in good time (cf. e.g. Pindar, *Ol.* 6, 28: "I must come to Pitana today in good time").

2. The adj. *hōraios*, belonging to *hōra*, and used since Hesiod, means appropriate to the season, at the right time (Hdt., 4, 28). In connexion with the timely occurrence of happy events, *hōraios* can take on the meaning of agreeable, lovely and finally beautifully formed (cf. LXX Deut. 33:13 f., 16 with *hōra* in this meaning of *hōraios*).

OT The noun *hōra* is found some 50 times in the LXX, chiefly for the noun *ʿēṯ*, time, but also for 5 other Heb. nouns; *hōraios* some 25 times for 8 different Heb. expressions.

1. *hōra* serves initially to indicate a somewhat indeterminate period of time (as well as *hēmera*, day, e.g. Dan. 12:13). Even where, as in Dan. 4:16 (Theodotion)

hōra is accompanied by an ordinal number it could scarcely be an hour of 60 minutes that is in question. Rather, Belshazzar was numb with terror for some while. "A division of day and night into hours was not known in ancient times ... only general designations such as 'in the morning', 'at midday', 'in the evening' (Gen. 3:8; 18:1; 1 Sam. 11:11); a sundial is mentioned for the first time in Isa. 38:8 (2 Ki. 20:9–11)" (W. Rordorf, *BHHW* II 1275). In Neh. 8:3 the morning hour is mentioned. Exod. 18:22, 26 is concerned with longer periods of time. At all hours, i.e. at any time, the elected judges were to give judgment.

More frequently than periods of time *hōra* denotes a more or less restricted point of time. Where it is a matter of the prompt "execution of official, and especially of police measures" the prepositional phrase *en ekeinē tē hōrā* or *(en) autē tē hōrā* acquired the meaning of immediately, on the spot (J. Jeremias, *ZNW* 42, 1949, 215; Dan. [Theod.] 3:6; 3:15; 1 Esd. 8:62; cf. Lk. 20:19). Similarly, this formula can express temporal connexion (Est. 8:1, immediately thereupon; cf. Matt. 26:55; Lk. 2:38, of immediate effect (Dan. [Theod.] 4:30; cf. Acts 16:18; 22:13; Matt. 9:22; 15:28; 17:18) or action following without delay (Est. 9:2; cf. Lk. 24:33; Jn. 19:27; cf. Jeremias, ad loc.). Various formulae express details of time: "tomorrow at this hour" (e.g. Exod. 9:18; 10:4; Jos. 11:6; 1 Ki. 19:2; 21:6) and "a year ahead at this time" (2 Ki. 4:16 f.; Gen. 18:10, 14). In Rom. 9:9, where this passage is quoted, *hōra* is replaced by the materially synonymous *kairos*.

2. Characteristic for the OT understanding of time and thus for the use of *hōra* is faith in God as the Creator and Lord of time in all its dimensions. "Time belongs to created reality" (M. Rissi, *BHHW* III 2210). It is Yahweh who sees to it in nature that everything takes place at its appointed hour, e.g., that rain comes at the proper season (Deut. 11:14; Job 36:28; Zech. 10:1), and that the corn is ripe for harvest (Job 5:26; cf. Hos. 2:9). Even the times for driving the cattle home (Gen. 29:7) and for regular eating of meals (Ruth 2:14) are part of God's creation. He is Lord of the hour of birth (cf. Gen. 18:10, 14; 2 Ki. 4:16 f.). It is he who determines the hour of death (cf. 2 Sam. 24:15; Job 5:25), not human beings like Jezebel (1 Ki. 19:2). The praise of the divine apportionment of time for the natural processes sounds out over and over again: "The works of God are all good, they supply every need in its season [*en hōra autēs*]. None may say: This is inferior to that. For everything avails in its season [*en kairō*]" (Sir. 39:33 f.).

3. Especially important for the Israelites are God's mighty acts in history, such as when he strikes the enemies of his people at some particular hour (Jos. 11:6; Egypt with hail in Exod. 9:18 [cf. Job 38:22 f.], or with locusts in Exod. 10:4), or when he suddenly strikes terror into Belshazzar with the mysterious writing on the wall (Dan. [Theodotion] 5:5). God's word is accomplished at a stroke (Dan. [Theodotion] 4:30; cf. Dan. LXX 4:23 *eis kairon kai hōran*) or is fulfilled punctually at the predetermined hour (Gen. 21:1 ff. with reference to Gen. 18:10, 14; and 2 Ki. 4:16 ff.). When some hoped-for intervention by God is still outstanding, temptation can arise, as in Job 24:1: "Why are not times of judgment kept by the Almighty, and why do those who know him never see his days?"

The remembrance of God's saving activity in history is to be kept alive at fixed festal hours in the cult (Exod. 13:10). The children of Israel are thus to keep the Passover at the appointed "hour" (Num. 9:2). The chronological concept of hours, which later played such a large rôle in Christian liturgy, is approached most closely

by the mention of "the hour of the evening sacrifice" in Dan. [Theodotion] 9:21. But in the OT as a whole, the temporal sense of *hōra* recedes behind that fullness of content which is effected by Yahweh or related to God in the cult.

4. In later Jewish writings *hōra*, like other temporal concepts, acquired a strong eschatological and apocalyptic stress. Like the "day of the Lord", so the *hōra kairou*, "hour of time", (Dan. LXX 8:17, 19) or the *hōra synteleias* "hour of consummation" (Dan. LXX 11:40, 45) refers to the events of the last days when God will come with accompanying cosmic phenomena, in order to punish the godless in the judgment and to lead the righteous to everlasting salvation. Therefore Sirach urges: "Before judgment examine thyself, and in the hour of visitation [*en hōra episkopēs*] thou shalt find forgiveness" (Sir. 18:20). For the individual's hour of death there is the promise of Sir. 11:22: "The blessing of God is the portion of the righteous; in a speedy time [*en hōra tachinē*] his hope shall flourish." With regard to the godless Sir. 11:27 states: "An evil time [*kakōsis hōras*] causeth forgetfulness of delights."

NT By comparison with the LXX *hōra* is used almost twice as often in the NT. The instances accumulate in the Gospels (76 times, including 26 in Jn.) and Rev. (20 times). *hōra* occurs seven times in Paul. The adj. *hōraios* is found 4 times.

1. (a) Linked with ordinal numbers *hōra* serves to fix any events chronologically in the course of the day (e.g. Matt. 20:3, 5 f., 9; Jn. 1:39; 4:6; Acts 2:15). This is especially true of particular points of time within the Passion narrative of Jesus (Jn. 19:14; Mk. 15:25, 33 f.; Matt. 27:45; Lk. 23:44) and in connexion with Jewish times of prayer in the prayer-life of the pious man (Acts 3:1; 10:3, 9, 30; for specific cultic actions; cf. also Lk. 1:10, the hour of → incense). Alongside precise indications of time of this sort, *hōra* can also be used in accord with the ancient division of the day for more imprecise designations such as "at a late hour [of the evening]" (Matt. 14:15; Mk. 6:35; 11:11). More generally still, *hōra* is used where in phrases like "up to this hour" (1 Cor. 4:11), "in that [or this] hour" (e.g. Matt. 8:13; 18:1; Lk. 7:21; 10:21; 13:31; 20:19) or "from that hour onwards" (e.g. Matt. 9:22; 15:28; 17:18) it places a particular event in a temporal relationship to something anterior, simultaneous or subsequent. The allusions to the point in time of the parousia of the Son of man are similarly generalizing (cf. Matt. 24:36; 25:13; Mk. 13:32; also in the parousia-parables Matt. 24:50; Lk. 12:46, "the master of that servant will come on a day when he does not expect him, and at an hour he does not know"). Especially vivid is the contraction of time (proposed by the use of the word *hōra*) to a single moment, embedded in greater periods of time, in the apocalyptic vision of Rev. 9:15: "So the four angels were released, who had been held ready for the hour, the day, the month, and the year, to kill a third of mankind."

(b) So far we have been dealing with more or less exact indications of time which are given by the word *hōra*, partly in the sense of → *kairos*. In another group of passages the word serves to describe limited time-spans. Analogously with temporal concepts such as year, month and day, *hōra* also means the length of time of a measurable hour. "Are there not twelve hours in the day?" (Jn. 11:9; cf. Josephus, *War* 6, 1, 7). The last of the labourers to be hired worked only one hour (Matt. 20:3, 5, 6, 12). The disciples could not stay awake one hour (Matt. 26:40; cf. Lk. 23:44; Acts 5:7; 10:30; 19:34, two hours). In general, an hour is felt to be relatively short.

This is also shown in those places where the thought is obviously not simply of a space of time of sixty minutes (Jn. 5:35; 1 Thess. 2:17; Phlm. 15; cf. also Rev. 18:10, 17, 19, of Babylon's judgment which comes very quickly). Now and then in connexion with *hōra* longer periods of time can be in mind (cf. 1 Cor. 15:30).

2. (a) Like other biblical temporal concepts, *hōra* also acquires its decisive importance from its content, from the event which has been, is being or will be enacted at a particular hour. Admittedly, it is by no means irrelevant to the authors of the NT when something took place, but even more significant for them is what invests the particular unit of time with its essential quality. This is already the case in the general human context. In a woman's life it is the sudden change from pain to joy which gives its own value to the hour in which she gives birth to a child (Jn. 16:21).

(b) Much more far-reaching in their force of statement are the individual hours within Jesus' life-time. Again and again the evangelists point to particular periods of time in which things happen to or through Jesus which reveal his incomparable majesty and authority. There is, for instance, the hour in which God's messenger, as it were, legitimates himself for the benefit of the doubting John the Baptist by means of healing miracles (Lk. 7:21 ff.; for further hours of the Saviour cf. Matt. 8:13; 9:22; 15:28; 17:18; Jn. 4:52 f.). It is Jn. above all who stresses over and over again that such miraculous → signs are not intended to serve Jesus' self-glorification but to point to God the Father. For the → glory of God (*doxa tou theou*) to shine out, Jesus must wait for the right hour, the *kairos*. This is true of Jesus' miraculous actions (cf. Jn. 2:4) as it is of his suffering (cf. Jn. 7:30; 8:20; 13:1). When the "hour" of his arrest, his death and his return to the Father is impending (Jn. 13:1), Jesus uses the remaining time (according to Jn.'s account) for table-fellowship with his disciples in order – yet again and as it were by way of summary – to express his love in the symbolic action of the foot-washing and the farewell discourse.

The degree to which all the prominent hours of Jesus' life aim to manifest God's glory is perhaps shown most clearly in the Johannine account of the → transfiguration. The "hour" of suffering, which Jesus dreads and yet recognizes to be in accord with the will of the Father (Jn. 12:27), is illuminated by God in a unique way. In answer to Jesus' prayer that the Father will glorify his name, a voice from heaven declares: "I have glorified it, and I will glorify it again" (Jn. 12:28). This means that Jesus is confirmed as the Lord, the One over whom the spirits will divide in the future, as during his life-time (Jn. 5:24 ff.). "This is why the coming of Jesus is the judgment: it is precisely the historical figure of Jesus, precisely his human history that has become the eschatological event by means of the *hōra* of *doxasthēnai*" (R. Bultmann, *The Gospel of John*, 1971, 493 f.).

3. As well as the general temporal and christological passages, eschatological conceptions of time play an important part in the NT. From the Gospels to Rev. there becomes apparent, alongside belief in the hour which is filled with meaning by Christ, the expectation of a still-awaited *hōra eschatē*, a last hour, which, after a while of eschatological terrors (cf. Jn. 16:2, 32; Rev. 3:10) will run into the final hour of → judgment (Rev. 14:7; cf. 14:15; Jn. 5:24 ff.). Nobody, not even Jesus, is able to give exact indications of "day and hour" (Mk. 13:32; Matt. 24:36, 44, 50; 25:13), for the "last hour" will break in suddenly like a thief (Lk. 12:39 f., 46; Rev. 3:3). But for this very reason one must stay awake and ready (Rom. 13:11) and be careful to increase one's vigilance for the "signs of the times" (Matt. 16:3; cf. Lk. 12:56).

1 Jn. 2:18 can even say that the "last hour [*eschatē hōra*]" has come. When it became clear that the parousia was being delayed, there still remained the task of handling every particular present hour (the Now) in the right way, grasping it as time given by God and realizing the possibilities that lay within it. This was the case both in the ethical responsibility of every-day life (cf. Rom. 13:11 ff.) and in the testing of times of persecution, for which Jesus had already sought to prepare his disciples (Jn. 16:1 ff.). To those who have to answer for their faith in court Jesus promised in particular the assistance of his Spirit (Matt. 10:19; cf. Mk. 13:11; Lk. 12:12), so that even the "hour" of their trial can serve to glorify God.

To sum up, *hōra*, like other units of time, is understood in the NT as time which is given and filled by God. Thus right up to the "final hour" (*eschatē hōra*), the "hour of Jesus" gives all men's hours their sense and their definition as hours of decision in the realm of faith and of testing in the realm of ethics. *H.-C. Hahn*

→ Darkness, Night, → Fullness, → Goal, → Present, Day, → Promise, → Sabbath

(a). J. Barr, *Biblical Words for Time*, *SBT* 33, 1962; K. Barth, *CD* I, 2, 45–121; II, 1, 409 ff., 417 ff., 465 ff., 592 ff., 625 ff.; *CD* III, 2, 437–640; *CD* IV, 1, 286 ff., 318 ff., 725–39; E. Bickerman, *Chronology of the Ancient World*, 1968; T. Boman, *Hebrew Thought Compared with Greek*, 1960; S. G. F. Brandon, *Time and Mankind: An Historical and Philosophical Study of Man's Attitude to the Phenomena of Change*, 1951; and *History, Time and Deity*, 1965; H. E. Brunner, "The Christian Understanding of Time", *SJT* 4, 1951, 1–12; J. E. Bruns, "The Use of Time in the Fourth Gospel", *NTS* 13, 1966–67, 285–90; R. Bultmann, *History and Eschatology: The Presence of Eternity*, Gifford Lectures 1955, 1957; H. J. Cadbury, "Some Lucan Expressions of Time", *JBL* 82, 1963, 276 ff.; F. W. Camfield, "Man in his Time", *SJT* 3, 1950, 127–48; G. I. Capaldi, "The Fullness of Time", *SJT* 25, 1972, 197–216; J. V. L. Casserley, *Toward a Theology of History*, 1965; H. Conzelmann, *The Theology of St Luke*, 1960; O. Cullmann, *Christ and Time: The Primitive Conception of Time and History*, 1951; and *Salvation in History*, 1967; D. Daube, *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*, Jordan Lectures, 1956, 406–17; G. Delling, *kairos*, etc., *TDNT* III 455–64; and *hōra*, *TDNT* IX 675–81; R. C. Dentan, ed., *The Idea of History in the Ancient Near East*, 1965; F. W. Dillistone, "The Church and Time", *SJT* 6, 1953, 156–64; G. Ebeling, "Time and Word", in J. M. Robinson, ed., *The Future of Our Religious Past: Essays in Honour of Rudolf Bultmann*, 1971, 247–66 (partial ET of E. Dinkler, ed., op. cit. under (b)); F. V. Filson, *"Yesterday": A Study of Hebrews in the Light of Chapter 13*, *SBT* Second Series 4, 1967; J. Finegan, *Handbook of Biblical Chronology: Principles of Time Reckoning in the East and Problems of Chronology in the Bible*, 1964; E. Fuchs, *sēmeron*, *TDNT* VI 269–75; and "Jesus' Understanding of Time", in *Studies of the Historical Jesus*, *SBT* 42, 1964, 104–66; M. Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 1962; and *On Time and Being*, 1972; E. Jenni, "Time", *IDB* IV 643–49; E. Käsemann, "An Apologia for Primitive Christian Eschatology", in *Essays on New Testament Themes*, *SBT* 41, 1964, 169–95; and "On the Subject of Primitive Christian Apocalyptic", in *New Testament Questions of Today*, 1969, 108–37; W. G. Kümmel, *Promise and Fulfilment: The Eschatological Message of Jesus*, *SBT* 23, 1961[2]; J. McIntyre, *The Christian Doctrine of History*, 1957; J. Manek, "The Biblical Concept of Time and our Gospels", *NTS* 6, 1959–60, 45–51; J. Marsh, *The Fulness of Time*, 1952; and "Time", in A. Richardson, ed., *A Theological Word Book of the Bible*, 1950, 258–67; P. S. Minear, "The Time of Hope in the New Testament", *SJT* 6, 1953, 337–51; and *Eyes of Faith*, 1946; J. Mole, " 'Time' as a New Apologetic", *SJT* 11, 1958, 150–57; C. F. D. Moule, "The Influence of Circumstances on Eschatological Terms", *JTS* New Series 15, 1964, 1–15; J. Muilenburg, "The Biblical View of Time", *HTR* 54, 1961, 225–71; A. Murtonen, "The Chronology of the Old Testament", *StTh* 8, 1954, 133–37; P. Neuenzeit, "Time", *EBT* III 911–15; D. E. Nineham, *et al.*, *Historicity and Chronology in the New Testament*, *SPCK Theological Collections* 6, 1965; M. P. Nilsson, *Primitive Time Reckoning*, 1920; M. Noth, "History and the Word of God in the Old Testament", in *The Laws in the Pentateuch and Other Studies*, 1966, 179–93; and "The Understanding of History in Old Testament Apocalyptic", ibid., 194–214; G. Ogg, *The Chronology of the Public Ministry of Jesus*, 1940; and *The Chronology of the Life of Paul*, 1968; W. Pannenberg, ed., *Revelation as History*, 1969; G. von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, II, 1965, 99–125; M. Rissi, *The Future of the*

World: An Exegetical Study of Revelation 19.11–22.15, *SBT* Second Series 23, 1972; J. A. T. Robinson, *In the End God . . .*, (1950) 1968[2]; and *The Redating of the New Testament*, 1976; J. M. Robinson and J. B. Cobb, eds., *Theology as History*, *New Frontiers in Theology*, III, 1967; H. J. Rose, "Time-Reckoning", *OCD*, 1075 f.; H. Sasse, *aiōn, aiōnios*, *TDNT* I 195–209; N. H. Snaith, "Time in the Old Testament", in F. F. Bruce, ed., *Promise and Fulfilment: Essays Presented to S. H. Hooke*, 1963, 175–86; G. Stählin, *nyn (arti)*, *TDNT* IV 1106–23; P. Tillich, *The Eternal Now*, 1963; T. F. Torrance, *Space, Time and Incarnation*, 1969; S. J. De Vries, *Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow: Time and History in the Old Testament*, 1975; J. Wilch, *Time and Event: An Exegetical Study of ʿēth in the Old Testament in Comparison to Other Experiences in Clarification of the Concept of Time*, 1969; A. Willingale, "Time in the Bible", *Faith and Thought* 96, 1967, 25–53.

(b). W. Anz, "Zeit", *RGG*[3] VI 1880 ff.; G. Bilfinger, *Die antiken Stundenangaben*, 1888; H. Blauert, *Die Bedeutung der Zeit in der johanneischen Theologie*, (Dissertation, Tübingen) 1953; K. Bornhäuser, *Tage und Stunden im Neuen Testament*, 1937; P. Brunner, "Die Zeit im christlichen Glauben", in *Pro Ecclesia*, II, 1966, 50–59; G. Delling, *Das Zeitverständnis des Neuen Testaments*, 1940; and *Zeit und Endzeit*, *BSt* 58, 1970; E. Dinkler and H. Thyen, eds., *Zeit und Geschichte. Dankesgabe an Rudolf Bultmann zum 80. Geburtstag*, 1964 (extracts translated in J. M. Robinson, ed., op. cit. under (a)); E. von Dobschütz, Zeit und Raum im Denken des Urchristentums", *JBL* 41, 1922, 212–23; U. Duchrow, "Der sogenannte psychologische Zeitbegriff Augustins im Verhältnis zur physikalischen und geschichtlichen Zeit", *ZTK* 63, 1966, 267 ff.; H. Eibl, "Das Problem der Zeit bei den alten Denkern", *Archiv für systematische Philosophie*, 1923, 67 ff., 153 ff.; W. Eichrodt, "Offenbarung und Geschichte im Alten Testament", *ThZ* 4, 1948, 321–31; and "Heilserfahrung und Zeitverständnis im Alten Testament", *ThZ* 12, 1956, 103 ff.; K. Galling, "Das Rätsel der Zeit im Urteil Kohelets (Koh. 3, 1–15)", *ZTK* 58, 1961, 1 ff.; K. Goldammer and W. Anz, "Ewigkeit", *RGG*[3] II 810 ff.; E. Jenni, "Das Wort *ʿōlām* im Alten Testament", *ZAW* 64, 1952, 197–248; ibid. 65, 1953, 1–35; *ʿōlām*, *THAT* II 228–43; and *ʿēt*, *THAT* II 370–86; J. Jeremias, *"En ekeinē tē hora, (en) autē tē hora"*, *ZNW* 42, 1949, 214–17; M. Kähler, "Zeit und Ewigkeit", *Dogmatische Zeitfragen*, III, 1913; G. Klein, "Die Prüfung der Zeit (Lc. 12, 54–56)", *ZTK* 61, 1964, 373 ff.; F. Kümmel, *Über den Begriff der Zeit*, 1962; C. Lackeit, *Aion, Zeit und Ewigkeit in Sprache und Religion der Griechen*, (Dissertation, Königsberg) 1916; J. Lebram, "Die Weltreiche der jüdischen Apokalyptik", *ZNW* 55, 1964, 143 ff.; W. Michaelis, "Reich Gottes und Äonenwende in der Verkündigung Jesu", in *Neutestamentliche Aufsätze*, Festschrift J. Schmid, 1963, 161 ff.; J. Mouroux, *Eine Theologie der Zeit*, 1965; C. Mugler, "Le Retour éternel et le Temps linéaire dans la Pensée Grecque", *Bulletin de l'Association G. Budde* 25, 1966, 405–19; P. Neuenzeit, "Biblische Zeitvorstellungen", in V. Berning, P. Neuenzeit and H. R. Schlette, eds., *Geschichtlichkeit und Offenbarungswahrheit*, 1964, 37–65; C. von Orelli, *Die hebräischen Synonyma der Zeit und Ewigkeit genetisch und sprachvergleichend dargestellt*, 1871; E. Otto, "Altägyptische Zeitvorstellungen und Zeitbegriffe", *Die Welt als Geschichte* 14, 1954, 135–48; F. Pfister, "Kairos und Symmetrie", Festgabe für H. Bulle, *Würzburger Studien zur Altertumswissenschaft* 13, 1938, 131–50; G. Pidoux, "À Propos de la Notion biblique du Temps", *Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie* 3, 1952, 120–25; G. Quispel, "Zeit und Geschichte im antiken Christentum", *Eranos-Jahrbuch*, 1951, 115 ff.; C. H. Ratschow, "Anmerkungen zur theologischen Auffassung des Zeitproblems", *ZTK* 51, 1954, 360–87; R. Rendtorff, "Geschichte und Wort im Alten Testament", *EvTh* 22, 1962, 621 ff.; M. Rissi, *Zeit und Geschichte in der Offenbarung des Johannes*, 1952; and "Zeit", *BHHW* III 2210 ff.; G. Rosenkranz, "Fernöstliches und christliches Zeit- und Geschichtsverständnis", in *Religionswissenschaft und Theologie*, 1964, 162 ff.; H. Sasse, *Aiōn erchomenos*, (Dissertation, Berlin) 1923; G. Sauter, *Zukunft und Verheissung. Das Problem der Zukunft in der gegenwärtigen theologischen und philosophischen Diskussion*, 1965; J. Schmidt, *Der Ewigkeitsbegriff im Alten Testament*, 1940; W. H. Schütte, "Tod Gottes und Fülle der Zeit", *ZTK* 66, 1969, 62 ff.; M. Sekine, "Erwägungen zur hebräischen Zeitauffassung", *Supplements to VT* 9, 1963, 66–82; A. Strobel, *Kerygma und Apokalyptik*, 1967; M. Vereno, "Zeit", in M. Schmaus and A. Läpple, eds., *Wahrheit und Zeugnis*, 1964, 860 ff.; A. Vögtle, "Zeit und Zeitüberlegenheit im biblischen Verständnis", in *Zeit und Zeitlichkeit*, 1961, 99 f. (reprinted in J. B. Bauer, ed., *Weltverständnis im Glauben*, 1965, 224–53); W. Vollborn, *Studien zum Zeitverständnis des Alten Testaments*, 1951; O. Weber, "Zeit und Ewigkeit", *EKL* III 1888 ff.; H.-D. Wendland, *Geschichtsanschauung und Geschichtsbewusstsein im Neuen Testament*, 1938.

Tithe

δεκάτη

ἀποδεκατεύω (*apodekateuō*), give a tithe, give one tenth; ἀποδεκατόω (*apodekatoō*), give a tithe or tenth, collect a tithe; δέκατος (*dekatos*), tenth; δεκατόω (*dekatoō*), collect or pay a tithe, tenth; δεκάτη (*dekatē*), tenth, tithe.

OT 1. *Definition.* "Tithe" translates Hebrew and Greek words that mean "a tenth," or "to take or give a tenth" of something (Heb. *maʿăśēr*, a tithe; cf. *ʿeśer*, ten; Gk. *deka*, ten; → Number). The tenth was usually of the produce of the ground and was considered that part of the whole due from a worshipper to his God for the support of the God's sanctuary and its priests.

2. *Origin.* When and why the fraction, one tenth, was chosen for the sacred "tax" is unclear. All that can be said as to when is that the custom is very old and widespread, possibly antedating Israel's history, not confined to Semitic peoples but including Indo-Germanic peoples as well.

The apparent reason why a tenth was adopted may have to do with the ancient system of counting by tens, a system made easy by the ten fingers and toes common to mankind. But the tithe may also have been selected because of the views about number that the ancients had. Not only was ten a favourite round number that could be greater or less according to the circumstances (Gen. 31:7), but seemingly it was also a sacred number made up of two other specially sacred numbers – three and seven. Note how many times in the OT the number ten figures in holy matters: the clauses, "and God said", "and God saw", "and God blessed", in Gen. 1 occur ten, seven and three times respectively, hardly by coincidence; there are ten patriarchs mentioned before the flood (Gen. 5) and ten mentioned after it (Gen. 11:10–30); ten was used in measuring Noah's ark (Gen. 6:15) and frequently in measuring and furnishing the tabernacle (Exod. 26; → Tent); ten is also prominent in apocalyptic symbolism (Dan., Rev.), and Matthew sees Jesus' messianic power proven by ten miracles (Matt. 8–9).

3. *The Tithe in Secular Literature.* Although the tithe formed an important part of Israelite culture, it was nevertheless not unique to that culture. Extra-biblical literature indicates that the tithe was employed in many places. Sometimes it was a strictly political matter, a tax paid by the people to their king or one imposed on conquered nations by the conqueror (Diod. Sic., 20, 14).

More often, however, it was a combination of the secular with the sacred. In Babylon during the reign of Nebuchadnezzar II, a tithe from the land was paid to the temple by all, including the king, while at the same time Babylonian kings took a tithe of all imports (C. H. W. Johns, *Babylonian and Assyrian Laws, Contracts and Letters*, 1904, xi, 205–206). Persian satraps also demanded a tithe of imports (Aristot., *Oecon.* 134b; 135b). Yet Cyrus, the Persian, made his soldiers give a tenth of their spoils to Zeus (Hdt., 1, 89). Pausanias (2nd century A.D.) gives many examples from Greece and Rome of a tithe as a tax on land which occasionally was dedicated to the gods.

There are also numerous examples in secular literature of the tithe being solely a sacred matter, a sacrifice due to the deity alone: Agamemnon conquered Mycenae and dedicated a tenth to the gods (Diod. Sic., 11, 65). On conquering the Etruscans, the Liparians were said to have dedicated a tithe of the spoils at Delphi (*ibid.* 5, 9;

Hdt., 7, 132; see W. H. D. Rouse, "Tithes (Greek)", *ERE* XII 350–51, for abundant additional evidence of tithing among the Greeks).

4. *Tithing in the OT.* The concept of the tithe in the OT seems to have developed as time went on and as Israelite society became more complex. Very early in the record Abram gave → Melchizedek a tenth of everything (Gen. 14:20), but this was of the spoils of war, not the produce of the land, and there is no mention of any law demanding this of Abram, nor is there any explanation as to why he gave it. Jacob, too, vowed to give a tithe to God (Gen. 28:22). Again, Jacob's tithe apparently was a spontaneous thought, a promise to thank God conditional on God's prospering him and bringing him back home again safely. But there are no details as to why it was a tenth or how this tithe would be given or who would receive it in God's behalf.

It is strange that there is no mention of the tithe in the great law code contained in Exodus, but laws governing the giving of the first fruits of the land are (Exod. 23:16, 19; 34:22–26). The first of the crop, etc., and presumably the best, was sacrificed to God, probably in recognition that all things belong primarily to him (Deut. 26:10). It is possible, then, that the gift of first fruits was the forerunner of the tithe, and that the term "tithe" was introduced because it was necessary to fix precisely the amount of first fruits to be brought. But this question about the relation of the first fruits to the tithe cannot be answered unequivocally because the biblical texts seem both to equate them (Deut. 26:1–15) and to distinguish between them (Neh. 12:44).

It is difficult also to reconstruct precisely the history surrounding the term tithe. Presumably, however, it could be as follows.

(a) From the beginning the tithe of the land's produce – seed, fruit trees, etc. – was recognized as belonging in some unique way to the Lord. It was "holy to the LORD" (Lev. 27:30–32). At first it was treated as a personal offering of grain, wine, oil, etc. Annually a person was required to bring his tithe to some designated place and eat it there in company with his sons, daughters, servants and the Levites who happened to be present (Deut. 12:6, 11, 17). If the journey to this designated place was too far, the tithe could be turned into money and the money brought to be spent there on whatever the appetite craved. There the offerer with his household and the → Levite was to eat before the Lord and rejoice (Deut. 14:22–29; 15:19–23). Note that the Levite was included in this annual tithe-feast, but nowhere is there a hint in these texts that the tithe was exclusively for him. Rather it was primarily for the enjoyment of the landowner and his family.

(b) As time passed, Israelite society developed and its social problems increased. To help solve these problems laws governing the tithe were modified. Now the tithe of the land's produce was offered to God in a new way. Every third year the tithe, instead of being taken away from home and consumed by the offerer himself in some distant place, was stored up within local communities and used to meet the material needs of Levite, sojourner, orphan and widow in and around that community (Deut. 14:28; 26:12).

(c) Gradually Israel's cultus grew. The number of Levites and priests multiplied. Since these people had been given no land by which to support themselves, maintenance of them and the sanctuary had to come from the gifts of the people. As the number of Levites and priests increased as well as that of the accoutrements of the sanctuary, a tithe only every three years was insufficient. Hence, the law of the tithe

appears like this: God has given to the sons of Levi *every* tithe in Israel for an inheritance (Num. 18:21). It now seems that annual tithing was strictly for the support of the Levites, the priests and the house of God. The Levites themselves saw to the collection of the tithes from all the rural towns and the priest, Aaron's descendant, accompanied them on their rounds. From the tithe that the Levites collected they gave a tenth to the priest (Num. 18:28; Neh. 10:32–39) and in return the Levites and the priest served in the sanctuary.

On more than one occasion Israel neglected its obligation with regard to the tithe. Consequently the Levites had to leave the sanctuary for the fields in order to support themselves by tilling the soil, and the sanctuary fell into disrepair. Reforms took place under Hezekiah (2 Chr. 31:5 f.), Nehemiah (Neh. 13:12) and Malachi (Mal. 3:8, 10) so that the people once more gave their proper tithe, the sanctuary was restored and the priests and Levites were able to give themselves wholly to the Law of the Lord once again.

5. *The Tithe in Hellenistic and later Judaism.* The tithe in the period of Hellenistic Judaism was still the chief source of income for the priests and Levites though, as in the OT, left to the conscience of the tax payer, the tithe often was not paid. On occasion, therefore, greedy high priests made sure they received their due by sending bands of desperados to take the tithe on the threshing floors. The peasant was considered untrustworthy to discharge this important religious responsibility (Josephus, *Ant.* 20, 181; 20, 206 f.). In the late pre-Christian and early Christian centuries the tithe was augmented by a kind of poll tax for the support of the temple and its ministers – an annual half shekel (Matt. 17:24; Josephus, *Ant.* 18, 9, 1; Mishnah tractate Shekalim, but cf. also Exod. 30:11–16) – was collected not only from the Jews in Palestine but from those of the Diaspora as well. (This latter extension of the tax to include people outside of Palestine was a rabbinical innovation.) After the destruction of the temple the rabbis still stressed the importance of tithing. They viewed it as one of the three elements through whose merit the world was created (Gen. R. 1, 6), and as the means by which Israelites escape the lot of the wicked (*Jewish Encyclopedia*, XII, 151b).

6. *Meaning of the Tithe.* Underlying the giving of the tithe was the basic idea that "the earth is the LORD's and all that is in it" (Ps. 24:1). To give a tenth, therefore, meant to acknowledge in a tangible way the Lord's ownership of the land and its produce. Hence, Judah's failure to do this was tantamount to robbing God (Mal. 3:8, 10), not of the material things themselves – these already belonged to God (Ps. 50:10) – but of the recognition that these material things belonged to him and were exclusively his. Man's possessions were seen as gifts given by God, the proper response to which was gratitude. Tithing, then, came to mean also an expression of thanks to God for his generosity (cf. Gen. 28:20–22). Finally, the effect of tithing meant that the Levites and priests could be supported and the poor provided with food. Tithing was viewed, therefore, as God's way of involving his people in his own redemptive activity, in his own immense concern for the poor and destitute. Just as God had shared his blessings with his people, so they who received them must share them with people less fortunate. Hence, religious leaders repeatedly reminded the Israelites of the importance of tithing: to give the tithe would bring divine blessing; to withhold it, divine cursing (Ezek. 44:30 ff.; Mal. 3:8, 10).

NT 1. *The Tithe in the NT.* Since the tithe played such an important part in the OT and in Judaism contemporary with early Christianity, it is surprising to discover that never once is tithing mentioned in any of the instructions given to the church. Jesus mentions → scribes and → Pharisees who tithe (Matt. 23:33 par. Lk. 11:42; 18:12), but he never commanded his disciples to tithe. The writer to the Hebrews refers to Abraham paying tithes to → Melchizedek and Levi paying his tithe to Melchizedek through Abraham (Heb. 7:2, 5), but he never taught his readers to follow their example. Paul writes about sharing material → possessions to care for the needs of the → poor (1 Cor. 16:1–3; 2 Cor. 8–9; Eph. 4:28) and to sustain the Christian ministry (1 Cor. 9). He urges and commends generosity (2 Cor. 9:6; 8:1–5) but never once does he demand, as a command from God, that any specific amount be given.

Paul, however, did demand (*diatassein*) of his churches that collections (*logeiai*) be taken for the saints, i.e. for the Christians in the mother church at Jerusalem (1 Cor. 16:1–3; 2 Cor. 8:4; 9:1, 12). Since the word *logeia*, used here, can mean a collection of → taxes as well as voluntary contributions collected at worship for charity (Liddell-Scott, 1055; A. Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East*, 1927 [3], 105), it might be assumed that Paul's choice of this unusual word implies an official tax paid by the Pauline churches to the poor (a technical term for "the saints") in Jerusalem in recognition of Jerusalem's status as headquarters for the church universal (see K. Holl, "Der Kirchenbegriff des Paulus in seinem Verhältnis zu der Urgemeinde", *Neue Jahrbücher des klassischen Altertums*, 33, 1914, 521–56). This would be similar to the poll tax paid annually to the temple by faithful Jews who lived outside as well as inside of Palestine, and very like the tithe in concept.

Yet the fact that Paul uses *logeia* only twice (1 Cor. 16:1 f.), a word that could be construed as a technical fiscal term, and quickly substitutes for it a devotional expression (*charis*, 1 Cor. 16:3), and the fact that the collection Paul was concerned with was actually for the support of the *socially* poor in Jerusalem (cf. Rom. 15:26) argues against such an assumption. All of Paul's special vocabulary about giving (*charis*, → grace, 1 Cor. 16:3; *koinōnia*, → fellowship, 2 Cor. 8:4; *diakonia*, service, 2 Cor. 8:4; 9:1; *eulogia*, praise, blessing, 2 Cor. 9:5), and his explicit teaching on the subject (Rom. 15:25–28; 1 Cor. 9:8–18; 2 Cor. 8–9) indicate that for the Christian giving is voluntary, an act of free will, a non-compulsory sharing of his material possessions with no stipulated amount, such as a tax or tithe, demanded of him. The Christian gives as he has made up his mind to give (2 Cor. 9:7) and as God has prospered him (1 Cor. 16:2). He gives because he is aware that he is God's (Christ's) → slave (*doulos*, Rom. 6:16; 1 Cor. 7:22; Eph. 6:6; 1 Pet. 2:16); that neither he nor his possessions are really his own to use as he likes (1 Cor. 6:20); that essentially he is a steward charged with the responsible handling of his master's goods (1 Pet. 4:10) and that eventually he must account for what he has done with these goods (Rom. 14:12). He gives because he has the generosity of Christ as his model (2 Cor. 8:9) and the impelling power of God's Spirit within him as his motivation. Hence, the Christian's giving, in contrast to that of the OT saint, is not done with reluctance or compulsion (2 Cor. 9:7), nor is it limited to a tithe of each year's income. Rather it is done cheerfully, voluntarily, systematically and with open-ended generosity (1 Cor. 16:1 f.; 2 Cor. 9:6–9).

2. *Tithing in the Early Church.* In the writings of the Apostolic Fathers and the

Apologists the common words for tithing do not appear. Nevertheless, giving still continued to be an important part of early Christian worship. Justin Martyr observes that every Sunday "those who prosper and so wish, contribute, each one as much as he chooses. What is collected is deposited with the president, and he takes care of orphans and widows and those who are in want . . . and those who are in bonds and the strangers who are sojourners among us" (*I Apol.* 67; cf. also *Apost. Const.* 2, 27). Irenaeus considered tithing to be a Jewish law not required of Christians for Christians had received "liberty" and should consequently give without external constraint (*Haer.* 4, 18, 2). Origen viewed tithes as something to be far exceeded by Christians in their giving (*In Num. hom.* 11). Hence, for the early Fathers of the Church, as for the writers of the NT, the tithe was a thing of the past; a new principle for giving was guiding them now and propelling them to share – the goodness of God and the inward compulsion of the Holy Spirit.

Note that in this primitive period of the church's history, giving was still voluntary, was directly related to whether God had prospered a person or not and was chiefly for the aiding of the poor. Little or nothing is said about how the clergy and the church were sustained. Presumably they were kept going by the free will gifts of the people to whom they ministered. Later, however, tithing was reintroduced as a means of supporting the church. It was reintroduced first by instruction with the aid of such NT passages as Matt. 10:10; Lk. 10:7; 1 Cor. 9:3 f., etc., and on a voluntary basis. Eventually, however, the power of civil law was required to effect what instruction failed to accomplish. The renowned decree of Charlemagne (A.D. 785) no longer gave the people an option – they were taxed for the support of the church whether they liked it or not. *G. F. Hawthorne*

→ First, → Fruit, → Gift, → Number, → Poor, → Possessions, → Sacrifice, → Tax

H. Conzelmann, *First Corinthians*, *Hermeneia*, 1975, 294–96; A. Deissmann, *Light From the Ancient East*, 1927[3]; C. L. Feinberg, "Tithe", *ZPEB* V 756 ff.; M. Jastrow, *The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, 1898; C. H. W. Johns, *Babylonian and Assyrian Laws, Contracts and Letters*, 1904; H. Landsell, *The Sacred Tenth; Studies in the Tithe-Giving Ancient and Modern*, 1906; J. A. MacCulloch and W. H. D. Rouse, "Tithes", *ERE* XII 347–51; G. F. Moore, *Judaism* II 70 ff.; E. Schürer, *A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*, 1, 2, 181, 189 (new edition, 1, 1973, 465, 469); 2, 1, 233–48; W. R. Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, 1927[3].

Torment

βάσανος

βάσανος (*basanos*), torture, torment; βασανίζω (*basanizō*), to torture, torment; βασανισμός (*basanismos*), torturing, torment; βασανιστής (*basanistēs*), torturer.

CL *basanos* comes from the Egyptian word for a touchstone for gold (*lydia lithos*, Bacchyl. *Frag.* 14). Attested since Theognis and Pindar in cl. Gk. usage, it signifies originally a means of testing; then torture, as a means of examination; and finally, torment generally.

OT In the LXX the word-group is found mainly in 4 Macc. (20 out of 30 uses of the vb., 41 out of 61 occurrences of the noun) and in the Wisdom literature; that is to say, it is a typical word-formation of the Hellenistic epoch. Only *basanos* is found in

scattered references for Heb. words, such as *'āšām*, denoting a means of reparation for guilt, four times in 1 Sam. 6:3 f. 8, 17, which elsewhere means a guilt-offering (→ Sacrifice); *kᵉlimmâh*, shame, disgrace, in Ezek. 16:52, 54; 32:24, 30; and *miḳšôl*, a cause of sin or misfortune, in Ezek. 3:20 and 7:19. *basanos* is used concretely in Ezek. 16:52 and 54 of God's punishments of → Jerusalem, and in Ezek. 32:24, 30 of his punishment of the heathen nations. On the other hand, Wis. 3:1 says of the righteous that they are untouched by any torment.

In 2 Macc. 7:13 and often in 4 Macc. (where *basanismos*, torturing, also occurs, 9:6; 11:2) both noun and vb. are used of the tortures of Jewish martyrs (*basanos* in 4:26; 5:6; 6:27, 30; 7:2, 16; 8:9, 19; 9:5 f., 9, 16, 18; 10:11, 16; 11:1, 6, 23; 12:12; 13:15; 14:5, 8, 11; 15:11, 18–22, 32; 16:1 f., 17; 17:3, 7, 10, 23; 18:20; *basanizō* in 6:5, 10 f.; 8:2, 5, 27; 9:7, 15, 27, 30, 32; 11:16, 20; 12:4, 13; 13:27; 15:22; 16:3, 15). In Christian literature it is used of the torture of Christian martyrs (1 Clem. 6:1; 2 Clem. 17:7; Eusebius, *H.E.* 5, 1, 20 and 24). In the Christian acts of the martyrs the derivative *basanistēs*, torturer, is also found (Mart. Poly. 2, 3; cf. Eusebius, *H.E.* 5, 1, 24).

NT 1. In the NT the words are rare. *basanos* is found once in Matt. and twice in Lk.; *basanistēs* only in Matt. 18:34 for a torturer; *basanizō* 6 times in the Synoptics, 5 times in Rev., and 2 Pet. 2:8; *basanismos* only in Rev. (5 times).

(a) *basanos* in Matt. 4:24 is the physical afflictions of the sick which Jesus healed; in Lk. 16:23, 28 it is the torments which the rich man must suffer in Hades, the *topos tēs basanou*, the place of torment (on the parable see J. D. M. Derrett, "Dives and Lazarus and the Preceding Sayings", in *Law in the New Testament*, 1970, 78–99; → Judgment; → Punishment).

(b) The vb. *basanizō* (used as *basanos*) has in the NT the general meaning of to torment, to oppress; the servant of the centurion from Capernaum was tormented by his sickness (Matt. 8:6); the demons were afraid that Jesus would torment them (Matt. 8:29 par. Mk. 5:7; Lk. 8:28); the disciples on the sea were hard pressed by the wind and waves (Matt. 14:24; Mk. 6:48). 2 Pet. 2:8 depicts how righteous Lot felt his soul tortured by his observation of the dissolute activities of the people of Sodom. The vision of Rev. 12:2 mentions the labour-pains (*basanizomenē tekein*) of the mother of the Christ child. Only in Rev. is *basanizō* used of the torments which are the consequence of the divine → judgment (Rev. 9:5; 11:10; 14:10); in particular, Rev. 20:10 describes the eternal torments which the divine judgment brings to the anti-Christian powers, to → Satan, the beast (→ Animal, art. *thērion*) and the false → prophet.

2. The word *basanismos* is found five times in Rev. In the active sense it is used of the torments which are occasioned after the fifth trumpet by the eschatological locusts (Rev. 9:5); it has a passive sense in Rev. 14:11 and 18:7 ff. In Rev. 14:11 those who worship the beast are threatened by the angel with eternal torment. Rev. 18:7, 10, 15 deal with the *basanismos* which → "Babylon the harlot", i.e. the anti-Christian metropolis under judgment, must undergo. The connexion with the judgments which God issues at the end of time is everywhere clear.

W. Mundle

κολαφίζω

κολαφίζω (*kolaphizō*), strike with the fist; πληγή (*plēgē*), beating.

The word *kolaphizō*, to strike with the fist, is found neither in cl. Gk. nor in the LXX. It is found only in Christian literature, and only 5 times in the NT (Matt., Mk., 1 Cor., and 1 Pet.). It is derived from *kolaphos*, a blow with the fist, which, though attested from Hippocrates onwards, does not occur in the NT.

1. (a) In the passion narrative at Matt. 26:27 and Mk. 14:65 *kolaphizō* is to be understood literally; in a more general sense the word refers to the blows and maltreatments to which not only the apostle Paul was often subjected during his missionary work, but also other Christians, in times of persecution (1 Cor. 4:11; 1 Pet. 2:20). Paul mentions *plēgai*, beatings, of this kind in his career as an apostle (2 Cor. 6:5; 11:23). *kolaphizō* accordingly means the same as *epitithēmi plēgas* (Acts 16:23; cf. Lk. 10:30), to inflict blows.

(b) The word *plēgē* which is more commonly used in secular Gk. and the LXX can also denote the wound which results from a blow (Isa. 1:6; Jer. 10:19; Rev. 13:3, 14), and also the blows which come from God, i.e. his punishments (Exod. 11:1; 13:13). In 1 Sam. 4:8 *plēgē* denotes the plagues in → Egypt; Rev. 9:18, 20; 11:16; 15:1, 6, 8; 16:9, 21; 18:4, 8; 21:9; 22:18 refer to the punishments in the events of the end in which the divine wrath is consummated.

2. 2 Cor. 12:7 demands particular attention. Here the apostle is speaking, in connexion with the thorn (*skolops*) which he was given in the flesh, of the "messenger of Satan" who buffets him. In these words Paul hints at his lot of suffering which torments him painfully, but to which he was subjected in the will of God. To his prayer for release from this suffering he received from the Lord the comforting reply which we read in 2 Cor. 12:9: "My grace is sufficient for you, for my power is made perfect in weakness."

The question as to the nature of this suffering has received much attention from commentators. The older interpretation, in particular, thought of persecutions, spiritual temptations and painful hindrances to his missionary work which struck the apostle. More recent exegesis suggests some event or sickness which (cf. Job 2:6; Lk. 13:16) could have been understood by Paul as the work of a Satanic power. The diagnoses which have been suggested vary widely. At the beginning of the century the opinion was widely held that Paul was thinking here of epileptic attacks. But many other possibilities were also considered, such as hysteria, malaria, and migraine of the eyes (Gal. 4:15), to name but a few (cf. Arndt, 763 f. for details of various views and relevant literature). H. Lietzmann was strongly inclined to the view of the psychiatrist K. Bonhoeffer that Paul suffered from periodic, endogenous depressive states (*An die Korinther* I–II, *HNT* 9, 1969[5], enlarged by W. G. Kümmel, 157). However that may be, Paul's statements are not exact enough to allow definite conclusions. For further discussion → Fruit, art. *skolops*. *W. Mundle*

ὠδίνω

ὠδίνω (*ōdinō*), to travail as in giving birth; ὠδίν (*ōdin*), pain of labour.

CL The cl. authors used *ōdinō* to describe the throes of parturition, and also occasionally of animals giving birth to their young. The term claimed a wide metaphorical usage, being employed of any great anguish, hard physical work, emotional or mental strain, or ardent frustrated longing. Occasional references in the papyri reflect a general figurative usage. The noun *ōdin* constitutes a late literary form of *ōdis*, and occurs only in the LXX, the NT and one or two places in the papyri. Cl. Gk. authors used the earlier form *ōdis* to describe the pains associated with giving birth, whether among humans or animals, as well as in a metaphorical sense to refer to any kind of anguish or travail.

OT *ōdinō* occurs in the LXX, especially in Isa. (e.g. 23:4; 45:10; 51:2) to describe the pangs of childbirth. It translates the MT *ḥûl*, *ḥîl*, to writhe in childbirth, and also the intensive form of the vb. *ḥābal*, to be pregnant with (Ps. 7:15), be in travail with (Can. 8:5). All these terms were employed predominantly in a literal sense. *ōdin* occurs frequently in the LXX (e.g. Isa. 13:8; 37:3; Jer. 6:24), sometimes describing the agonies of death (e.g. 2 Ki. 22:6; Ps. 17:4 [MT 18:4]), but often in the literal context of childbirth. As such it was the equivalent of several Heb. words: *ḥîl*, labour pains; *ḥûl*, to experience labour pains; *yālaḏ*, to bear, bring forth a child; *ḥeḇel*, labour pains; *ḥalḥālâh*, anguish; *mašber*, literally *cervix uteri*; and *ṣîr*, pains, convulsions. While the Heb. words were sometimes used figuratively, the literal interpretation was always strongly represented.

NT The vb. *ōdinō* is used literally in the NT at Gal. 4:27, citing LXX Isa. 54:1, and at Rev. 12:2. The only metaphorical sense is found in Gal. 4:19. *ōdin* occurs in 1 Thess. 5:3, where the inevitable fact of labour under normal circumstances in a pregnant woman is used as a figure of the inescapable prospect of Christ's return. In both cases, even when it is expected, it is sudden in its incidence. As a metaphor of intense suffering, *ōdin* occurs in Matt. 24:8 and Mk. 13:8. In Acts 2:24 the pains of travail are associated with death (*thanatos*), reflecting the phraseology of LXX Ps. 17:5 (*ōdines thanatou*, "cords of death" RSV) and 17:6 (*ōdines hadou*, "cords of Sheol" RSV). The very thought that the messiah could remain in the grip of death is inconceivable (→ Resurrection). *R. K. Harrison*

ταλαιπωρέω

ταλαιπωρέω (*talaipōreō*), experience distress, endure hard labour; *ταλαιπωρία* (*talaipōria*), strenuous work, suffering, hardship; *ταλαίπωρος* (*talaipōros*), wretched, distress. The basic meaning of these terms is that of a miserable, distressed condition, whether of the body, mind or the environment.

CL Cl. authors used the vb. *talaipōreō* to describe those who endured hard work or who suffered distress or hardship, perhaps to the point of being worn out physically or emotionally. As can be imagined, the word lent itself readily to figurative usage. The meaning of the noun *talaipōria* varied from the concept of regular exercise or normal usage to that of hard work, hardship, or suffering, the latter including pain caused by physical diseases. The few references in the papyri refer to difficult social or environmental conditions. Cl. authors employed the adj.

talaipōros to describe people and circumstances that were wretched, unhappy and miserable, a sense which is also found in the papyri.

OT In the LXX the vb. *talaipōreō* is found principally in the prophetic literature (e.g. Isa. 33:1; Jer. 4:13, 20; 10:20), usually in its ordinary physical sense, as the equivalent of the Heb. *'āwâh*, do wrong, pervert the right, and *šāḏaḏ*, deal violently with, despoil. Devastation of a serious nature was generally envisioned in the MT, and the passive voice was used on occasions. In LXX Ps. 16:9 and Isa. 33:1 *talaipōreō* occurs in the active voice and means to distress, make weary. The noun *talaipōria* is common in the LXX (e.g. Job 5:21; Hos. 9:6; Mic. 2:4), though with rather less emphasis on the nature and extent of the destruction than the MT indicates. It renders several Heb. words: *maḥšāḵ*, lit. a dark place; *nûš*, be ill, sick; *šā'ōn*, desolate territory; *šō'âh*, trouble, *mᵉšo'âh*, desolation; *šeḵer*, to drink, be intoxicated; *šōḏ*, violence, devastation; *šāḏaḏ*, to despoil, treat violently. Consistently in the MT the troubles and difficulties, whether literal or figurative, are of a serious nature. The adj. *talaipōros* occurs in the LXX predominantly in the apocryphal writings to describe the persecutions of the Maccabean period (e.g. 2 Macc. 4:47). The MT counterpart is *šāḏaḏ*, to deal violently with, devastate, which in LXX Isa. 33:1 is rendered by *poiein talaipōrous*, to make wretched. In LXX Ps. 136:8 the related form *šᵉḏûḏâh*, the devasted one ("destroyer" NEB) occurs.

NT The vb. *talaipōreō* occurs only once in the NT (Jas. 4:9) in the middle voice, distress yourselves ("be wretched" RSV), in a call to penitence and humility. The noun *talaipōria* occurs only twice in the NT, first in Rom. 3:16, where LXX Isa. 59:7 is quoted in a section in which numerous *hapax legomena* occur, and secondly in Jas. 5:1, where the plur. form ("miseries" RSV) is used. The adj. *talaipōros* is utilized only twice (Rom. 7:24; Rev. 3:17), both instances describing a miserable, wretched condition of humanity. *R. K. Harrison*

(a). G. Bertram, *ōdin, ōdinō*, *TDNT* IX 667–74; J. D. M. Derrett, "Dives and Lazarus and the Preceding Sayings", in *Law in the New Testament*, 1970, 78–99; K. L. Schmidt, *kolaphizō*, *TDNT* III 818–21; J. Schneider, *basanos* etc., *TDNT* I 561 ff.
(b). J. Scharbert, *Der Schmerz im Alten Testament*, *Bonner Biblischer Beiträge* 8, 1955.

Touch

ἅπτω

ἅπτω/ἅπτομαι (*haptō/haptomai*), to touch.

CL In Homer the act. *haptō* has basically the meaning to fasten to, then to take hold of, kindle (i.e. to take hold of with fire). It is far more frequently found in the middle *haptomai*, touch, eat (i.e. touch food), attack (i.e. touch with hostility). In the classical writers of the 5th cent. it is used also for sexual relationships with women, and also means to seize, attack, concern oneself with (a work or philosophy) and finally to understand. Aristophanes tells ironically how the god of healing, Asclepius, healed miraculously by a touch. Other stories of healing by touch, whether by Asclepius, Serapis or other gods, come mostly from the 2nd and 3rd cent. A.D.

OT Occasionally the LXX uses *haptō* to render the Heb. *'ālâh*, to cause to mount up (e.g. a light, Exod. 30:8; cf. Tob. 8:13; or a fire, Jud. 13:13). The middle renders once each *'āhaz*, hold fast (Ezek. 41:6), *šālaḥ yāḏ*, stretch out the hand (Job 1:12), and the Aram. *šᵉlēṭ*, to have power over (Dan. 3:27). Normally, however, *haptomai* translates *qārab*, draw near, set about, go after (5 times, e.g. Num. 3:10, 38; Job 31:7) and especially *nāḡa'*, touch, meet (98 times). It is found:

1. For the touching of persons and things that have been made particularly sacred, e.g. the tree of knowledge of good and evil (Gen. 3:3), Mt. Sinai (Exod. 19:12), or in contrast the things through which one became cultically unclean, e.g. unclean animals (Lev. 11:8), corpses (Num. 19:11), tombs (Num. 19:16). More than merely external and superficial contact is implied in Gen. 20:6, which is dealing with sexual intimacy. In 2 Sam. 5:8 (where the Heb. text is questionable) and Zech. 2:8(12) it means kill or attack.

2. For the → angel's touch which lamed Jacob's thigh (Gen. 32:25) and raised Daniel up from his deep sleep (Dan. 8:18).

3. God himself touches men either to change their heart (1 Sam. 10:26) or to afflict them with illness (2 Ki. 15:5) or distress (Job 19:21).

NT 1. In the NT the active *haptō* is found 4 times and only in Luke for the kindling of light (Lk. 8:16; 11:33; 15:8) and of fire (Acts 28:2). The middle *haptomai* is used of sexual relations in 1 Cor. 7:1, of the touching of "unclean" foods in Col. 2:21 (cf. Matt. 15:11) and of demonic heathen impurity in 2 Cor. 6:17, quoting Isa. 52:11. In Lk. 7:39 we see the difference between Jesus and his host, for he does not shrink from the touch of an "unclean" woman. After his resurrection Jesus forbade Mary to touch him (Jn. 20:17). The RSV "do not hold me" and NEB "do not cling to me" are probably preferable.

2. The most frequent use of *haptomai* (30 times in all) is in the Synoptic reports of Jesus' acts of healing (→ Heal). They give a completely new connotation to the word. Isa. 6:5 ff. was fulfilled in Jesus once for all. The Lord touched, for example, the → leper so deeply and invisibly by the visible touch of his human hand, that he blotted out his impurity (Mk. 1:40 ff.). Both the form of the story and the choice of vocabulary have been assimilated to 2 Ki. 5:11–15 LXX. In healing the deaf man with an impediment in his speech, Jesus put his fingers into his ears, spat, touched his tongue and said to him "Ephphatha" (Mk. 7:33 f.); → Magic, art. *mageia* NT5. "This sequence of actions indicated to the man that he was to expect healing from the one who stood before him. The act of healing itself was accomplished with the word of liberation addressed not to the defective organs but to the man as a whole person: 'Be opened' " (W. L. Lane, *The Gospel of Mark, NLC*, 1974, 267).

3. The second and third of the three great stories of healing in Mk. 1:34; 3:10 f.; 6:56 are → miracles involving touch. Because they realized that "power came forth from him" (Lk. 6:19), the sick "pressed upon him to touch him" (Mk. 3:10) or his garment ((Matt. 9:20 f. par. Mk. 5:27–30, Lk. 8:44 f.), or even its fringe (Mk. 6:56; Matt. 14:36). Those who in faith touched even his clothes, like the one suffering from an "unclean" disease (Mk. 5:27), or those of Galilee whose diseases rendered them incapable of walking (Mk. 6:55), became well and were made whole (lit. "passed through to salvation" *diesōthēsan*, Matt. 14:36), for whether they knew it or not they had touched the form of glory and life. According to Mk. 5:30 and Lk. 8:45 f.

Jesus did not even know who had touched him, but only that "power has gone forth from me". For all that, his divine power lay open without restriction for the woman who had wanted to "steal" her cure, for she had acted in true and simple faith: "your faith" – not your touch – "has made you well" (Mk. 5:34). It should be remembered that a woman's menstrual flow was regarded as a source of uncleanness (Lev. 15:19–24; 2 Sam. 11:4), which precluded sexual intercourse (Lev. 15:19, 24; 18:19; Ezek. 22:10). A discharge of longer duration caused things which the woman touched to be unclean (Lev. 15:25–30). Hence, the woman was not only physically ill but debarred from normal human relationships. Her desire to touch the garment of Jesus may have been motivated by the thought that to touch his person under these circumstances was out of the question. Mk. and Lk. proclaim something offensive to modern thought, i.e. the power inherent in touching the Lord in faith. He alone acts and awakens in the sick person the faith to touch him. The one who does not believe touches him only superficially (Mk. 5:31) and does not experience his power. He whom Jesus touches of his own volition shares in his divine power (Mk. 9:27) and God himself turns to him.

Did the women have a presentiment of this, when, following an old Jewish custom, they brought their children to Jesus that he might – as did the scribes – bless them and pray over them (Matt. 19:13 ff. par. Mk. 10:13–16; Lk. 18:15 ff.)? Be that as it may, the account leaves no room for the concept of a magical power in a touch so often found in popular beliefs. *R. Grob*

→ Baptism, → Blood, → Heal

Transfigure, Transfiguration, Transform

μεταμορφόω

μεταμορφόω (*metamorphoō*), change into another form or image, transform.

CL The idea of transformation from one appearance or form into another is common in both Gk. and Lat. literature. Two famous Lat. works, by Ovid and by Apuleius, are called *Metamorphoses* (a transliteration from the Gk.). The former is a series of tales involving supernatural beings as well as humans, who experience different kinds of transformations. Apuleius describes, in autobiographic style, being transformed into an ass and finally being restored by the power of the goddess Isis. The latter experience illustrates the concept of religious change and release which was idealized in Hellenistic religion. It differs significantly from the NT experience of 2 Cor. 3:18 as well from that of Christ in his transfiguration.

OT There are no useful linguistic data in the OT, but two passages provide some background. In Exod. 34:29–35 the skin of Moses' face shone after his conversation with God on Mount Sinai. This experience underlies 2 Cor. 3:12–18. The vision of Dan. 10:5 f. does not involve a transformation, but does provide an apocalyptic imagery useful in the study of the description of Jesus' transfiguration. Dan. 12:3 describes the shining of the "wise" in the future resurrection. That theme is found later in the Pseudepigrapha (cf. Syr. Bar. 51:1–12).

NT The word is used four times (Matt. 17:2; Mk. 9:2; Rom. 12:2; 2 Cor. 3:18) and is apparently deliberately avoided once. This omission is in the Lucan account of

the transfiguration of Jesus, possibly because Luke did not want to use a term which could invite comparison with the pagan ideas of transformation.

1. In Matt. 17:2 and Mk. 9:2 the word is used to describe the transformation of the features (Matt. only) and clothing (Matt. and Mk.) of Christ during the transfiguration event. To understand its meaning and significance, we shall draw not only upon these two passages but also the account in Lk. 9 and the description in 2 Pet. 2. Matthew and Luke use differing terminology to express the transfigured radiance of Jesus' face. Matt. 17:2 uses the image of the shining sun. Lk. 9:29 incorporates the concept of transfiguration without using the term, by saying that "the appearance of his face changed." Thus far a comparison may be drawn with the radiance of Moses' face in Exod. 34, although it must be remembered that the LXX terminology, except for the single word "face", is different. In Jesus' transfiguration, moreover, his clothing also was rendered brilliant: "white as the light" (Matt.), more dazzling than bleached cloth (Mk.) and "bright as a flash of lightning" (Lk., New International Version). Jesus' total appearance was thus transformed.

2. This experience was clearly understood and related by the apostles as an actual event. It was also called a "vision" (*horama*, Matt. 17:9), a word which often refers to something observable which partakes of a supernatural quality or origin (elsewhere in the NT only in Acts 7:31; 9:10, 12; 10:3, 17, 19; 11:5; 12:9; 16:9, 10; 18:9). The Marcan account, which is usually considered primary, simply calls it "what they saw" (9:9). All three Synoptic Gospels link the event with the foregoing narrative sequence. While the temporal indicator, "after six days" (Matt. 17:1; Mk. 9:2; "about eight days after," Lk. 9:28), may have some further significance, it at least serves to connect this happening with a cohesive context. The following episode occurs, at least according to Lk. 9:37, as they are descending from the mountain. Theories which see this as a displaced post-resurrection story (R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, 1954, I, 26) must be judged as incapable of proof. In addition to this, 2 Pet. 1:16–18 employs the transfiguration as an evidence of the reliability of the Christian gospel. The writer obviously considered it a historical event which had convincing apologetic value and claimed that he himself was an eyewitness. The transfiguration is thereby ascribed a reality beyond that sometimes implied in the word "vision."

3. The assumption that the transfiguration is to be understood on the analogy of Hellenistic epiphany stories and, by implication, of no more historical value than they, has been properly challenged by recent scholarship. The eminent proponent of the former view, E. Lohmeyer, changed his view between 1922 and 1938 (E. Lohmeyer, "Die Verklärung Jesu nach dem Markus-Evangelium," *ZNW* 21, 1922, 185–215; *Das Evangelium des Markus*, *KEK* 1, 2, 1938, 174 f.). While some have still held to the Hellenistic epiphany model (e.g. S. Schulz, *Die Stunde der Botschaft*, 1970, 58; W. G. Kümmel, *The Theology of the New Testament*, 1973, 121–23; H. Conzelmann, *An Outline of the Theology of the New Testament*, 1969, 128), others have recognized the relevance of biblical and extra-biblical apocalyptic parallels (e.g. W. Gerber, "Die Metamorphose Jesu, Mark 9, 2 f. par.", *ThZ* 23, 1967, 385–95; M. Sabbe, "Le Rédaction du Récit de la Transfiguration," *La Venue du Messie. Messianisme et Eschatologie*, 1962, 65–100; H. C. Kee, "The Transfiguration in Mark: Epiphany or Apocalyptic Version?", in *Understanding the Sacred Text: Essays in Honor of Morton S. Enslin on the Hebrew Bible and Christian Beginnings*,

ed. J. Reumann, 1972). The issue is complex, involving assumptions about Hellenistic influence upon early Christian thought and categories. It is important to allow the whole biblical context and world-view to be the primary guide in such matters. Thus the comment in 2 Pet. 1:17 that Jesus "received honour and glory from God the Father" when God declared him to be the Son shows Jesus to be the worthy object of glorification. This is different from the manifestation of a divine essence through the miraculous transformation of some semi-mythical Hellenistic figure. Many earlier devout theologians thought that the transfiguration was a manifestation of the inner essential glory of Christ (though not in the Hel. sense). While this viewpoint has validity, 2 Pet. 1:17 would indicate otherwise. Another unique characteristic of the transfiguration of Jesus is that all three Synoptic Gospels mention radiant clothes. While the face might show forth inner glory, this would not seem to be the case with clothing.

4. The meaning of the transfiguration is likewise to be found in the biblical context and commentary. Among the many treatments of the subjects, the study by G. H. Boobyer which saw the transfiguration as a foreshadowing of the parousia (G. H. Boobyer, *St. Mark and the Transfiguration Story*, 1942), and that by H. Riesenfeld, which viewed the event as representing the enthronement of Jesus as messiah (H. Riesenfeld, *Jésus Transfiguré. L'Arrière-Plan du Récit Évangélique de la Transfiguration de Notre Seigneur*, 1947) have probably had, apart from Bultmann's resurrection-appearance theory, the widest influence.

If the introductory words of Matt. 16:28, Mk. 9:1 and Lk. 9:27 are understood as applying primarily to the transfiguration, their most natural point of reference, the imagery, is definitely that of Dan. 7:13 f. The word "power" found in Mk. 9:1, also occurs in the Petrine description (2 Pet. 1:16), where the word *parousia*, "coming" or "presence", is also found (cf. the idea of coming in Matt. 17:28 and Mk. 9:1). Several of the elements in the ensuing narrative also suggest a glorified Son of man motif, most notably the cloud. This point of reference does not exhaust the meaning of the transfiguration, however. Not only are there messianic motifs, but also the imagery of the biblical exodus is prominent. In that OT event, for example, God also made his presence known in a cloud. The six-day interval of Matt. 17:1 and Mk. 9:2 may recall the period of waiting when Moses ascended a mountain, also with three companions, to receive God's commandments (Exod. 24:9–16). A cloud was present there also, both as a covering and as a vehicle for the manifestation of God's glory. The very fact that Moses appears on the Mount of Transfiguration suggests that the exodus motif is prominent. Luke further records that → Moses and → Elijah were discussing the "departure" (Gk. *exodos*) which Jesus was about to accomplish at Jerusalem (Lk. 9:31).

Rather than limiting the imagery of the transfiguration scene to one point of reference, it is better to see it from both a typological (exodus) and an eschatological (parousia) perspective. The latter is reinforced by the presence of that great Jewish figure of eschatological significance, Elijah (cf. Mal. 4:5; on Elijah as an eschatological figure, see J. Jeremias, *Hēl(e)ias, TDNT* II 939 ff.). The essential meaning is, however, not centred in either a past or future event, but in the person of the one transfigured. This is made clear by the voice from heaven, which employs terminology recalling four christologically important passages: Ps. 2:7 about the royal son; Gen. 22:2 about the beloved only son (where the wording of the LXX is very

similar to Matt. 17:5 and Mk. 9:7); Isa. 42:1 about the chosen servant; and Deut. 18:15 ("listen to him") about the prophet Moses. The transfiguration is to be understood, therefore, as an affirmation by God of the messiahship and unique sonship of Jesus, who would indeed fulfill his mission as the suffering servant in accordance with the declarations in the preceding narrative in Mk. 8:27–9:1 and parallels.

5. The other two occurrences of the word *metamorphoō* are related to the experience of Christians. In Rom. 12:2 a continuing process of transformation is to characterize the believer. This is accomplished by an inner renewal of the mind and by a resistance to the influence of the world (or "age," *aiōn*). A more detailed explanation of the Christian's transformation is given in 2 Cor. 3:18, where the experience of Moses in Exod. 34:29–35 serves as an imperfect model. The glory brought by the gospel is not temporary, like the radiance of Moses' face, but is enduring. The Christian believer has an open relationship with the Lord of glory, which has a transforming effect. *W. L. Liefeld*

μετασχηματίζω *μετασχηματίζω* (*metaschēmatizō*), change the form of a person or thing.

This word is used in 1 Cor. 4:6; 2 Cor. 11:13, 14, 15; Phil. 3:21. In the context of 2 Cor. it has the meaning of taking on a disguise, or "masquerading". It pictures Satan appearing as an angel of light and false teachers pretending to be genuine. In a totally different application, Paul employs it in Phil. 3:21 to describe the future transformation of our "lowly" bodies by the power of God. No detail is given there of the exact nature of this transformation. (→ Form, art. *schēma.*) *W. L. Liefeld*

→ Elijah, → Form, → Jesus Christ, → Moses, → Son

(a). B. W. Bacon, "The Transfiguration Story: A Study of the Problem of the Sources of our Synoptic Gospels", *American Journal of Theology* 6, 1902, 236–65; J. B. Bernardin, "The Transfiguration", *JBL* 52, 1933, 181–89; G. H. Boobyer, *St. Mark and the Transfiguration Story*, 1942; G. B. Caird, "The Transfiguration", *ExpT* 67, 1955–6, 291–94; C. E. Carlston, "Transfiguration and Resurrection", *JBL* 80, 1961, 233–40; H. Conzelmann, *An Outline of the Theology of the New Testament*, 1969, 128; E. F. Harrison, *A Short Life of Christ*, 1968, 150–64; J. Jeremias, *Hēl(e)ias*, *TDNT* II 939 ff.; S. L. Johnson, "Transfiguration of Christ", *Bibliotheca Sacra* 124, 1967, 133–43; H. C. Kee, "The Transfiguration in Mark: Epiphany or Apocalyptic Vision?", in J. Reumann, ed., *Understanding the Sacred Text: Essays in Honor of Morton S. Enslin on the Hebrew Bible and Christian Beginnings*, 1972; W. G. Kümmel, *The Theology of the New Testament*, 1973, 121–23; W. L. Liefeld, "Theological Motifs in the Transfiguration Narrative", R. N. Longenecker and M. C. Tenney, eds., *New Dimensions in New Testament Study*, 1974, 162–79; W. F. Moulton, "The Significance of the Transfiguration", in *Biblical and Semitic Studies*, 1902; A. M. Ramsey, *The Glory of God and the Transfiguration of Christ*, 1967; M. E. Thrall, "Elijah and Moses in Mark's Account of the Transfiguration", *NTS* 16, 1969–70, 305–17; T. Torrance, "The Transfiguration of Jesus", *EQ* 14, 1942, 214–29.

(b). H. Baltensweiler, *Die Verklärung Jesu*, 1959; J. Blinzler, *Die neutestamentlichen Berichte über die Verklärung Jesu*, 1937; W. Gerber, "Die Metamorphose Jesu, Mark 9, 2 f. par.", *ThZ* 23, 1967, 385–95; S. Hirsch, "Taufe, Versuchung und Verklärung Jesu", *Religionswissenschaftliche Studien* 1, 1932, 5–98; M. Horstmann, *Studien zur markinischen Christologie*, 1969, 72–103; E. Lohmeyer, "Die Verklärung Jesu nach dem Markus-Evangelium", *ZNW* 21, 1922, 185–215; and *Das Evangelium des Markus*, *KEK* 1, 2, 1938, 174 f.; C. Masson, "La Transfiguration de Jésus", *Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie* 14, 1964, 1–14; H. P. Müller, "Die Verklärung Jesu", *ZNW* 51, 1960, 56–64; H. Riesenfeld, *Jésus Transfiguré. L'Arrière-Plan du Récit Évangélique de la Transfiguration de Notre Seigneur*,

Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis 16, 1947; M. Sabbe, "Le Rédaction du Récit de la Transfiguration", *La Venue du Messie. Messianisme et Eschatologie*, 1962, 65–100; S. Schulz, *Die Stunde der Botschaft*, 1970.

Tree, Plant, Root, Branch

δένδρον

δένδρον (*dendron*), tree; *ξύλον* (*xylon*), tree, wood, → cross; *φυτεία* (*phyteia*), plant; *φυτεύω* (*phyteuō*), to plant; *ἔμφυτος* (*emphytos*), implanted; *βλαστάνω* (*blastanō*), sprout, shoot forth; *ῥίζα* (*rhiza*), root; *ῥιζόω* (*rhizoō*), take root; *ἐκριζόω* (*ekrhizoō*), uproot; *κλάδος* (*klados*), branch; *κλῆμα* (*klēma*), branch; *φύλλον* (*phyllon*), leaf; *ἐνκεντρίζω* (*enkentrizō*), to graft.

CL In secular Gk. many of these words, apart from their literal use in agricultural contexts, carry a metaphorical and sometimes even a philosophical or cosmological sense. They are often associated with people or families. *phyteuō* is used of a father begetting children (e.g. Hdt., 4, 145; Eur., *Alcestis* 662); *blastanō* of children being born (Soph., *Aj.* 761). Demosthenes speaks of the branches (*klēma*) of a people (*ap. Aeschin.* 77, 27).

rhiza, in particular, has a wide range of meanings. It is used for the foundation of the earth (Hesiod, *Works* 19) and the foot of a mountain (Aesch., *PV* 365). It is also regularly used for that from which other things spring, i.e. the root of evil or good (Eur., *Frag.* 912, 11 (anap.); Epicurus, *Frag.* 409), and the stock of a race or family (Aesch., *Ag.* 966). The soul is the head or origin (Plato, *Tim.* 90a). The earth is the origin of all things (Tim. Locr. 97e). *enkentrizō* is used of grafting plants. The nouns *enkentris* and *enkentrisis* mean respectively a sting, spike, stylus for writing, and inoculation or grafting.

OT This group of words will be considered as a whole, rather than separately, because of the frequency with which they are combined. The subject is best approached by way of the separate, but related ideas which these words are used to convey. The main emphasis will be upon the application of the word-group to people and nations, but mention may be made of other uses.

1. *Miscellaneous Uses.* (a) *dendron* and *xylon* are regularly used to denote idolatrous worship (e.g. Isa. 57:5; Jer. 2:27; Ezek. 6:13). In Isa. 27:9 and elsewhere *dendron* is employed for the Heb. *'ăšērîm*, Asheras or sacred poles (cf. Deut. 16:21). *xylon* carries a much wider range of meanings in the LXX than in the NT and is often used as a synonym for *dendron*. For its use in connexion with execution → Cross, art. *xylon*.

(b) The words are regularly used symbolically to denote promises of God's blessing, God's wrath and God's providence. Through Ezekiel comes the promise that there will grow all kinds of trees for food; their leaves will not wither nor fail (Ezek. 47:12 f.; LXX *dendron*; Heb. *'ēṣ*; cf. Ps. 1). "Then shall the trees of the wood sing for joy before the LORD, for he comes to judge the earth" (1 Chr. 16:33; LXX *xylon*; Heb. *'ēṣ*; cf. Pss. 96[95]:13; 104[103]:10 f.; Joel 1:19; 2:22). In this context the → vine and the fig tree (→ Fruit, art. *sykē*) represent a man's personal security. There is personal disaster when Yahweh smites "their vines and fig trees" (Ps. 105[104]:33; cf. Jer. 5:17; Hos. 2:12). "Every man under his vine and under his fig tree" sym-

bolizes personal peace and prosperity (Mic. 4:4; cf. 1 Ki. 4:25; 2 Ki. 18:13; Zech. 3:10).

(c) Both *dendron* and *xylon* are used in the expression "the tree of life" (→ Cross, art. *xylon*). Apart from Gen. 3:22, 24 (*xylon*), however, references are confined to the Book of Proverbs. The fruit of the righteous is the tree of life (Prov. 11:30; LXX *dendron*). A desire fulfilled is a tree of life (Prov. 13:12; LXX *dendron*). A gentle tongue is a tree of life (Prov. 15:4; LXX *dendron*). Wisdom is the tree of life (Prov. 3:18; LXX *xylon*). Life is depicted as the fruit of a tree, and the trees are variously described.

2. *Trees and Plants as Parables of People.* Several recurring themes are found in passages where trees and plants are used as parables of people.

(a) Israel is a tree of God's planting. Sometimes the tree or plant is a picture of the individual: men looking for a ruler (Jdg. 9:8; *xylon*); the godly man (Ps. 1:3; Jer. 17:7; *xylon*); Job (Job 19:10; *dendron*); a → eunuch (Isa. 56:3). The tree may represent that which is lofty, the proud and arrogant man (Isa. 2:23, the cedar and oak).

Sometimes the tree represents mighty nations other than Israel: Pharaoh and hence his kingdom (Ezek. 31:3 f.; a cedar, *xylon*); Nebuchadnezzar and → Babylon (Dan. 4:10 f.; *dendron*); Moab (Jer. 48:32; a vine). All these trees are under the control of God (Ezek. 17:24).

But most frequently it is Israel which is pictured as a tree. Although the vine is the most common, other trees are employed, too. In Ezek. 17:5 ff. Israel is a vine planted by the king of Babylon, a theme which takes over the earlier theme of the vine setting it in the context of the exile. But in the last analysis Israel is God's own planting: a vine (Isa. 5:1; Ezek. 19:10; Ps. 80[79]:8 f.); the shoot of God's own planting (Isa. 60:21; *phyteuma*); a tree (Isa. 65:22; *xylon*); a poplar, olive, cedar and vine (Hos. 14:5 f.).

Three further observations may be made here. (i) In Hos. 14:8 the picture changes. God himself is the tree (a cypress). Whatever fruit Israel produces comes ultimately from him. (ii) Nowhere in the OT is Israel pictured directly as a fig, though this is implicit, since God requires good figs as well as good grapes (Jer. 24:1 f.; 8:13; cf. Mic. 7:1). (iii) Men of God may be called to represent Yahweh in the work of planting. Thus Jeremiah's prophetic ministry is described as one of uprooting (*ekrhizoō*) and planting (*kataphyteuō*).

(b) Israel is a people planted in good soil. The importance of the ground where a tree is planted is a frequent thought. Water is necessary (Job 14:7) and fertile soil (Ezek. 17:6, 8). Yahweh has provided the right ground (2 Sam. 7:10; Ezek. 19:10; Isa. 5:1 f.). It is described as his own mountain (Exod. 15:17), the law of Yahweh (Ps. 1:2; Isa. 5:24), and the remembrance of God himself (Deut. 29:18; Job 8:11; Jer. 17:8). God himself is the soil. If the root is not planted in him, the fruit fails or is poisonous.

(c) Where there is a root, there is hope of a new beginning after catastrophe. With this thought Job contrasts the life of a man with that of a tree (Job 14:7 ff.). The expressions "root and fruit" and "root and branch" signify totality, and usually in the context of totality of destruction (cf. Job 18:16; Amos 2:9). Nebuchadnezzar is reassured that, despite his coming downfall, the stump of the roots (*rhizan mian* or *tēn phyēn tōn rhizōn*) will be left in the earth (Dan. 4:15, 26).

rhiza is occasionally related to the future hope in the OT. (i) It is used in connex-

ion with the holy → remnant. The "surviving remnant shall take root downwards" (2 Ki. 19:30). The Servant of the Lord is seen as a young plant and "like a root out of dry ground" (Isa. 53:2). Isa. 6:13 refers to the remaining "stump" (MT *maṣṣebeṯ*; LXX *thēkē*), when the tree is felled, but the explanation of this as "the holy seed" is not in the LXX. (ii) *rhiza* is also found in connexion with the messianic hope. In Isa. 11:1 the root (Heb. *geza'* and *šōreš* which are synonymous) refers to the house of Jesse itself. Hope lies in the shoot or branch (Heb. *ḥōṭer* and *nēṣer*; LXX *rhabdos* and *anthos*; cf. Isa. 60:21; O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 1–12*, 1972, 157 ff.). In Isa. 11:10, however, it is the *rhiza* which springs from the house of Jesse and is therefore identified with the messiah. The thought of the messiah as the root continued into Judaism and synagogue teaching but with the recognition that *šōreš* should be understood as "shoot" (Tg. Pro. Isa. on 11:1) and with the observation that there is preference elsewhere to speak of the messiah as the *ṣemaḥ*, branch (Isa. 4:2; Jer. 23:5; 33:15; Zech. 3:8; 6:12). It is interesting that in all these latter examples the LXX changes the imagery. At Isa. 4:2 it substitutes *epilampsei ho theos*, "God will shine", and in Jer. and Zech. it employs the word *anatolē*, rising. Two further points may be noticed. On the one hand, *rhabdos* can mean "sceptre", and there is a play on these two meanings (Ezek. 19:11, 14). On the other hand, Joshua and Zerubbabel, the Lord's anointed, are called branches (Heb. *šibbōleṯ*; LXX *kladoi*). (iii) In the later writings → Abraham is thought of as a root. It is said that "he knew that the plants of righteousness would go forth from him" (Jub. 16:26). There is the belief that there is blessing for all those identified with him. The OT never speaks of Abraham as the root, but the thought is implicit (Isa. 41:8; 51:2; Ps. 105[104]:6).

(d) The vitality of the tree is evidenced by the growth of leaves, fruit and spreading branches (Pss. 1:3; 80[79]:10 f.; Ezek. 31:5; Hos. 14:6).

(e) The branches sheltering the birds and beasts are a metaphor for a mighty kingdom offering protection to its vassals (Dan. 4:21 f.; Ezek. 17:23; 31:6).

(f) The tree is assessed by its fruit and its fate is often a picture of Yahweh's judgment. Despite assiduous care the vine, representing Israel, brought forth only wild grapes (Isa. 5:4). When Yahweh would gather them, there are no grapes on the vine or figs on the fig tree (Jer. 8:13). The cedar (Pharaoh) is cut down (Ezek. 31:12). The forest (Assyria) is cut down (Isa. 10:34). The vineyard (Israel) is made a waste (Isa. 5:6). The oak (Israel) is felled (Isa. 6:13). The olive tree (Israel) is stripped apart from a few gleanings (Isa. 17:6), and under the influence of the exile the vine (Judah) is plucked up and transplanted (Ezek. 19:12 f.).

(g) The vb. *enkentrizō* is used only once in the LXX with the meaning of to goad or spur on (Wis. 16:11). But the thought of grafting into the tree of Israel is found in the teaching of the rabbis (Yeb. 63a). God engrafted two sprigs into Abraham, Ruth and Naamah. Hence, Jewish proselytes were regarded as grafted into the tree whose root was Abraham (Philo, *Exsec.* 6; cf. SB III 291).

NT 1. *Miscellaneous Uses.* (a) The NT frequently draws on illustrations from nature.

Jesus did this in the cursing of the fig tree. Leaves on the branches indicate that there will presently be fruit (Matt. 24:32 par. Mk. 13:28; Lk. 21:29). The lesson is: Why can you not read the signs of the times as well as the signs of nature? (cf. Matt. 16:1–4). But there is also the implication that the time of reckoning is drawing near

and that Israel will be judged shortly on how the nation has responded to the mission and message of Jesus (→ Fruit, art. *sykē* NT).

(b) In the Book of Revelation the natural world shares with mankind the results of God's blessing or wrath (Rev. 7:1, 3; 8:7; 9:4).

(c) There is reference to the tree of life (*xylon*) in Rev. 2:7; 22:2, 14, 19) and to the tree, i.e. the cross (*xylon*) in Acts 5:30; 1 Pet. 2:24; Acts 10:39; Gal. 3:13. But everywhere else the word for tree is *dendron*.

2. *Trees and Plants as Parables of People.* These terms are particularly significant, when they are applied to people, and the OT concepts referred to above provide a framework for understanding.

(a) Range of application. (i) Individuals are pictured as trees, though the references are largely to Jewish opponents: the → Pharisees (Matt. 3:10; 12:33; Lk. 6:43 ff.); false prophets (Matt. 7:17); ungodly men and scoffers (Jude 12). In Matt. 15:13 the Pharisees are called plants (*phyteia*) which God has not planted, reminiscent of the parable in Matt. 13:24 f. and the weeds sown by the enemy. (ii) The old Israel is still pictured as a tree. In Matt. 21:33 f. par. Mk. 12:1 f., Lk. 20:9 f. there is the picture of the vineyard with God as the planter (*phyteuō*). The fig tree in Mk. 11:12 f. (cf. par. Matt. 21:18 f.) is probably to be understood as Israel (cf. W. L. Lane, *The Gospel of Mark*, *NLC*, 1974, 399 f.), as is also the fig tree in Lk. 13:6–9. (iii) But the tree also symbolizes the new community of Israel. The kingdom is like a mustard seed becoming a tree (Matt. 13:32 par. Mk. 4:30, Lk. 13:18 f.). It has apparently insignificant origins, but like the kingdoms in the same picture in the OT its branches extend far and wide offering protection for all who live in it (cf. Dan. 4:21 f.; Ezek. 17:23; 31:6). The church is like the branches of a vine which is Christ (Jn. 15:1 f.). (iv) The new tree is still in the process of growth. (v) There is a strong organic connexion between the old and the new trees. In Mk. 12:1 f. God is still the planter of the vineyard, but he does not destroy it. He replaces one set of tenants by another. In Rom. 11:17 f. the olive tree stands for both the old and the new communities and there is the same root. According to E. Schürer, there was a Roman synagogue called the *synagōgē elaias*, the Synagogue of the Olive Tree (Schürer, II, ii, 74, 248). It may be that the Christian congregation in Rome was an offshoot (cf. M. Black, *Romans*, *New Century Bible*, 1973, 22, 145). (vi) Jesus Christ himself is also the one who plants. He is the sower (*ho speirōn*; cf. Matt. 13:37), and his followers are called to do the same (1 Cor. 3:6; 9:7). The gospel preached is "the implanted word [*ton emphyton logon*], which is able to save your souls" (Jas. 1:21). But whereas the apostles plant the word, the Son of man also plants people (Matt. 13:38; cf. the terms of application of the parables in Matt. 13:18–23 par. Mk. 4:13–20, Lk. 8:11–15). Thus, "the word is sown [*speiretai ho logos*]" (Mk. 4:15), but vv. 16–20 can speak of "the ones sown [*hoi speiromenoi*]."

(b) The necessity of good soil. Mk. 12:1 f. and Lk. 13:6 f. speak of the care given by God to ensure the right soil. The new Israel too is planted in good soil, rooted (*errhizōmenoi*) in the love of Christ (Eph. 3:17; Col. 2:7). But in the teaching of Jesus the hearts of men also represent the soil. Good soil is the heart which hears, understands, holds fast and yields fruit (Matt. 13:23 par. Mk. 4:20, Lk. 8:15; cf. Jas. 1:21).

(c) *rhiza* is used in a variety of contexts. (i) It is used as a metaphor for source or origin. The love of money is the root of all (kinds of) evil (1 Tim. 6:10). Heb. 12:15

warns against allowing a root of bitterness to spring up, preventing believers from attaining to the grace of God, causing trouble and defilement, as Esau did in selling his birthright (cf. Heb. 12:16 with Gen. 25:29–34). (ii) The root guarantees the life of the tree (Rom. 11:16, 18). Without roots a plant dies (Mk. 4:16 f. par.). John the Baptist prophesied total destruction (Matt. 3:10 par. Lk. 3:9): the axe is laid at the root of the tree. (iii) Jesus Christ is described as the root three times (Rom. 15:12; Rev. 5:5; 22:16). Isa. 11:1, 10 is clearly in mind, but perhaps the thought is implicit elsewhere. In Rom. 11:17 f. Paul probably adopts the Jewish thought of Abraham as the root of Israel, but this passage is to be understood in the light of Gal. 3:6 f., where sharing Abraham's faith determines one's kinship to him, and to be in Christ is to be a child of Abraham (Gal. 3:29). It would be wrong to regard the "holy root" (v. 16) as Christ as some of the early fathers did.

(d) The fruit evidences the quality of the tree. Character may be gauged from conduct (Matt. 3:8 par. Lk. 3:8; Matt. 7:16 f. par. Lk. 6:43 f.; → Evil; → Good). In Matt. 12:33 f. the fruit is the Pharisees' words of condemnation of Jesus (cf. v. 24). In Matt. 21:33–46 (par. Mk. 12:1–12, Lk. 20:9–19) the parable of the wicked husbandmen in the vineyard is accompanied by two other parables, the two sons (Matt. 21:28–32) and the marriage feast (Matt. 22:1–14). All three follow the question concerning Jesus' authority (Matt. 21:23). The fruit required is the acceptance of Jesus' authority and invitation (cf. H. B. Green. *The Gospel according to Matthew*, 1975, 178). In Jn. 15:1 f. the fruit required from the branches (*klēma*) is love, obedience and prayer. It cannot be produced without complete dependence on the vine which is Jesus Christ himself.

(e) The branches (*kladoi*) offer protection (Matt. 13:32 par. Mk. 4:32, Lk. 13:19). J. Jeremias claims that this came to be a technical expression for the incorporation of the Gentiles (*The Parables of Jesus*, 1962 [2], 147).

(f) Fruitlessness leads to destruction. The trees are cut down (*ekkoptetai*, Matt. 7:19). The plants are uprooted (*ekrhizōthēsetai*, Matt. 15:13; cf. Jude 12). In Rom. 11:19 branches are broken off (*exeklasthēsan*). On the withering of the fig tree cursed by Jesus (Matt. 21:18 f. par. Mk. 11:12 f.) → Fruit, art. *sykē* NT. In Mk.'s account it is seen as a comment on the cleansing of the temple and hence a picture of judgment on Israel. In Matt. 3:10 par. Lk. 3:10 John the Baptist speaks of this judgment as imminent: the axe is laid now (*ēdē*) at the root of the tree. But in the parable of the fig tree in Lk. 13:6–9 there is a temporary stay of execution to allow one final chance for the nation of Israel to bear the fruit of repentance (cf. v. 5).

(g) In Rom. 11:16 f. Paul uses the picture of grafting (*enkentrizō*). The process referred to is sometimes said to be untrue to actual practice, where a wild olive (*agrielaios*) becomes a cultivated olive (*kallielaios*) by the engrafting on it of a cutting from a cultivated olive. However, the *agrielaios* may have been an oleaster, and the practice of such grafting in order to rejuvenate an unproductive olive was not unknown in the ancient world (Philo, *Exsec.* 6; cf. M. Black, op. cit., 145; SB III 291; → Oil, art. *elaion* NT 4). In order to make the picture applicable, the Gentiles who are now in Christ members of the people of God have to be the *agrielaios*. Perhaps the tension between Paul's picture and approved horticultural practice is intended to underline the miraculous nature of this work of God which is contrary to nature (*para physin*, v. 24; cf. A. Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East*, 1927 [3], 274).

For Paul the grafted branches are not proselytes but Gentile Christians as a body.

The thrust of the passage is to illustrate what God has done by incorporating the Gentiles into his covenant people through Christ. But the passage also contains a warning to the Gentiles, lest they fall into arrogance. They should acknowledge their humble dependence. They are supported by the root (v. 18). It may be noted that in v. 17 the reading "sharers in the rich root of the olive [*tēs rhizēs tēs piotētos tēs elaias*]" is perhaps better attested. The Gentiles should not write off unbelieving Jews, because (i) if the root is holy, so are the branches (v. 16), and Israel is consecrated by its connexion with the patriarchs, and (ii) God has power to graft in again the natural branches. *E. M. Embry*

→ Cross, → Fruit, → Grow, → Oil, → Seed

(a). J. G. Baldwin, "*Ṣemaḥ* as a Technical Term in the Prophets", *VT* 14, 1964, 93–97; M. M. Bourke, *A Study of the Metaphor of the Olive Tree in Romans 11*, 1947; I. Engnell, " 'Knowledge' and 'Life' in the Creation Story", *Supplements to VT* 3, 1955, 103–119; A. Goor and M. Nurock, *The Fruits of the Holy Land*, 1968, 89–120; F. N. Hepper, *Plants of the Bible*, forthcoming; E. O. James, *The Tree of Life: An Archaeological Study*, 1966; C. Maurer, *rhiza* etc., *TDNT* VI 985–91; H. N. and A. L. Moldenke, *Plants of the Bible*, 1952; G. E. Post, *Flora of Syria, Palestine and Sinai*, I–II, 1932–33²; J. Schneider, *klados*, *TDNT* III 720 ff.; and *xylon*, *TDNT* V 37–41; J. Smith, *Bible Plants, Their History*, 1878; R. A. Stewart, "Engrafting", *EQ* 50, 1978, 8 ff.; G. Widengren, *The King and the Tree of Life in Ancient Near Eastern Religion*, 1951; M. Zohary, "Flora", *IDB* II 284–302.
(b). M. Buber, "Der Baum der Erkenntnis", *ThZ* 7, 1951, 1–8; G. Dalman, *Arbeit und Sitte in Palaestina*, I–II, 1928; P. Humbert, *Études sur le Récit du Paradis et de la Chute dans la Genèse*, 1940; I. Loew, *Die Flora der Juden*, I–IV, 1928–34; G. Pidoux, "Encore les deux Arbres de Genèse 3", *ZAW* 66, 1954, 37–43; J. A. Soggin, *ʿēṣ*, *THAT* II 356–59.

Tribe

φυλή	*φυλή* (*phylē*), tribe, clan, nation.

CL *phylē* derives from *phyō*, to bring forth, produce, grow, be born. As applied, e.g. to the old Doric and Ionic tribes, the Gk. *phylē* became in the Athenian state a highly important, if artificially constructed, unit of political organization. At first, *phylē* was limited in meaning to a group bound together by common descent, but the element of blood-relationship almost disappears. The original inhabitants of conquered territories were absorbed into the *phylai*, and *phylē* came to mean simply a political sub-division of the people. The corresponding Lat. *tribus* denoted in the historical period a local administrative district.

OT In the LXX *phylē* occurs over 400 times, most frequently in translating the Heb. *maṭṭeh* (169), *šēḇeṭ* or *šeḇeṭ* (118), and *mišpāḥâh* (42). Of these terms, *maṭṭeh* basically means twig, branch, from *nāṭâh*, stretch out; *šēḇeṭ* means rod, staff, sceptre; hence tribe, from the sceptre of the prince of the tribe. Pal. Jud. almost always uses *šēḇeṭ*, not *maṭṭeh*. Apart from Isa. 19:13, where the reference is to the tribes of Egypt, these two Heb. nouns apply only to Israelite tribes. The other Heb. term which *phylē* sometimes translates is the very common word for clan, *mišpāḥâh* (from *šāpâh*, spread out). The AV and (sometimes) RSV can mislead in rendering *mišpāḥâh* as family, which today implies too small a unit. The tribe (*maṭṭeh*, *šēḇeṭ*) was divided into a number of clans (*mišpāḥâh*) and the clans into families (*bêṯ ʾāḇ*,

house of a father), as in Jos. 7:14 NEB: "In the morning come forward tribe by tribe ... clan by clan ... family by family." Most frequently the LXX translates *mišpāḥâh* by *dēmos*, but where it uses *phylē* the reference is almost always to a blood-group, e.g. Abraham's kin, Gen. 24:38; the Edomite tribes, Gen. 36:40. The general meaning of *phylē* is a body of people united by kinship or habitation. In the OT *phylē* is used not only as a tech. term for the twelve tribes of Israel (Num. 34:18–28) but can also apply to the nations of the world, as in the blessing of Abraham (Gen. 12:3). In later Judaism the tribes of Israel are usually mentioned only in reference to OT texts, the number twelve (e.g. in the format of the work Test. XII), or in connexion with the related hope of a regathering of all Israel, as in the Eighteen Benedictions (SB II 606–8; IV 881 f., 902–6). The Qumran community speaks of the future restoration of a kingdom of twelve tribes (1QM 2:2 f., 3:14 f.; 1QSa 1:15, 29), and mentions the standards (Num. 2:2) of the twelve tribes (1QM 3:12–4:17). The little interest which Philo shows in plain history means that he rarely speaks of the tribes of Israel as such, though he does comment at some length on the zeal of Levi concerning the incident of the golden calf (*Vit. Mos.* 2, 160–73). Josephus is proud of his priestly *phylē* (*Life* 1, 1). His references to the tribes are otherwise mostly in connexion with the biblical narrative, but he mentions that in his day countless numbers of members of the ten tribes still remained by the Euphrates (*Ant.* 11, 133).

NT In the NT *phylē* can refer in the literal sense to the historic tribes of Israel (Rev. 7:4–8), or universally to the tribes of the earth, i.e. peoples and nations (Rev. 1:7). The expression "the twelve tribes of Israel" is used metaphorically of Christians as the true people of God, in the address of the Epistle of James (cf. 1 Pet. 1:1), and of eschatological Israel (Matt. 19:28; Lk. 22:30; Rev. 7:4, 21:12), and literally of all the Jewish people (Acts 26:7). In Matt. 19:28 "the twelve tribes of Israel" represents restored new Israel, i.e. the regenerated elect gathered out of the twelve tribes of historical Israel down the ages (Rom. 11:26). If the expression was intended by Matthew to include born-again Gentiles, so that the church was henceforth to be regarded as the true Israel, the designation did not catch on for many years. The word Israel is first equated with the Christian church by Justin Martyr *c.* A.D. 160 (*Dial.* 125, 1). The nearest parallel in the NT itself is Gal. 6:16, where Paul calls down peace and mercy upon the Israel of God, i.e. upon all Christians, Jewish and Gentile, who glory in the cross as the sole basis of their standing with God (W. Hendriksen, *The Epistle to the Galatians*, 1969, 247). The promise in Matt. 19:28 made to the twelve apostles that they should sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel, is of a reward for their loyalty to Jesus. They will be given a position of royal authority and honour in the new world as judges, i.e. rulers (the sense of judge as in the book of Judges). Those who have been closest to him here will be closest to him there. In the parallel verse in Luke (22:29) Jesus speaks of *assigning* royal power to them. The Gk. verb is *diatithēmi*, the usual biblical verb for the making of a covenant. The glorious future which Jesus describes is as sure as the covenant of God (L. Morris, *Luke*, *TC*, 1974, 308).

In Rev. 21:12 there are twelve gates to the heavenly Jerusalem, corresponding to the number of the tribes of Israel, and the names of the tribes are inscribed on the gates. The following verse shows that John's vision of the allocation of Jerusalem's gates is along similar lines to that in Ezekiel's vision (Ezek. 48:30–34). The Temple

Scroll at Qumran speaks not of the city of Jerusalem but of the middle and outer courts of the temple as having twelve gates after the twelve tribes of Israel (Y. Yadin, *BA* 30, 1967, 139). More grandly, Rab. Jud. thought in terms of 144 gates in the city wall, twelve for each tribe (Mid. Ps. 48:4). We are not to seek to match names of tribes with gates, any more than names of apostles with foundations and jewels (Rev. 21:4, 19 f.). The number twelve implies completeness: the whole regenerate people of God, the whole apostolic band. All twelve tribes are listed in Rev. 7:5–8, except that Dan is replaced by Manasseh, which was actually a section of the tribe of Joseph. The change is probably deliberate. According to Irenaeus (*Haer.* 5, 30, 2), the early Christians considered on the basis of Gen. 49:17 that Dan was omitted because his was the tribe from which Antichrist should come. Rabbinical tradition consistently associated Dan with idolatry. Dan's dwelling was in the north (Num. 2:25). Darkness comes from the north, and Dan and his idolatry brought darkness into the world. From 1 Ki. 12:28 f. the rabbis deduced that only Dan responded to the lure of the golden calf of Jeroboam I. The prince of Dan is said to be Satan in Test. Ben. 5:6, on the basis of Jdg. 18:30. Jewish and early Christian tradition is at one. But John himself nowhere makes any reference to this tradition, and his own doctrine of Antichrist does not harmonize with it. Although Reuben was the first-born son of Jacob (Gen. 35:23), John puts Judah at the head of his list of the twelve tribes. This is no doubt because Jesus was of that tribe (Heb. 7:13 f.; Rev. 5:5), in accordance with messianic expectation (Gen. 49:9). Since there are more than twenty differently arranged lists of the twelve tribes in the Bible, the reason for John's order is unlikely to be explained with any certainty. See G. R. Beasley-Murray, *The Book of Revelation, New Century Bible*, 1974, 144; A. Farrer, *The Revelation of St John the Divine*, 1964, 106.

A great many Jews in NT times were either from proselyte families or the descendants of men forcibly converted to Judaism by John Hyrcanus (Josephus, *Ant.* 13, 257) or Aristobulus I (*Ant.* 13, 318). This meant that only a minority of 1st-cent. Jews could genuinely trace their genealogy back to one of the twelve tribes of Israel. Even fewer Jews would be able to do so after Herod the Great, in an attempt to blur the notoriety of his own utter lack of Israelite blood, burnt many Jewish family registers, if the Christian writer Julius Africanus (d. *c.* 240) is quoting a reliable report in his *Letter to Aristides* (Eusebius, *HE* 1, 7, 13). Certainly, for Herod to do this would be in character (J. Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus*, 1969, 275–302). Examples like Anna of the tribe of Asher (Lk. 2:36; cf. Gen. 30:13), and Paul of the tribe of Benjamin (Rom. 11:1; Phil. 3:5) show that where tribal origin was known, the pedigree was treasured. To be able to trace the ancestral line back to the tribes was to have a sure claim on the covenant promises made by the God of Israel to his people.

Paul's pride in his membership of the tribe of Benjamin (Phil. 3:5) was unlikely to be due to the fact that he had been named after the Benjaminite Saul, the first king (1 Sam. 9:1 f.; Acts 13:21). Nor was Benjamin's history unsullied. Members of the tribe had been involved in atrocity (Jdg. 19:16–30), rape (Jdg. 21), and an insult to David, a man after God's own heart (2 Sam. 16:5–13). But on the positive side, the apostle might have thought more highly of the fact that Benjamin was the only son of Israel to be born in the land of promise, and born to Israel's favourite wife Rachel as she died (Gen. 35:16–20). The Blessing of Moses describes Benjamin as the beloved of

the LORD (Deut. 33:12). After the division of the kingdom, following the death of Solomon, it was the tribe of Benjamin, or at least a large part of it, which in company with Judah kept loyal to the house of David (2 Sam. 2–3) and later formed the nucleus of the exiles who returned to restore the land of their fathers (Ezr. 4:1). Possibly too the apostle drew encouragement from the knowledge that it was another Benjaminite, Mordecai, who uttered the memorable words: "If you keep silence at such a time as this, relief and deliverance will arise for the Jews from another quarter, but you and your father's house will perish. And who knows whether you have not come to the kingdom for such a time as this?" (Est. 4:14). If therefore there could have been saving value in being an Israelite, Paul as a Benjaminite, and one who had sat at the feet of another Benjaminite, the rabbi Gamaliel I (Acts 22:3), had the purest possible claim (W. Hendriksen, *The Epistle to the Philippians*, 1963, 156–8). But now, for Paul, his present relationship to God through the knowledge of Christ Jesus the Lord meant that he willingly discarded the proudest of human links with the past, a divinely organized past at that, as being by comparison so much rubbish (Phil. 3:7 f.).

No NT writer has any comment to make about the supposed ten "lost" tribes of Israel. They did not lose their identity so completely as is commonly thought (F. F. Bruce, *The Book of Acts*, 1956, 61). The tribe of Asher for one is represented in Anna, daughter of Phanuel (Lk. 2:36). The Apocrypha mentions Tobit and others of the tribe of Naphtali (Tob. 1:1; 7:3), Judith of the tribe of Simeon (Jud. 8:1; 9:2), and descendants of the tribe of Levi (1 Esd. 8:47; Ad. Dan. Bel 1:1 LXX). *N. Hillyer*

(a). K. Elliger, "Tribes, Territories of", *IDB* IV 701–10; H. L. Ellison, "Tribe", *ZPEB* 5, 813–20; Z. Kallai, "Tribes, Territories of", *IDB Supplementary Volume*, 1975, 920 ff.; C. Maurer, *phylē*, in *TDNT* IX 245–50; G. E. Mendenhall, "Tribe", *IDB Supplementary Volume*, 1976, 919 f.; P. Richardson, *Israel in the Apostolic Church*, *Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series* 10, 1969; C. U. Wolf, "Tribe", *IDB* IV 698–701.
(b). K. Latte, *phylē*, in Pauly-Wissowa XX 996–1011.

Trumpet

σάλπιγξ

σάλπιγξ (*salpinx*), trumpet, trumpet-call; σαλπίζω (*salpizō*), sound the trumpet, give a blast of the bugle.

CL In the ancient world the trumpet was used to give signals in war, whether to change guard, or to prepare for attack or retreat, or to terrify or deceive the enemy. In times of peace it was used at trials, before prayer, by shepherds, in funeral or festal processions, and at athletic contests. Aeschylus called trumpet-blasts "shattering"; the instrument was ill-adapted for music.

OT In the LXX *salpinx* renders some six Heb. terms, the most common being *šôp̄ār* (originally the curved "ram's horn," then more generally "horn" or "wind instrument") and *ḥ*ᵉ*ṣōṣ*ᵉ*râh* (the long straight "trumpet" made of beaten silver and used mainly for religious, not martial, purposes). The trumpet was sounded at burnt offerings and peace offerings (Num. 10:10; 2 Chr. 29:27–28), at feast times (Lev. 25:9), at royal coronations (2 Ki. 9:13), and at dedications (2 Chr. 5:12; Ezr. 3:10), as well

as in war to mark the beginning of a battle (Job 39:24–25; 1 Macc. 9:12–13) or to warn of an invasion (Amos 3:6). Trumpets played an important part in the taking of Jericho (Jos. 6:4–21) and Gideon's defeat of the Midianites (Jdg. 7:16, 20 ff.). In the Qumran War Scroll (IQM) mention is made of various battle-trumpets bearing inscriptions such as "Reminder of vengeance in God's appointed time."

NT Occurring 11 times in the NT, *salpinx* denotes both the instrument itself (1 Cor. 14:8) and the sound it emits (1 Cor. 15:52). Of the 12 uses of *salpizō* in the NT, all but two (Matt. 6:2; 1 Cor. 15:52) occur in Rev. 8–11.

(a) The injunction of Jesus to his disciples not to "sound a trumpet" before them when giving alms (Matt. 6:2) prohibits ostentatious giving that is designed to gain men's attention and praise (Matt. 6:1–4). Jesus may be alluding to a practice (apparently not elsewhere attested) of blowing a trumpet in the → temple when alms were being collected for some special relief project or in the synagogue when notable gifts were given, to encourage other generous donations and to bring the donors to God's attention. But the verb *salpizō* here may well be metaphorical: "Don't advertise [your almsgiving]."

(b) Paul observes that only a distinct bugle-blast rouses troops for battle. Similarly only clear, intelligible communications should have a place in corporate church worship (1 Cor. 14:8–9).

(c) Although "the sound of a trumpet" may be one of the concomitants of a theophany (Heb. 12:18–19), sometimes the authoritative and indescribable voice of God or Christ is itself said to sound "like a trumpet" (Rev. 1:10; 4:1). As in Jewish literature (canonical and extra-canonical), so in the NT, a trumpet-call announces divine judgment (Rev. 8:2–9:21; 11:15–19; cf. Joel 2:1–2; Zeph. 1:14–16; Apc. Mos. 22; Sib. 8, 239), the resurrection of the dead (1 Thess. 4:16; 1 Cor. 15:52; cf. 2 Esd. 6:23–24; Sib. 4, 173–174), and the gathering of the elect from the four corners of the earth (Matt. 24:31; cf. Isa. 27:13; Apc. Abr. 31:1–2).

(d) In only one place in the NT is there a reference to the trumpet as a musical instrument (Rev. 18:22, *salpistēs*, trumpeter). *M. J. Harris*

→ Judgment, → Resurrection

G. Friedrich, *salpinx*, *TDNT* VII 71 ff.; E. Werner, "Musical Instruments", *IDB* III 469–76; Y. Yadin, *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness*, 1962, 87 ff.

Truth

ἀλήθεια

ἀλήθεια (*alētheia*), truth, sometimes faithfulness; ἀληθής (*alēthēs*), true, sincere, real, correct, faithful, trustworthy, genuine, veracious; ἀληθινός (*alēthinos*), genuine, real, true, valid, trustworthy; ἀληθῶς (*alēthōs*), truly, certainly, indeed, in very truth; ἀληθεύω (*alētheuō*), to speak the truth.

CL 1. For many years there has been a tendency in biblical studies to over-generalize about the uses of *alētheia* and *alēthēs* in cl. Gk. This has been done partly with a view to drawing a clear-cut contrast betweeen Gk. and Heb. concepts of truth. It is then argued that whilst some NT writers preserve the Heb. concept, other writers, es-

pecially Jn., achieve a fusion of these two views. Thus R. Bultmann too readily speaks of "the Gk. use" of *alētheia* as over against "the semitic use" (*TDNT* I 238). According to this theory, *alētheia* in cl. Gk. denotes truth in contrast to mere appearance, whilst in Hebrew the parallel word denotes stability or faithfulness. It is also urged that truth in Gk. writers is timeless, raised above the temporal and material world. It relates only to extra-historical being. Most scholars also insist that the basic meaning of *alētheia* in cl. Gk. is that of unhiddenness or unveiling. These traditional claims of nineteenth- and twentieth-century biblical scholarship are valid up to a point, but can be misleading unless they are carefully qualified.

2. The traditional approach depends largely on three arguments. (a) Much is made of the etymology of *alētheia* in ancient Gk. The word is said to derive from *lēthō* or *lanthanō*, meaning to escape notice or to cause to forget, together with *Alpha* privative prefix, which negates the idea. The difficulty, however, is to show that the etymology of the word played a decisive part in determining its meaning in later Gk. of the cl. and Hel. periods. Indeed, even Homer shows little evidence that the word has this special nuance. (b) *alētheia* does indeed mean truth in contrast to mere appearance in much Gk. philosophy. But the vast majority of cl. Gk. writers and readers were not philosophers. J. B. Skemp observes, "There is one particular vice in the theological picture (or rather, caricature) of the Greeks. They are always represented as philosophical thinkers. . . . Such a description of the Greeks ignores the fact that many other Greeks at all the relevant times thought differently, and that a multitude of them did not think in this systematic way at all" (*The Greeks and the Gospel*, 1964, 3–4). (c) The notion of truth as against mere appearance and as that which belongs only to the realm of timelessness and immateriality finds strong support in Parmenides and especially in Plato. This need not be denied. Nevertheless, even within Greek philosophy itself there are other views of truth besides Plato's, for example, that of the Sophists, which Plato himself attacks, and also that of Aristotle. In these writers truth has a more positive relation to the material world.

3. (a) In Homer *alētheia* is most frequently used in contrast to the telling of a lie or to the withholding of information, e.g. "Tell me all the truth [*pasan alētheian*] whether my son is by the ship" (*Il.* 24, 407); "I will tell you all the truth" (*Od.* 11, 507). When Odysseus with cunning "spoke not the truth", he simply tells a lie (*Od.* 13, 254). Achilles set an umpire to tell the truth of a race, i.e. the state of affairs as it really was (*Il.* 23, 361). However, this is not the only meaning of *alētheia* or *alēthes* in Homer. In *Il.* 12, 433 *gynē chernētis alēthes* means a woman who is careful, honest, accurate, or even perhaps reliable. (b) *alētheia* usually stands in opposition to falsehood in Hdt., Thuc. and Xen. For example, the cowherd in Hdt. "tells the truth" under threat of violence (1, 116). Thuc. speaks of "the actual truth" in contrast to mere empty boasts (2, 41, 2). An oracle provides true answers to enquiries (Hdt., 1, 55). (c) This usage also persists in later Hel. writers. Thus Epict. contrasts telling the truth with deceiving flatteries (*Discourse* IV, 1, 6, 7). Philo writes that Moses marvelled at the delusion (*pseudos*) which the multitude had bartered for the truth (*alētheia*) (*Vit. Mos.* 2, 167). The evil spies sent out to view the land prefer deceit (*apatē*) to truth (*Vit. Mos.* 1, 235). Josephus uses *alētheia* in several different senses. (i) Truth is that which corresponds to the facts of the matter. Thus Jonathan did not question the truth (veracity) of David's words (*Antiquities* 6, 225). (ii) Truth is also proved to be such by historical events. The words of a prophet are thus proved true

(*Antiquities* 2, 209); whilst in the previous passage Jonathan does not wait to see David's words proved true (*Antiquities* 6, 225). (iii) Josephus also uses *alēthēs* in the sense of "genuine" or "real". Thus Ahab killed the real owner (*ton alēthē despotēn*) of the vineyard (*Antiquities* 8, 360).

4. The use of *alēthēs* in Gk. philosophical texts is best seen in Parmenides, the Sophists, Plato, and Aristotle. Some of Plato's uses also appear in Philo. (a) Parmenides asks what is the nature of real being, and draws a contrast between the way of truth and the way of seeming. Change belongs only to the material world, which is the realm of mere appearance. There can be no change in what really exists (*Fragment* 8, 29). "What is not" is unthinkable and unknowable, but change would be the supposed movement of what is to what is not, or of what is not to what is. Hence truth, in contrast to appearance, belongs to the extra-historical realm of the changeless. That such a view occurs in Gk. philosophical literature is therefore clear. What is less certain is the extent to which ordinary Gk. writers shared the view of Parmenides. (b) The Sophists clearly held a different view. In particular Protagoras refused to view the material world as mere illusion. His famous dictum that "man is the measure of all things" was not intended merely, as Plato implied, as an extreme form of relativism. He cited the example of a wind which may seem warm to one person and cool to another. It is not necessary, he urged, to say that one view is true and the other false. Each may be true for the person concerned. In this way Protagoras comes near to the modern notion of existential truth. (c) Plato rejects this view. (i) He replied that if "true" and "false" are only relative to the individual thinker, then as soon as someone says that the philosophy of Protagoras is false for him, it is therefore false (*Theaetetus* 171a). Falsehood, for Plato, is a matter of deception. It conceals reality (*ta onta*). False words, he believed, are merely a copy (*mimēma*) of deception in the soul (*Republic* 2, 21, 382a–383b). Falsehood is the presentation of what is only appearance (*phantasma*). By contrast "the divine and the divinity are free from falsehood [*apseudes ... to theion*]". God is true in deed and word (*alēthēs en te ergō kai en logō*) and neither changes himself nor deceives others (382e). Plato thus returns to the view, earlier outlined in Parmenides, that truth stands in contrast to appearance and to change, although he goes further than Parmenides in locating it in the realm of eternal ideas. (ii) At the same time Plato also uses *alētheia* and *alēthēs* in more ordinary and less metaphysical ways. Truth sometimes means simply "the facts of the matter" (*Epistles* 7, 330). *alētheia* stands in contrast to legend (*Timaeus* 22d). "Equal to equal ... because of truth" (*Leg.* 2, 668a). (d) Aristotle takes us closest to the view of truth found in modern propositional logic. Firstly, Aristotle distinguishes between the genuine proposition, which is true-or-false, and sentences such as pleas or commands. "We call propositions only those (sentences) which have truth or falsity in them" (*On Interpretation* 4, 17a, 4). Secondly, he considers the logical conditions under which the truth of a proposition entails the denial of its contrary. If it is true to say "Socrates is well", it is therefore false to say "Socrates is ill" (*Categories* 10, 13b, 14–35). Thirdly, he argues that "the truth of a proposition consists in corresponding with facts" (*hoi logoi alētheis hōsper ta pragmata, On Interpretation* 9, 19a, 33). The principle is said to include statements about future states of affairs (18a–b). Often, however, the actual word *alētheia* is used in its ordinary everyday sense without philosophical content. The philosopher seeks to discover "the truth" that is in the universe (*De Mundo* 4, 391a). (e) Philo uses *alētheia* in ordinary

ways, as we have seen. As a Jewish theologian he speaks of "true doctrine" (*alēthes dogma*, *Leg. All.* 3, 229). But as a speculative writer who has been influenced by Platonism he also contrasts truth with mere appearance: "Moses desired truth rather than appearance [*tou dokein*]" (*Vit. Mos.* 1, 48). However, he also sees the truth of God manifested in historical events, as in a quick punishment for unbelief (*Vit. Mos.* 2, 284).

5. *alēthinos* frequently has the meaning in cl. Gk. of "real" or "genuine", but it may also mean simply "truthful". Xenophon speaks of securing a real army (*strateumati alēthinōi*), in the sense of an army worthy of the name (*Anabasis* 1, 9, 17). Plato speaks of having a real passion for genuine philosophy (*alēthinēs philosophias alēthinos erōs*) (*Republic* 499c). Philo has an interesting theological use in which he describes God as "the real one", like a coin which is genuine rather than counterfeit, or an article which is not merely veneer (*Congr.*, 159).

6. The adverb *alēthōs*, truly, varies in force from context to context. At its weakest it may mean little more than "indeed", "really", or "certainly". But it may sometimes be used more solemnly to mean "in very truth". We may compare "Necessity was in truth upon him" (Hdt., 1, 11) with Plato's phrase "really alive" (*Timaeus* 19b). Sometimes the adverb means "honestly" or "straightforwardly".

7. The verb *alētheuō* usually means simply to speak the truth. For example, Plato argues that he who commends justice speaks the truth (*alētheuei*), and this is parallel to his earlier statement that such a man speaks truly, whilst he who commends injustice speaks falsely (*pseudoito*, *Republic* 589c). However, sometimes *alētheuō* means to prove true; or in the passive, to be fulfilled (Xen., *Institutio Cyri* 4, 6–10).

OT 1. The Hebrew word which is the nearest equivalent to *alētheia is* *'emeṯ*. Whilst the LXX regularly translates *'emeṯ* as *alētheia*, the Eng. versions sometimes render it as "truth", and sometimes as "faithfulness". Indeed the majority of O.T. scholars claim that for the Heb. writers "truth" is close to faithfulness in meaning, suggesting the idea of stability, firmness, or reliability. Thus A. Jepsen writes, "By way of summary: *'emeṯ* was used of things that had to be proved to be reliable. . . . 'Reliability' would be the best comprehensive word in English to convey the idea. . . . *'emeṯ* is that on which others can rely". This applies, Jepsen concludes, to God's truth as well as to man's. As the God of truth, "Yahweh is . . . the God in whose word and work one can place complete confidence" (*TDOT* I 313).

For many scholars, this argument is strengthened by a consideration arising from etymology. It is widely agreed that *'emeṯ* is derived from the root *'mn*, which has the meaning to be firm. On this basis it is often argued that truth in the OT is not merely theoretical or abstract, but is grounded in the faithfulness of God. If this view is adopted we have all the ingredients for postulating a radical and clear-cut contrast between Hebraic and Gk. conceptions of truth. We have already suggested, however, that whilst such a contrast has validity in certain respects, it can be misleading and simplistic to build arguments on this foundation, unless certain strong qualifications are first made and observed (see above, CL).

(a) Justice must be done, as J. Barr insists, to the variety of different contexts in which *'emeṯ* is employed in the OT (*The Semantics of Biblical Language*, 1961, 187–205). Even the statistical distribution should make us hesitate to assume that it performs the same rôle for all biblical writers. In the Pss., where the word often

means faithfulness, *'emeṯ* occurs 37 times. It is used 12 times in Isa., and 11 each in Prov. and Jer., but is entirely absent from a number of writers, including Job. This is not necessarily, however, because, as Jepsen suggests, the author of Job has nothing on which he can rely (op. cit., 310).

(b) The Qal of *'āman* may admittedly mean to support or to sustain. In Num. 11:12 it is used of a nurse carrying a child. In the hiph. it has the sense of putting confidence in something, and is used of having confidence in God (Deut. 1:32). In the niph. it is used of a firmly-fixed peg (Isa. 22:23, 25); whilst the noun *'ōmnâh* means a post or pillar on which a structure may lean (2 Kings 18:16). At first sight, therefore, through *'āman* the connexion between *'emeṯ* and the idea of firmness seems to be established. But the fact that the word is historically derived from a root of which other forms mean "firm" does not give us any precise information about its own distinctive uses in a subsequent period of linguistic history. Etymology provides only statements about the past history of a word; not about its use at some later stage. Hence arguments about the nature of truth which depend on the etymology of *'emeṯ* are no more conclusive than those which we earlier considered and rejected concerning connexions between *alētheia* and *lēthō* or *lanthanō* (→ CL).

(c) It is much more significant that the LXX translates *'emeṯ* not only as *alētheia*, truth, but also as *pistis*, faith, or faithfulness. It need not be denied that *'emeṯ* does frequently mean "faithfulness". However, it is possible to offer two quite different explanations for this. (i) It is usually assumed that since *'emeṯ* means both truth and faithfulness, each concept necessarily entails the other, with the result that faithfulness is a necessary part of the distinctively Heb. concept of truth. But another explanation may also be offered. (ii) We have here an example of polysemy, or multiple meaning. *'emeṯ* means "truth" in *some* contexts, and "faithfulness" in *other* contexts. We may compare the parallel semantic phenomenon in the case of the word "taste" in English, French, German, and Italian (*goût*, *Geschmack*, *gusto*). The word means taste by the tongue in eating in some contexts, and taste in aesthetics in other contexts. The semantic phenomenon does not commit us to the conclusion that there is a distinctive Western European concept of taste, according to which aesthetic judgments have a close connexion with enjoying food. The same principle can be applied to the Heb. word *dāḇār*, which can mean either word or thing (cf. J. Barr, op. cit., 129–40; and A. C. Thiselton, "The Supposed Power of Words in the Biblical Writings" in *JTS* n.s 25, 1974, 283–99, and "Semantics and New Testament Interpretation" in I. H. Marshall, ed., *New Testament Interpretation*, 1977, 75–104).

2. *'emeṯ* means faithfulness in a number of instances in the OT. (a) We may compare the similar use of the noun *'ᵉmûnâh*, which is also derived from the same root *'mn*. *'ᵉmûnâh* and *'emeṯ* are both often translated by *pistis* in the sense of fidelity or faithfulness in the LXX (→ Faith). But whereas *'ᵉmûnâh* hardly ever means "truth", as against faithfulness, *'emeṯ* embraces both word-uses. (i) Normally the nearest that *'ᵉmûnâh* comes towards meaning "truth" is in the sense of reliability, trustworthiness, or honesty. Thus in 2 Kings 22:7 no accounting of money is made concerning the collectors under Hilkiah in Josiah's reformation "because they deal honestly", i.e. they act with fidelity (*'ᵉmûnâh*). (ii) *'ᵉmûnâh* also, on at least one occasion, means firm or steady, in accordance with the usual theory about its etymological root *'mn*. Thus in Ex. 17:12 Aaron and Hur hold up Moses' hands so that they remain "steady" (Heb. *'ᵉmûnâh*; LXX *estērigmenai*) until the sun goes down. (iii) Sometimes it is not

entirely clear whether *'ᵉmûnâh* means faithfulness, or honesty or even integrity. In 1 Sam. 26:23 and in Isa. 11:5 it occurs in parallelism with "righteousness": "The LORD rewards every man for his righteousness and his faithfulness [honesty?]"; "Righteousness shall be the girdle of his waist, and faithfulness the girdle of his loins". As we shall see, the connexion between faithfulness and truth depends not on semantic considerations said to be peculiar to the Heb. language, but on the fact that when God or man is said to act faithfully, often this means that his word and his deed are one. He has acted faithfully in accordance with his spoken word. Hence the believer may lean his whole weight confidently on God, and find him faithful. What is perhaps most distinctively Hebraic is the notion that even God binds himself to his word once spoken, especially in the covenant. Hence, the biblical writers speak repeatedly of the faithfulness of God, with whom word and deed are one.

(b) When it is used in the sense of faithfulness, *'ᵉmeṯ* frequently occurs in parallelism with the word *ḥeseḏ*, steadfast love. This conjunction of *ḥeseḏ* and *'ᵉmeṯ* is said by many writers to lie behind the phrase "grace and truth" in John's prologue (→ NT 4). However, we must still distinguish between contexts in which *'ᵉmeṯ* (in syntagmatic relation to *ḥeseḏ*) means faithfulness, and those in which it means truth. When Abraham's servant Eliezer asks Bethuel and Laban to show *ḥeseḏ* and *'ᵉmeṯ* to Abraham (Gen. 24:49) it is possible that both words mean loyalty and fidelity, but more likely that we should follow the RSV phrase "deal loyally and truly", in the sense of acting with honesty and integrity. However, earlier in the same chapter when he first meets Rebekah, Eliezer praises God "who has not forsaken his *ḥeseḏ* and his *'ᵉmeṯ*", meaning that God has remained loyal and faithful to his covenant promises to Abraham (24:27). In precisely the same way Jacob acknowledges that he is not worthy of all God's faithfulness (*'ᵉmeṯ*; Gen. 32:10). In Exod. 34:6, Yahweh renews his covenant with Moses, declaring himself, indeed pledging himself, to be "merciful and gracious, slow to anger and abounding in steadfast love and faithfulness" (*ḥeseḏ wᵉ'ᵉmeṯ*). G. Quell is probably correct in interpreting this to mean "worthy of confidence" (*TDNT* I 236). But even here the context may suggest the idea of truth in the sense both of veracity and integrity, since the next verse sets side by side the promise of mercy for thousands and the warning of punishment for the guilty. *'ᵉmeṯ* is almost certainly used in the sense of faithfulness in David's solemn charge to Solomon. He and his sons are to take heed to walk before the Lord "in faithfulness" (1 Kings 2:4). Conversely, Solomon later declared that David received the *ḥeseḏ* of God because he walked before him in faithfulness (*'ᵉmeṯ*) and righteousness and uprightness of heart (3:6). Hezekiah prays, at the point of possible death, that God will remember that he has walked before him faithfully and with a whole heart, i.e. "with a conscience wholly unimpaired" (J. Gray, *I & II Kings*, 1964, 634).

Characteristically it is in the Psalms that both praise and prayer are offered repeatedly on the basis of God's faithfulness. Over half of the occurrences of *'ᵉmeṯ* have this meaning. When the Psalmist exclaims that "all the paths of the LORD are mercy and truth" (Ps. 25:10), he testifies that God's dealings with his people are utterly trustworthy, because they are characterized by loyalty to the covenant (M. Dahood, *Psalms*, 1966, I, 156). "Faithfulness" is also the meaning of *'ᵉmeṯ* when it occurs in conjunction with *ḥeseḏ* in Pss. 57:3 and 10; 61:7; 69:13; 108:4; and 115:1. In this sense, as the AV puts it, "mercy and truth are met together" (Ps. 85:10). God's steadfast love is manifested as an expression of his faithfulness (or perhaps as

Kissane suggests, God's steadfast love calls forth Israel's faithfulness). Even without syntagmatic relation to *ḥesed*, *'emeṯ* regularly means faithfulness in such characteristic passages as "I will praise for thy *'emeṯ*" (Ps. 71:22). God's faithfulness endures for ever (Ps. 117:2). Even the phrase "word of truth" in Ps. 119:43 is interpreted by A. A. Anderson to mean the record of God's faithfulness to his people (*The Book of Psalms*, II, 1972, 821). The idea of testimony to God's *'emeṯ* is even more striking in Ps. 30:9, where it is said that Sheol cannot declare God's faithfulness, presumably because there is a cessation of that ongoing experience which enables the believer to testify to God's faithfulness anew. Other examples in which *'emeṯ* probably means faithfulness can be found in Prov. 3:3; 16:6; Isa. 16:5; 38:18; Hos. 4:1 and Zech. 8:8.

3. It would be a mistake, however, to infer from these examples that *'emeṯ* always means reliability in a theological sense, rather than simply "truth" in contrast to deceit or falsehood. This is not to say that truth in the OT is merely theoretical and abstract. It is to say that we must first complete our survey of *different* uses of *'emeṯ* before endeavouring to reach larger conclusions about the matter.

(a) Truth is used in contrast to deceit or falsehood in a number of places. In Gen. 42:16 Joseph says that he wishes to establish whether the brothers have told the truth. Admittedly it may be claimed that he is testing their "reliability"; but this sense of the term would apply equally to statements about testing the truth in Homer or Herodotus. The issue is whether their statements accord with the facts, and are therefore correct. The same principle applies to Exod. 18:21, where Moses selects men of truth who hate a bribe, to help him with the burden of administration. To be sure, these men are to be reliable and trustworthy. But the reference to bribery implies that their trustworthiness rests on their honesty and integrity. They themselves are to reach decisions and to make judgments on the basis of truth, i.e. by taking account of all the facts and hiding nothing. Similarly in Deut. 13:14 the injunction is given to check whether or not the report that citizens have been seduced into idolatry is actually true. Whether the report is reliable depends on whether it accords with fact (cf. Deut. 17:4). In 1 Kings 17:24 the widow acknowledges the truth of Elijah's word when he restored her son to life. It may equally be said that his word is reliable, or that he has not deceived her.

(b) In the Wisdom literature, *'emeṯ* is sometimes used in the sense of faithfulness (Prov. 3:3; 16:6), but perhaps more often against the background of the contrast between truth and falsehood or deception. When Wisdom says, "My mouth will utter truth" (Prov. 8:7), the point is that she will not deceive the one who embraces her. Indeed, she will bring him the disclosure which comes through instruction and knowledge. In Prov. 12:19 truthful lips are set in contrast to a lying tongue, and the whole passage attacks lies, deceit, and false witness (vv. 17–22). In 22:21 truth is disclosed in order that a true answer may be given, i.e. that there be no lie or deception. Finally, the injunction to "buy" truth (23:23) can hardly refer to stability or reliability. What can be "acquired" is knowledge of the true facts of the matter, and an end to deception through false or partial information. The emphasis is on the value of good education (R. B. Y. Scott, *Proverbs, Ecclesiastes*, 1965, 143).

(c) The contrast between truth and falsehood or deception is also prominent in the Psalms even though we have also noted that here *'emeṯ* often means faithfulness, especially when applied to the faithful acts of God. Indeed, in perhaps three passages

in the Psalms, truth stands in contrast to concealment, almost in a sense which many scholars claim to find exclusively in Gk. literature. In Ps. 43:3 the Psalmist prays, "Send out thy light and truth". This is not a prayer for God to remain faithful, but that God will show him the truth of the matter in the face of the enticing words of "deceitful men" (v 1). Hence he needs truth and *light*. Truth enables him to escape from the dark, and to see things for what they are. In the same way the king in Ps. 45:4 is to be a champion of truth. Here the thought is not so much his reliability as his readiness to expose whatever is shady, underhand, unfair, or false. He defends the afflicted by bringing their cause out into the open. The well-known reference to "truth in the inward parts" in Ps. 51:6 is less clear. A. A. Anderson insists that here *ʾemeṯ* means faithfulness (*Psalms*, I, 396). But the idea seems to be that the psalmist pleads not for loyalty but for liberation from self-deception. The theme of the psalm is confession, which is an acknowledgement of truth of the state of affairs as God sees it. This interpretation is even more likely to be correct, if we understand "inward parts" to mean "that which is covered over" in the context of the need for revelation (E. A. Leslie, *The Psalms*, 1949, 400), and the theme of the Psalm to be that Yahweh is in the right (S. Mowinckel, *The Psalms in Israel's Worship*, 1967, I, 214).

(d) The prophets also use *ʾemeṯ* sometimes in the sense of faithfulness (above, 2(b)), and sometimes in the sense of truth in contrast to falsehood. In Isa. 43:9 the nations are to come together as a judicial assembly to determine whether the claim of Yahweh, or of the pagan gods, is true. The claim is reliable only if it is valid, or accords with the facts of the matter (C. Westermann, *Isaiah 40–66*, 1969, 121–2). In Isa. 59:14, 15, the complaint that truth is lacking seems at first sight to be an allusion to Israel's unfaithfulness, since v. 13a refers to "turning away". But on closer inspection it is clear that the real cause of complaint is "lying words" (13b). Jeremiah similarly complains that "every one deceives his neighbour, and no one speaks the truth; they have taught their tongue to speak lies" (9:5). Admittedly this has the consequence that no one can trust his brother (v. 4). But it is the lying itself that is the main issue here. Zechariah expresses the same concern: "Speak the truth to one another; render in your gates judgments that are true. . . . Love no false oath" (8:16, 17). In Daniel the truth of God is set in contrast with the deceptions of godless powers (Dan. 8:12; 9:13).

4. Now that we have attempted to set out the different uses of *ʾemeṯ* that occur in the OT, is it possible to say anything at all about truth in the OT as such? Are the usual generalizations about Gk. and Heb. views of truth entirely wrong, or do they have a limited validity, given certain qualifications?

(a) Even when we take account of the varied ways in which *ʾemeṯ* is used, it is still clear that in the vast majority of contexts truth is not a merely abstract and theoretical concept. Certainly it is never located, as it is in Plato, in some timeless extra-historical realm. To this extent W. Pannenberg is correct when he asserts that in accordance with the OT background "the truth of God must prove itself anew" (*Basic Questions in Theology*, II, 1971, 8). The God of Israel reveals his truth not only in his words but also in his deeds, and this truth is proved in practice in the experience of his people. Similarly, men express their respect for truth not in abstract theory, but in their daily witness to their neighbour and their verbal and commercial transactions. It is not surprising, then, to find at times what would nowadays be called an existential view of truth in the OT. For example, when it is said in Ps.

119:142 that "the law is true", this acknowledgement has the existential ring of testimony on the part of one who delights in God's law (v. 143). However, it is not *only* existential truth. For the same Psalmist sees the law of God as a lamp and a light (v. 105) which shows the believer the true state of affairs, although admittedly the true state of affairs as it relates in practice to him ("my feet ... my path").

(b) Such truth can be relied on, and is firm. But this insight is not arrived at on an exclusively theological basis. Certainly the believer may confidently rely on God because of his covenant faithfulness (*'emeṯ, ḥeseḏ, 'mûnâh*). But this particular use of *'emeṯ* does not lie behind every occurrence of the word. The Hebrews recognized the *logical* truth that others also recognized, that a true word can be relied upon because it accords with reality, and that both for a God of truth and for a man of truth, word and deed are one. Thus serving God "in sincerity and truth" (Jos. 24:14) means serving him with honest intention and integrity. Those who call on God "in truth" (Ps. 146:18) do so honestly. God's decrees are enacted with *'emeṯ* (Ps. 111:8), because, in Calvin's words, there is agreement between the sayings and doings of God (*Psalms*, III, ET 1840, 149). This is the logical point which lies behind the connexion between truth and faithfulness, and it is not to be confused with arguments about "faithfulness" found in most studies of this subject. We shall see that the notion of truth as correspondence between word and deed has particular significance in the NT.

5. (a) In the post-canonical Jewish writings, *alētheia* is used mostly but not always to mean truth in contrast to falsehood. In 1 Macc. 7:18 the word may seem at first sight to be used in the sense of faithfulness, since the statement "there is no truth in them" is parallel to "they have broken the covenant and oath which they made". But the context shows that the real issue is the deceitful use of words. In Sir. 7:20 the servant works reliably indeed, but the main point is that he is "true" in the sense of being honest. In Tobit 7:10 truth is used of giving a true report. However, sometimes *alēthēia* does duty for *'emeṯ* in the sense of faithfulness (*pistis*), especially when the later Jewish writer quotes or paraphrases the OT. Thus in Wis. Sol. 15:1 the writer declares, "Thou, our God art kind and true [*chrēstos kai alēthēs*]", probably in paraphrase of Exod. 34:6 (A. T. Hanson, *Grace and Truth*, 1975, 9 and 114). Here the word probably means faithfulness, because the sense of Exod. 34 is too clear to be lost. On the other hand, in Wis. Sol. 3:9 truth is used either in opposition to falsehood, or else in the more absolute sense of "revealed truth" or "doctrine" (cf. 6:22).

(b) Truth is especially prominent in the Dead Sea Scrolls, perhaps most of all in the Thanksgiving Hymns. God is the God of truth (1QH 15:25), and the phrase "truth of God" also occurs (1QS 3:6; 11:4; 1QM 4:6). J. Murphy-O'Connor points out that the word often occurs as a designation of revealed doctrine, which embodies both the law and its interpretation ("Truth: Paul and Qumran" in *RB* 72, 1965, 29 ff. = *Paul and Qumran*, 1968, 179–230). But no less strongly, truth is also emphasized as a quality of moral behaviour. Entrance into the Qumran community is a conversion to truth (1QS 6:15), and the initiates bind themselves to the precepts of truth by oath (1QS 1:15). They are now within the sphere of influence of the spirit of truth (1QS 3:24). J. Murphy-O'Connor observes, "This is the crucial point, for it is in proportion as a man is dominated by this spirit that he loves truth (1QS 4:17, 24)" (op. cit., 184). Truth plays a part in cleansing him from sin; he grows in the knowledge of

truth; and at the end of time all lies will be done away with (1QS 4:20–21; 9:17). Meanwhile, it is binding on the members of the community to practise truth (1QS 1:5; 5:4; 8:2). A man is not established in truth if he has a double heart. Indeed only by responding to God in singleness of heart can a man embrace truth (1QH 4:14; 16:17). Finally the community are "witnesses of truth" (1QS 8:6). As against those fellow Jews whom they regarded as apostate, the Qumran community see themselves, in effect, as the true Israel. In this sense, many of their uses of the word "true" articulate a polemical claim. Truth, then, is used in a variety of ways in the Qumran writings, and is very important for the community. Their uses of the term have their basis in the OT, but also offer striking points of comparison with the NT writings. In particular the community's conception of God's revelation as "the truth" invites careful comparison with Paul, and the notion of "the spirit of truth" invites comparison with John.

6. *alēthinos* in the LXX overlaps with the meaning of *alēthēs*, which, in turn, reflects *alētheia*. However, sometimes *alēthinos* has its more distinctive sense of "real" or "genuine". Thus in 2 Chr. 15:3 it is said that for a long time Israel was without the "true" God.

NT 1. Although the words for "truth" and "true" become very important in Paul and John, *alētheia, alēthēs*, and *alēthōs* occur relatively seldom in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts, and even then they have little distinctive theological significance.

(a) On the lips of Jesus himself these terms occur only in Lk. 4:25; 9:27; 12:44; and 21:3. In the first two instances the forms "I tell you in truth" (*ep' alētheias*) or "I tell you truly" (*alēthōs*) serve to introduce a solemn statement, and are presumably Luke's translation into Gk. of the characteristic *amēn*-formula used elsewhere by Jesus. In spite of Berger's arguments, J. Jeremias has shown convincingly that the *amēn*-formula takes us back to the *ipsissima verba* of Jesus (→ Amen). It is used by Jesus, Jeremias argues, to strengthen his words, to express his authority, and to underline the certainty of his message (J. Jeremias, *New Testament Theology: I, The Proclamation of Jesus*, 1971, 35–6; and *Abba*, 1966, 148–51).

(b) At the same time the isolated occurrences of *alētheia* and *alēthēs* in the Synoptics do not exhaust what we may infer about Jesus' attitude to truth. (i) Negatively, many of his sayings attack hypocrisy, or, more generally, any discrepancy between word and deed, or between word and reality. "The Pharisees ... preach but do not practise.... You tithe mint and dill ... and have neglected the weightier matters of the law ... straining out a gnat and swallowing a camel" (Matt. 23:2, 3, 23, 24). "Woe to you lawyers, for you load men with burdens hard to bear, and you yourselves do not touch the burdens with one of your fingers" (Lk. 11:46; cf. Matt. 23:4). Such an attitude is untruthful, for it is deceitful, and based on a contradiction between word and deed. (ii) Positively, Jesus' own words always accord with his deeds and with actuality. He proclaims grace to the outcast; therefore he eats with tax-collectors and sinners. He is messiah in word, proclaiming the advent of the kingdom of God; therefore he is also messiah in deed, demonstrating the advent of the kingdom by works of power. Jesus' life of integrity culminates in the cross. Thus his life provides backing that gives the status of reliable currency to his words (→ Word). Whether or not this has any special connexion with the notion of truth or reliability in the OT, we have argued that this aspect of truth is bound to come into

prominence whenever emphasis is laid upon a correspondence between word and deed. It is left to Jn. to show how this correspondence exhibits the truth of Jesus' words especially in the context of his christological claims.

(c) Other occurrences of *alētheia* and *alēthēs* in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts either have the sense of truth in contrast to falsehood, concealment, or deception, or else refer to honesty or sincerity. In Matt. 22:15 (Mk. 12:14) the Pharisees and Herodians seek to trap Jesus with their questions and introduce this query with the words, "We know that you are true [*alēthēs*] and teach the way of God truthfully [*en alētheia*]". The point here is that Jesus will not conceal the truth through any fear of the consequences of stating it. He is known to be honest in stating his views. This can be called the Gk. view of truth only on the unwarrantable assumption that the contrast between truth and concealment (*lēthō*) occurs only in Gk. literature. The same meaning of *alētheia* occurs in Mk. 5:33, when the woman with a flow of blood who touched Jesus in the crowd tells "the whole truth", i.e. conceals nothing. However, in Mk. 12:32, to speak *ep' alētheias* is simply to state the facts of the matter accurately or correctly. This accords with the statement in Acts 26:25: "I am not mad, most excellent Festus, but I am speaking the sober truth". The words are based not on fancy but on fact.

(d) *alēthinos* occurs in the Synoptics only in Lk. 16:11: "who will entrust to you the true riches?" Here the meaning is clearly that of "genuine" or "real".

2. Research on the Pauline uses of *alētheia* is still dominated by the question raised by H. H. Wendt in 1883 about the extent to which NT writers are influenced by a distinctively Heb. understanding of truth ("Der Gebrauch der Wörter *alētheia*, *alēthēs* und *alēthinos* im NT auf Grund der alttestamentlichen Sprachgebrauches", *Theologische Studien und Kritiken, eine Zeitschrift für das Gesamt der Theologie* 65, 1883, 511–47). In a study of 1928, prior to his article in *TDNT*, R. Bultmann agreed that Wendt's thesis applied to Paul, but not to John ("Untersuchungen zum Johannesevangelium", *ZNW* 27, 1928, 113–63; cf. *TDNT* I 242–50). An unduly clear-cut contrast between Gk. and Heb. views of truth also marks D. J. Theron's study "*Alētheia* in the Pauline Corpus" (*EQ* 26, 1954, 3–18). However, we have already seen that such an approach needs to be qualified in the light of concrete examinations of specific passages and word-uses.

(a) One of Paul's most distinctive uses of *alētheia* within the NT (if the Pastorals are included) is his use of the phrase "the truth" (*hē alētheia*) to characterize the gospel itself. Although this is most prominent in the Pastorals (→ (g) below) this meaning already occurs in Gal. and perhaps in 2 Thess. The actual situation in Gal., rather than considerations about Gk. or Heb. background, makes this correlation intelligible. In Gal. 2:5 Paul declares that what is at issue in his conflict with the Judaizers is quite literally "the truth of the gospel". In Paul's judgment, enticement to compromise the gospel is an enticement to compromise the truth, and vice versa. To give way is deny the truth, both in the sense of his own integrity and in the sense of the actual situation in salvation-history as it now is. Hence by Gal. 5:7 "the truth" has become synonymous with the gospel itself: "What hindered you from obeying the truth?" J. Murphy-O'Connor rightly comments "No single term could better mark the contrast between the reality of the Gospel and the ineffectiveness of the Law" (*Paul and Qumran*, 195). He is also correct in noting the parallel between this use of *alētheia* in Paul, and the use of the term to mean revealed truth or correct doc-

trine in Qumran (op. cit., 183–202). It is open to question whether *pistei alētheias* in 2 Thess. 2:13 also has this meaning. As E. Best argues (*The First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians, BNTC*, 1972, 315), the phrase is already ambiguous, meaning either the truth which creates saving faith, or the faith which is placed in the truth. Whichever interpretation is accepted, *alētheia* here may mean either the gospel, as the message of salvation, or else (more probably) that which is real, in contrast to mere human imaginings. Another ambiguous reference is 2 Cor. 13:8 (→ (e)), which Bultmann places under this heading, in analogy to Dan. 8:12 (*TDNT* I 244). Truth here, he argues, means true doctrine, as opposed to "a different gospel" (11:4). Bultmann's suggestion about this verse is possibly correct, although open to question. However, his attempts to assimilate several other passages from 2 Cor. (e.g. 4:2) must be rejected, since the issue behind these allusions to truth concerns a correspondence between speech and conduct (→ (d)).

(b) Paul also uses *alētheia* in a similar but definitely broader sense, to mean God's revelation of his will or even of his Being either through the law or even, at one point, through creation. This use is characteristic of the first two chapters of Romans. Men by their wickedness "suppress the truth" (Rom. 1:18), and exchange the truth about God for a lie (*pseudei*) (1:25). Hence there will be wrath for those who do not obey the truth (2:8). The law itself, by contrast, is the embodiment of knowledge and truth (2:20, *tēn morphōsin tēs gnōseōs kai tēs alētheias en tō nomō*). The truth at issue here is not primarily the truth of the gospel. Men are without excuse for Paul not, as for John, because they lay claim to a knowledge which would allow them to recognize the messiah, but because they reject the truth about God as creator and judge. Paul does not say that the whole Gentile world has wilfully rejected gospel-truth, but that it has wilfully suppressed (*katechein*) what may be seen about God and his sovereign claims from creation: "the invisible attributes of God are plainly seen, namely, his eternal power and deity" (Rom. 1:20). That "the truth" here does not mean specifically the truth of the gospel is clear when we remember that Paul is stating a central principle of Jewish synagogue-preaching in Hel. cities, as reflected equally in Wis. Sol. 13:1–10, 14. To admit this is not necessarily to be committed to a full-scale natural theology. Even Karl Barth allows that nature and the order of creation at least disclose, to those who will see, "the insecurity of our whole existence, the vanity and utter questionableness of all that we are" (*The Epistle to the Romans*, ET 1933, 46). To say that the law is an embodiment of truth (2:20) does not narrow this concept of truth, but is to say only that this truth comes to a focus in the law of God as revealed in men's hearts. Admittedly, once again, Paul is taking up standard Jewish sermon-material, with a view to using it against the Jews themselves. But he does not deny its general validity.

(c) Truth in Paul often stands in contrast to lying or deception. Indeed, together with Wis. Sol. 13 and 14, Paul inherits the traditional Heb. prophetic view that divine truth stands in contrast to idolatry, precisely because idolatry is a deception and delusion (cf. Rom. 1:25). We have already said that there is nothing distinctively Greek about this contrast. Paul uses the word in a thoroughly natural sense when he asserts, "I am speaking the truth in Christ; I am not lying" (Rom. 9:1). "Everything we said to you was true" (2 Cor. 7:14). Whereas some writers employ this contrast in a primarily intellectual way, others underline its ethical and practical significance for life. This is not, however, chiefly a contrast between Heb. and Gk. thought, but

between those for whom practical integrity is important, and those whose main concerns are more strictly to do with theoretical knowledge. Thus we find that for Paul, as for Jesus, truth becomes a matter of correspondence between word and deed.

(d) These two aspects of *alētheia* are brought together in a striking way in 2 Cor. On the one hand, Paul was accused of vacillation and change, and asserts his own concern for the truth in the sense of an honesty or integrity in which word and deed correspond. Indeed, he urges, it is the false apostles who need artificial commendation, rather than that of a costly and fruitful ministry which proves the worth of words. On the other hand, Paul is also accused of veiling his gospel. Once again, he urges it is not he but his opponents who tailor the gospel message to conform to human expectations and demands. Hence he exclaims: "We have renounced disgraceful, underhanded ways: we refuse to practise cunning or to tamper with God's word [*mēde dolountes ton logon tou theou*], but by the open statement of the truth we would commend ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God" (4:2). But side by side with this emphasis on truth or unconcealment (the so-called Gk. views), Paul stresses his unity of word and conduct: "We commend ourselves [cf. 4:2] ... through great endurance, in afflictions, hardships, calamities ... by truthful speech ..." (2 Cor. 6:4–7).

(e) Paul believes in the power of truth. Truth exposes lies (Rom. 3:4, where divine truth exposes human falsehood for what it is). Love of the truth can even lead to salvation (2 Thess. 2:10), although this means not mere theoretical admiration of intellectual truth, but commitment to the truth as this is expressed in the gospel. To encounter the truth as it is in Jesus leads on to transformation of life, in which the believer turns away from old deceits (Eph. 4:21, 22). Thus in 2 Cor. 6:7 "truthful speech" occurs in parallel with the power of God and weapons of righteousness. Paul does not use the weapons of power politics or psychological pressure, but with honest integrity speaks and acts in truth and righteousness. Similarly in Eph. 6:14 truth is part of the Christian's armour, which protects him in the face of attack. 2 Cor. 4:2, to which we have already alluded, has the same flavour. Paul's statement in 13:8, "We cannot do anything against the truth, but only for the truth", may just possibly refer to truth as a synonym for the gospel, as R. Bultmann maintains (→ (a)), but more probably conveys the idea that the power of truth is such that openness to truth, whatever its consequences, can only further the cause of Christ and the gospel.

(f) Truth is demanded of the Christian as a corollary of his union with Christ and status as a new creation. In 1 Cor. 5:8 the Christian celebrates the festival of the new life with sincerity and truth, banishing all impurity and deception or dishonesty, just as the Jews banished the old leaven from their houses at Passover time. Truth and purity stand in contrast here to *kakia*, *ponēria* and *porneia*. The new life is to be untarnished; free from anything that spreads corrupting influences by virtue of its impurity or duplicity. The same idea occurs in Eph. 4:25, with more explicit reference to falsehood. Because the believer has put on the new nature (v. 24), Paul adds: "Putting away falsehood [*to pseudos*], let every one speak the truth with his neighbour, for we are members one of another". The word for "putting away" (*apothemenoi*) is the same as that which is used in v. 22 for "putting off" the old nature. Paul is probably citing Zech. 8:16 (→ OT). Paul also insists that the Christian speaks the truth in love (→ (h), *alētheuō*, Eph. 4:15). Two commentators even

suggest that after the sentence "love rejoices at the truth" (1 Cor. 13:6), we should understand "love bears all things" (*panta stegei*, v. 7) to mean that love "keeps all confidences" (W. F. Orr and J. A. Walther, *I Corinthians*, 1976, 296). But although *stegei* means "covers over" in some contexts, here it probably means either "is proof against everything" (A. Robertson and A. Plummer, *1 Corinthians, ICC*, 1914) or else "supports everything" (C. K. Barrett, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians, BNTC*, 1968, 304). The interpretation of "love rejoices at the truth" is difficult. The RSV translates *alētheia* as "right", in contrast to *adikia* in the previous clause. But the meaning of the verse probably is: love is brave enough to face the truth. It has nothing to conceal, and so is glad when the truth prevails. Genuine love entails not the kind of deception that makes someone else a tool or a captive, but the kind of truth which is the basis of fully inter-personal relationships.

(g) The Pastoral Epistles reflect a distinctive outlook, although they take up and develop a trend which we have already noted in Gal. and Rom. Truth is essentially the revealed truth of the gospel message. This is precisely because the problem of false doctrine looms as large as it did earlier in Gal. To become a Christian is "to come to the knowledge of the truth" (1 Tim. 2:4; 2 Tim. 3:7). By contrast, the great danger which is under attack is that men will listen only to teachers who "suit their own likings, and will turn from listening to the truth and wander into myths" (2 Tim. 4:3, 4). Such men have "a morbid craving for controversy and for disputes about words ... wrangling among men who are ... bereft of the truth" (1 Tim. 6:5). The term "controversy" (*zētēsis*) in this context denotes not concern to arrive at or to defend the truth, but "pre-occupation with pseudo-intellectual theorizings" (J. N. D. Kelly, *The Pastoral Epistles, BNTC*, 1963, 134). This kind of controversy keeps truth at arm's length. It is in this connexion that we should consider the quotation of the logical antinomy of Epimenides in Tit. 1:12, 13. The logical puzzle is the status of the assertion that "all Cretans are liars", if this is spoken by a Cretan. If the statement is true then it is falsified by a Cretan's speaking it truly; whilst if it is false, to assert it would be untrue. Its conclusion in the Pastorals with the added statement "this testimony is true" suggests not that the author has misunderstood the philosophical point, but that the Cretan antinomy constitutes a valid example of the kind of profitless controversy described above, which makes truth a merely theoretical matter. By contrast, "the truth" in the Pastorals, especially in the sense of Christian revelation, is wholesome and health-giving (Gk. *hygiainousēs*, e.g. 2 Tim. 4:3). Thus, far from evading the question of truth, the Pastorals demonstrate the NT concern for it, even though *alētheia* is more readily restricted to the content of Christian revelation than in earlier epistles such as 2 Cor.

(h) The verb *alētheuō* occurs only twice in the NT, both times in Paul. In Gal. 4:16 Paul exclaims, "Have I then become your enemy by telling the truth?" Here the irony has most point if "truth" is understood to mean the actual facts of the gospel as they really are, in contrast to the deceptions of Paul's opponents. Even if *alētheuō* is understood to mean little more than "to proclaim the Christian message", the contrast between Paul and his opponents loses its point if this is not specifically a truth proclamation which hides nothing from the hearer, however unpalatable. In Eph. 4:15 the believer is enjoined to speak the truth in love. It is possible that *alētheuō* here entails integrity of life in addition to truthful speech. The previous verse warns against the kind of fickleness which moves from one novelty to another in response

to deceptive persuasions. The adjective *alēthinos* occurs only once in Paul, where "to serve the living and true God" (1 Thess. 1:9) seems to have, once again, its characteristic meaning of real or genuine. The real God, here, stands in contrast to idols, or so-called gods. The adverb *alēthōs* also occurs only once in Paul, in the same epistle. The Thessalonians received the message of Christ not as mere human words, but "as what it really is, the word of God" (1 Thess. 2:13). The word describes what is genuinely or really the case.

3. In the rest of the NT apart from the Johannine writing and Rev., *alētheia* is used only 8 times; *alēthēs*, twice; and *alēthinos* three times. *alēthōs* and *alētheuō* do not occur at all.

(a) In the Petrine Epistles we find "the truth" or "the way of truth" used as it is especially in the Pastorals virtually as a synonym for the truth of the gospel. Christians are therefore those who have become obedient to the truth (1 Pet. 1:22). On the other hand false prophets and false teachers deny Christ, and thereby cause men to revile the way of truth (2 Pet. 2:2).

(b) Sometimes "true" means "in accordance with the facts of the matter" and even "in accordance with experience". Thus "the true grace of God" (1 Pet. 5:12) means the grace which the readers had proved true in their experience, and which was based on reality and not delusion. A true proverb (2 Pet. 2:22) states truth as it is in the light of experience.

(c) At first sight "the word of truth" in Jas. 1:18 seems to mean simply the message of the gospel (→ 2(a) and 3(a)). But the context suggests that what is at issue is that God acts reliably and consistently. God does not tempt men to sin (vv. 13–16). With him is no shadow due to change (v. 17). His word is, in this sense, the word of truth. To wander from the truth (Jas. 5:19) might also seem to mean to turn away from the gospel. But once again the term here is broader, meaning "the right path". In what sense does selfish ambition lead one to be "false to the truth" (Jas. 3:14)? James may be referring to a false estimate of one's own capabilities. But it is more likely that he is warning his readers that selfish ambition and arrogance lead men to put considerations about their own status even above those which concern the truth. Often lies stem from a concern to defend, or assert the claims of, one's own status in the eyes of others (→ 5(h)).

(d) The reference in Heb. 10:26 to receiving knowledge of the truth certainly means knowledge of the truth of the gospel. But "truth" here also underlines the absoluteness and finality of the Christian message. If a man turns his back on that which is the *truth*, indeed there is nothing else.

(e) *alēthinos* occurs three times in Heb., describing "the true tent" (8:2 and 9:24) and "a true heart" (10:22). (i) Many scholars see the contrast between the true tabernacle and its earthly "copy" (*cheiropoiēta* . . . *antitypa*; cf. 9:24) as a clear and unambiguous allusion to the Platonic doctrine of forms. The earthly sanctuary is that which is a mere copy of the "real" sanctuary in the realm of eternal ideas. In spite of the long vogue which this theory has enjoyed, C. K. Barrett and several other scholars have shown that the Jewish apocalyptic writers also drew a contrast between the heavenly sanctuary as it existed in the mind of God, or in heaven, and the earthly tabernacle which reflected on earth this heavenly reality ("The Eschatology of Hebrews", in W. D. Davies and D. Daube, eds., *Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology. In Honour of C. H. Dodd*, 1956 and 1964; R. G.

Hamerton-Kelly, *Pre-existence, Wisdom and the Son of Man, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series* 21, 1973, 256–8; and A. Cody, *Heavenly Sanctuary and Liturgy in the Epistle to the Hebrews*, 1960). It is possible that apocalyptic Judaism is indirectly influenced by Platonic ideas, but this is very different from claiming to see a Platonic view of truth in Heb. At the same time, this is not to deny that *alēthinos* in 8:2 and 9:24 bears its characteristic meaning of genuine or real. (ii) By contrast in 10:22 "a true heart" means one that is honest and without deceit. The believer draws near to God without the burden and duplicity of a divided self, coming in full assurance of faith with a heart sprinkled clean from an evil conscience.

4. Considerations about word-frequency alone suggest the importance of truth in John and the Johannine Epistles. Nearly half of the 109 occurrences of *alētheia* appear in the Johannine writings (25 times in the Gospel and 20 times in the Johannine Epistles). *alēthēs* is used 17 times out of a total of 26 occurrences in the NT; whilst *alēthinos* appears 23 times (including 10 times in Rev.) out of a total of only 28 uses in the whole NT. In all, therefore, over half of the NT uses of all three words occur in the Johannine writings. Thus it is all the more unfortunate that many scholars allow their exegesis of passages about truth to be dominated by the questions of whether John holds the "Gk." or "Heb." view of truth. R. Bultmann and C. H. Dodd argue that John sees truth primarily as reality in contrast to falsehood or appearance, but insist on seeing this as evidence of a Hellenistic view of truth in John. Other writers, including most emphatically L. J. Kuyper ("Grace and Truth, An OT Description of God and its Use in the Johannine Gospel", *Interpretation* 18, 1964, 3–19) and more moderately C. K. Barrett, L. Morris, and R. E. Brown, underline instances in John where *alētheia* may possibly mean faithfulness, as evidence of affinities with the OT and Judaism. This way of posing the question, however, is unsatisfactory for two main reasons. Firstly, we have seen that an unduly clear-cut contrast between Heb. and Gk. views of truth must be in question. Secondly, it is misleading to tie exegetical conclusions about the meaning of *alētheia* to a theory about Johannine affinities of thought. The view adopted in this article is that John uses *alētheia* regularly in the sense of reality in contrast to falsehood or mere appearance, but that this in no way provides evidence of Gk. affinities of ideas, or of disregard for the OT tradition.

(a) Special consideration may be given to the use of the phrase "full of grace and truth" (*plērēs charitos kai alētheias*) in the Prologue (1:14; cf. *hē charis kai hē alētheia*, 1:17). It is usual to find the background to these verses in Exod. 34:6: "The LORD, a God merciful and gracious, slow to anger, and abounding in steadfast love and faithfulness" (Heb. *raḇ ḥeseḏ wᵉʾᵉmeṯ*; LXX, *polyeleos kai alēthinos*). The LXX use of *eleos* to translate *ḥeseḏ* represents a standard procedure, but this need not be an obstacle to the argument that Jn. takes up this phrase from Exod. 34. Jn. does not always follow the LXX accurately, and in any case in later Gk. *charis*, grace, comes regularly to replace *eleos*, mercy, as the standard translation of *ḥeseḏ* (J. A. Montgomery, "Heb. Ḥeseḏ and Gk. Charis", *HTR* 32, 1939, 97–102). L. J. Kuyper therefore urges emphatically that the OT idea of covenant loyalty, expressed in *ḥeseḏ*, completely determines the meaning of the whole phrase "grace and truth" in Jn. Everything turns on fidelity, loyalty, faithfulness, and dependability (op. cit., 6–9 and 14–16). That Exod. 34 lies behind these verses is well argued by A. T. Hanson (*Grace and Truth*, 1975, 5–11). Moses had made the bold request that he might see

God's glory (Exod. 33:18). God replied that no one might see his face and live; but he promised that "you shall see my back". The phrase cited in John 1:14 describes this experience of "seeing" God. But Jn. gives the phrase fresh point. He says that truly to "see" God is to see nothing other than his glory in *Christ*. This interpretation of John 1:14–18 is valid. However, does *alētheia* (vv. 14 and 17) therefore necessarily mean faithfulness (Kuyper), reliability (Morris), or constancy (Brown)? Bultmann flatly rejects this as "not possible" (*The Gospel of John*, 1971, 74 n. 2). For this reason he also rejects Exod. 34 as the background of the passage. But must both possibilities be either accepted or rejected together? On the one hand, the Exod. 34 background of "seeing God" is appropriate to Jn.'s thought. On the other hand, to say that Christ the Logos abounds in covenant faithfulness, or reliability, seems strained in this context. Admittedly C. K. Barrett is correct in seeing the idea of God's covenant faithfulness in the background (*The Gospel according to St. John*, 1958, 139). God's promises of grace and revelation are pre-eminently fulfilled in Christ. But what Jn. wishes to stress in these verses is that, in Christ the Logos, men can see God in his genuine actuality and reality. If men can see God's *reality* anywhere, it is in Christ. Thus R. Schnackenburg rightly comments that whilst it is just possible to understand *alētheia* here as steadfastness, "the evangelist probably took it to mean 'divine reality' in a more strongly ontological sense (cf. v. 17) as he understands *alētheia* in 4:23; 8:44; 14:6; 17:17; 18:37d. The hymn sees in the bodily presence of the Logos among men the eschatological fulfilment of God's dwelling among his people" (*The Gospel according to St. John*, I, 1968, 273). This would accord entirely with the sense of v. 17. The law does indeed constitute a witness to God, as does Moses; but the reality itself, to which everything else witnesses, is encountered in Christ.

(b) There can be no doubt at all that sometimes in Jn. *alētheia* and *alēthēs* mean simply truth in contrast to falsehood. In Jn. 4:18 the woman of Samaria speaks the truth about her marital status. In 10:41 it is affirmed that everything that John the Baptist said about Jesus is true. The statement "I tell you the truth; it is to your advantage that I go away" (16:7) dispels any suspicion that the words may have been tailored to provide some illusory comfort. In 1 Jn. a liar is one who does not speak the truth (2:4; cf. 2:21, 27). To err from the truth is to be deceived (1 Jn. 1:8). The notion of witness is very prominent in the Fourth Gospel, and much is made of the fact that the witness to Christ is true (Jn. 5:31 f.). However, the notion of a witness which is true rather than false leads on to the question of the validity of that witness, and thereby to the use of *alētheia* in the sense of validity.

(c) The debate about truthful witness, which is touched on in Jn. 5:31, is developed more fully in 8:13–58. Here it may seem that we come closest in Jn. to the so-called Heb. concept of truth as reliability. Witness to Jesus Christ is reliable because it comes from God, and from more than one witness (8:17, 18). But on closer inspection the issue turns on validity, rather than reliability as such. The witness to Jesus Christ is valid, because there is no higher court of appeal than God himself. The witness of those who judge "according to the flesh" (v. 15) is not necessarily dishonest (although there may be a hint of this in 9:41); but such testimony is untrue in the sense that it is invalid. Valid witness depends on revelation.

(d) One of the most important uses of *alētheia* and *alēthēs* in Jn. is to convey the idea of reality, in contrast to whatever the situation may seem to look like on the sur-

face. (i) The clearest example of this use is when the adj. *alēthēs* is used in the same sense as the more characteristic word *alēthinos* to mean "real". Thus in 6:55 Jesus says that his flesh is real food, and his blood is real drink. It is more genuinely food and drink than other things that go under these names. Real food gives more lasting satisfaction and nourishment than other things which men call "food". (ii) Those who worship God in Spirit and in truth (4:23, 24) are not those who worship in sincerity and inwardness. The Samaritans are not criticized for lacking sincerity. True worship is that which accords with reality, which men grasp on the basis of revelation. The phrase *en alētheia*, as C. H. Dodd rightly insists, means "on the plane of reality" (*The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, 1953, 175). It is on the plane of *ta onta* as distinct from *eidōla* or *phantasiai*. Hence it is associated with the Holy Spirit.

(e) Special attention should be given to the phrase "doing the truth" in Jn. and the Johannine Epistles. At first sight it may seem simply to reflect the OT and Jewish usage according to which it need mean little more than practising fidelity. But C. H. Dodd and others are correct in rejecting this interpretation of the phrase in Jn. It combines an allusion to the way of Christian revelation with an additional reference to the contrast between truth and falsehood. Thus in Jn. 3:21 the statement, "He who does what is true comes to the light that it may be clearly seen that his deeds have been wrought in God," cannot simply refer to the man who lives up to his aspirations faithfully. This would make nonsense of the thrust of the whole chapter, namely that even a good man needs to be born anew. C. K. Barrett, therefore, understands the phrase to mean: "he that practises the true (Christian) faith and life" (op. cit., 182). However, the verse also means more than this. For there is the additional thought that such a man will in practice wish to hide nothing. Truth can only serve Christian faith and Christian life. 1 Jn. 1:6 similarly combines the notion of truth as revelation with truth in contrast to falsehood. A sharp tension between profession of faith and actual practice is both inconsistent with Christian revelation and also in principle self-contradictory. Hence if we claim to have fellowship with God but walk in darkness "we do not live according to the truth".

(f) There are several passages in Jn. in which the meaning of *alētheia* or *alēthēs* is too broad to be equated with any one of the five categories discussed above. (i) One of the most important of these is Jn. 14:6 where Jesus declares, "I am the way, the truth, and the life; no one comes to the Father, but by me." (A survey of interpretations can be found in I. de la Potterie, " 'Je suis la Voie, la Vérité et la Vie' (Jn. 14:6)" *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* 88, 1966, 907–42.) Dodd and Bultmann interpret this verse along the lines of a Hellenistic or gnostic dualism, to mean that through Christ the soul ascends to the heavenly realm of truth. Whilst we may question Bultmann's assumptions about the relevance of the gnostic background, he is nevertheless correct when he writes: "He (Christ) is the way in such a manner as to be at the same time the goal; for he is also *hē alētheia* . . . as the revealed reality of God." To say that Jesus is the way as well as the truth means that "the discovery of this *alētheia* is not something . . . at man's disposal . . . Jesus *is* the truth; he does not simply *state* it. One does not come to him to ask about truth; one comes to him as the truth" (op. cit., 605 f.). Since the way leads to the Father, I. de la Potterie and R. E. Brown stress that "the way" is primary, and that "the truth" describes the way. Nevertheless, as the truth, Jesus is also the goal of man's search, for "he who has seen me has seen the Father" (v. 9). When he declares that he *is* the truth, therefore, a number of distinct

ideas are combined. Firstly, truth is not abstract or supra-historical but revealed in the actual personal life of the Word made flesh. This looks back to the point made with reference to the Synoptics about the correspondence between word and deed in the life of Jesus Christ (→ 1 (b)). Secondly, Christ is also the truth because he is the revelation of God, and therefore his own witness is valid (→ 4(c) and (e)). Thirdly, truth also stands in opposition to deception or falsehood. In the case of divine revelation, this means that Christ is both truth and reality (→ 4(b) and (d)).

(ii) It is probable that the same range of meaning applies to the assertion "thy word is truth" in Jn. 17:17. The context of thought is the distinctiveness of the community of believers as over against the world. The community is holy, for it belongs to God and is founded on God's word. However, the very word on which the community depends for its existence and its consecration is also a word of commission which sends it out into the world (v. 18). In both respects, this word from God is valid, effective, in no way false, indeed in accord with reality. It is all these things precisely because it is the revealing word of God himself. Thereby the sanctification of the community is assured, and its commission validated. In addition to this, the verse looks back to the OT and Judaism. The Gk. phrase is identical with the LXX form of Ps. 119:142, as found in Codex Sinaiticus (although not in the MT and other MSS of the LXX, which read "your law is truth"). Jer. 10:10 also has: "Purify our hearts to serve you in truth. . . . Your word is truth", and Jewish prayer regularly expressed the thought that God consecrates men through his commandments. There is perhaps some justification, therefore, for correlating "word" here with the (OT) Scriptures, although it primarily refers to God's word to the Christian community. If, in effect, God's word may be said to include the NT writings, it should still be remembered that this verse is not making an explicit statement about the truth-status of the Bible as such.

(iii) In Jn. 8:44, 45, the truth spoken by Jesus is set in contrast to the lie spoken by the devil. The devil "has nothing to do with the truth, because there is not truth in him [*en tē alētheia ouch hestēken; hoti ouk estin alētheia en autō*]". Here truth is primarily but not exclusively contrasted with falsehood or deception. There is doubtless an allusion here to the deception by the serpent in Gen. 3:4, 5. The implication is that by opposing the truth of Jesus (here, also in the sense of the authentic divine revelation), the Jews are actually doing the devil's work. R. Bultmann argues that truth in this verse stands in opposition not only to falsehood, but also to reality and to authentic existence (op. cit., 320–22). The devil seduces men away from reality and life.

(iv) By contrast, the Spirit of God is the Spirit of truth (Jn. 14:17; 15:26; 16:13; cf. 1 Jn. 4:6; 5:6). It is striking that this phrase is repeated in no less than three of the five Paraclete sayings. This harmonizes well with C. K. Barrett's understanding of the work of the Paraclete as that of a prosecuting counsel who "exposes" (*elenchein*) the facts of the matter. He brings things "to the light of day" or "shows a thing in its true colours". It is "the activity of a judge and prosecuting counsel in one" (op. cit., 76). The Spirit places the Christian community in the light of judgment which belongs, strictly speaking, to the last day. Hence his verdict is absolutely valid and needs in no way to be modified by fresh knowledge. One other idea, however, must be added. It is also true that "the Spirit of truth is a Paraclete precisely because he carries on the earthly work of Jesus" (R. E. Brown, op. cit., 644). In 18:37 Jesus

declares to Pilate, "For this I was born, and for this I have come into the world, to bear witness to the truth. Everyone who is of the truth hears my voice". The Spirit, as Paraclete, continues the work of Jesus also as Paraclete, whereby proponents of truth and falsehood are shown up to be what they are. Falsehood is exposed in all its seductive deception as a lie. The truth is shown to be reality, based on God's revelation. In this comprehensive theological sense what is true and what is false is brought out fully into the open only in relation to Christ and the Spirit. Pilate's baffled question, "What is truth?" (18:38), is a direct rejoinder to Jesus' claim that he bears witness to the truth. It is not, as L. J. Kuyper claims, that Pilate cannot understand a Heb. concept of truth, because he himself approaches the matter with a Gk. view of truth (op. cit., 17–18). Pilate remains baffled because there are certain questions about truth which can be answered only when a man is fully open to hear the witness of Jesus. This brings us back to the claim of Jn. 14:6, that Jesus Christ not only states the truth; he *is* the truth.

(g) It remains to consider *alēthinos* and *alēthōs* in the Johannine writings. (i) Often *alēthinos* has its characteristic meaning of "genuine" or "real". In Jn. 1:9, Jesus is the real light, in contrast to John the Baptist. C. K. Barrett rightly points out that this "light" means not so much the idea of inward illumination as of exposing to the light of judgment (op. cit., 134; cf. *phōtizō*, shed light upon). John the Baptist did indeed expose men's actions and call them to repentance; but the *real* crisis of division, which brings to light the direction in which men are going, is Jesus Christ. We have already seen that "real worshippers" (4:23) are those whose worship is based on reality, not on human aspiration (→ (d)). In 6:32 Jesus tells his hearers that whereas Moses gave Israel bread from heaven, God now gives them the real bread. The manna was physical nourishment which both fed Israel and taught them dependence on God. But the real bread, to which the manna merely pointed forward, was Jesus himself. Similarly in 15:1 Jesus is the real vine, worthy of the name. Israel was like a vine which was unproductive and wild; real fruitfulness is to be found only in Christ. (ii) On the other hand, *alēthinos* may also have the same range of meaning as *alēthēs*. It may denote a true saying (4:37), or true judgment (8:16). Sometimes the two senses merge, as when the meaning is primarily or partly, but certainly not exclusively, that of "real", e.g. "the only true God" (17:3). (iii) It is difficult to determine how narrowly or otherwise we should interpret the meaning of *alēthinos* in Rev. God is "the holy one, the true one" (Rev. 3:7); "the faithful and true witness" (3:14). "Just and true are thy ways" (15:3); "Just and true are thy judgments" (16:7). "These are the true words of God" (19:9); "these words are trustworthy and true" (21:5; cf. 6:10; 19:2; 22:6). It must not be forgotten that Rev. uses only *alēthinos* and never *alēthēs*, or even *alētheia*. Hence it would be unwise to try to draw too clear-cut a distinction between them. In Hellenistic literature *alēthinos* is used of divine beings to mean "that which truly exists", and this may well form part of the meaning in Rev. But God is also true in contrast to the deceits and falsehoods of idolatry and the antichrist. The martyrs and faithful believers may also rely upon his truth. As in the case of the last category which we examined under *alētheia* and *alēthēs* (→ (f)), "true" in these passages seems to include several of the nuances which we examined earlier separately. (iv) The adverb *alēthōs* occurs seven times in Jn., once in 1 Jn., and is absent from Rev. Sometimes it is used in the sense of "real" or "genuine", as an adverbial equivalent to *alēthinos*. Thus Nathanael is "really an

Israelite" (Jn. 1:47) in the sense of being a man really worthy of the name. Usually, however, the adverb is used in the sense of "truly" or even "indeed", and requires no additional comment.

5. Discussions about truth in modern philosophy are extremely complex, but certain basic points may be made with reference to current philosophical and theological discussion.

(a) Account must be taken of the varied ways in which the words "true" and "truth" are actually used in everyday speech, including that of the religious man. When we speak of a "true" report in the press, we usually mean that it corresponds to the facts of the matter, as may be confirmed by eye-witnesses of the event. When a historical statment is described as "true", this generally also means "corresponding to the facts", but in this case contemporary eye-witnesses (as opposed to reports of other past eye-witnesses) can no longer corroborate the event. Indeed in this case the usual way of testing the truth may be with reference to the internal coherence of a variety of historical traditions and reconstructions. However, when someone says that the statement "confession is good for the soul" is true, he usually means that he endorses this value-judgment, or that this maxim rings true in his own experience. The truth of a poem is something different from the truth of a report. In one sense, to speak of factual truth, historical truth, existential or personal truth, poetic truth, and moral truth, is to speak of different things. Yet in another sense, there is a closer relation between these different uses of the word "truth" than mere family resemblances. Many Christians would wish to claim that whilst the Bible contains more than one kind of truth, nevertheless there is a comprehensiveness about the truth of God which embraces all this particular variety. Our discussion, then, must do justice to two sets of considerations. On the one hand, truth is multiform, and criteria for different kinds of truth may vary. On the other hand, the truth of God lays claim to a universality which somehow undergirds and holds together particular expressions and experiences of truth in thought and life.

(b) From Plato and Aristotle to M. Heidegger, J. L. Austin and Peter Strawson, philosophers have debated the validity of the *correspondence theory of truth.* Thomas Aquinas defined truth in terms of the correspondence (or more strictly, adequacy) between the mind and the thing itself (*veritas est adequatio rei et intellectus*) (*Summa Theologiae* 1 Q. 16, 1). This points back to Aristotle's definition that "To say of what is that it is not . . . is false, while to say of what is that it is . . . is true". Plato made a parallel point in the *Sophist*: the statement "Theaetetus is sitting down" is true because Theaetetus is in fact sitting down; whilst the statement "Theaetetus is flying" is clearly false (*Soph.* 263 a, b).

(i) The correspondence theory of truth has received special discussion in modern times from Moore and Russell, and is also bound up with the earlier Wittgenstein's picture theory of meaning. In his earlier work Wittgenstein argued that there are two different ways in which a proposition may be true or false. A statement such as "Either it is raining or it is not raining" is a logical or necessary truth. It is "irrefutable by any possible experience". But the statement "it is raining" depends for its truth on whether it corresponds with the state of affairs which it describes. In the *Tractatus*, Wittgenstein argued that any contingent proposition, however complex (i.e. one that does not merely express logical necessity), depends for its truth on the correspondence between its smallest fact-stating units (elementary propositions) and

states of affairs. In technical terms: "A proposition is an expression of agreement and disagreement with truth-possibilities of elementary propositions" (*Tractatus*, 4.4). In the case of an elementary proposition, the constituent elements of the proposition correspond with the configuration of simple objects in the state of affairs (*der Sachverhalt*) which they portray.

(ii) The unprecedented clarity and rigour with which Wittgenstein stated this theory, however, by its very thoroughness also exposed some of its weaknesses. These were so clearly apparent that Wittgenstein himself came to adopt a radically different approach in his own later writing, although his later work concerns language and meaning rather than (at least, explicitly) a theory of truth. Firstly, can the relationship between truth and *all* language be explained in this way? In his earlier writings Wittgenstein had answered this question by asserting, even more sharply than Kant, a dualism between the truths of factual statements about the physical world and truths of religion and ethics which could not be expressed in language at all. Moral, religious, or poetic truth might be "shown" but it could not be "said". In his later writings, however, Wittgenstein saw that in practice human language functions in many varied ways, and that his earlier approach was arbitrary and doctrinaire. Language does not only *either* portray facts within the world *or* express logical truths. But as soon as we extend our view of language, we have surrendered the picture theory of meaning with which the correspondence theory of truth is bound up. Secondly, Wittgenstein also came to doubt whether all language and meaning operates solely, or even primarily, on the basis of reference. To say that the meaning of a word is the object to which it refers is a view which already requires a prepared framework of linguistic habit or training. Some simple meanings, like "bread" or "table" might seem to be arrived at on this basis; but more complex examples like "the square root of minus one" or even the warning "Look out!" cannot be explained in this way. Thirdly, how do we escape the difficulty that when we try to test the truth of our judgment about a fact with the fact itself, all that we can really do is to compare our first judgment with some second *judgment*, not with "the fact itself" independently of any human judgment? To borrow a simile used by Wittgenstein in another context, it is like buying a second copy of the morning paper in order to test whether what the first copy said was true.

(iii) It may be replied that in practice we always test our first judgment in the light of better or improved evidence, even if this can never be "the fact itself" independently of all human judgment. This then brings us to a weakened version of the correspondence theory of truth, which we find in J. L. Austin. Austin argues that there cannot indeed be an exact one-to-one correspondence between facts and language, but that speech-acts, or units of language, can be more broadly related to the world in a way which takes full account of the part played by convention. "The statements fit the facts always more or less loosely, in different ways on different occasions for different intents and purposes" ("Truth", in G. Pitcher, ed., *Truth*, 1964, 28). But this gives rise to a view of truth which in practice tends towards relativism. Elsewhere he writes that truth stands "only for a general dimension of being a right and proper thing ... in these circumstances, to this audience, for these purposes" (*How to Do Things with Words*, 1962, 44). In the context of British linguistic philosophy, P. F. Strawson has attacked Austin's approach, claiming that "what supremely confuses the issue is the failure to distinguish between the task of

elucidating the nature of a certain type of communication (the empirically informative) from the problem of the actual functioning of the word 'true' within the framework of that type of communication" ("Truth", in G. Pitcher, ed., op. cit., 53; see below, (d) (iv)). Current controversy in British philosophy is still influenced by the terms of the Austin-Strawson debate. In German philosophy the adequacy of the correspondence theory of truth has been emphatically challenged by Martin Heidegger (see below, (e) (ii)), and there are other factors which tend further to undermine it in a variety of philosophical traditions (see below, (f)).

(c) A number of philosophers have advocated alternative theories to that of a correspondence view of truth. Next in importance and influence to the correspondence theory is the *coherence theory of truth.* Leibniz, Spinoza, Hegel, and Bradley, all held versions of this theory. A statement is described as true or false in accordance with the extent to which it coheres, or fails to cohere, with a system of other statements. Just as empirical facts tend to be cited as the primary models for discussion in the context of the correspondence theory, so truths of mathematics perhaps most clearly demonstrate the principle of coherence. A mathematical proposition is true if it coheres with other propositions (ultimately with axioms) of its system. Traditionally many systematic theologians test theological truth in this way. If a proposition contradicts one or more of the accepted axioms of theology, it is said to be false. This criterion is also of special value to theology in that it takes account of the expansion and all-inclusiveness of truth. F. H. Bradley stressed that only the whole system is *wholly* true. In this sense, as J. Macquarrie remarks, "Theological statements are true in the sense that they are on the way to truth; that is to say, they do not freeze the question but open up the possibility of new insights" ("Truth in Theology", *Thinking about God,* 1975, 25).

It may seem that the relevance of this theory of truth to theology is ruled out by the fact that many theological statements, especially the language of the Bible, impinge on history. But we have already seen that statements about past history relate more closely to the coherence theory than to the correspondence theory (see above, (a)). The chief difficulty with the coherence theory is that it is possible to have two or more different systems, within each of which many propositions cohere. Only if the whole of truth, embracing all human history and the whole of reality, can be expressed as a single comprehensive system, can the coherence theory retain its fullest value as a criterion of truth. But *whether* a given system *is* fully comprehensive is very often precisely the point which is at issue. In such a case the theory would operate only if we assumed the truth of the very thing that is in question. This is not to deny that Christians often affirm this about Christian truth *as a statement of faith* (see below, (g)). But this is different from holding that the coherence theory offers a complete and final answer to all questions about truth.

(d) Other philosophical theories of truth have been put forward. (i) The *pragmatic theory of truth* is associated with the names of C. S. Pierce, William James, and John Dewey. It is argued that thought does not merely duplicate reality, or represent experience. A thought or an idea is true not when it provides a good copy of experience; but when it is good, fruitful, workable, or practical, in relation to a particular problem before us. In one sense this accords with the biblical perspective that truth is not merely abstract or theoretical. "By their fruits you shall know them" (Matt. 7:16). However, in another sense this theory is at variance both with Christian

thought and with philosophical reflection. A false belief may help someone to come to terms with life, or may help him to see the way forward in a particular situation; but this does not make it true. False prophets in the OT spoke words of encouragement which led to certain courses of action. But we should not for this reason claim that their utterances were in practice true. The truth of a theology or religion is not determined by calculating its effects, nor the numbers of its adherents at given points in history. Rudolf Carnap and G. E. Moore pointed out that in these terms truth would be a mutable concept, perpetually open to revision as circumstances changed.

(ii) The so-called *redundancy theory of truth* was formulated by F. P. Ramsey, and taken up by A. J. Ayer. Ramsey argued that there is no difference between the truth-value of the assertion "It is raining" and of the assertion "It is true that it is raining". In Ayer's words, "To say that a proposition is true is just to assert it" (*Language, Truth, and Logic*, 1946[2], and 1971, 118). Ayer then argues, "We conclude, then, that there is no problem of truth as it is ordinarily conceived" (op. cit., 119). The abstract noun "truth", he insists, can always be translated in terms of the adjective "true". We are simply misled by accidents of grammar into false assumptions about the "problem" of truth. Probably few philosophers would entirely endorse this view, without wishing to take the issue further. However, some thinkers do accept one of two possible variants, which take Ramsey's approach as a point of departure.

(iii) Alfred Tarski outlined what is often called the *semantic theory of truth.* As against Ramsey, Tarski insists that "true" functions as a genuine adjective, in the sentence "It is true that it is raining". But it does not simply make an assertion, let alone a repeated assertion, within the same language-system as "it is raining". In effect, it states that the sentence "it is raining" is a true sentence in English. It is a statement about a sentence. The standard objection to this theory is that we predicate truth not of sentences in a particular language, but of statements or propositions.

(iv) P. F. Strawson has advocated a *performative theory of truth.* Contrasting Austin's approach, he holds that, in terms of bare assertion, "it is true that. . ." adds nothing to the statement "it is raining". But it is not (as Tarski would hold) an assertion about the status of a sentence in a given language. To add the phrase "it is true that. . ." is to perform *the act of accepting and endorsing* the statement which the phrase qualifies. As against Austin, Strawson writes, "Why should the problem of Truth (the problem about over-use of 'true') be seen as this problem of elucidating the fact-stating type of discourse? . . . The occurrence in ordinary discourse of the words 'true', 'fact', etc. signalizes, without commenting on, the occurrence of a certain way of using language" ("Truth", in G. Pitcher, ed., op. cit., 42). There is a certain irony in Strawson's attacking J. L. Austin (the philosopher who did most to elucidate the nature of performative language) by means of the latter's own weapons. It is Austin himself who argues that "I know" can be used performatively rather than descriptively. Strawson's approach, however, has been attacked in turn by other philosophers, including G. J. Warnock. To say "That is true", Warnock argues, may indeed be to endorse a statement; but it is also *more* than this. It is also to make a statement about a statement. Otherwise it is hard to see any difference between "it is true that" and "I believe that".

(e) Questions about truth have been approached quite differently by philosophers of the existentialist or phenomenological tradition. In the view of Kierkegaard and

Heidegger, truth is not primarily a property which resides in propositions at all. It relates first and foremost to the human subject, who alone can appropriate and live out truth. (i) Kierkegaard writes: "Truth becomes untruth in this or that person's mouth" (*Concluding Unscientific Postscript*, 1941, 181). "It would help very little if one persuaded millions of men to accept the truth, if precisely by the method of their acceptance they were transformed into error" (op. cit., 221). Truth, for Kierkegaard, was not something that can be received neatly served out on a plate. Truth, in any important sense, needs to be sought for and passionately engaged with. In this sense "truth is subjectivity" (op. cit., 169; cf. 169–224). For "everyone who has a result merely as such does not possess it; for he has not *the way*" (*The Concept of Irony*, 1966, 340). Christ, therefore, is himself both the truth and the way (Jn. 16:6 f.; see above, 4). The truth of Christ is seen not so much in some objective body of knowledge, as in the way in which the gospel transforms someone's life when its truth is actively appropriated. This is the perspective that lies behind Bultmann's belief that the truth of the gospel comes to light not as theory but in personal decision.

(ii) Martin Heidegger firmly rejects the correspondence theory of truth (see above (b)). He writes: "Representations [*Vorstellungen*] do not get compared . . . in relation to the real thing. . . . 'Confirmation' signifies the entity's showing itself in its selfsameness" (*Being and Time*, 1962, 261). "Truth does not possess its original seat in the proposition" (*Vom Wesen der Wahrheit*, 1961[4], 12). Truth, for Heidegger, is a matter of the "standing open" of the attitude of the "I" or *Dasein* (*Offenständigkeit des Verhaltens*). Truth, in effect, is almost synonymous with revelation. It is the "letting-be of things that-are [*das Seinlassen von Seiendem*]" (*Vom Wesen der Wahrheit*, 16). Especially in his later writings Heidegger stresses that truth, as unveiling, comes only to the one who waits for it in quiet composure (*Gelassenheit der Milde*).

(iii) Hans-Georg Gadamer attacks a view of truth which is bound up too narrowly with theoretical reason alone. Such a view, he insists, belongs essentially to the outlook of the Enlightenment and its rationalism. Even Aristotle recognized that the *sophia* (wisdom) of the scholar depended on the practical *phronēsis* (wisdom) of the wise man. The Romans stressed the practical significance of the *sensus communis*. As against the narrow rationalism of Descartes, Vico went back to his broader and more practical perspective. Thomas Reid called attention to the rôle of common sense in assessing truth; whilst Shaftesbury stressed the rôle of wit, and Bergson, that of creative intuition. Truth, Gadamer urges, is not merely a property of concepts, but relates more deeply and broadly to all human experience. For example, "The experience of art acknowledges that it cannot present the perfect truth of what it experiences in terms of final knowledge" (*Truth and Method*, 1975, 89). Experience of reality and the truth conveyed in it transcend the conscious states of mind of a given historical moment; just as in a game, the reality of all that makes up the game transcends the conscious thoughts of the player. We discover truth, Gadamer urges, when we are grasped deep down by the "world" of the work of art, or the "world" of the game.

(iv) Largely on the basis of the view of truth and language found in Heidegger and Gadamer, E. Fuchs and G. Ebeling have approached the writings of the NT in a way which sees the truth of the gospel as that which is communicated at a pre-conceptual, pre-cognitive level (→ Explain, art. *hermēneuō*, NT 5(b)). In the parables, for example,

the truth of Jesus' message grasps the hearer not by passing on information in discursive form, but by drawing him into a world of new values which engages with his precognitive attitudes and presuppositions. In America this approach has been explored by R. W. Funk, W. Wink, and J. D. Crossan, although less explicitly with reference to Heidegger.

(f) A number of different factors have combined to produce a measure of scepticism about truth in our own day. Our own age often feels obliged to rest content with a kind of relativism which reveals extreme pessimism about questions of truth. From among a whole variety of causes, three may be selected for special comment.

(i) Philosophers like René Descartes felt able to rest the trustworthiness of human reason and sense perception on the character of God (*Meditations*, IV, V). We can come to know truth, he believed, because God exists and will not deceive us. Each in his different way, Berkeley and Leibniz also believed that truth depends on God. The correspondence and coherence theories of truth (see (b) and (c)) were more convincing in the context of this theological belief. In modern conservative Protestant theology and apologetics, it is the particular achievement of H. Dooyeweerd, Cornelius Van Til, and Francis Schaeffer to urge that theories of truth which may hold water within the framework of a biblical theism take on a radically different shape when they are transferred from their original moorings into a secular climate of thought. When theories of truth are placed in an entirely secular context there is an inevitable tendency towards greater scepticism and relativism.

(ii) This tendency is also aggravated by a pessimism about the unity of truth which stems partly from Kant, and which then receives further impetus from Kierkegaard and Nietzsche. In German thought this is bound up with the problem of "objectifying" thinking. Kant stressed the activity of the human mind in shaping and conceptualizing the phenomena placed before it. The truth of God was therefore to be found outside this realm, in the area of moral or practical reason. A division between rational and moral truth emerged, which in Kierkegaard and Schopenhauer (and later in Bultmann) became a dualism between thought and will. In particular the Neo-Kantianism of the late nineteenth century stressed the subjectivity of human consciousness. Hermann Cohen, for example, argued that "sensation can be nothing else but a question mark"; whilst Helmholtz believed that space itself depends on man's bodily modes of apprehension. Knowledge, Heinrich Hertz maintained, depends not on the direct apprehension of truth, but on the use of models (*Bilder*) and representations (*Darstellungen*). To think, therefore, is to construct and to shape "objects" in accordance with laws of thought. P. Natorp insists, "All objectifying [*objektivieren*] is the creative work of consciousness". It is because he so readily accepts this background of Marburg Neo-Kantianism that Rudolf Bultmann removes the truth of God from the realm of objectifying thinking. For on the basis of this theory of knowledge, to make God an object of thought is somehow to put knowledge of him at man's disposal; to make it human "work". The price to be paid for this approach, however, is a fragmentation of truth, in which the Christian believer can hardly move from beyond a confession of faith to making objective truth-claims. Even historical knowledge, including knowledge about Jesus, is placed in the realm of objectifying thought. Hence, according to Bultmann, strictly history as such cannot communicate religious truth.

Whilst many British and American theologians would hesitate to adopt the same

philosophical and theological perspective, nevertheless the *mood* of uncertainty to which late nineteenth-century Neo-Kantianism gives rise in theology has spread far beyond Germany. A parallel problem has also arisen in the area of psychology, where it is often argued that the power of the human mind is such that men can persuade themselves to believe almost anything. Even in physics, the world of Newton has given way to the less objectivist world of Einstein. The approaches of J. C. Maxwell, Heinrich Hertz, Max Born, and W. Heisenberg, suggest that "the world is not a fixed, solid array of objects, out there.... It cannot be fully separated from our perception of it.... The knowledge that it yields has to be *interpreted* by us. There is no way of exchanging information that does not demand an act of judgment". "There is no absolute knowledge" (J. Bronowski, *The Ascent of Man*, 1976, 353 and 364). At a popular level such an admission invites either of two different responses. Either it can lead to increased scepticism about the possibility of arriving at truth in any area; or else it can lead to the recognition that truth in the realm of religion is in the end hardly more nebulous or "subjective" than truth in the physical sciences. In this connexion T. F. Torrance writes, "We cannot pretend for a moment that objectivity can be abstracted from the subject-object relationship all knowledge involves" (*Theological Science*, 1969, 36). "The kind of demonstration (i.e. of truth) which a scientific theology requires is one in strict accord with the nature of its Object" (i.e. God; op. cit., 139).

(iii) Karl Rahner points out that one consequence of the attitude of relativism and scepticism in our own age is quite simply a lack of reverence for truth as such (*Theological Investigations*, VII, 1971, 230–33). Mass advertising and party-political propaganda, through mass media, exemplify this lack of reverence for truth. A sense of need is artificially stimulated, and false claims are implied by the arbitrary use of inappropriate visual images. The mass media, though perhaps in themselves often neutral, nevertheless increase the opportunities which are at the disposal of politicians and commercial advertisers, whereby this other-than-serious attitude to truth becomes the commonly accepted ethos of the age. Attitudes towards truth reflected in the OT and NT (→ above) stand in sharp contrast to, and indeed invite judgment on, any passive acceptance of such an ethos.

(g) Wolfhart Pannenberg has pointed the way forward to recovering a sense of the unity and comprehensiveness of truth in theology ("What is Truth?", *Basic Questions in Theology*, II, 1971, 1–27). Admittedly he begins by making over-generalizing remarks about the contrast between Gk. and Heb. concepts of truth, against which we have expressed strong warnings (→ CL, OT). Nevertheless he is correct in his claim that the biblical writers do not see the truth of God simply in terms of logical necessity which has no grounding in the contingent events of history. Theological truth, especially in the OT, is not like the truth that the sum of the angles of a triangle amount to 180°. For this remains true independently of whether such a geometrical figure is actually drawn and given existence. The truth of God "is not the result of a logical necessity.... The truth of God must prove itself anew in the future" (op. cit., 8). At the same time, this truth "embraces all other truth". This does not mean, as in Platonism, that it is above time and change. Indeed precisely the opposite is the case. "Truth is not to be found already existing somewhere as a finished product, but is instead thought of as history, as process" (op. cit., 21). Pannenberg does not deny that this understanding of truth has affinities with Hegel's philosophy. Indeed he praises

the value of Hegel's thought for theology. However he looks still more decisively to biblical eschatology as the basis for his view of truth, allowing that the horizon of the future is effectively lost in Hegel's thought.

If we once allow, with Hegel and Bradley, that the whole truth can be found only in the whole, from a biblical perspective this means that the whole truth emerges fully only at the end of history, when history reaches the goal. Pannenberg argues, however, that the significance of Jesus Christ, especially in the context of apocalyptic expectations, is that he constitutes the proleptic revelation of the End. In Jesus we see proleptically what God decrees and destines for the church and for the world. Hence Jesus Christ *is* the truth, in a way which allows for the unity and comprehensiveness of this truth. All reality is seen in this light, because Jesus Christ is the revelation of God, who is the God of all history. Pannenberg concludes, "the unity of truth is constituted only by the proleptic revelation of God in Jesus Christ" (op. cit., 27). In spite of his language about "Gk." and "Heb." concepts of truth, Pannenberg's achievement is to hold together a confident acceptance of the unity of the truth of God against the inroads of relativism and scepticism, whilst also acknowledging the particular (though limited) value of Kierkegaard's emphasis on personal truth. It should be noted that whatever his similarities to Hegel, Pannenberg's approach is a theological one, which rests on the decisive role of revelation. Nevertheless this is emphatically not to follow Bultmann in making almost everything depend on faith and decision. The truth of God is revealed publicly for all to see, in history and in Jesus Christ.

(h) In practical terms, reverence for the truth demands openness towards it, and submission to its leading. From the Protestant side, T. F. Torrance speaks of the readiness to submit all pre-conceptions to the test of truth, which characterized the Reformation. From the Roman Catholic side, K. Rahner speaks of the way in which self-defensiveness and self-assertion give rise to falsehood. Why else should someone wish to lie, except to gain undue advantage for himself, with a view to preserving his own reputation or urging his own views? Only the man who feels insecure, whose sins have not been forgiven, and who therefore fears to take the blame, needs to lie. The liberated man will have the courage to bear witness to the truth. He will follow truth, wherever it leads, having no vested interests in arriving at some pre-determined destination. In theology, this attitude need not and should not be the prerogative of classical liberalism alone, as is sometimes claimed. It is larger than any one theological tradition. As T. F. Torrance rightly argues, the method of following wherever the truth may lead is the only appropriate and genuinely "scientific" method when what is at issue is the truth of God himself. Reverence for truth is not simply the pseudo-cynicism of our own age which tries to "unmask" everything, in the belief that no one and nothing can genuinely lay claim to truth. It is the attitude which combines joyful confidence that truth can indeed be found, with a humble submission to truth whenever and wherever it emerges. Such openness to truth is required of those who worship the God of truth; whilst a due reverence for truth ensures honesty in a man's dealings with his neighbour, both in word and deed. This is the attitude, we have seen, to which both the OT and the NT bear witness.

A. C. Thiselton

(a). S. Aalen, "Truth, a Key Word in St. John's Gospel", *Studia Evangelica*, II, 1964, 3–24; J. L.

Austin, "Truth", in *Philosophical Papers*, 1961, 85–101 (also in G. Pitcher, below)*; A. J. Ayer, *Language, Truth and Logic*, 1946 and 1971, 116–35*; J. Barr, *The Semantics of Biblical Language*, 1961, 187–205; R. E. Brown, *alētheia, The Gospel according to John*, I, *Anchor Bible*, 499–501; E. Brunner, *Truth as Encounter*, 1964; R. Bultmann and G. Quell, *alētheia* in *TDNT* I, 1964, 232–51; C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, 1953, 170–79; J. J. L. Feisser, "Kant without End? The Critique of Kant in the Work of Dooyeweerd", in *Philosophy and Christianity: Essays for H. Dooyeweerd*, 1965, 212–19*; H.-G. Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, 1975*; A. T. Hanson, *Grace and Truth. A Study in the Doctrine of the Incarnation*, 1975; M. Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 1962, 256–73*; E. Hoskyns and N. Davey, *The Riddle of the New Testament*, 1947[3], 26–31; W. A. Irwin, "Truth in Ancient Israel", *JR* 9, 1929, 357–88; I. Jepsen, *'āman, TDOT* I, 1974, 292–323; L. J. Kuyper, "Grace and Truth", *Reformed Review* 16, 1962, 1–16, and "Grace and Truth. An OT Description of God and its Use in the Johannine Gospel", *Interpretation* 18, 1964, 3–19; J. Macquarrie, "Truth in Theology" and "Mystery and Truth", in *Thinking about God*, 1975, 15–43; L. Morris, *The Gospel according to John*, 1971, 293–6; J. Murphy-O'Connor "Truth: Paul and Qumran", in *Paul and Qumran*, 1968, 179–230; W. Pannenberg, "What is Truth?", in *Basic Questions in Theology*, II, 1971, 1–27; G. Pitcher, ed., *Truth*, 1964 (essays by Austin, Strawson and Warnock)*; K. Rahner, "On Truthfulness", *Theological Investigations* VII, 1971, 229–59; E. T. Ramsdell, "The O.T. Understanding of Truth", *Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society*, 31, 1951, 264–73; B. Russell, *An Inquiry into Meaning and Truth*, 1940, 226–326*; V. H. Stanton, "Truth", in *HDB* IV, 816–20; R. H. Strachan, *The Fourth Gospel*, 1941, 141–5; D. J. Theron, "Alētheia in the Pauline Corpus", *EQ* 26, 1954, 3–18; A. C. Thiselton, "Kierkegaard and the Nature of Truth", *The Churchman* 89, 1975, 85–107; T. F. Torrance, *Theological Science*, 1969, 141–202; and *God and Rationality*, 1971; J. Wheatley, "Austin on Truth", in K. T. Fann, ed., *Symposium on J. L. Austin*, 1969, 226–42*; A. R. White, *Truth*, 1970*; L. Wittgenstein, *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*, (1922) 1961*; and *On Certainty*, 1969*.

(b). J. Blank, "Der johanneische Wahrheits-Begriff", *BZ* 7, 1963, 164–73; R. Bultmann, "Untersuchungen zum Johannesevangelium: A *Alētheia*. I Der Begriff der Wahrheit im Alten Testament und unter alttestamentlichem Einfluss", *ZNW* 27, 1928, 113–34, "II *Alētheia* in der griechischen und hellenistischen Literatur", ibid., 134–63; E. Fuchs, "Wahrheit", *RGG*[3] VI, 1962, 1515 ff.; M. Heidegger, *Vom Wesen der Wahrheit*, 1954 (also in *Wegmarken*, 1967)*; K. Jaspers, *Von der Wahrheit*, 1947*; W. Kamlah, *Wissenschaft, Wahrheit, Existenz*, 1960*; D. Michel, "Ämät. Untersuchung über Wahrheit in Heb.", *Archiv für Begriffsgeschichte* 12, 1968, 30–57; I. de la Potterie, "L'Arrière-Fond du thème Johannique de Vérité", *Studia Evangelica* I, 1959, 277–94; and "Je suis la Voie, la Vérité et la Vie (Jn. 14:6)", *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* 88, 1966, 907–42; H. von Soden, *Was ist Wahrheit?*, 1927.

* philosophical works

Turn Away

ἀποτρέπω

ἀποτρέπω (*apotrepō*), mid. turn away from, avoid; *ἐκτρέπω* (*ektrepō*), pass. turn away (from), avoid.

CL Both verbs are more commonly used in secular Gk. than in biblical Gk. Whereas *apotrepō* is commonly used metaphorically (in the active voice) of dissuading, deterring or diverting a person from a particular course of action and (in the middle and passive voices) of avoiding danger or rejecting truth, *ektrepō* often denotes a literal turning aside, as of a tributary from a river or a person from a road.

OT *apotrepō* is not used in the LXX version of the Heb. canonical scriptures. Elsewhere in the LXX it is used in reference to such matters as the averting of reproofs (Sir. 20:29) and the relinquishing of pleasures (4 Macc. 1:33) or the diverting of people from their designs (3 Macc. 1:23). The single LXX use of *ektrepō* is in Amos 5:8 (God turns darkness into morning).

NT (a) In Heb. 12:13 the author encourages the disheartened to make straight paths for their feet "in order that what is lame may not be dislocated (*ektrapē*) but rather be healed" (cf. Arndt, 245). Minor injuries ("those who are lame") were to be bound up ("healed"), so that major injuries (such as dislocation) would be avoided. The reference to healing shows that *ektrepō* bears its technical medical sense of "dislocate" (as in Hippocrates) rather than its general sense of "turn away".

(b) In 2 Tim. 3:5b Paul enjoins Timothy (and indirectly the church at Ephesus) to "keep clear of" (*apotrepou*) any persons who are characterized by the vices he lists in vv. 2–4, for they "preserve the outward form of religion, but are a standing denial of its reality" (NEB, v. 5a). Such people were to be denied church membership as much as the controversialists mentioned in 2 Tim. 2:23–26. *apotrepomai* in 2 Tim. 3:5 is virtually synonymous with *ektrepomai* in 1 Tim. 6:20, both being followed by an accusative. In the latter passage, Timothy is told to shun (*ektrepomenos*) "irreligious and frivolous talk" (Weymouth) and the subtle and endless distinctions that belong to what is falsely called "knowledge". Timothy was to turn a deaf ear to this pseudo-science and to these unholy discussions that relied on futile jargon, because those who had given their attention to such matters had "shot far wide of the faith" (NEB, v. 21).

In the remaining three uses of *ektrepomai* in the Pastoral Epistles, the idea of doctrinal or ethical deviation is uppermost. As a result of neglecting the Christian triad of love that springs from a pure heart, a good conscience and sincere faith, the false teachers had "gone astray [*exetrapēsan*] into a wilderness of words" (NEB, 1 Tim. 1:6). Paul warns Timothy that the time would come when people would follow their own fancies and find themselves a crowd of teachers to satisfy their craving for novelty. They would shut their ears to the truth and turn aside (*ektrapēsontai*) or wander into a counterfeit world of mythology (2 Tim. 4:4). Already some widows had become idle scandal-mongers (1 Tim. 5:13) and gone astray (*exetrapēsan*) to become Satan's servants (1 Tim. 5:15), probably an allusion to their immorality.

M. J. Harris

M. Dibelius and H. Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles*, *Hermeneia*, 1972; C. Spicq, *Saint Paul. Les Épîtres Pastorales*, I–II 1969[4].

Type, Pattern

τύπος

τύπος (*typos*), form, likeness, model, type; *τυπικῶς* (*typikōs*), as an example, typologically; *ἀντίτυπος* (*antitypos*), corresponding to; *ἀντίτυπον* (*antitypon*), copy, image, antitype; *ὑποτύπωσις* (*hypotypōsis*), pattern, model, example, prototype, standard.

CL The etymological derivation of *typos* is disputed. It may be derived from *typtō*, strike, beat, which is found in the NT, particularly in Lk. and Acts (Matt. 24:49; 27:30; Mk. 15:19; Lk. 6:29; 12:45; 18:13; 23:48; Acts 18:17; 21:32; 23:2 f.; 1 Cor. 8:12). Whereas this meaning can frequently be demonstrated for *antitypos*, in the active as well as in the passive use of the adj. (i.e. in the sense of repelling and repulsed), it would hold for *typos* in at most one ref. (Hdt., 1, 67, 4). Otherwise this word, with

its denominatives *typoō*, *typōsis*, *typōma*, etc., is found in the original meaning of form, and in particular, a (hollow) mould.

1. In this sense, *typos* refers first of all to a concrete object such as the shape of a loaf, a relief, a coin, etc., and then (still concrete) the impression of a form, i.e. what an object leaves behind when pressed against another, such as a trace, a scar, the impress of a seal, a letter of the alphabet, etc., and still more generally, a likeness (→ Image, art. *eikōn*).

2. The word is found to a great extent in the abstracted sense of general form or type, such as the form of a style or a doctrine. There then follows the wider abstraction of the word in both directions; signifying the mould, the form which stamps and the impress, the form which is stamped. *typos* thus denotes: (a) an original, a pattern, and in two senses: the technical sense of prototype, model, and the ethical sense of example (so also *hypotypōsis*); and (b) copy (so also *antitypon*). (For further details of secular usage see L. Goppelt, *typos* etc., *TDNT* VIII 246 ff.)

OT 1. In the LXX *typos* occurs in only 4 places. It renders the Heb. words, *taḇnîṯ* (Exod. 25:40), original, model, and *ṣelem* (Amos 5:26), image, idol. Both Heb. words are elsewhere translated by other words, *taḇnîṯ* above all by *paradeigma*, example, pattern, and *homoiōma*, likeness, copy (→ Like art. *homoios*), *ṣelem* usually by *eikōn*, picture. In 3 Macc. 3:30 *typos* denotes the form, the style of writing, and in 4 Macc. 6:11 the (religio-ethical) example.

2. The wŏrd is a favourite term of Philo who uses it entirely in accord with general Gk. usage. Platonic influence primarily determines the following twofold usage: *typos* can specifically denote both the original, the picture–model, pattern as well as the imitation or copy. It is not a special concept for model or copy (for which Philo has a sufficient number of other terms), but is rather capable of denoting both at the same time. It is the general form which characterizes both originals (patterns) and copies or likenesses. Philo claims that God conceived of the *archetypos*, archetype, of the tabernacle which he gave as a *typos* or *paradeigma*, model, to the spirit of Moses (cf. *Leg. All.* 3, 102; *Vit. Mos.* 2, 74 ff., 141; *Som.* 1, 206; *Op. Mund.* 16, 19, 29, 36, 129; Exod. 25:40; cf. *TDNT* VIII 258).

3. *typos* was also used amongst the rabbis as a loan-word (*dᵉp̄ûs* and *ṭûp̄ôs* and several variable vocalizations) with the meaning, as in Gk., of form, model, and then the more general meaning, which (as in Lat. since Cicero) is current in numerous languages today. It may be compared with the introduction of *sēmeion*, sign, as the loan-word *sēmān*, which can express a correspondence of historical situations, a "typological" relationship, and thus approximate more closely to a distinctive NT usage of *typos*.

NT In the NT *typos* is found 14 times, but without allowing any particular emphasis to be discerned in individual writings. The word is missing entirely from the Synoptics, the Catholic Epistles (except 1 Pet.) and Rev., and also several letters in the Pauline Corpus.

1. The concrete meaning, the impression of a form, is found in Jn. 20:25a for the mark of the nails in the hands of the risen Christ.

2. In Acts 23:25 *typos* has the abstract sense of the gist, the content of a letter, in Rom. 6:17 the content, the expression of the doctrine. In the latter reference,

however, the original meaning of the form which stamps can still be strongly felt. As previously sin, so now the new teaching, i.e. the message of Christ, is the factor which stamps and determines the life of the Christian.

3. This basic meaning of the form which stamps is the one that is most commonly found.

(a) The double meaning of *typos* as the form of both pattern and copy is found in two references in Acts. Acts 7:43, with the LXX quotation from Amos 5:26, takes over the meaning of the images of idols. Acts 7:44 and Heb. 8:5 quote Exod. 25:40 and denote by *typos* the heavenly original, on the basis of which Moses had to erect the holy tent. Whereas the reference in Acts focuses on the divine commissioning of Moses' work and the divine institution of the earthly sanctuary, the OT quotation in Heb. is to be seen in the context of a more comprehensive concern with the interpretation of OT assertions about the saving work of Christ. A certain closeness to the Platonically influenced speculation concerning original and copy must not mislead us: even this passage has its place in the eschatological-temporal theology of history of Heb. The relationship of the original heavenly pattern (*typos*, Heb. 8:5, and *eikōn*, Heb. 10:1) to the earthly copy (*antitypon*, Heb. 9:24, or *hypodeigma* and *skia*, shadow, Heb. 8:5) is inserted into the scheme of the past and future blessings of salvation. Through Christ the heavenly patterns enter history and show the copies and shadows to be perishable (cf. ch. 10; see also O. Michel, *Der Brief an die Hebräer*, *KEK* 13, 1966[12], 286).

(b) Alongside *typos* and *hypotypōsis*, in the sense of example, stand other words such as *hypodeigma* or *hypogrammos* (→ Image). These latter represent Christ's ministry of self-sacrifice (Jn. 13:15) and his suffering (1 Pet. 2:21) not simply as an ethical example, but as the saving work which the community may appropriate and so follow Christ (cf. 1 Pet. 2:21b). *hypodeigma* is also found only (apart from in Jas. 5:10 as the example of the suffering of the prophets) in the sense of a terrifying object-lesson (Heb. 4:11; 2 Pet. 2:6). *typos*, meaning example, is used solely with reference to Paul (Phil. 3:17; 2 Thess. 3:9), the officials of the congregation (1 Tim. 4:12; Tit. 2:7; 1 Pet. 5:3) or the congregation itself (1 Thess. 1:7). These passages are not simply admonitions to a morally exemplary life; they call for obedience to the message (2 Thess. 3:6). It stamps those who proclaim it, and gives them authority. The shaping power of a life lived under the Word has in turn an effect on the community (1 Thess. 1:6), causing it to become a formative example.

4. Besides this common Gk. linguistic usage, *typos* also appears in the NT for the first time to denote historical events. It becomes a hermeneutical concept in the interpretation of OT tradition, in particular, of specific historical experiences of Israel, with the present eschatological event of salvation.

(a) In 1 Cor. 1:6, 11, Paul uses *typos* to interpret the events in the Corinthian church in the light of Israel's experiences in the wilderness. The punishment of God's ancient people which followed their disgraceful practices is seen as a prefiguration of judgment on those who abuse the Lord's Supper. It carries a specific warning to the "strong" at Corinth not to abuse the sacrament. The typological method developed by Paul thus consists in expounding the analogous relationship of concrete historical OT events, in the sense of the past prefiguring present or future eschatological happenings. This introduces a vital theological concern of Paul. God's activity in history is expounded, in order to show how God is bound to his promises. It is God himself

who creates this "typical" relationship, in so far as his Word of revelation (the Scriptures) fulfils it (cf. Rom. 4:23 f.; 1 Cor. 10:11). In this prefiguration of eschatological saving events in OT history, witness is born to the participation of the community in the saving work of Christ. As against some supposed metaphysical misinterpretation, salvation history is interpreted as the self-fulfilling activity of God in concrete human history. (On the question of allegory or typology in Paul → Parable, art. *parabolē*, NT 9.)

(b) The argument in Rom. 4 and Gal. 3 is also typological in this sense, though without the actual occurrence of the word *typos*. The same typological argumentation is present in 1 Pet. 3:21. Noah's deliverance through the waters of the flood is seen as a prefiguration and type of the saving event of → baptism, which thus becomes the *antitypon*, the antitype (in the sense of being an image).

(c) In Rom. 5:14, the *typos*-concept produces a tension which basically breaks through the typological method. The figures of → Adam and Christ are compared and contrasted in their significance and effectiveness for "all". Adam is designated a "*typos* of the one who was to come". This has given rise to an Adam-Christ typology. But since, on the one hand, Adam cannot really count as a faithful prefiguration of Christ, and on the other there is no other known occurrence of *typos* meaning a contrasting picture, Paul is here quite possibly employing the concept with the precise polemical intention of rejecting a traditional Adam-messiah typology. It is a matter of the radical abrogation of the old by the new; the new only becomes actual, when the old is overcome. Paul thus shows that this paradoxical relationship of the radical opposition and profound association of old and new is the reality in which the community is already living in the present.

Typology in Paul has obviously not yet hardened into a methodology simply requiring appropriate technical application to any situation. Its degeneration in subsequent years has cast suspicion on its credibility. On the other hand, attempts are being made in present-day (especially OT) scholarship to make the original relevance of typology fruitful again for the interpretation of the OT and so also for practical preaching. *H. Müller*

→ Explain (especially for discussion and literature on hermeneutics), → Image, → Parable, → Truth, → Word

(a). P. Achtemeier, *An Introduction to the New Hermeneutic*, 1969; F. W. Beare, "On the Interpretation of Romans vi. 17", *NTS* 5, 1958–59, 206–10; W. P. de Boer, *The Imitation of Paul: An Exegetical Study*, 1962, 17–24, 96–216; F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, *NLC*, 1964; and *This is That: The New Testament Development of Some Old Testament Themes*, 1968; F. Büchsel, *allēgoreō*, *TDNT* I 260–63; J. Daniélou, *From Shadows to Reality: Studies in the Biblical Typology of the Fathers*, 1960; C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, 1952; E. E. Ellis, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament*, 1957; L. Goppelt, *typos* etc., *TDNT* VIII 246–59; P. Fairbairn, *The Typology of Scripture*, 1854 [3]; A. T. Hanson, *Jesus Christ in the Old Testament*, 1965; and *Studies in Paul's Technique and Theology*, 1974; R. P. C. Hanson, *Allegory and Event: A Study of the Sources and Significance of Origen's Interpretation of Scripture*, 1959; G. W. H. Lampe and K. Woolcombe, *Essays in Typology*, *SBT* 22, 1957; E. K. Lees, "Words Denoting 'Pattern' in the New Testament", *NTS* 8, 1961–62, 166–73; R. N. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*, 1975; I. H. Marshall, ed., *New Testament Interpretation*, 1977; N. H. Ridderbos, "Typology", *Vox Theologica* 31, 1961, 149 ff.; H. J. Schoeps, *Paul: The Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish Religion and History*, 1961; R. V. G. Tasker, *The Old Testament in the New Testament*, 1954 [2]; H. E. W. Turner, *The Pattern of Christian Truth*, 1954; C. Westermann, *Essays on Old Testament Hermeneutics*, 1963; and *The Old Testament and Jesus Christ*, 1970.

(b). S. Amsler, "La Typologie de l'Ancien Testament chez S. Paul", *Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie* 37, 1949, 113–28; and *L'Ancien Testament dans l'Église. Essai d'Herméneutique Chrétienne*, 1960; A. von Blumenthal, "*typos* und *paradeigma*", *Hermes* 63, 1928, 391–414; R. Bultmann, "Ursprung und Sinn der Typologie als hermeneutische Methode", *TLZ* 75, 1950, 205–21 (reprinted in *Exegetica*, 1967, 369 ff.); U. Früchtel, *Die kosmologischen Vorstellungen bei Philo von Alexandrien*, (Dissertation, Hamburg) 1962; E. Fuchs, *Hermeneutik*, 1970 [4]; *Marburger Hermeneutik, Hermeneutische Untersuchungen zur Theologie* 9, 1968; *Zum hermeneutischen Problem in der Theologie*, 1959; K. Galley, *Altes und neues Heilsgeschehen bei Paulus*, 1965; L. Goppelt, "Apokalyptik und Typologie bei Paulus", *TLZ* 89, 1964, 321–44; and *Typos. Die typologische Bedeutung des Alten Testaments im Neuen, Beiträge zur Förderung der Theologie*, II, 43, 1966; J. Kürzinger, "*Typos Didachēs* und der Sinn von Röm. 6:17 f.", *Biblica* 39, 1958, 156–76; W. G. Kümmel, "Schriftauslegung", *RGG*[3] V 1517–20; C. Larcher, *L'Actualité Chrétienne de l'Ancien Testament d'après le Nouveau Testament*, 1962, 489–513; E. Larsson, *Christus als Vorbild, Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis* 23, 1962; O. Michel, *Der Brief an die Hebräer, KEK* 13, 1966 [12]; K. Müller, *Die Auslegung alttestamentlichen Geschichtsstoffes bei Paulus*, (Dissertation, Halle) 1960; A. Schulz, *Nachfolgen und Nachahmen. Studien über das Verhältnis der neutestamentlichen Jüngerschaft zur urchristlichen Vorbildethik, Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament* 6, 1962, 308–31; C. Spicq, *L'Épître aux Hébreux*, I–II, 1953 [2]; E. Starfelt, *Stud. i rabbinsk och nytestamentlig skriftolkning, Studia Theologica Lundensia* 17, 1959, 241–53, 284 f.; A. Takamori, *Typologische Auslegung des Alten Testaments? Eine wortgeschichtliche Untersuchung*, (Dissertation, Zürich) 1966; H. Ulonska, *Die Funktion der alttestamentlichen Zitate und Anspielungen in den paulinischen Briefen*, (Dissertation, Münster) 1963.

U

Unanimity

ὁμοθυμαδόν

ὁμοθυμαδόν (*homothymadon*), unanimous, of one mind.

CL *homothymadon* is compounded of *homo-*, together and *thymos* (derived from *thyō*, rage, seethe), the principle of life, feeling and thought. *homothymadon* thus means unanimous, but is later weakened to mean together. It is first found in the 5th and 4th cent. B.C. (Aristophanes, Plato, Demosthenes) and in the political sphere is used especially for the visible, inner unity of a group faced by a common duty or danger. The unanimity is not based on common personal feelings but on a cause greater than the individual.

OT The LXX uses it 36 times in all, generally as a rendering for *yaḥaḏ* (e.g. Job 3:18; 6:2) and *yaḥdāw* (Exod. 19:8; Job 2:11; Jer. 5:5; 46:21; Lam. 2:8), which mean together, all together, i.e. *homothymadon* is used in the weakened Hellenistic sense. At the same time the rendering of these Heb. words by *hama*, at the same time (Isa. 1:28; 42:14), and *epi to auto*, together (Ps. 41:7 [MT 41:8]; Amos 1:15) may indicate that the translators intended there to be overtones of the original meaning of *homothymadon*.

In Hellenistic Jewish literature *homothymadon* occurs in its original meaning in contexts of praise and lament (e.g. Jud. 4:12; Wis. 10:20; 3 Macc. 4:6; in a secular sense Jud. 15:9; Aris. 178), and also in the general sense of together (e.g. Jud. 15:2, 5 which, however, RSV renders with the force of unanimity; Wis. 18:5; 3 Macc. 4:4).

NT Apart from Rom. 15:6, *homothymadon* is used only in Acts (10 times). In Acts 12:20 it obviously means no more than that Tyre and Sidon joined in sending envoys to King Herod Agrippa I. In the other cases a unanimity is indicated: the eleven with the women and Mary in prayer (Acts 1:14), the growing church in the temple, breaking bread, etc. (Acts 2:46 f.; 5:12), the prayer after the release of Peter and John (Acts 4:24); the decision to send Judas and Silas with the decisions of the Jerusalem meeting (Acts 15:25). Equally there is unanimity even in the qualified hearing of Philip's message (Acts 8:6; *prosechō*, give heed to, follow), and the hatred of the Jews (Acts 7:57; 18:12 f.) and Hellenists (Acts 9:29), when faced with the message of the crucified and exalted Jesus.

There is thus a double kind of unanimity shown us in Acts, of the church and of its enemies. The cause is the same, viz. the preaching of Christ as Saviour and Lord. The reaction can be either faith and worship or hatred and rejection. His enemies found themselves united for the first time when they rejected the claims of Christ. Similarly the unanimity of the church was not based on the sharing of the same

human or religious feelings and convictions, but on the reality of Christ which had brought together both Jews and Gentiles (Acts 15:11). The unanimity of their enemies stemmed from seeing their religious (Acts 7:56 f.; 18:13) and commercial traditions challenged and their wish to maintain them at all costs.

When the local church lives and works *homothymadon*, it is living and working in harmony with its origin. That is why it is repeatedly stressed by Luke. If he plays down almost all the elements that militated against such unanimity in his picture of the primitive church (Acts 6:1 ff.; 15:37 ff.; cf. 8:1), it was hardly because he wanted to idealize it. It had its tensions and controversies (cf. 1 and 2 Cor., Gal., Epp. of Jn.). Rather, he wanted to show the essential unanimity of the church, an expression of its nature and therefore a pattern for later generations. Its realization is continually offered and promised to it, so that it may carry out its work of witness (Acts 1:8) in a world that rejects the salvation offered to it. The same goal, the unanimous praise of God *en heni stomati*, with one voice, is also envisaged by Paul in Rom. 15:5 ff., when he prays to God for the unanimity in service that comes from Christ Jesus and that surmounts all differences in understanding and knowledge. *E. D. Schmitz*

→ One

H. W. Heidland, *homothymadon*, *TDNT* V 185 f.

V

Vessel, Pot, Potter, Mix

κεράμιον

κεράμιον (*keramion*), an earthenware vessel, jar; κέραμος (*keramos*), clay, earthenware vessel, a roof tile; κεραμεύς (*kerameus*), potter; κεραμικός (*keramikos*), belonging to the potter, made of clay; κεράννυμι (*kerannymi*), mix; σκεῦος (*skeuos*), thing, object, vessel.

CL In antiquity a complex of words clustered around the basic term *kerameia*, which designates the potter's craft. From Homer onward *keramion* denotes vessels of clay, and especially earthenware jars for storing wine or water. The potter was a familiar figure in every village, and in the larger cities potters were organized as a trade guild. The potters' quarter in Athens was called the *kerameikos* (Menecles Barcaeus 3; Scholia to Aristophanes, *Birds* 395; *Knights* 769; *Frogs* 131). The absence of skill, evident in the crude work of an apprentice only learning his trade, gave rise to the proverbial statement, "he learned the potter's craft on a large wine jar!" which describes those who undertook the most difficult tasks without learning the elements of a trade (Plato, *Protagoras* 324 e; *Laches* 187 b; *Gorgias* 514 e). The fragility of earthenware and the ease with which a potter's stock could be depleted through breakage gave rise to a number of proverbs which suggest that the potter was sometimes the butt of jokes: e.g., "to make a pot of the potter" (Plato, *Euthydemus* 301 d); "and potter bears a grudge against potter!" (Hesiod, *Works and Days* 25; cf. Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1381 b 16). "A rich potter" became a euphemism for anything fragile or uncertain (Diogenianus 5, 97, 98), and "broken pottery" was a common phrase for ostracism (Strabo 7, 3, 9; *Comica Adespota* 33).

Although *keramos* describes a clay vessel, and in a collective sense pottery from the time of Homer (*Iliad* 9, 469; cf. Herodotus 3:96), it also came to designate in the plural tile-work. It is used in this sense in accounts associated with the building of a temple at Delos in the 3rd cent. B.C. (C. Michel, *Recueil d'Inscriptions Grecques*, 1900, 594 [52], 1387 [123]). In the Hellenistic period the idea was prevalent, according to Plutarch, that a person marked for death could not return to his house in the ordinary way. Thus people who were reported missing were not allowed on their return to enter their house through the door, but had to climb to the roof, remove the tiles, and lower themselves through the opening (*Quaestiones Rom.* 5). On the other hand, it was also believed that demons, disease, and death characteristically entered a house through the roof (Gellius, 10, 15, 8).

The verb *kerannymi*, which means to mix or blend, may originally have had something to do with the necessity of mixing water with soil in order to prepare the potter's clay. But in our existing sources it is used primarily of diluting wine with water (*Odyssey* 3, 393; 5, 93; 18, 423; 20, 253; 24, 364; *Iliad* 4, 260). A medical

prescription from the first century A.D. preserved among the Oxyrhynchus Papyri (VIII, 1088 [55] : "give to drink with raisin-wine and honey and pine-cones mixed") indicates a persistent tendency to dissociate the verb from the potter's craft.

OT In the LXX the Greek term *keramion* designates an earthenware pot or jar, perhaps of a fixed measure. In Isa. 5:10 God warns unresponsive Israel that ten acres of vineyard will yield only one measure (Heb. *baṯ*) of wine. The possession of jars filled with wine was a token of prosperity and blessing. Conversely, the judgment upon Moab may be pronounced in terms of emptying his vessels and smashing his wine-jars (Jer. 48:12).

The noun *kerameus* was consistently used to translate Heb. *yôṣēr*, potter, as in 1 Chr. 4:23 which speaks of the potters among the men of Judah who laboured for the king. Normally the reference to the potter is literal in the OT, although the potter's craft suggested a metaphor for God in his relationship to Israel and the nations (Ps. 2:9; Isa. 29:16; 41:25; 45:9; Jer. 18:2, 3, 6, on which → *pēlos*, clay). Typical of these passages is the oracle of lament in Isa. 45:9, which pronounces woe upon those who disbelieve in the deliverance God has promised. As inconceivable as it would be for a lump of clay to inquire of the potter what he was doing in the moulding process, or an unfired jar to complain that handles had not been added to the completed piece, so is the folly of anyone who would seek to show through argument that God is unable to accomplish what he has promised.

Keen observation of the potter is characteristic of the later scribe Joshua ben Sira (*c.* 200 B.C.). In a moving passage, Ben Sira contrasts the wisdom of the scribe with the skill evidenced by the farmer, the gem-cutter, the smith, and the potter – all men who keep the fabric of the world stable (Sir. 38:24–34). He observed not only the potter at work at his wheel, but the importance of glazing and the cleaning of the kiln (Sir. 38:29–30). It was inevitable that the concentration of the potter upon his work should suggest an apt figure for God in the pursuance of his purposes among men (Sir. 33:13). Similarly, the effect of the kiln upon the finished vessel furnished a simile for the manner in which human reasoning tests individual character (Sir. 27:5).

In common with classical usage, the verb *kerannymi* has reference to the diluting of wine with water (Prov. 9:2, 5; Isa. 5:22; 19:14; Bel and the Dragon 11) and has no association with the potter's trade.

NT The sole instance of *keramion* in the NT occurs in connexion with the arrangements for the paschal meal (Mk. 14:13 par. Lk. 22:10). The instructions given to the two disciples charged with the preparation of the Passover meal were to follow a man they would meet in the city, who would lead them to the house, where the feast was to be celebrated. They would recognize the man by the fact that he was carrying an earthenware water-jar. Jesus' knowledge of this circumstance and his precise instructions concerning what was to be said to the householder provides evidence of arrangements finalized in advance. The device of a man carrying a water-jar suggests a pre-arranged signal, for ordinarily only women carried water in jars; it would be normal to find a man carrying a wine-skin. A sufficient reason for resorting to a means of recognition which required no exchange of words in the street is provided by the determined search for Jesus and the issuing of a warrant for his arrest implied in Jn. 11:15.

The only instances of *keramos* in the NT occurs in Lk. 5:19, in the sense of roof-tiles. When four men were unable to break through a crowd with their paralyzed friend, they ascended a staircase on the side of the house to the flat roof which they broke open in order to lower the man before Jesus. It was not difficult to make an opening in the roof, which was made from light material coated with clay (cf. Mk. 2:4). The opening of a roof is mentioned elsewhere in contemporary literature, e.g., Midrash Rabba to Leviticus, 29, 6 end (in a story about Jeconiah's wife): "they opened the roof and let him down to him." In the Roman setting, Cicero speaks of letting a man down through the tiles (*In M. Antonium oratio Philippica* 2, 18, 45).

Of the three NT instances of *kerameus*, two occur in the stylized phrase "the potter's field" (Matt. 27:7, 10). The reference is to a field which the chief priests purchased with the thirty pieces of silver Judas returned after the betrayal of Jesus, as burial ground for strangers who died in Jerusalem (Matt. 27:3–10; Acts 1:18; → Akeldama). The field contained a pit where potsherds were discarded. A site has been located south of the Valley of Hinnom, where in Jeremiah's day a potter pursued his trade (cf. Jer. 18:2; 19:2).

The third instance occurs in the parable of the potter in Rom. 9:19 ff., where God's sovereign disposition over his own creation is affirmed on the analogy of the potter's determination to make from the same lump of clay one vessel (*skeuos*) of striking beauty and another destined for menial use (Rom. 9:21). The interpretation of the passage must take account of the context. In responding to the charge that God is unjust in the administration of his judgment, Paul appeals to Exod. 33:19, where God affirms, "I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy." From this, Paul deduces that everything depends upon God's mercy, which he extends or withholds according to his sovereign will (Rom. 9:15–18). Verse 19 then takes account of the defiant question, how can God hold the individual accountable for his transgression, if he himself assigns to each person his rôle? In his reply to this objection, Paul makes use of the parable of the potter, which earlier had informed the preaching of Isaiah (Isa. 29:16; 45:9). As the clay cannot protest against the action of the potter, neither can the creature protest against the action of his Creator (verse 20). Verse 21 recalls Jer. 18:6 (cf. Wis. 15:7), where God's right to make vessels designed for different purposes from the same lump of clay is affirmed. God as Creator has an indisputable right to use the vessels which he makes for an honourable or less honourable purpose. The verses which follow (vv. 22 ff.) contemplate the two categories of earthenware vessels in terms of the sovereign disposition of the divine will. Implied in the discussion is a call for Israel to become open to God's grace expressed in Christ and to the experience of God's mercy. What is only implied in Rom. 9:19–33 is made explicit in 2 Clement where the parable of the potter is retold in order to underscore a new point: the potter can refashion vessels he has made only so long as he has not fired them (2 Clem. 8:2). On this basis men are summoned to repentance before they forfeit the opportunity to be responsive to God.

The noun *skeuos*, thing, object, vessel, jar, dish, occurs elsewhere in Paul and in other NT writings. In 2 Cor. 4:7 Paul speaks of having the treasure of the knowledge of the glory of God "in earthen vessels" (→ *ostrakinos* NT). The believer who purifies himself from what is ignoble "will be a vessel for noble use, consecrated and useful to the master of the house, ready for any good work" (2 Tim. 2:21; → *ostrakinos* NT). This reflects the language of Acts 9:15, where Ananias is told that Saul of Tarsus is

"a chosen instrument of mine to carry my name before the Gentiles and kings and the sons of Israel." *skeuos* means generally a thing or object used for any purpose (Mk. 11:16), goods or property (Matt. 12:29; Mk. 3:27; Lk. 17:31). The addition of a qualifying phrase may define its nature more precisely, e.g. *panta ta skeuē tēs leitourgias*, "all the vessels used in worship" (Heb. 9:21; cf. also Rev. 18:12). In Acts 27:17 it appears to be the kedge or driving anchor (Arndt, 761), though it may be gear or sails (cf. also Acts 10:11, 16; 11:5). The sense of vessel, jar, dish, etc., which is well attested in cl. Gk., is found in Lk. 8:16; Jn. 19:29; Rom. 9:21 ff.; 2 Tim. 2:20 f.; Rev. 2:27. For discussion of the meaning in 1 Thess. 4:4 and 1 Pet. 3:7 in the context of marriage relationships → Woman, art. *gynē* NT 2.

The adj. *keramikos* occurs only once in the NT, in the pledge of shared power with Christ extended to the Christian at Thyatira who remains faithful to his Lord (Rev. 2:27). He is promised power over the nations which will be ruled with an iron rod, "as when earthen pots are broken to pieces." The reference to the iron rod, which was apparently the shepherd's oak club, the end of which was capped with iron, and the shattered clay vessels, furnish a clear allusion to Ps. 2:9, where the Lord's Anointed is promised sovereignty over the nations who resist his rule. The new order must be preceded by the shattering of the old (cf. Rev. 11:15). In context, the promise provides an assurance of vindication and a reversal of rôles in which the humiliated people of God will share in the sovereign authority of their Lord. The existence of a potters' guild at Thyatira has been confirmed by an inscription (*Inscriptiones Graecae ad res Romanas pertinentes* 4, 1205).

Although the vb. *kerannymi* has reference to mixing or blending, in the NT it is unrelated to the potter's craft. In common with older Greek practice it is used of diluting wine with water. In Rev. 14:10 it carries the nuance of pouring, in reference to the wine of God's wrath which is "poured out unmixed into the cup of his anger." In Rev. 18:6 it occurs in a context describing the fate of → Babylon, whose judgment is described figuratively under the image of mixing a double portion of wine which will make her reel from drunkenness and deprive her of all sense and capability (cf. Isa. 19:14; Ps. Sol. 8:14). *W. L. Lane*

ὀστράκινος

ὀστράκινος (*ostrakinos*), made of earth or clay, earthenware.

CL Another term for a potter was *ostrakeus* (Nicaenetus in *Anthologia Graeca* 4, 191), which is related to the description of his wares as *ostraka*. In the classical and Hellenistic periods, the singular noun *ostrakon* can denote either an earthenware vessel, or a fragment of such a vessel, a potsherd. From the practice at Athens and elsewhere of using potsherds for voting on the banishment of a citizen, the verb *ostrakizō* was coined to speak of the ostracizing of someone (Thucydides 1, 135; 8, 73; Andocides 3, 3; Aristotle, *Polity of the Athenians* 22, 6; *Politics* 1284 a 21). In Hellenistic Greek "to cast the ostracon" means to vote for any one's banishment (Plutarch, *Alcibiades* 13; cf. *Pericles* 14).

The adjective *ostrakinos* was used by the Jewish composer of Sibylline Oracles 5, 495 to describe as useless and lifeless the terracotta images of pagan idols that were carried in processions (cf. Epistle of Diognetus 2:2, 7). There is little evidence of a

metaphorical use of *ostrakinos* in antiquity until the second century A.D. when Artemidorus describes the body of a man as an earthenware vessel (5, 25).

OT In the LXX the adjective *ostrakinos* simply defines the material from which a vessel was made as clay or earthenware (Lev. 6:28; 11:35; 14:5, 50; 15:12; Num. 5:17; Jer. 32:14). Thus pleasant speech (lit. "smooth lips") concealing an evil heart is compared to earthenware concealed by a silver glaze (Prov. 26:23). The humiliated sons of Zion, who are "worth their weight in gold," are considered to be of no more value than common earthenware by their captors (Lam. 4:2). Similarly, in rendering the Aramaic portion of Daniel the translators chose *ostrakinos* to describe the great image seen by Nebuchadnezzar in a dream, whose feet were partly of iron and partly of clay (Dan. 2:33, 34, 41, 42).

The related meaning, potsherd, also occurs. Judgment is pronounced upon Israel's unbelief in terms of the ruthless smashing of a potter's vessel into fragments so small there remains no sherd large enough to carry fire from the hearth nor to dip water from the cistern (Isa. 30:14). The familiar sight of sherds of pottery bleached by the scorching sun provided a suggestive image for the parched sufferer who complains that his strength is dried up "like a potsherd" (Ps. 22:15; LXX 21:16). Both nuances of the word are evident in the instruction given to Jeremiah to purchase an earthenware flask from the potter, but to smash it in the presence of the elders as a representation of what will happen to Jerusalem for its defilement through idolatrous practices (Jer. 19:1, 11).

In the intertestamental period the impossibility of mending a smashed pot provided Ben Sira with the proverb, "He who teaches a fool is like one who glues potsherds together" (Sir. 22:7). It is a study in futility.

NT *ostrakinos* occurs twice in the NT meaning earthenware. In 2 Cor. 4:6 Paul had described the gospel as "the splendour of the knowledge of the glory of God." In the following verse he makes the startling statement that this treasure has been committed to earthen vessels (*en ostrakinois skeuesin*), a metaphor which compares the apostle and his colleagues to common clay pots. The striking contrast between the splendour of the treasure and the commonness of the vessel in which it is stored directs attention away from the preachers to the glory of the message they proclaim. It was not unusual in the ancient world to conceal valuable treasures in earthenware urns. In this context *ostrakinos* refers to the whole man who is entrusted with the gospel. This description finds a parallel in rabbinic accounts of men as clay vessels containing the Torah or wisdom which God has bestowed, e.g. Sifre Deut. 48 (84a on Deut. 11:22): as it is not possible for wine to be stored in golden or silver vessels, but only in one which is least among the vessels, an earthenware one, so also the words of Torah can be kept only with one who is humble in his own eyes; cf. b. Taanith 7a, where "glorious wisdom in a repulsive earthen vessel" describes R. Jehoshua ben Chanaiah, whose appearance was unattractive. Paul's detractors had described his bodily appearance as weak and dismissed his words as inconsequential (2 Cor. 10:10; cf. 10:1; 11:6). His self-description as *ostrakinos* attests that human weakness presents no barrier to the accomplishment of the divine intention when it is undergirded by the transcendent power of God (cf. 2 Cor. 3:5; 4:7; 12:9–10; 13:3–4).

The second instance of *ostrakinos* occurs in a context, where Paul urges Timothy to separate himself from false teachers like Philetus and Hymenaeus, who have subverted the faith of some Christians at Ephesus (2 Tim. 2:14–19, 22–26). The appearance of false teachers poses the question as to why there are disloyal persons in the congregation. Paul responds by comparing the church to a large house in which it is normal to find vessels of differing material, which serve different, indeed opposite, functions (2:20). Even as the presence of vessels of wood and earthenware (*ostrakinos*) devoted to disreputable use in such a house occasions no surprise, so the evidence of base leadership in the church can be anticipated. But verse 21 makes the point that, whether a vessel is made of gold, silver, or earthenware, it may be clean in order to be ready for honourable service to the owner. By separating himself from the false teachers and cleansing himself from their disreputable actions, Timothy will be prepared for any task to which his Master is calling him. *W. L. Lane*

πηλός

πηλός (*pēlos*), clay, mud, mire.

CL In classical Gk. *pēlos* means mud, muck, dung, loam, or clay. The primary thought is of dust or soil mixed with some fluid, especially water, with the result that the material becomes soft and pliable. Herodotus was struck by the fact, that in the districts inhabited by the Scythians, it was so unbearably cold for eight months of the year that it was a burning fire, not water poured upon the ground, that formed mud (4, 28).

The term commonly designates the clay or earth used by masons and potters (Herodotus 2, 36, 136; Aristophanes, *The Birds* 1143; Plato, *Theaetetus* 147a). The skill of the potter in moulding clay suggested an image for describing men as "clay figurines" (Aristophanes, *The Birds* 268; cf. Callimachus, *Fragment* 87). In the Hellenistic period the thought of man as a piece of clay is a commonplace, as in Herodas 2, 28 f.: "who ought to know who he is, and of what clay he is mixed, and to live as I do, in awe of even the least of the citizens." Epictetus observed that "the body is by nature clay" (*Dissertationes* 4, 11, 27).

In the Roman period there is some evidence for the use of mud or clay in medical prescriptions (Galen, *De Theriaca* 19) and in connexion with treatments at the shrine of Aesculapius in Pergamon (Aelius Aristides, *Orations* 48, 74 f.) and in Epidauros (the Apellas stele in W. Dittenberger, *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*[3] 1170).

OT In accord with common Greek usage, the LXX uses *pēlos* for mud or mire (e.g. 2 Sam. 22:43; Ps. 68:14 [EV 69:13]), loam or clay (e.g. Isa. 29:16; 41:25; Jer. 18:6). It is especially the work of the potter in his preparation and shaping of clay that suggested lines of thought that were theologically important in the OT.

1. The account that God formed the first man out of dust or loam (Gen. 2:7; 3:19) finds a distinct echo in the book of Job where men are described as those "who dwell in houses of clay" (Job 4:19). Job chides God for having fashioned him and then turning about to destroy him: "Remember that you have made me of clay. Will you turn me to dust again?" (Job 10:8–9). The fragility of clay provides an apt figure for Job's powerlessness when overcome by affliction and impending death. The implicit allusion to the action of the potter in the thought of man fashioned by God's

hands becomes explicit in Isaiah. The prophet cautions those who believe they can conceal their counsel from the Lord not to confuse themselves with God who made them: "Shall the potter be regarded as the clay . . . that the thing formed should say of him who formed it, 'He has no understanding'?" (Isa. 29:16). A rebellious man who strives with his God is like an earthen vessel who wishes to dispute with the potter (Isa. 45:9). God's sovereign jurisdiction over man whom he fashioned from dust is affirmed emphatically by the scribe Joshua ben Sira (c. 200 B.C.), who comments, "As clay in the hand of the potter – for all his ways are as he pleases – so men are in the hand of him who made them, to give to them as he decides" (Sir. 33:10–13).

2. Jeremiah found in the action of a local potter working at his wheel an object lesson which illumined the sovereign judgment of God upon the nation (Jer. 18:1–12). When the recalcitrant clay refused to conform to the potter's purpose, and the intended vessel was spoiled, he reworked the clay into another vessel. The potter furnished a parable of the divine potter at work with human clay. God remains master of the clay, which in this context designates Israel as a nation. He will shape it to his intended purpose. If Israel fails to respond to the shaping pressure, it will be remoulded: "Behold, like the clay in the potter's hand, so are you in my hand, O house of Israel" (Jer. 18:6). The responsiveness of the best quality clay to the potter's hands becomes a paradigm for Israel's sensitivity to the intention of God.

3. In the preparation of clay for his trade, a potter would knead the clay by treading upon it with his feet (cf. Nah. 3:14). This common practice furnished Isaiah with a vivid image for the ruthless treatment Babylon could expect from an invader who would approach from the north (Isa. 41:25). As a potter treads upon the clay with which he works, this conqueror will trample under foot his enemies.

4. The latter half of the Wisdom of Solomon (11:2–19:22) is a polemic against the Gentiles. The writer focuses attention upon a pagan potter who makes his living from the manufacture and sale of terracotta figurines (Wis. 15:7–17). From the same lump of clay he moulds "counterfeit gods" (Wis. 15:9) and sewer tiles (Wis. 15:7): "with misspent toil, he forms a futile god from the same clay – this man who was made of earth a short time before and after a little while goes to the earth from which he was taken . . . his life is of less worth than clay" (Wis. 15:8, 10). Here the older biblical motifs of God as Creator and man as clay are combined with a defence of the second commandment prohibiting the fashioning of graven images (Wis. 15:13). The lifelessness of a fragile, clay figurine is mocked by the God who breathes the breath of life into men whom he fashioned from clay (Wis. 15:7–17).

NT In the NT *pēlos* is used in two distinct ways.

1. In John it designates the mixture of dirt and spittle which Jesus applied to the eyes of a man who had been born blind (Jn. 9:6–15). The application of spittle to the eyes and the laying on of hands in healing was widespread in Jewish practice. By his touch and action Jesus entered into the thought-world of the man and established significant contact with him. The repeated reference to the clay-like mixture (five times in Jn. 19:6, 11, 14, 15), however, suggest a deeper level of meaning. By his action on the blind eyes of the man, Jesus completes the creative activity which provides men with sight and demonstrates that he is the Light of the world (cf. Jn. 1:4–9; 8:12; 9:5). By juxtaposing Jesus' declaration that he is the Light of the world (Jn. 9:5) with the account of the opening of the blind man's eyes (9:6–15), John

affirms his theological understanding of this incident with its focus upon the application of clay to unseeing eyes.

2. In Rom. 9:20–21 Paul draws upon the common OT image of God as the Potter who exercises sovereign control over his creation. In the context man is described as moulded clay and God as the one who moulded the clay for his own purposes. The rhetorical question, "Has the potter no right over the clay, to make out of the same lump one vessel for beauty and another for menial use?" is indebted to Isa. 29:16 and 45:9. The imagery underscores God's freedom and sovereignty in relationship to men as his creation and repeats the caution of Isaiah that men are not to confuse their claims with the divine prerogative. *W. L. Lane*

φύραμα

φύραμα (*phyrama*), a mixture, a lump.

CL In the classical and Hellenistic periods *phyrama* describes something mixed or kneaded, like dough (Mnesimachus 4, 11; Aristotle, *Problems* 929 a 25; Plutarch, *Moralia* 693 e). The cognate verb is almost restricted to the sense of mixing flour or some similar substance. Only rarely is there reference to the mixing of soil with water to form a clay paste (cf. Plato, *Timaeus* 73 e; *Theaetetus* 147 c). Not until Plutarch is there a clear instance of the use of *phyrama* for the dough-like mixture from which the potter moulds his ware (*Moralia* 811 c).

OT In the LXX the term *phyrama* is unrelated to the potter's craft. It denotes the kneading bowls in which dough is prepared (Exod. 8:3), the dough itself (Exod. 12:34), or the coarse flour to be worked into dough (Num. 15:20 f.). Consistent with this, the cognate verb *phyraō* describes the mixing of unleavened flour with oil (Exod. 29:2, 40; Lev. 2:4, 5; 6:21; 7:2; 14:10; Num. 15:4; 1 Chron. 23:29) or the action of kneading (Gen. 18:6; 1 Sam. 28:24). In no passage does it describe the preparation of clay for use by the potter or the lump of clay which he places upon his wheel.

NT Of the five occurrences of *phyrama* in the NT, four have reference to a lump of dough (Rom. 11:16; 1 Cor. 5:6, 7; Gal. 5:9). In Rom. 9:21, however, *phyrama* denotes the lump of clay from which a potter may make one vessel for honoured use and another to serve a menial purpose. This singular use of *phyrama* to refer to the dough-like mixture from which earthenware vessels are to be fashioned is supported in the context by the parable of the potter who from the same lump of clay makes vessels of differing quality and function. Even so God has fashioned men as vessels of mercy and vessels of wrath who advance his redemptive purposes. In the context it is clear that God's wrath stands in the service of his mercy and is designed to draw attention to the extent of his mercy toward all who will receive by faith the righteousness provided in Christ (Rom. 9:22–33). *W. L. Lane*

(a). R. Amiran, *Ancient Pottery in the Holy Land*, 1969; K. Barth, *CD* II, 2, 222–233; C. Chavasse, "Studies in Texts – 2 Cor. 4:7," *Theology* 54, 1951, 99–100; D. Daube, *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*, 1956, 385–387; N. L. Lapp, "Pottery," *IDB Supplementary Volume*, 1976, 674–677; C. Maurer, *skeuos*, *TDNT* VII 358–367; E. H. Plumptre, "The Potter and the Clay," *Expositor*, 1st Series 4, 1876, 469–480.

(b). V. d.W. te G., "Onderscheidene vaten in 's Heeren huis; 2 Tim. 2:20–21," *Gereformeerd*

Theologisch Tijdschrift 3, 1902, 171–173, 184–185; K. Jägger, *Das Bauernhaus in Palästina*, 1912, 11 ff., 22 ff.

Vine, Wine

ἄμπελος

ἄμπελος (*ampelos*), vine, grapevine; ἀμπελουργός (*ampelourgos*), vine-dresser, gardener; ἀμπελών (*ampelōn*), vineyard; οἶνος (*oinos*), wine; οἰνοπότης (*oinopotēs*), wine-drinker; οἰνοφλυγία (*oinophlygia*), drunkenness.

CL & OT 1. *ampelos* is found in cl. Gk. from Homer onwards meaning a vine. In the LXX is stands chiefly for *gepen*, whereas *ampelōn* is used chiefly for *kerem*. The rare term in the LXX *ampelourgos* translates *kōrēm* (2 Ki. 25:12; 2 Chr. 26:10; Isa. 61:5; Jer. 52:16). *oinos* stands for 8 different Heb. words, but mainly for *yayin*, and less frequently for the archaic *tîrōš* and *tîrôš*.

2. Viticulture is one of the oldest forms of agriculture, and Gen. 9:20 f. (attributed to J) says that "Noah was the first tiller of the soil. He planted a vineyard; and he drank of the wine, and became drunk, and lay uncovered in his tent." The twin themes of the vine and wine as symbols of fertility and well-being on the one hand and of wine as a cause of debauchery and shame on the other hand run throughout Scripture. Isa. 5:1–7 not only gives a description of contemporary viticultural practice; it sees Israel as the vineyard, Yahweh as the vinedresser and a harvest of wild grapes instead of ripe, juicy grapes from which to make wine.

The vine was an important part of OT economy. As with other crops, the owner was not permitted to reap the vineyard twice in one harvest; gleanings were to be left for those who lacked possessions (Lev. 19:10; Deut. 24:21). Vineyards were to lie fallow every seventh year (Exod. 23:10 f.; Lev. 23:3 ff.). They were not to be sown with other plants (Deut. 22:9; but cf. Lk. 13:6, though some some scholars think that the reference here may be to an orchard, cf. Arndt, 46).

The symbolism of Isa. 5:1–7 is found in the Pss. and other prophetical books. Israel is a vine brought out of Egypt which fills the land; the Psalmist asks why Yahweh has allowed it to be ravaged (Ps. 80[79]:8–13). Although Israel was a "choice vine", he became a "wild vine" (Jer. 2:21). The infidelity of Israel is reproached by Hosea: "Israel is a luxuriant vine that yields its fruit. The more his fruit increased the more altars he built; as his country improved he improved his pillars" (Hos. 10:1). The wood of the vine is good for nothing but fuel (Ezek. 15:1–8; cf. 19:10–14), and so the vine that has ceased to bear fruit is a symbol of judgment. In the allegory of Ezek. 17:1–10 "the seed of the land" (Zedekiah) is planted by "a great eagle" (Nebuchadnezzar) and becomes "a low spreading vine". However, it is transplanted by another eagle (Hophra). The allegory closes with the question whether the transplanted vine will survive, when the east wind strikes it. In Ps. 128(127):3 the wife of him who fears Yahweh "will be like a fruitful vine in your house." The abundance of vineyards is a sign of Yahweh's favour (Hos. 2:15). Superabundance will characterize the end-time: " 'Behold, the days are coming,' says the LORD, 'when the plowman shall overtake the reaper and the treader of grapes him who sows the seed; the mountains shall drip sweet wine, and all the hills shall flow

with it' " (Amos 9:13). This is developed in Syr. Bar. to the point at which each vine will have a thousand branches, each branch a thousand clusters and each cluster a thousand grapes (Syr. Bar. 29:5). The dominion of the messiah is like a vine (Syr. Bar. 39:7). In Sir. 24:17 the vine is a symbol of wisdom. Other expressions in the OT compare Israel with grapes in the wilderness (Hos. 9:10) and a cluster of grapes (Isa. 65:8).

3. Wine is frequently mentioned in lists of produce (e.g. Gen. 27:28; Deut. 7:13; 11:14; 18:4; 2 Ki. 18:32; Jer. 31:12). Because of its colour it could be called "the blood of the grape" (Gen. 49:11; Deut. 32:14; Sir. 39:26; 50:15; cf. Isa. 63:3; Rev. 14:20). The misuse of wine brings numerous evils, beginning with the nakedness of Noah and the curse of Canaan (Gen. 9:20–27; cf. 19:32–35). Those whose lives are in the grip of wine are denounced by the prophets (Isa. 5:11, 22; 28:7; 56:11 f.; Hos. 4:11; 7:5; Hab. 2:5; Mic. 2:11). Priests were forbidden to drink wine when engaged in their duties (Lev. 10:9; Ezek. 44:21). Similarly Prov. has numerous warnings against inordinate love of wine (Prov. 20:1; 21:17; 23:20 f.; 23:31 ff.). The Nazirites took vows never to drink wine or the products of the grapevine (Num. 6:3; cf. Jdg. 13:4, 7, 14), and the Rechabites abstained both from wine and from building houses (Jer. 35:6 f.). But wine was also part of daily life, and would be safer to drink than much of the water. Wine was drunk at feasts, and was an honoured gift (cf. 1 Sam. 25:18; 2 Sam. 16:1). It was an article of trade (2 Chr. 2:8 ff., 15). Wine is praised by the psalmist as gladdening the heart of man (Ps. 104[103]:15; cf. Jdg. 9:13; Eccl. 10:10). Libations of wine were also used in → sacrifice, both to false gods (Deut. 32:37 f.; Isa. 57:6; 65:11; Jer. 7:18; 19:13) and to Yahweh in connexion with other offerings (Exod. 29:40; Lev. 23:13; Num. 15:7, 10; 28:14). It is treated in later practice as if it were blood and was poured out at the base of the altar (Sir. 50:15; Josephus, *Ant.* 3, 234). Its use in the Passover is first mentioned in Jub. 49:6.

4. In the prophets → judgment is expressed under the symbolism of wine: the wicked will be forced to drain the cup with the consequences that they will not be able to stand (Pss. 60[59]:3; 75[74]:8); the wine-harvest (Joel 3:13) and the treading of the grapes (Isa. 63:2–6) are pictures of judgment. On the other hand, abundance of wine is a sign of blessing (Gen. 27:28; Joel 2:24; 3:18; Amos 9:13; Zech. 10:7).

5. In Gk. religion the cult of Dionysus or Bacchus which originated in Thrace played a prominent part. There were numerous Dionysia or festivals characterized by orgies. But modern scholastic opinion connects Dionysus more with emotional religion and fertility rites associated with phallic symbols, than with wine (*OCD* 352 f.).

NT 1. Vineyards feature in Jesus' parables. In Lk. 13:6–9 the centre of interest is the fig-tree which is planted in a vineyard (*ampelōn*) and tended by a vine-dresser (*ampelourgos*) who pleads for it to be spared one more year after three successive years of failure to bear fruit. If it fails then, after further careful tending, it will be cut down. The parable is a parable of judgment on the Jewish people in the light of their failure to respond to the preaching of Jesus. In context it explains the previous verses which record various disasters which have befallen people. The fact that the hearers have been spared similar disasters is no proof of their righteousness before God.

"Unless you repent you will all likewise perish" (Lk. 13:5b). The ultimate disaster came with the Jewish War and fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70.

Matt. 20:1–16 records the parable of the labourers in the vineyard. It is preceded by and concludes with the assertion that the first will be last and the last first. In the parable each of the labourers receives a denarius regardless of how long he has worked. The main point of the parable is not to teach about vocation or that all men are of equal value in God's sight. D. Hill sees it as teaching God's sovereign grace which (in contrast with the grumbling attitude of the Pharisees) welcomes latecomers into the kingdom (*The Gospel of Matthew, New Century Bible*, 1972, 285; cf. Lk. 15:15). As such, it is an explanation of the first-last theme, not an illustration. If the parable is a warning against a begrudging attitude to Jesus' reception of sinners, its teaching is similar to that of the parables of the lost sheep, the lost coin and the lost son in Lk. 15. But another viewpoint is possible. In the context of Matt., it follows Jesus' response to Peter's declaration, "Lo, we have left everything and followed you. What then shall we have?" (Matt. 19:27). Jesus' reply promises that the disciples shall sit on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel (Matt. 19:28), and that those who have left houses and relatives "will receive a hundredfold, and inherit eternal life" (Matt. 19:29). In context the parable may be seen as counterbalancing these statements and encouraging the disciples not to be self-seeking, but to accept what God gives. Thus, the disciple who has laboured all day, having agreed like the rest to work for a denarius, is told, "Friend, I am doing you no wrong; did you not agree with me for a denarius? Take what belongs to you, and go; I choose to give to this last as I give to you. Am I not allowed to do what I choose with what belongs to me? Or do you begrudge my generosity? So the last will be first, and the first last" (Matt. 20:13–16).

The parable of the two sons, the first refusing to work in the vineyard but then going and the second promising but not actually going (Matt. 20:28–32), may be seen as a Matthean counterpart to the parable of the lost son in Lk. 15:11–32. Here again the first-last theme recurs. It is explained: "Truly, I say to you, the tax collectors and the harlots go into the kingdom of God before you. For John came to you in the way of righteousness, and you did not believe him, but the tax collectors and the harlots believed him; and even when you saw it, you did not afterward repent and believe him" (Matt. 20:31 f.).

This is immediately followed by the parable of the wicked husbandmen which is a christological restatement of Isaiah's parable of the vineyard (Matt. 21:33–46 par. Mk. 12:1–12, Lk. 20:9–19; cf. Isa. 5:1–7). The tenants of the vineyard (the Jewish nation) have killed servants (the prophets down to John the Baptist) who were sent by the owner (God) to get his fruit. By killing the heir (Jesus), the tenants believe that the vineyard will be theirs to use as they wish. But the owner will put the tenants to death and replace them with "other tenants who will give him the fruits in their season" (Matt. 21:41), i.e. a new people of God. The parable has been seen as taking its origin not in the teaching of Jesus but in the *Sitz im Leben* of the early church and its conflict with Judaism (cf. W. G. Kümmel, "Das Gleichnis von den bösen Weingärtnern (Mk. 12, 1–9)", reprinted in *Heilsgeschehen und Geschichte*, 1965, 207–17). But in fact, the situation fits the setting given in Matt. with the rejection of Jesus at the climax of his ministry, and recent writers are now more inclined to admit the presence of allegory in the teaching of Jesus than earlier writers who insisted that

authentic parables should have only one point (cf. M. Black, "The Parables as Allegory", *BJRL* 42, 1959–60, 273–87; R. E. Brown, "Parable and Allegory Reconsidered", *New Testament Essays*, 1965, 254–64).

Jn. 15:1–11 contains the great description of Jesus as himself the vine, the Father as the vinedresser and the need of the disciples to abide in him in order to bear fruit. This is more precisely defined in terms of his words abiding in them (v. 7) and abiding in his love (v. 9), which means keeping his commandments (v. 10). All this is said that the joy of Jesus may be in them to the full (v. 11). Whereas Israel was the vine or the vineyard in the OT, the vine is now narrowed down to Jesus himself. In view of the OT and Jewish parallels and the late date of his own putative sources it would seem misguided to follow R. Bultmann in his claim that the vine here does not have its origin in OT-Jewish tradition but in the myth of the tree of life (*The Gospel of John*, 1971, 530; cf. E. Schweizer, *EGO EIMI ... Die religionsgeschichtliche Herkunft und theologische Bedeutung der johanneischen Bildreden, FRLANT* 56, [1939] 1965 [2], 39 ff., who cites numerous examples from Mandaean sources). As C. K. Barrett points out, the Mandaean references to the vine are almost certainly dependent on Christian sources (*The Gospel according to St John*, 1955, 394). Some have speculated that the saying was occasioned by the disciples commenting on the ornamental vine which decorated Herod's temple (cf. Middoth 3:8; Josephus, *War* 5, 210; Tacitus, *Historiae* 5, 5). If so, it would be a further comment on the true identity and character of the vine in the tradition of prophetic imagery, but going beyond anything the prophets had said, by identifying the vine with Jesus. It also stands in contrast with the disciples of Johanan ben Zakkai at Jabneh (Jamnia) who after A.D. 70 were called *kerem b^{e}yaḇneh*, the vineyard of Jabneh (Ketuboth 4:6). Not only is Jesus said to be the true vine; the only way for the branches to live and flourish is to abide in him. Paul does not use this picture of the vine, but uses that of the olive tree from which the natural branches have been removed and those of a wild olive grafted in (Rom. 11:17–24; → Oil, Olive, art. *elaion*).

2. Wine is generally understood lit. in the NT, and never in a cultic sense. John the Baptist abstained from drinking wine (Lk. 1:15; cf. 7:33; Matt. 11:18), perhaps following a Nazirite vow. Jesus, on the other hand, was accused of being "a glutton and a drunkard [*oinopotēs*]" (Matt. 11:18 f.; Lk. 7:33 f.). The spirit that was to fill John was the Holy Spirit: "For he will be great before the Lord, and he shall drink no wine nor strong drink, and he will be filled with the Holy Spirit, even from his mother's womb" (Lk. 1:15; cf. Num. 6:3; Jdg. 13:4, 7). Jesus justified his refraining from fasting on the grounds that the presence of the bridegroom is a time for festivity; but when the bridegroom is taken away the disciples will then fast (Mk. 2:18–22 par. Matt. 9:14–17, Lk. 5:33–38). The saying has not only messianic implications, but a hint of Jesus' death. The same passage contains the sayings about patching an old garment and putting new wine into old wineskins, implying that the Pharisaic outlook is burst apart by the life that he brings. Lk. 5:39 adds: "And no one after drinking old wine desires new; for he says, 'The old is good.' " The statement is not intended to be a rule-of-thumb guide for wine connoisseurs. It is a warning against over-estimation of the old by those who think that they know best. It is a comment on the attitude of Jesus' opponents who stick to the old and familiar, thinking that they know that the old is better simply because it is old. Similar sayings are given in both Jewish and classical writings (Sir. 9:10; Ber. 51a; Lucian, *De Mercede*

Conductis 26; Plutarch, *De Mario* 44; Plautus, *Casina* 5; cf. *TDNT* V 163).

The NT maintains a similar attitude to wine as the OT. On the one hand, it is one of God's gifts of creation to be enjoyed. On the other hand, to refrain from drinking wine may be necessary for the sake of the gospel. Drunkenness (*oinophlygia*) is a characteristic of the Gentile way of life (1 Pet. 4:3). "It is not right to eat meat or drink wine or do anything that makes your brother stumble" (Rom. 14:21). The disciples are exhorted to "take heed to yourselves lest your hearts be weighed down with dissipation and drunkenness and cares of this life, and that day come upon you suddenly like a snare" (Lk. 21:34). Timothy, on the other hand, is exhorted to drink a little wine for his stomach's sake (1 Tim. 5:23). Moderation must not be confused with licence. Bishops and deacons must not be drunkards (1 Tim. 3:3, 8; Tit. 2:3). Eph. 5:18 warns against excessive drinking: "And do not get drunk with wine, for that is debauchery; but be filled with the Spirit" (cf. Prov. 23:31). At → Pentecost the bystanders made the opposite mistake, concluding that the disciples were filled with new wine (*gleukos*), whereas in fact they were filled with the Spirit (Acts 2:13).

Some scholars interpret the miracle of the water into wine at Cana (Jn. 2:1–11) as unhistorical on the basis of redaction criticism (cf. B. Lindars, *The Gospel of John, New Century Bible*, 1972, 123–33; cf. R. Bultmann, op. cit., 113–21). Parallels have been suggested in the Graeco-Roman world (cf. Euripides, *Bacchae* 704 ff.; Lindars, op. cit., 127). The Logos under the guise of Melchizedek brought wine instead of water (Philo, *Leg. All.* 3, 82). The miracle is described only by implication. "The point of the story does not lie in the transformation of water into wine as such, but in the comment of the steward, who does not even know what has happened" (Lindars, op. cit., 131; cf. v. 9). Lindars concludes: "If the form-critical analysis . . . is accepted, the transformation is regarded as unhistorical, so that the miracle requires no explanation. But if the narrative is accepted as substantially historical, it is essential to accept the miraculous element along with it, and to assume that Jesus could and did perform the miracle as it is described" (ibid.). The story has been seen not only as symbolic of Jesus' transforming power, but also as a symbolic anticipation of the new age foretold in the OT and deutero-canonical writings in which wine would be present in abundance. For further discussion see J. D. M. Derrett, "Water into Wine", *Law in the New Testament*, 1970, 228–46.

oinos is not mentioned in the accounts of the Last Supper, but Jesus said: "Truly, I say to you, I shall not drink again of the fruit of the vine [*ek tou genēmatos tēs ampelou*] until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God" (Mk. 14:25 par. Matt. 26:29; → Lord's Supper). Elsewhere the consummation is pictured in terms of an eschatological meal (cf. Matt. 8:11; 22:1–14). On the drinks offered to Jesus on the cross (Matt. 27:34; Mk. 15:23) → Gall. Wine is a means of healing in Lk. 10:34.

Wine is mentioned frequently in Rev., but only once literally (Rev. 18:13), where it is a commodity which cannot be sold in the days of judgment. On Rev. 6:6 → Oil, art. *elaion*. On Rev. 14:10; 16:19; 19:15 it symbolizes the wrath of God, recalling OT imagery on wine and the cup of God's wrath (cf. Jer. 25:15 f., 27 f.; Isa. 51:17, 22; Ezek. 23:31–35; Hab. 2:16; Ps. 75:8). Rev. 14:8 celebrates the fall of → Babylon "who made all nations drink of the wine of her impure passion" (cf. Rev. 17:2; 18:3). Here the debauching effects of wine are seen as descriptive of worldly passion which will be requited by the wine of God's wrath. *C. Brown*

→ Drunken, → Fruit, → Gall, → Lord's Supper, → Oil, → Seed, → Tree

(a). J. Behm, *ampelos*, *TDNT* I 342 f.; J. D. M. Derrett, "Water into Wine", in *Law in the New Testament*, 1970, 228–46; M. Jastrow, Jr., "Wine in the Pentateuchal Codes", *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 33, 1913, 180–92; H. F. Lutz, *Viticulture and Brewing in the Ancient Orient*, 1922; J. F. Ross, "Vine", *IDB* IV 784 ff.; and "Wine", *IDB* IV 849–52; H. Seesemann, *oinos*, *TDNT* V 162–66. (b). L. Anderlind, "Die Rebe in Syrien, insbesondere Palästina", *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 11, 1888, 160–77; E. Busse, *Der Wein im Kult des Alten Testaments*, *Freiburger Theologische Studien* 29, 1922; J. Döller, "Der Wein in Bibel und Talmud", *Biblica* 4, 1923, 143–67, 267–99; V. Zapletal, "Der Wein in der Bibel", *Biblische Studien* 21, 1920, 103–6.

Virtue, Blameless

Virtue is a fundamental term in Gk. and idealist anthropology, expressing particularly the ethical qualities of a person (cf. the Ger. words *taugen*, *Tauglichkeit*, to be of value, suitability, which are related to the term *Tugend*, virtue). The main word in Gk. is *aretē*, which refers both to an appropriate awareness of what is right and to commendable behaviour. In contrast to the philosophical concept of virtue, *anenklētos* belongs to the legal setting of accusation in court, and connotes behaviour which is irreproachable, against which no accusation can be made. From the sphere of religious worship come the terms *amiantos*, undefiled, and *aspilos*, spotless, both of which originally refer to cultic and ritual purity, but are later used with reference to moral purity. These are accordingly dealt with under the heading of *anenklētos*. The article concludes with a discussion of *Haustafeln*.

ἀνέγκλητος

ἀνέγκλητος (*anenklētos*), not accused, without reproach, blameless, irreproachable; ἀμίαντος (*amiantos*), undefiled; ἄμωμος (*amōmos*), unblemished, blameless; ἄσπιλος (*aspilos*), spotless, without blemish.

CL 1. *anenklētos* is derived from *enklēma*, (a) accusation, complaint; (b) crime, defect, with *a*-privative. Thus in cl. Gk. from Plato onwards it means a person or thing against which no accusation can be made, or free of guilt, and so in its original meaning denotes not accused, innocent (Plato, *Laws* 737a). It is used frequently in colloquial speech, as papyri from both pre-Christian and Christian eras bear witness (P. Soc. 541, 6, 3rd cent. B.C.; *BGU* 1347, 8, 2nd cent. B.C.; *Papyrus de Magdola* 15, 3, 3rd cent. A.D.). In the process the meaning underwent a change from the original sense to that of respectability without reproach. In the LXX it is only found at 3 Macc. 5:31 (cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 10, 281; 17, 289).

2. On the other hand, *amiantos*, undefiled, and *aspilos*, spotless, are cultic terms; so too is *amōmos*, faultless, which is used particularly in Lev. for Heb. *tāmîm* (e.g. 3:1, 6) and Num. (e.g. 6:14) of sacrificial animals which were free from blemish, but also in Pss. in a moral sense. *amōmētos*, unblemished, is in origin a specific term of praise, almost equivalent in meaning to *anenklētos*. The same is true of *amemptos*, blameless, except that here the legal background is absent and the word has more of an emotional content.

OT The NT use of *anenklētos* is not theologically affected by the OT or LXX. The word is found only in 3 Macc.; *amiantos* only in Wis. 3:13; 4:2; 8:20. and 2

Macc. 14:36; 15:34; *aspilos* only at Job 15:15 (Symmachus). Only *amemptos* appears more frequently, in the book of Job, where it is used together with *dikaios*, just, and *katharos*, pure, cf. Job 11:4; 12:4. *amōmos* stands for *tāmîm* and cognates at Exod. 29:1; Lev. 1:3, 10; 3:1, 6, 9; 4:3, 14, 28, 32; 5:15, 18, 25 (6:5); 9:2 f.; 14:10; 22:19, 21; 23:12, 18; Num. 6:14; 19:2; 28:3, 9, 11, 19, 31; 29:2, 8, 13, 17, 20, 23, 26, 29, 32, 36; 2 Sam. 22:24, 31, 33; Pss. 15(14):2; 18(17):23, 30, 32; 19(18):7, 13; 37(36), 18; 64(63):4; 101(100):2, 6; 119(118):1, 80; Prov. 11:5, 20; 20:7; Ezek. 28:15; 43:22 f., 25; 45:18, 23; 46:4, 6, 13. It stands for *m'ûm*, blemish, used with a negative at Dan. 1:4, but is otherwise without Heb. equivalent at Exod. 29:1, 38; Lev. 4:14; 12:6; 23:18; Num. 7:69, 88; 15:24; 28:27; Ps. 37(36):28; Prov. 22:11; Eccl. 11:9; Wis. 2:22; Sir. 31(34):8; 40:19; Isa. 33:15; 1 Macc. 4:42. *amōmotēs* is found only in variant translations of Ps. 26(25):1, 11. *amemptos* translates 9 different Heb. terms: *bar*, pure (Job 11:4); *zāḵâh* (Job 15:14) and *zāḵaḵ* (Job 15:15; 25:5), pure; *ḥap̄*, pure (Job 33:9); *ṭāhēr*, clean (Job 4:17); *nāqî*, free from guilt, innocent (Job 22:19); *tām*, unblemished, blameless (Job 9:20); *tāmîm*, unblemished, blameless (Gen. 17:1; Job 12:4); *ṣāḏaq*, righteous (Job 22:3); and *yāšār*, upright, blameless (Job 2:3). It has no Heb. equivalent at Wis. 10:5, 15; 18:21. The adv. *amemptōs* is found only at Est. 3:13.

NT 1. *anenklētos*, not accused, without reproach, is found in the NT along with the other related terms mentioned in CL 2 above. In relation to their original meanings the words have here taken on theological ideas arising to a considerable extent from their context. The meaning of *anenklētos* in the Pastorals (Tit. 1:6 f.; 1 Tim. 3:10) is akin to the usage in Hellenistic colloquial speech. Under discussion here are the qualifications for office in the church as a deacon, elder or → bishop. The other adjectives used in this context indicate that the meaning is beyond reproach, in the ordinary sense of common respectability. Thus in addition to qualifications of a spiritual nature, ordinary standards of decency are made into preconditions of office in the church, for the sake of the church's good name in the world. The adoption of Hellenistic Stoic ideas also marks other aspects of the theology of the Pastoral Epistles.

2. *anenklētos* is found in the original, legal sense in 1 Cor. 1:8 and Col. 1:22.

(a) 1 Cor. 1:8 speaks of the eschatological day of the Lord (→ Present, art. *hēmera*). God promises believers that he will keep them firm (*bebaiōsei*) to stand blameless, i.e. innocent, on the day of the Lord. This blamelessness is not to be understood as an ethical quality and so as the Christian's own achievement, but rather follows from the call into fellowship with Christ (v. 9); and blamelessness on the day of the Lord is the consequence of holding fast to fellowship with Jesus Christ until the end (*telos*, v. 8).

(b) A similar affirmation is made in Col. 1:22. This passage also speaks of → judgment. Again it is the work of Christ, i.e. the → reconciliation which has been effected by his death, that forms the basis of the Christian's blamelessness. The writer is speaking of justification. Alongside *anenklētos*, the word drawn from the original legal and moral thought of Hellenism, he uses here *amōmos*, faultless, a word drawn from the language of Jewish ritual (cf. Phil. 2:15; Eph. 5:27; 1 Pet. 1:19). Both words have been divorced from their Hellenistic or Jewish origins by the new content given to them. The deliverance from well-merited accusation which is already (*nyni*, now,

v. 22) beginning through faith in Jesus Christ (v. 23) has as its final purpose (v. 22 *parastēsai*, to present you, a final infinitive) the confirmation of this state of blamelessness on the day of the Lord (*katenōpion autou*, before his face; cf. Rom. 8:33 f.).

3. *amiantos*, undefiled, pure, is used to express the purity of Christ as High Priest (Heb. 7:26), of our heavenly inheritance (1 Pet. 1:4), of sexual relations within marriage (Heb. 13:4), and of practical religion (Jas. 1:27). The common factor is the absence of anything which would constitute defilement before God (→ Defile, art. *miainō*). There are cultic overtones in each of these contexts, even in those cases where it is a question of everyday living, for the secular is to be hallowed. *amōmos* means unblemished in the cultic sense of free from defects, and hence Christ is described as "a lamb spotless and without blemish [*amnos amōmos kai aspilos*]" (1 Pet. 1:19). He "presented himself as an offering without blemish to God [*heauton prosēnenken amōmon tō theō*]" (Heb. 9:14). *amōmos* is used in the moral and religious sense of blameless of the Christian community (Eph. 1:4; 5:27; Col. 1:22 with *hagios* and *anenklētos*; 2 Pet. 3:14 *v.l.* with *aspilos*; Phil. 2:15; Rev. 14:5; cf. Jude 24). For the use of *amemptos* → Guilt, art. *amemptos*. *H. Währisch*

ἀρετή

ἀρετή (*aretē*), virtue.

CL The noun *aretē* is related to the vb. *ararisko*, to fit together, and is derived from the root *ari-* which is also seen in *areskō*, to please, *arestos*, pleasing, and *aristos*, best. Originally it meant the specific quality appropriate to an object or a person.

1. In the early classical period, the term *aretē* was used fairly universally with reference to things, animals, men and gods. Thus it can connote the excellent quality of arms or horses (Hdt., 3, 88; Plato, *Republic* 335b). Homer speaks of the *aretē* of the gods and demonstrations of their power (*Il.* 9, 498; → Strength, art. *bia*). This religious usage is found right up to the Hellenistic period (Philo, *Som.* 1, 256; *Spec. Leg.* 1, 209; Josephus, *Ant.* 17, 130; 18, 266). Usually, however, the reference is to human qualities, e.g. *aretē* of feet, in fighting, or of the mind (Homer, *Il.* 15, 642; 20, 411). Thus *aretē* is used of the whole man, of both physical and spiritual abilities. In this sense *aretē* may describe the quality of women (Homer, *Od.* 2, 206) or courage of men (Xen., *Anabasis* 1, 4, 8; cf. Lat. *virtus*). The extraordinarily wide variety of uses to which this word can be put also extends to good fortune (Homer, *Od.* 13, 45; Hesiod, *Works* 313) in a more general sense, and the glory (*doxa*; Soph., *Philoctetes* 1420), which all men seek.

2. The meaning of the concept of virtue is limited in the case of Socrates, who used *aretē* to describe not general human qualities which are outwardly apparent, but only morality. His individualistic and rationalist ethic removes the ties binding *aretē* to the *polis*, making it into something based upon man's striving for the good, and leading to the thesis that virtue may be learned. He who attains a true insight into the good, will also do it (Plato, *Protagoras* 329 f.; *Apology* 25d).

Plato saw virtue as conditioned by the soul and in his doctrine of the soul (*Republic* 1, 353; 2, 376e) developed the sequence of the four classic virtues: *sophia*, wisdom; *andreia*, courage; *sōphrosynē*, prudence; and *dikaiosynē*, justice (*Republic*

4, 433). This scheme of the four cardinal virtues is taken over by the Wisdom literature (see below, OT 2) and Cicero (*de Officiis*).

In contrast to the psychology of Plato, Aristotle regarded virtue as *hexis*, i.e. as the permanent pattern of behaviour of a person, depending on his qualities and decisions (cf. his definition in *Eth. Nic.* 2, 4 f.; 1106a 14 ff.). He distinguished between ethical, i.e. practical virtues, which include courage, temperance and generosity; and dianoetic virtues, i.e. ways in which the reason is used, which include insight, wisdom, knowledge and art (cf. *Eth. Nic.* 1130 ff.). Ontologically, virtue is defined as the mean between two extremes (the doctrine of *mesotēs*, *Eth. Nic.* 1107a).

3. The Stoics emphasized the agreement between the virtues and human nature (*kata physin zēn* means *kat' aretēn zēn*, to live according to nature means to live according to virtue). They serve no outside purpose, such as the interests of the state or of the gods, but are an end in themselves, bringing about by means of knowledge and practice the goal of *eudaimonia*, happiness (Seneca, *Ep.* 66, 31 f.; Cicero, *Leg.* 1, 8; 1, 16; cf. also Diogenes Laertius, 7, 81 ff.; 10, 132 ff.). The Platonic scheme of the four cardinal virtues became the basis for summaries of the virtues, the so-called catalogues of virtue (Epictetus, *Dissertationes* 2, 16, 45; 3, 2, 3 and 14; 3, 22, 13; and often). Similar catalogues of virtue are found in Philo (*Sacr.* 22, 27; *Leg. All.* 1, 86; *Spec. Leg.* 3, 63), in Qumran (see below, OT 3) and in the NT (see below, NT 3).

OT 1. The Heb. language has no word corresponding to the Gk. *aretē*. The only places where the word occurs in the canonical books of the LXX are Isa. 42:8, 12; 43:21; 63:7, where it translates *t*ehillâh*, praiseworthy deed, the praise of Yahweh, and two occasions where it stands for *hôḏ*, majesty (Hab. 3:3, with reference to Yahweh; and Zech. 6:13, where it refers to Joshua, the priestly messiah-designate). In none of these instances does it represent a toning down of the OT concept of Yahweh's acts in history (which are especially prominent in Isa.) to accommodate this to Gk. ideas of quality.

2. *aretē* is often mentioned in the books of Maccabees, especially 4 Macc. In 2 Macc. 6:31 the martyrdom of Eleazar is called a memorial of his *aretē* (cf. 4 Macc. 1:8, 10). In 4 Macc. *aretē* often means the martyrs' loyalty to the faith, which they have maintained until death despite suffering and torture (4 Macc. 7:22; 9:8, 18; 10:10; 11:2; 17:12, 17). At the same time we find the Gk. concept of *aretē* as courage (2 Macc. 15:17), manliness (4 Macc. 17:23), cleverness (4 Macc. 1:2), or reason (4 Macc. 1:30). Gk. influence can be detected also in the Book of Wisdom, when in Wis. 5:13 virtue is contrasted with wickedness, and in Wis. 4:1 it is linked with immortality. In Wis. 8:7 the four Platonic cardinal virtues are named.

3. In a way similar to the Stoic writers, the Qumran community included in its Community Rule catalogues of virtues and vices, which contrast the behaviour of the righteous and the wicked in accordance with the OT idea of the two ways (cf. Jer. 21:8b) and the sect's own dualistic outlook on the world (1QS 4:3–14; 10:22, 25 f.). The virtues which characterize the children of light are purity (1QS 4:5), wisdom (1QS 4:6), love (1QS 2:24; 5:4), humility (1QS 2:24), and faithful observance of the law (1QS 8:2; 10:25 f.), while among the many and various vices of the children of darkness particular prominence is given to immorality and impurity (1QS 4:10; CD 8:5; 19:17), lying (1QS 4:9; 10:20) and hatred (CD 8:6; 19:18). (On Qumran teaching see A. R. C. Leaney, *The Rule of Qumran and Its Meaning*, 1966.)

NT The term *aretē* does not play a crucial part in the vocabulary of the NT. It appears only once in Paul (Phil. 4:8), once in 1 Pet. (2:9), and 3 times in 2 Pet. (1:3, 5). More important are the catalogues of virtues (and vices), in which the virtues of the Christian (and vices of the non-Christian) are spelled out.

1. In 1 Pet. 2:9 and 2 Pet. 1:3 it is God's *aretē* that is mentioned. Since 1 Pet. 2:9 is a citation of the LXX version of Isa. 43:21, the acc. plur. *aretas* should be rendered as in Isa. (see above, OT 1), praiseworthy acts. These are to be proclaimed by the old people of God and by the new. More Gk. thought may be recognized in the sentence in 2 Pet. 1:3 f., which mentions, along with *aretē*, *doxa* (glory) and *dynamis* (power) (see above, CL 1). *aretē* here means God's attribute of perfection, which through its manifestations of power (*dynameis*) has granted gifts to men, by which they in their turn, as v. 4 puts it, are to become partakers of the divine nature (*theias physeōs*), i.e. likewise the divine virtue of perfection (cf. Matt. 5:48). In the background here is the Gk. idea of the relatedness of divine nature and human nature (cf. also Acts 17:28).

2. The two other instances (Phil. 4:8 and 2 Pet. 1:5) speak of human virtue. In both cases the term *aretē* forms part of a series in a comprehensive list of virtues, and both series have parallels in classical literature (with Phil. 4:8 cf. Cicero, *Tusculan Disputations* 5, 23, 67; with 2 Pet. 1:5 ff. cf. *OGI* § 438). *aretē* is used in both these passages not, as in 4 Macc. (see above, OT 2) of loyalty to the faith (thus O. Bauernfeind, *TDNT* I 460 f.), but as a general term for good and correct behaviour in Christians.

3. The connexion between individual words for virtue in the NT and corresponding lists in non-Christian Gk. literature is indisputable. Thus, for example, Paul speaks quite unreservedly about "what is good" (Rom. 12:9), or about "whatever is just, whatever is honourable, whatever is lovely" (Phil. 4:8), as the goal which Christians ought to strive to attain. The earliest church was thus fully aware of good qualities in the heathen, and brought → conscience (Rom. 2:14) and virtue into its Christian proclamation. On the other hand, we should not overlook the differences between Stoic and Christian catalogues of virtue, or between the Gk. and NT concepts of virtue. The Platonic scheme of the four cardinal virtues (see above, CL 2) does not appear in the NT catalogues. Instead, all the virtues, though individually drawn in part from Gk. lists, are brought under the main concepts of love (Gal. 5:22; Eph. 4:32–5:2; Col. 3:12) or of faith (Eph. 4:2 ff.; 2 Pet. 1:5) and are controlled by these. Nor does the NT know the Aristotelian distinction between practical and theoretical virtues (see above, CL 2). It stresses rather the totality of our actions, both as practical acts and as expressions of obedience. Finally – and this is of great importance – it must be said that the Stoic's view of himself as autonomous in his virtues (see above, CL 3), is one completely foreign to the NT. Here the virtues are the fruit of the Spirit (Gal. 5:22), subservient to mutual love and the glorification of God. Hence, the NT virtues are not derived from the harmony of the soul (Plato) nor from the quality of the man (Aristotle), but are seen as gracious gifts (*charisma*) of the divine Spirit: they are the actions and the marks of God's new creation.

4. The infrequent occurrence of the term *aretē*, and still more the different basis and composition of the catalogues of virtue, mean that in the NT – and therefore also in reformed theology – "virtue" in its autonomous, secular sense has no place. Attempts have been made again and again, to combine the Gk. concept of virtue with

Christian theology, e.g. by Ambrose (*De Officiis Ministrorum* 1, 24–49), Augustine (*De Libero Arbitrio* 1, 27), and Thomas Aquinas (*Summa Theologiae* 1a 2ae. 55–67; 2a 2ae. 101–22), right up to Schleiermacher and some recent Catholic writing (J. Pieper); but such attempts remain highly problematical. In Pauline and reformed theology the place of autonomous virtue, based on a rationalist ethic, is taken by the Spirit-given freedom of the Christian, which is both developed and maintained in love. *H.-G. Link, A. Ringwald*

Haustafeln

1. *Definition.* By this term, which derives from Luther (see B. J. Kidd, *Documents Illustrative of the Continental Reformation*, 1911, 220–22), NT scholarship means a body of formalized ethical teaching by which members of the early communities were expected to conform to the standards of their contemporary society, but with a Christian motivation. In particular, the imperatives are addressed to husbands, wives, parents, children, masters and slaves. The purpose of the *Haustafeln* (lit. "house-tables") was to ensure the good ordering of the various relationships in which members of the household or family stood.

2. *Virtues and Vices.* Included under the fabric of *Haustafeln* are catalogues of virtues and vices which most likely are indebted to Jewish proselyte catechism as the church took over lists of ethical qualities required by its self-understanding as a neo-levitical community (P. Carrington, *A Primitive Christian Catechism*, 1940, developed from G. Klein, *Der älteste christliche Katechismus und die jüdische Propaganda-Literatur*, 1909). This suggested origin has been challenged in more recent times, mainly by those who have traced the origin of such ethical lists to Stoicism (A. Vögtle, *Die Tugend- und Lasterkataloge im Neuen Testament*, 1936) or even to Iranian influences, mediated through sectarian Judaism (S. Wibbing, *Die Tugend- und Lasterkataloge im Neuen Testament*, 1959). Finally, E. Kamlah (*Die Form der katalogischen Paränese im Neuen Testament*, 1964) has sought to combine the two separate strands of the exhortation (*i.* promises and threats, partly based on *lex talionis*: "destruction to the destroyer": see E. Käsemann, "Sentences of Holy Law in the NT", *New Testament Questions of Today*, 1969, 66–81; and *ii.* the themes of *deponentes/induentes*, i.e. putting off the old life as a prelude to putting on a new life, which he traces to the hellenistic syncretism of the mystery cults). But D. Schroeder ("Lists, Ethical", *IDB Supplementary Volume*, 1976, 546) argues against this on the ground of the more likely background in the ethical dualism of the OT. There apocalyptic promises and threats contain lists of blessings and curses (Deut. 27 ff.).

The lists of vices and virtues found in Gal. 5:19–23; Phil. 4:8; Col. 3:5, 12 (cf. 2 Cor. 12:20) owe only formal similarities to OT and contemporary models, whether in Stoic moral philosophy or the Dead Sea scrolls (see Wibbing), and there are no parallels to the "fruit of the Spirit" in Stoicism, just as there are observable transferences of meaning. For instance, → "humility" (*tapeinophrosynē*) is a term of opprobrium in Greek thought (W. Grundmann, *TDNT* VIII 2), whereas in the Dead Sea Scrolls (1QS 5:3 f.; cf. 1QS 2:24; 4:3 f.; 5:25) and in Paul (e.g. Phil. 2:3; Col. 3:12) it connotes a practice of living together in community before God in such a way that other people are given a dignity and respect as they too are seen in God's sight (Rom. 12:3, 10). The "humility" of Christ becomes a model by which human

conduct is shaped by the Christian's conformity and obedience (see 2 Cor. 10:1; Phil. 2:4 ff.). Thus → "love" (*agapē*) – especially of one's enemy (Rom. 12:19–21), a thought absent from the Dead Sea Scrolls – becomes the norm to distinguish virtue from vice, especially as that love is seen in "life in Christ" and its social implications.

In the Pastorals, the ethical lists are extended and their range enlarged to include both virtues to be practised and sins to be avoided by church leaders (1 Tim. 3:1–13; Titus 1:5–9), but occasionally the list reaches out to include a more general coverage (Titus 3:3). The indictment of Gentile sins derives from Wis. 14:23–26; cf. Rom. 1:26–32; 1 Cor. 6:9–10; Col. 3:5; 1 Peter 4:3 (Vögtle, op. cit., 96 ff.). Women members are especially singled out in the Pastorals, based on Plutarch, *Praec. conj.* 139–41 (ibid., 81, 91). The good qualities expected of the ruler (ibid., 73 ff.), the king (ibid., 74), the general (ibid., 80) and the midwife (Soranos, *Gynaecia* I–II, c. A.D. 100; ibid., 80) are displayed in the tables in B. S. Easton, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 1948, 201.

Virtues and vices recur in a formalized "Two Ways" scheme, found in *Didache* 1–5; Barn. 18–20 and Hermas, *Man.* 6, 1, cf. Ignatius, *Magn.* 5; 2 Clem. 4. Many think that there is, underlying these documents, a Jewish proselyte-catechism (evidence for which is in Test. Levi 19:1, Test. Judah 20:1, which teaches two ways of light and darkness, governed by two spirits of truth and deceit: this suggestion is now confirmed by 1QS, though the contrast is typically OT, e.g. Ps. 1:6; Jer. 21:8; Prov. 4:18, 19).

The conclusion of this discussion is to shift the origin of ethical lists in early Christianity away from Hellenistic sources (where, to be sure, the rudimentary lists of good versus evil are attested in the Orphics and Pythagoreans and go as far back as to Heracleitus' antitheses) to the OT-Jewish tradition. Deissmann's ingenious suggestion that 1 Cor. 6:9, 10 was based on the practice of children's moral instruction where counters, as separate discs, were labelled with vices and shuffled in a game (*Light from the Ancient East*, 1927³, 316) is less cogent than it seems in view of the common catalogue of virtues and vices in proselyte mission-propaganda which, in turn, derived from the OT tradition.

3. *House-tables.* In the strict sense of the term, the rules formulated to govern behaviour patterns within the Christian household are limited to specific classes. These appear in the earliest attested Christian *Haustafel* (Col. 3:18–4:1: so E. Schweizer, *Der Brief an die Kolosser*, 1976, 159) as: wives, husbands, children, parents, slaves, masters. The best description of these injunctions (set in the imperative mood) is station code (Schroeder). That is, Christians are addressed according to their station in life, and especially within the Christian household. Each party is named, a command is given, and a motivation for behaviour is supplied (W. Lillie, "The Pauline House-tables", *ExpT* 86, 1974–75, 180). The same pattern recurs in Eph. 5:22–6:9 (which represents a redaction of the Colossian *Haustafel*); 1 Pet. 2:18–3:7; Tit. 2:2–10; 1 Tim. 2:9–15; cf. 1 Clem. 21:6–8; Ignatius, *Poly.* 4:1–6:2; Polycarp, *Phil.* 4:2–6:1. The key thought in the NT examples is submission, though there is a reciprocity between the members (e.g. Eph. 5:21), not found outside of the NT; and the primary motive behind these admonitions is that such an attitude expresses subordination to Christ's Lordship (so W. Schrage, "Zur Ethik der neutestamentlichen Haustafeln", *NTS* 21, 1975–76, 1–22, though more specific and concrete reasons have been suggested, as we shall observe later).

Other blocks of similar material contain encouragements addressed to Christians who are called to be submissive to their church leaders ("overseers", "elders", "deacons", based on earlier teaching in 1 Thess. 5:12, 13; Heb. 13:17: the leaders are commended as worthy of respect and obedience in the Pastorals, e.g. 1 Tim. 3; Tit. 1:6 ff., though in 2:2 ff. the admonition shades into a general call to the "older men" in the congregation). Widows are a particular responsibility in these paraenetic sections (1 Tim. 5:3–16) that are more properly called "church codes". The summons in 1 Tim. 2:1 ff. to pray for public officials in the state is another aspect of these "tables" (Rom. 13:1–7 uses the key-verb, "be submissive" to the ruling authorities, a theme enforced in 1 Pet. 2:13–17).

4. *Backgrounds to the House-tables.* "Historical study of the Christian *Haustafeln* is at an impasse" (J. E. Crouch, *The Origin and Intention of the Colossian Haustafel*, 1972, 32). The reason for this negative assessment is that, in a field of diverse and competing theories, no one hypothesis can be supported by indisputable evidence that is unambiguous and explains all the features. A survey of the leading suggestions made to account for the presence of this standardized teaching in the NT epistles confirms this statement.

At least at one point there is a consensus. The use of paraenetic material in Col. 3:18–4:1 is not occasioned by the local situation of Onesimus' return to Philemon at Colossae. See F. F. Bruce, *Colossians*, 1957, 293 n. 153 and R. P. Martin, *Colossians and Philemon*, 1974, 123 f. 147, citing Col. 3:25 and Phm. 17, 18. The content of the Colossian *Haustafel* is traditional teaching, brought over and used by Paul for other reasons. Most plausibly its function is to repel false ideas that derived from the gnostic heresy at Colossae (see below). But what may be known of the pattern of ethical teaching on which the Colossian code as an independent, self-contained unit is based?

(a) A view, stated by M. Dibelius (H. Greeven, *An die Kolosser*, 1953, 48–50) and elaborated by his pupil K. Weidinger, *Die Haustafeln*, 1928 (on this see W. K. Lowther Clarke, *New Testament Problems*, 1929, 157–160), found the origin of the Christian house-tables in Hellenistic, specifically Stoic, moral philosophy. Key phrases, such as "it is proper" (*anēken*, Col. 3:18), "it is pleasing" (to God) (*euareston*, Col. 3:20), are appealed to in support, since these rubrics are found in Stoic literature. Moreover, "in the Lord" (v. 20) is only loosely attached to the second phrase, and this suggests an added Christian pendant. The Pauline version represents a bold appropriation of a Hellenistic code that is taken over and "Christianized" (*Verchristlichung* is Dibelius' term, op. cit., 49).

There is undoubtedly a pagan model in the background. Duties (what the Greeks called "unwritten laws", *nomima agrapha*) to the gods, heroes, the aged, parents, friends, one's country are commonplace (Diogenes Laert., 7, 117–25; 8, 22 ff.). Stobaeus preserves fragments of a different kind in which duties (Stoic *kathēkonta*) to family members – parents, brothers, wife, children and slaves – are covered (Weidinger, 27–34, 41 f.). Several writers mention similar obligations in tabulated form (especially Aristotle, *Pol.* 1, 2; Seneca, *Ep.* 94; Plutarch, *Lib. Ed.* 10; cf. Epictetus, *Dissertationes* 2, 10, 3, 7). No one list is exhaustive, but a skeletal basis has been inferred, to be clothed by different writers (Weidinger, 38 f.). The reason for the Christian adoption of such a scheme was found in a waning of an imminent parousia

(Dibelius), and the need to regulate the inner life of the church on a non-enthusiastic, non-eschatological basis (Weidinger, 9).

The popularity of this theory has been considerable (Crouch, 21 n. 42), but it is open to criticism, especially to do with the reason why Christians needed to borrow from contemporary sources. Weidinger is vulnerable to the charge that the differences between non-Christian and Christian material are greater than he allows. Motivations are different, and the whole setting of the specific rubrics is unparalleled in Stoic writing. Words such as "pleasing" (*euarestos*) are not unique to the *Haustafeln* (Eph. 5:10; Rom. 12:2; 14:18; 2 Cor. 5:9; Heb. 12:28; 1 Clem. 35:5; 41:1; 62:2).

(b) At the opposite end of the scale, K. H. Rengstorf (*Mann und Frau im Urchristentum*, 1954) and D. Schroeder have pleaded the cause of the *Haustafeln* as being uniquely Christian. To be sure, different models are proposed. Rengstorf looks back to the infancy narratives of Luke 1, 2 where the home-life of John and Jesus are described. Joseph like Zechariah is paterfamilias, and the boy Jesus is submissive (*hypotassesthai* in Luke 2:51 – the key term in the epistles). Schroeder postulates multiple roots of the codes, reaching back to the OT apodictic law, to Judaic tradition and most importantly to the Jesus-tradition underlying 1 Cor. 7:10; cf. Eph. 4:20. Both views are to be seriously questioned (Crouch, op. cit., 24–31), though there is no denying the primacy and uniqueness of the *agapē*-motif in Paul's counsels, a motif that does ultimately stretch back to Jesus' self-giving in the incarnation.

(c) More likely is the cluster of views that begin with the place of obedience to God's will, seen first in Jewish prescriptions (E. Lohmeyer, *Die Briefe an die Kolosser*, etc., 1930) and extended to form part of the outreach in Gentile missionary propaganda on the part of hellenistic Judaism (Crouch, ch. 6). The main authorities are Philo, *Hypothetica* 7:1–9 (cf. *Decal.* 165 ff.), Josephus, *Ap.* 2, 190–219 and *ps.-Phocylides*, an Alexandrian Jew (Weidinger, 23). These writers show some hint of the so-called Noachian laws by which the conduct of Gentiles was to be governed in matters of elementary morals (concerning immorality, idolatry, dietary rules). There is a link between the Noachian laws and the "unwritten laws" – basic moral and family precepts among the Greeks. Here was a meeting place between Judaism and Hellenism, and in both cultures a listing of social duties is common.

The Jewish missionary concern to influence Gentiles in the direction of ethical monotheism found greatest success among those disposed to accept a summary of duties and obligations as minimal, even if they stopped short of complete conversion as proselytes. The class of Gentile "God-fearers" is well-known in Judaism and the NT. It is highly probable that, as Judaism's offshoot, the primitive church reached out to evangelize, it would be this class that would naturally respond and need the codification of the apostolic decree (Acts 15:20, 29; 21:25 on which see M. Simon, "The Apostolic Decree", *BJRL* 52, 1969–70, 437–60). Later a Christianized version of a proselyte catechism that originally was used in Jewish-Hellenistic mission evangelism emerged as we have seen. It is in this confluence of materials – Greek "divine laws" (cf. *Antigone*, 11, 450 ff.) as modified by Stoic idealism, Jewish missionary tracts aimed at potential adherents, and a Christianized application to the new life in Christ – that the origin of the NT *Haustafeln* may be traced.

5. *Haustafeln as used by Paul and his Disciples.* J. E. Crouch has offered the most convincing *raison d'être* of Paul's use of *Haustafeln*. We may take up and ex-

tend his thesis. He notes the importance of the teaching in Gal. 3:27–29 to the effect that in Christ the disabilities that Judaism imposed on Gentiles, women and slaves are removed. It is reasonable to suppose, given the nature of Corinthian gnosticizing enthusiasm whose watchwords were "freedom", "*gnosis*", and "spiritual", that the Pauline statement of religious equality in Christ would be heard as a promise of social egalitarianism. So Paul modifies and corrects this tendency in 1 Cor. 7:17–24 (remain in your station) and 14:33–38 (women are to stay in their place). The effect of the *Haustafeln* is to confirm this restriction as binding and to safeguard the good order of the church against revolutionary attempts to undermine it by a false claim to unbridled freedom in the name of gnostic enlightenment and licence. The *Haustafeln* are therefore a counter-measure in the name of Pauline "orthodoxy" to keep the social fabric in check, partly on the theological ground of the creation ordinances of the Torah, and partly on the pragmatic level which requires that the Christian is not at liberty to overturn the social framework by denying the Jewish basis of the faith, by getting involved in a slave-uprising of the Spartacus type or by promoting a feminist movement. There are indications that Paul's controls were so understood in Eph. 5:22–6:9, 1 Tim. 2:9–15, and 1 Peter 3:1–7 (written under Pauline influence).

R. P. Martin

→ Defile, → Guilt, → Love, → Punishment, → Pure, → Righteousness

On *aretē*, *anenklētos* and *aspilos*:
(a). O. Bauernfeind, *aretē*, *TDNT* I 457–61; W. Grundmann, *anenklētos*, *TDNT* I 356 f.; and *memphomai* etc., *TDNT* IV 571–74; A. Oepke, *aspilos*, *TDNT* I 502.
(b). J. Gründel, "Tugend", *LTK* X 395 ff.; M. Hoffmann, *Ethische Terminologie bei Homer, Hesiod, Jambikern und Tragikern*, (Dissertation, Tübingen) 1914; E. Kamlah, *Die Form der katalogischen Paränese im Neuen Testament*, WUNT 7, 1964; A. Kiefer, *Aretalogische Studien*, (Dissertation, Freiburg) 1929; J. Klein, "Tugend", *RGG*[3] VI 1080 ff.; S. Reiter, "*Aretē* und der Titel von Philos 'Legatio' ", in *Epitymbion. Heinrich Swoboda dargebracht*, 1928, 228–37; J. Stenzel, *Studien zur platonischen Dialektik . . . Arete und Diairesis*, 1917; A. Vögtle, "Tugendkataloge", *LTK* X 399 f.; S. Wibbing, *Die Tugend- und Lasterkataloge im Neuen Testament und ihre Traditionsgeschichte unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Qumran-Texte*, *BZNW* 25, 1959.
On *Haustafeln* in addition to the articles mentioned in the text of the article see the following:
(a). D. Daube, "Haustafeln", in *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*, 1956, 90–105; B. S. Easton, "New Testament Ethical Lists", *JBL* 51, 1932, 1–12; A. M. Hunter, *Paul and his Predecessors*, revised edition 1961, 52–57, 128–31; K. E. Kirk, *The Vision of God: The Christian Doctrine of the Summum Bonum*, Bampton Lectures for 1931, 1932 [2]; L. H. Marshall, *The Challenge of New Testament Ethics*, 1956; J. N. Sevenster, *Paul and Seneca*, *Supplement to NovT* 4, 1961.
(b). H. Conzelmann, Exkursus "Die Haustafeln" zu Kol. 3, 18 ff., in *An die Kolosser*, 1976 [14]; L. Goppelt, "Jesus und die 'Haustafel'-Tradition", in *Orientierung an Jesus. Festschrift* J. Schmid, 1973, 93–106; W. Schrage, *Die konkreten Einzelgebote in der paulinischen Paränese*, 1961; E. Schweizer, "Die Weltlichkeit des Neuen Testaments: Die Haustafeln", in *Beiträge zur alttestamentlichen Theologie. Festschrift W. Zimmerli*, 1977; H.-D. Wendland, *Ethik des Neuen Testament, Eine Einführung*, 1970, 67 ff., 93 ff.

W

Walk, Run, Way, Conduct

ἀναστρέφω

ἀναστρέφω (*anastrephō*), to upset, overturn, turn back, turn round; fig. act, behave, conduct oneself, live; ἀναστροφή (*anastrophē*), turning back; fig. way of life, conduct, behaviour.

CL *anastrophē* is the noun derived from the compound *anastrephō*, from *strephō*, to turn, turn round. From Homer onwards, it has a great range of meaning in Gk. The vb. has the transitive meaning of to upset, to turn upside down, and the intransitive of to turn back, to turn round. In the middle and passive forms, too, the meaning of turning round, return, is to the fore (Homer, *Il.* 23, 436); thence follows the meaning of turning back and forth (in a place) or dawdling around, and lingering (Homer, *Od.* 13, 326), and finally the figurative meaning of human behaviour, to walk, to conduct oneself, to live in a particular way (Aristotle, *Eth. Nic.* 2, 1p, 1103b, 20; Epictetus, *Dissertationes* 3, 15, 5). The noun, found from Aeschylus and the Pre-Socratics onwards with several meanings, denotes intransitively a turning round or a turning movement, a resting-place in later poetic speech only, and then also the figurative sense of way of life, conduct (Polybius, 4, 82, 1).

From there *anastrophē* and *anastrephomai* have an ethical sense, which is found throughout the whole ancient world, and in no way needs to be explained simply from the Heb. *hālaḵ*. The kind of behaviour is more precisely described by adv., adj., or prepositional expressions, followed by *en*, in. In Gk. inscriptions from Roman times, conduct of life is judged by particular standards and distinguished by value-predicates such as "good and praiseworthy", "at all times blameless and fearless", "good, responsible and worthy of the city [*axiōs*]" (cf. *Die Inschriften von Pergamon* in M. Fraenkel, ed., *Pergamon* VIII, Nos. 459, 5; 470, 4; 496, 5 ff.).

OT In the LXX the vb. *anastrephō* stands 87 times for Heb. *šûḇ*, to turn round, to return, but only in the literal sense. Eight times the Heb. equivalent is *hālaḵ*, walk, but only in 1 Ki. 6:12; Prov. 8:20; 20:7 does the figurative sense of walking (in God's commandments, in righteousness, etc.) apply. "Walking rightly", *anastrephomenon orthōs*, in Ezek. 22:30 (LXX) is a free translation of the Heb. text: there is no corresponding Heb. vb. The noun *anastrophē* is encountered only in the Apocrypha (3 times) and only with the figurative meaning (Tob. 4:14, to show oneself well brought up in one's whole way of life; 2 Macc. 5:8, bad manner of life; 6:23, impeccable conduct from boyhood). The Hellenistic stamp of the term is here very clear.

In later Jewish writings, and also in the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Heb. *hālaḵ*, corresponding with Gk. *anastrephō*, is used frequently everywhere, and that both in positive and negative senses, often in connexion with the figurative use of "way" as

walking in the way of God or in the way of sin (cf. 1QS 1:6, 8, 15, 25; 2:2, 14, 26; 3:9, 18, 20 f. and often).

NT In the NT the vb. occurs only 9 times, the noun 13 times. Both words are totally absent from the four Gospels, occur seldom in Paul, and more frequently in the post-Pauline writings; 1 and 2 Pet. and Heb. are the areas of chief concentration. The literal sense of the verb is found only in Acts 5:22 and 15:16; otherwise only the figurative meaning is found. Apart from Heb. 10:33, where the vb. stands generally for living, taking place, the word-group is used throughout to designate way of life, and thus clearly belongs to the realm of paraenesis.

1. (a) Since noun and vb. are in themselves neutral terms, which only gain positive or negative valuation by means of attributes, they can designate a pre- or non-Christian (Jewish, Gal. 1:33; heathen, Eph. 2:3) way of life just as much as a Christian (2 Cor. 1:2). The kind of life led depends on what determines a man's thoughts and actions. The determining factor can be an ethical value-system (cf. Gk. inscriptions) or the Jewish faith which effects a corresponding Jewish way of life (Gal. 1:13). Lack of any obligation leads to an unbridled manner of life, where a man follows only his desires (1 Pet. 1:14; 2 Pet. 2:7) and finally destroys himself (Eph. 4:22).

(b) Turning to Christ implies a simultaneous turning away from a man's previous way of life, for which Christ frees and enables him. We see here – as the distribution of the word-group already indicated – the problems of the second and third generation, who are not only occupied with the missionary impetus but also concerned with the maintenance of faith in the community. The main point is to translate knowledge into practice. By → faith and → baptism man is introduced into the domain of power of Jesus Christ; he lives "in Christ" and thus in a new fellowship with God. The knowledge of the earlier perversity of his way of life (cf. 2 Cor. 6:14 ff.; Gal. 1:13; Eph. 2:1 ff.; 4:22; Col. 1:21 ff.; 3:1–17) makes him conscious of the new, and helps him to set aside the old. It is the person and work of Jesus Christ, or God who through Christ has freed him for a new life of obedience, piety and holiness (2 Cor. 1:12; 1 Pet. 1:15, 17; 3:16), which determines and stamps the new style of Christian conduct. Growing as it does out of the life bound to God or Christ, this kind of conduct can itself assume exemplary significance (1 Tim. 4:12; Heb. 13:7), and be crowned by an appropriate end of life (Heb. 13:7). For such a walk in the Christian community as the "household of God" (1 Tim. 3:15) the First Letter to Timothy intended to give instructions.

Such Christian conduct, however, is threatened continuously by a double danger: reversion to heathen modes of conduct (2 Pet. 2:8), and legalism, where in place of adherence to the person of Christ impersonal norms, foreign to Christ, enter in as regulating points of conduct (cf. in 1 Tim. 4:11 ff. the struggle against false teachers who wish to make celibacy and abstention from certain foods compulsory; cf. M. Dibelius and H. Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles*, *Hermeneia*, 1972, 65 ff.).

2. The word-group has particular significance in the paraenesis of 1 Pet. Here the present, in which Christians live in the world "as aliens and exiles", is seen as a time of testing for faith (1 Pet. 2:11 f.). The exhortation to live in a Christian way is thereby grounded (a) in their having been eschatologically called out by a holy God;

(b) by invoking the Father, who is also Judge of all and cannot be bribed, and (c) on the sacrificial death of Jesus, understood as a ransom "from the futile ways inherited from your fathers" (1 Pet. 1:15–18). But the exhortation to a way of life in conformity with Christ is also important for this reason, that the Christians are living under the critical eyes of a heathen environment. As Paul in 2 Cor. 3:2 can call the Corinthian community his "letter of recommendation" (in contrast with the written letters of commendation hawked about by his opponents), so it now becomes increasingly important that the Christians' way of life counts as a touchstone for the power of the gospel to which they bear witness. It can contradict the suspicions and slanders of the heathen environment and perhaps even gain the opponents and slanderers (1 Pet. 2:12; 3:1; 3:16).

3. Alternative terms for *anastrophē* are *agōgē* and *peripateō*.

(a) *agōgē* occurs only at 2 Tim. 3:10. The basic meaning is leading, especially in the sense of upbringing (cf. *paidagōgos*, custodian, → Teach) and then kind of life, conduct as the result of a particular upbringing (cf. K. L. Schmidt, *TDNT* I, 128 f.). 2 Tim. 3:10 ("You have followed my . . . conduct") has a double sense: You have let me lead you – and now you are conducting your life just as I did, namely, as a Christian, "in Christ" (cf. vv. 12 and 14).

(b) → *peripateō*, which in the figurative sense is the most common NT word for designating manner of life, is used almost exclusively by Paul and John.

G. Ebel

ὁδός

ὁδός (*hodos*), way, road, highway, way of life; μεθοδεία (*methodeia*), method, in biblical and Christian literature only in an unfavourable sense, i.e. scheming, craftiness; (plur.) tricks; μέθοδος (*methodos*), planned procedure; εἴσοδος (*eishodos*), entrance, access; ἔξοδος (*exhodos*), departure, exit; ὁδηγός (*hodēgos*), leader, guide; ὁδηγέω (*hodēgeō*), to lead, guide; καθοδηγός (*kathodēgos*), guide, leader.

CL 1. In Gk. *hodos* stands for the missing abstract of *ienai*, to go; the element of action could thus be the primary one in the word. It denotes a walk, a journey or a voyage by land or sea, as actions, from Homer onwards; in the local and spatial sense, the way, the path or the road as the place where one goes, drives or marches; also the passage a ship takes (Homer onwards; and inscriptions and papyri). The goal of the way is in Homer defined by *eis*, towards, and later also *epi ti*, towards, or the gen. The term is already used early on in a pictorial or figurative sense. Since one uses or must go by some way in order to reach a goal, *hodos* can acquire the meaning of the means and way of reaching or carrying out something, measures, procedure, the style and way in which one does something and in which one lives. Life is occasionally compared to a way, but not designated as a way (Democritus, *Frag.* 230). *hodos biou* does not mean the way of life, but the kind of life (Plato, *Rep.* 10, 600a; → Life, art. *bios*); incorrect behaviour in individual cases is described as "going a wrong way" (Thuc., 3, 64, 4).

hodos already stands for the intellectual-philosophical path of investigation and knowledge in Parmenides. Elsewhere, from Plato onwards, systematic and clear-

sighted procedure is denoted by *methodos* (and *methodeuō*; not before the LXX). But this then also comes to have the negative meaning (first in Plutarch) of cunning, deception, craftiness.

The noun *eishodos* (Homer onwards) denotes in the verbal sense entering, going into, entry; in the spatial sense the entrance or access to a place or building, the door (also figurative). *exhodos* constitutes the opposite of this, going out, departure; spatially, exit, door, opening; figuratively, passing away, disappearing, and frequently, the outcome of an event, the end. In the sense of the end of life, death (cf. Lat. *exitus*), it is rare. Anyone who does not know the way needs a *hodēgos* (not before Polybius), a leader to guide him and to show him the way (*hodēgeō*, Aeschylus onwards). The noun and the vb. are mostly used in their literal, rarely in a figurative sense (instructor, leader or to lead, to instruct). In the *Corp. Herm.* it is the *nous*, the mind, which leads to the "doors of knowledge" or to the "light of knowledge" (7, 2; 10, 21), where there are underlying spatial conceptions. *hodēgeō*, to lead, also occurs here in the context of the journey of the → soul to heaven (4, 11; 12, 12).

2. In Gk. literature one frequently encounters the picture of the two ways (Hesiod, *Works* 287 ff.; Theognis, 911 f.), which is particularly well-known from the Prodicus-fable of Hercules at the crossroads (Xen., *Mem.* 2, 1, 21–34). The grown man is faced with the problem of making a decision with reference to his conduct: *aretē* → virtue, and *kakia*, badness, represent the two possible choices. Whoever decides for virtue must, according to one of Socrates' theses, be ready to undertake hard work and exertion. For "only at the price of hard work do the gods sell us goodness". The motif of the two ways is frequently used in subsequent times with reference to the ethical decisions of mankind, right up to modern, popular philosophy and Christian literature (cf. W. Michaelis, *hodos*, *TDNT* V 43–8).

One also frequently meets with the conception of the two ways in the underworld: the way to the right leads to the place of the pious, the left-hand road to the place of punishment for the unrighteous. Here the thought is of real ways which men travel after → death to their varying fortunes (→ Resurrection, art. *anastasis* CL).

3. Significant in the history of religion is the occurrence of *hodos* in connexion with the idea of the ascent of the soul to the heavenly world, although other terms are also found for this (e.g. *anabasis*, ascent). The way to the → truth (right thinking) – "which carries the man who has knowledge far above all dwellings" – is depicted as the way to the divine light (Parmenides, *Frag.* 1). In the Hermetic writings the way is *gnōsis*, → knowledge. Anyone who has attained the goal of *gnōsis*, divinization and participation in immortality, sets out to draw the others out of their ignorance by serving them as a *kathodēgos*, a guide, a leader (*Corp. Herm.* 1, 26–29).

In Christian gnostic texts, such as the Odes of Solomon and the Naassene hymn, there is mention of the way which is opened to men by the Redeemer, who mediates gnosis to them (Od. Sol. 7:13 f.; 15:22 f.). The way or path plays a very large part in Mandaean *gnōsis*. The gnostic is on the "way of life" or "the way of the perfect", which is also designated as an ascent. The redeemer is regarded as leader and helper, but is never denoted as the way. (For gnosticism see *The Secret Book of John* in R. M. Grant, *Gnosticism: An Anthology*, 1961, 79; W. Foerster, *Gnosis: A Selection of Gnostic Texts*, I, 1972; II, 1974, see index.)

OT In the LXX *hodos* is encountered very frequently (some 880 times) in both literal and figurative senses. It represents 18 Heb. equivalents, but corresponds in more than 600 references with Heb. *derek̲*, way.

1. (a) The use of the term in the OT is very strongly stamped by the fact that God led his people by a way – out of → Egypt, forty years in the → wilderness, and then into the promised land. The way through the wilderness, in particular, is viewed by Deut. 8:2 as a testing ground.

The vb. *hodēgeō*, to lead, is found 42 times and is universally used with reference to God (e.g. Exod. 13:17; 15:13), predominantly in the Pss. in confessions of God's leading in the individual life (e.g. Pss. 23[22]:3; 25[24]:9) and in requests for his care and leading (e.g. Pss. 5:9; 31[30]:4), also in the figurative sense of teaching and guiding. In Wisdom literature → wisdom takes over the place of God. The noun *hodēgos*, leader, is found in but few late passages and is only in Wis. 7:15 referred to God. In Deutero-Isaiah, the language of which is largely stamped by the Pss., God is seen as the One who makes a way, where it appears impossible for men: at the first Exodus in the sea (Isa. 43:16; 51:10; cf. Ps. 77[76]:20) and at the second Exodus in the wilderness (Isa. 43:19).

exhodos stands as a designation for the departure from Egypt (e.g. Exod. 19:1; Num. 33:38; 1 Ki. 6:1; Ps. 105[104]:38), whereas otherwise it is found with various meanings, often combined with *eishodos*, entering in, entrance, in the sense of going in and out, which denotes continuous fellowship, or all one's activities (e.g. 1 Sam. 29:6; Ps. 121[120]:8). Occasionally it refers also to birth and death (Wis. 7:6; Sir. 40:1).

Isa. 40:3 is probably referring to a road in the strict sense of the word. On this road in the desert, Yahweh's glory is to be revealed in leading the nation home from the Babylonian captivity (cf. also Mal. 3:1). Babylonian parallels to this divine highway have been adduced (cf. F. Stummer, "Einige Keilschriftliche Parallele zu Jes. 40–66", *JBL* 45, 1926, 171–89). But R. N. Whybray thinks it unlikely that the prophet would wish to draw a parallel between Yahweh and other gods; he thinks it more likely that he was thinking of the construction or repair of roads in preparation for the advance of conquering kings (*Isaiah 40–66*, *New Century Bible*, 1975, 50).

(b) From this point onwards, the term "the way of God" acquires its fullness and significance. It denotes in a special way the saving activity of God (mostly sing., e.g. Ps. 67[66]:3): "that thy way may be known on earth, thy saving power among all the nations", or more generally, God's deeds (e.g. Pss. 25[24]:10; 145[144]:17), the ways which he takes. They surpass the ways of men, and cannot therefore simply be apprehended by them without further ado (Isa. 55:8 f.; Ps. 95[94]:7–11).

(c) It is a different matter, however, with the ways (sing. and plur.) appointed by God when he bids men walk in his →commandments (e.g. Gen. 18:19). The frequently found expression, "to walk in the ways of God, or the LORD" (→*poreuomai*). means to act according to the will of God revealed in commandments, statutes and ordinances (1 Ki. 2:3; 8:58). God's law is called "the way of the LORD" (Jer. 5:4) for which the prophets have to struggle to see that it is observed, because Israel again and again succumbs to the temptation to evade the demand of God (Exod. 32:8; Mal. 2:8). With the pictorial conception of the way (even whilst it is often totally faded) is connected the use in these contexts of expressions such as going, walking, straying, abandoning, deviating, etc. Alongside the confession of the individual in the

Pss., "I have kept the ways of the LORD" (Ps. 18[17]:21; cf. Job 23:11), there stands the prayer "LORD, show me thy way" (Pss. 27[26]:11; 86[85]:11). This way is often given further precision by means of an explanatory genitive: "way of thy testimonies", "way of truth", "way of thy commandments" (Ps. 119[118]). Instead of "ways of the LORD", there stands in Wisdom literature the phrase "ways of Wisdom" (e.g. Prov. 3:17; 4:11; Sir. 6:26).

2. (a) Human life as a whole or in its individual aspects can be called a way (Ps. 119[118]:105; Isa. 53:6). God's eyes see all the ways of men (Jer. 16:17; 32:19). He has them in his hand (Dan. 5:23). Therefore, it is good to entrust one's ways to him (Ps. 37[36]:5). Here the literal and pictorial senses often merge into one another. When a man dies, he goes "the way of all the earth" (1 Ki. 2:2), which all must go (Jos. 23:14), and from which one does not return (Job 16:22).

(b) "Way" also denotes in the LXX the deeds or behaviour of men, the living out of one's life (Exod. 18:20). The ways are mostly qualified in some manner or other (often by an additional genitive), either positively (e.g. "the ancient paths where the good way is", Jer. 6:16; "the right way", Prov. 8:20) or negatively ("false" or "evil" ways, Jer. 25:5; Prov. 8:13). Sometimes the evaluation can only be deduced from the context (e.g. the way of Jeroboam, 1 Ki. 15:34). The real point of reference for evaluating the way which a man takes is the will of God. Where a man allows this to be the determining factor of his actions, he goes God's way or in the ways of God. Everything else is a self-chosen way (Jer. 7:23 f.) or is "the way of sinners" (Ps. 1:1). This is where the prophetic call to repentance from evil ways has to begin (2 Ki. 17:13 f.; Jer. 25:5; Isa. 55:7), and where the devout man must ask for right guidance (Ps. 85[84]:11).

3. The way by which God leads his people has their salvation as its goal. The same applies to the ways which he enjoins on them (Deut. 30:15 f.). They are therefore "the ways of life" (e.g. Ps. 16[15]:11; Prov. 5:6). Turning away from these ways leads to destruction, and draws God's judgment upon one (Deut. 30:17 f.). What was at first referred to the nation as a whole is later individualized in Wisdom literature and post-exilic piety. Wisdom maintains that wise conduct leads to a successful life, but that foolishness leads to death (Ps. 1). The crisis of this line of thought when taken in an unqualified way is evident in Ecclesiastes, Job and also Ps. 73.

4. Whereas Gk. thought saw in men the possibility of making free decisions concerning their way of life, the OT knows only of obedience or disobedience to God. Since God has made the → covenant with Israel and thus made his decision, Israel can now only decide for or against God, keep the covenant and thus gain life and blessing, or break it – which means curse and death (Deut. 11:26 f.; 30:15 ff.). Similar thinking in the antitheses of good and evil, righteous and godless are encountered in connexion with "way" particularly in Wisdom literature (Prov. 2:12, 20; 4:18 f.; cf. Ps. 1). Nowhere are two ways expressly mentioned; but later on the "two-ways" scheme was able to utilize this antithetical thinking.

5. Judaism. (a) In Philo "way" occurs frequently, but not often influenced by OT linguistic usage. It is much more strongly affected by general philosophical and paraenetic usage. The really important lines of OT usage ("ways of God") find no continuation in him. He takes over the wandering motif from the OT and builds it into his basic philosophic theme of man's stepping out on a road, which according to

Num. 20:27 is called the "royal" road, because it leads to God, the king of the universe. This way is equated with Wisdom, by which the spirit reaches its goal, the knowledge of God (*Migr. Abr.* 195). In ethical statements the ascetic way to virtue plays an important rôle (*Post. C.* 154; *Leg. All.* 2, 98). For him, the way to virtue is philosophy.

Alongside other conceptions of the way, such as the middle way, one meets also in Philo the motif of the two ways. In its gnostic-dualistic contrast of flesh and spirit it points to non-Jewish influences. The way which is determined by virtue has life and immortality as its goal; on the other hand, the way determined by badness leads to flight from immortality and to death (*Spec. Leg.* 4, 108).

Philo also speaks of the necessity of a leader, since man of himself does not know the way (*Migr. Abr.* 170). Instead of *hodēgos*, Philo uses the phrase *hēgemōn tēs hodou*, leader along the way, in both the literal and figurative sense, for the Logos, and above all for God himself, who, as the compassionate redeemer, leads the *nous*, the mind, on the right way (*Migr. Abr.* 171; *Praem.* 117).

(b) In Josephus "way" predominates in the literal sense; only very occasionally is it found in figurative usage (*TDNT* V 64 f.). But here, too, there is no echo of the OT usage of "the ways of the Lord".

(c) By contrast with Philo and Josephus, the effects of OT usage are felt in the rest of Jewish literature. For the way in which men are commanded by God to walk one finds at times the absolute expression "the way" (2 Esd. 14:22; CD 1:13; 2:6). The way of the Lord is the "way of the law" (Syr. Bar. 44:3) and is called "the way of righteousness" (Jub. 1:20; 23:26). Probably the earliest attested reference to the term "the two ways" within the area of Jewish writing is to be found in Test. Ash. 1:3: "Two ways hath God given to the sons of man, and two inclinations, and two kinds of action, and two modes (of action) and two issues" (cf. v. 5). Man can choose between light and darkness (in Sl. Enoch 30:15 the two ways are designated exactly thus), between the law of the Lord and the works of Beliar (Test. Lev. 19:1), but he is threatened by demons who wish to lead him astray (Test. Ash. 8:9; Test. Reub. 2 and 3).

(d) The Dead Sea Scrolls, with their dualistic background, also speak of two kinds of ways: the ways of truth and the deeds of corruption (1QS 4:16) or the way of wickedness (1QS 5:10 f.). The children of righteousness walk in the ways of light, the children of error walk in the ways of darkness (1QS 3:17 ff.). Here, too, demonic powers threaten to seduce. The angel of darkness brings about the straying of all children of righteousness. For the Qumran community the way of the Lord in the wilderness (Isa. 40:3) is the *halachah* constructed by the study of the law (1QS 8:13; cf. A. R. C. Leaney, *The Rule of Qumran and its Meaning*, 1966, 221 f.; cf. also 142 f., 149, 231).

(e) The rabbis interpreted Deut. 11:26 and 30:19 to mean that God laid down two ways with blessing and curse, life and death. There was also a widespread conception of angels who conducted men on their ways and in their actions (B. Shab. 119b).

NT 1. (a) *hodos* in the literal sense is found 55 times in the NT, almost entirely in the Synoptic Gospels. The paths which Jesus took are not mentioned, although he was often *en tē hodō*, *en route* with his disciples (e.g. Matt. 5:25; 15:32; Mk. 8:3; 10:52), and events happened *para tēn hodon*, "along the way" (e.g. Matt. 20:30; Mk.

10:46). *hodos ethnōn* (Matt. 10:5) does not mean a heathen kind of life, but the road which led beyond and outside Israel to heathen territory. *hēmeras hodos* (Lk. 2:44) is the distance which one covers in one day, a day's journey. *sabbatou hodos* (Acts 1:12) denotes the distance a Jew was allowed to walk on the Sabbath without transgressing the commandment in Exod. 16:29 (cf. Num. 35:5), which was about 880 metres.

(b) The word "way" occurs 46 times, in a pictorial or figurative sense, spread over the whole NT. It stands in part, like the OT usage, for God's deeds and saving activity (e.g. Rom. 11:33; Rev. 15:3; Heb. 3:10), for God's will (e.g. Matt. 22:16; Mk. 12:14; Lk. 20:21; Matt. 21:32 also belongs in this context), very often in OT quotations and phrases (Acts 2:28; cf. Ps. 16:11; 13:10; cf. Hos. 14:9; Rom. 3:17; cf. Ps. 36[35]:1; Lk. 1:79; cf. Isa. 9:2), and also with the meaning of way of life (Acts 14:16; Rom. 3:16; 1 Cor. 4:17; Jas. 1:8; 5:20). On the other hand, John's Gospel (which uses *hodos* only 4 times) and Heb. use "way" in a sense somewhat different from the OT usage and which some scholars interpret in the light of Hellenistic-gnostic conceptions of the redeemer. A further peculiarity in the NT is the absolute use of "the way" in Acts as a designation for the Christian community and its preaching. (See below, 2 (c)–(e).)

(c) *eishodos*, entrance, access, approach, stands in 5 NT passages. They are: Heb. 10:19, "entrance into the sanctuary"; 2 Pet. 1:11, "entrance into the eternal kingdom"; Acts 13:24, the beginning of Jesus' appearance, his arrival; 1 Thess. 1:9 and 2:1, the "entrance" of Paul amongst the Thessalonians, the response which he found to the gospel there.

(d) *exhodos* is found in the NT in only 3 places (Heb. 11:22 of the exodus from Egypt; Lk. 9:31 and 2 Pet. 1:15 of death).

(e) *diexhodos* (Matt. 22:9) may mean a street crossing or the place where a street crosses a city boundary and goes out into the open country (Arndt, 193).

2. (a) In Matt. 3:3 par. Mk. 1:3, Lk. 3:4 (cf. Jn. 1:23), Isa. 40:3 is quoted with the call to prepare the way for the Lord (cf. OT 1 (a)). Through the transference of the *kyrios*-title to Jesus it becomes possible to see the work of John the Baptist as a fulfilment of the OT word. John, the forerunner, has prepared the way for Jesus by the announcement of his coming, by the call to repentance and baptism (cf. also the quotation from Mal. 3:1 in Mk. 1:2; cf. Matt. 11:10; Lk. 1:17, 76; 7:27).

(b) The Sermon on the Mount gives in Matt. 7:13 f. the double picture of the two ways and the two → gates. As in secular Gk., the goals to which the two ways lead are also brought into view. But here it is not the ethical problem of conduct, but the question of life or death, salvation or destruction, which is put before men in Jesus, though, to be sure, with a clear invitation to life ("Enter in . . ."). The picture of the two ways figures in both Jewish and early Christian writings (2 Esd. 7:7 ff.; Test. Ash. 1:3, 5; Pirke Aboth 2:12 f.; Did. 1:1; Barn. 18:1). "It may have been employed originally as a Jewish catechetical form and have been taken over as a pattern for Christian instruction" (D. Hill, *The Gospel of Matthew*, 1972, 150; cf. P. Carrington, *The Primitive Christian Catechism*, 1940). Despite Gk. affinities with the picture, this saying is very closely related in essence to Deut. 30:19, although, as distinct from Deut. 30:19 (cf. Jer. 21:8; 1QS 3:20 ff.), it alludes to the eternal destiny of men. By contrast with Gk. thought (cf. Hesiod, *Works* 287 ff.) and Jewish thought (cf. 2 Esd. 7:7 f.), the two ways are not described in detail. Matt. 7:13 f. belongs to that cir-

cle of sayings, which, especially in Matt., speak of entering into the kingdom of heaven (e.g. Matt. 5:20), into life (e.g. Matt. 18:8 f.) or into the joy of the Lord (Matt. 25:21, 23).

(c) It is in connexion with the conception of the high-priesthood of Jesus Christ that Hebrews (9:8; 10:19 f.) speaks of the "way" or the "entrance into the sanctuary", whereby *hodos* almost acquires the sense of *eishodos*, access. Jesus, the forerunner (Heb. 6:20) or the leader (Heb. 2:10; 12:2), has opened a previously non-existent and living way of access. This may be contrasted with the gnostic motif of the redeemer who prepares the way for his own; in Heb. the thought is linked with the sacrificial death of Jesus. The separating curtain through which Jesus has made the way is his flesh, an expression of the material which (in the gnostic understanding) bars the way to the heavenly world. But in that Jesus offers his flesh (and blood) as a sacrifice for sin, it becomes clear that (in the biblical understanding) it is not matter which separates men from God but sin. Only through Jesus' death is an approach to God which is freed from an evil conscience made possible (Heb. 10:22; parallels in substance in Rom. 5:1 f.; Eph. 2:18 f.; 3:11 f.). The underlying imagery in Heb. is the day of atonement ritual (cf. Lev. 16) in which the high priest entered the holy of holies once a year by means of sacrificial blood making atonement for the unwitting sins of the people. Only he had such access to Yahweh under the old covenant (→ Temple, art. *to hieron*; → Tent). 2 Pet. 1:11 also belongs in this context.

(d) In John's Gospel *hodos*, way, is applied to the person of Jesus, in a manner which is unique in the NT (Jn. 14:1–6). The whither of Jesus' departure is not known to the disciples; therefore they also do not know the way. Jesus reveals himself to them as the only way which leads to the Father: "I am the way and the truth and the life; no one comes to the Father but by me" (Jn. 14:6). The goal of the way of Jesus is his being with the Father (cf. Jn. 14:6b with 20:17), and through it the way also of his disciples. According to R. Bultmann, the pictorial conception of the way in the Gospel has been sharply repressed by comparison with the gnostic schema of the way of the redeemer which he detects behind these statements (*The Gospel of John*, 1971, 603–12). But it should be noted that the evidence that Bultmann cites for gnostic parallels is of a much later date. The vbs. of motion linked with this conception (depart [→ Come, art. *erchomai*]; ascend [→ Heaven, art. *anabainō*]) express the distance between God and man, and between heaven (→ art. *ouranos*) and earth, which is overcome in Jesus. Only through him does fellowship with God come about, embracing present and future.

(e) In Acts *hodos* occurs at 1:12; 2:28 citing Ps. 16:11; 8:26, 36, 39; 9:2, 17, 27; 13:10; 14:16; 16:17; 18:25 f.; 19:9, 23; 22:4; 24:14, 22; 25:3; 26:13. *hodoiporeō* is a hapax legomenon occurring only at Acts 10:9, "as they were on their way". Along with a use of the word defined by the OT (cf. 1 (b)), Acts demonstrates an absolute use of "way" (sing.), which is equally unique in the NT (e.g. Acts 9:2; 19:2, 23; 24:14). Perhaps we have here a term of missionary language, similar to the absolute use of *logos*, → word, for the early Christian preaching (e.g. Acts 4:4; 11:19). "It is clear from 24:14 that *hē hodos* was a designation applied to the Church by the Christians themselves whereas their opponents spoke of a *hairesis* [a sect]" (E. Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 1971, 320, n. 1). The origin of this self-designation has not yet been fully explained. E. Repo, *Der "Weg" als Selbstbezeichnung des Christentums*, 1944, traces it back through the group of disciples to the Qumran

community; Qumran certainly provides a parallel to the Acts usage, but not necessarily its source.

Acts 16:17 ("way of salvation") clearly concerns the Christian message, and Acts 18:25 ("way of the Lord") and 26 ("way of God") the proclamation concerning Jesus. Acts 13:12 speaks of the "teaching of the Lord", following on immediately after the mention in Acts 13:10 of the "straight paths of the Lord" (cf. Hos. 14:9). If all these passages point in the direction of teaching and proclamation, the passages with the absolute use of "way" show, on the other hand, that there this understanding is insufficient, since the Christians themselves are also included. When Paul, according to Acts 22:4, persecuted "the way", it is the Christian community and its message of the resurrection of the crucified one that is meant (→ Persecution, art. *diōkō* NT 1 (b)). It is therefore not permissible to construct false alternatives here by insisting that "way" must mean either teaching or the Christian community. Both are involved in the term and both belong together. We shall, therefore, be obliged to understand "way" in its absolute use in Acts as a designation for Christians and their proclamation of Jesus Christ, which includes the fact that this proclamation also comprises a particular walk of life or way.

(f) The "more excellent way" of which Paul speaks in 1 Cor. 12:31b means the living of the life which is governed by love, *agapē*, which is ranked above and before all aspirations after spiritual gifts (cf. 1 Cor. 14:1; Phil. 2:1 ff.; → Love, art. *agapaō* NT 3 (c)). We shall need to look at the "way" of 1 Cor. 12:31b together with 4:17, where Paul uses the expression "my ways in Christ". There he is dealing with the way of life in conformity with Christ, which he not only teaches everywhere, but which is also evident in his own conduct. For this reason he can say "my ways" and summon the congregation to be his "imitators", namely, in the way they live in accord with Christ (→ *peripateō*).

(g) In 2 Peter, in order to combat false doctrine, or heretical teachers, Christianity is called the "way of truth" (2:2; cf. Jas. 5:19 *v.l.*) and the "way of righteousness" (2:21). It is viewed very definitely from the angle of the new morality which it brings and demands (cf. 2 Pet. 2:20 f., the "holy commandment"), and which distinguishes it from paganism. The false teachers, with their scandalous conduct, have left the "straight" way (i.e. the way indicated and desired by God), and followed the "way of Balaam" (2:15), thus bringing Christianity into disrepute.

The expressions "the way of Balaam" and "the way of Cain" (Jude 11; cf. Gen. 4:3–8; Num. 22–24) should be understood less from the view-point of the OT (actions against the will of God) than from the later Jewish tradition which adhered to it (Cain and Balaam as the fathers and the teachers of all libertines and heretics; cf. Philo, *Post. C.* 38, 233; Pirke Aboth 5:19; on the thought of straying, → Lead Astray).

3. (a) The noun *hodēgos*, leader, guide, is found only 5 times in the NT (in Acts 1:16 of Judas), though also partly in pictorial expressions. The spiritual blindness of the → Pharisees to the essential will of God is exemplified by Jesus when calling them "blind guides" (Matt. 23:16, 24) or "blind leaders of the blind" (Matt. 15:14; cf. also Lk. 6:39). Similarly, in Rom. 2:19, Paul characterizes the Jew instructed in the law as one who presumes to be "a guide to the blind". *hodēgeō*, to lead, guide occurs 5 times. In addition to Matt. 15:14 and Lk. 6:39, it is used in Jn. 16:13 with reference to the Spirit of truth, who will guide into all the truth (parallel in substance in Jn.

14:26), and in Rev. 7:17 of the → Lamb who will guide those who have been made perfect to springs of living water. The clearly figurative sense of guide as instruct occurs only in Acts 8:31, where it concerns guidance in understanding the Scriptures. What is therefore characteristic for the OT use of the vb. has scarcely any effect in the NT.

(b) *methodeia*, a word not attested before the NT, and synonymous with the older *methodos*, which is used in the late papyrus attestations in the neutral sense of proceedings in the case of the collection of taxes and debts, is encountered in the NT only twice in a negative sense: cunning (sing. Eph. 4:14), and wiles, tricks (plur. Eph. 6:11). The term stands here in connexion with statements concerning the threats to which a Christian is exposed, whether from men or seductive powers.

(c) *euhodoō* means to be led along a good road, in the NT always fig., i.e. to get along well, prosper, succeed (Rom. 1:10; 1 Cor. 16:2; 3 Jn. 2).

G. Ebel

περιπατέω

περιπατέω (*peripateō*), go about, walk; ἐμπεριπατέω (*emperipateō*), go about, walk; πατέω (*pateō*), tread, trample.

CL *pateō* and its compounds denote in Gk. a stepping movement of the feet. *pateō* (not used before Pindar) means trans. to tread or tread on something, to set foot on or in, to trample under foot, to trample down; frequently also figuratively to treat contemptuously, to maltreat, to plunder; intrans. to go, to walk. *katapateō*, used from Thuc. onwards, denotes complete crushing or trampling down, often in the figurative sense of treating disdainfully, despising (e.g. the laws, Plato, *Leg.* 4, 714a).

peripateō (Aristophanes onwards) is found in cl. Gk. only with the literal meaning of strolling, stopping, (e.g. while one walks here and there in the market, Dem., *Orationes* 54, 7); the figurative meaning of walking, with reference to conduct, is lacking. Only in Philodemus (1st cent. B.C.) does one find the meaning to live (*De Libertate* 23, 3). *emperipateō*, to go around, to walk about, is first attested in Plut. (1st cent. A.D.).

OT In the LXX *peripateō* is found in only 33 passages, of which more than half come from Wisdom literature. It stands – as also *emperipateō* (9 occurrences: exception, Job 9:8) – for Heb. *hālaḵ* (mostly hith.), and means initially simply to go or to walk about (1 Sam. 17:39), generally with an indication of place (e.g. Exod. 21:11) or some other more precise information (e.g. Sus. 13, according to custom). Only in Jdg. 21:24 does it mean to go away. Several times God's walking or moving about is spoken of anthropomorphically (Gen. 3:8, 10; Ps. 103[104]:3), as also is → Satan's (Job 1:7; 2:2).

Only occasionally does *peripateō* denote in the figurative sense way of life (2 Ki. 20:3; Eccl. 11:9). The LXX prefers to use → *poreuomai*, to go, in combination with → *hodos*, way, because this can better express that one should conduct one's way of life in the paths indicated by God.

2. According to the Dead Sea Scrolls, God has set two spirits for men to walk in until the time of their visitation, namely the spirits of truth and of perversity (1QS

3:18 ff.; cf. A. R. C. Leaney, *The Rule of Qumran and its Meaning*, 1966, 33–56, 143–61). The sons of righteousness walk in the ways of light (i.e. according to the will of God (1QS 5:10), the sons of perversity or of wickedness walk in the ways of darkness (1QS 3:20 f.). Man in his walk of life is exposed to seduction by demonic powers (angels of darkness), which try to lead him astray. Although man should decide upon the right way, this freedom of decision seems on the other hand to have been removed from him. "For mankind has no way, and man is unable to establish his steps since justification is with God and perfection of way is out of his hand" (1QS 11:10).

NT In the NT *peripateō* occurs 95 times, of which about half are in the literal and half in the figurative meaning – a striking contrast to the LXX. It occurs predominantly in the Gospels, Acts and Rev. in the sense of to go, walk about. In 1 Pet. 5:8 it is applied to the devil who is like a lion walking about, seeking whom he may devour. In Rev. 2:1; 3:4; 21:24, it denotes walking in the perfection and light of the heavenly → Jerusalem. The hapax legomenon *emperipateō* occurs in 2 Cor. 6:16 (cf. Lev. 26:12) of God's covenant relationship with his people, in which he walks about among them. This now applies to the church. The simple form *pateō*, tread, trample, is found at Lk. 10:19; 21:24; Rev. 11:2; in each case with overtones of judgment and power, for invading armies or the Gentiles trampling over Jerusalem or the temple, or the Seventy trampling upon serpents and scorpions. *katapateō* means to tread underfoot (Matt. 5:13; 7:6; Lk. 8:5; 12:1), to despise (the Son of God, Heb. 10:29).

In the figurative sense of to walk (as a designation for conduct of life) *peripateō* is found chiefly in the Pauline (except for the Pastorals and Phlm.) and Johannine writings. Exceptions are Matt. 7:5; Acts 21:21; and Heb. 13:9, where it refers to the observance of Jewish traditions and customs. It obtains an outstanding significance as a term for denoting way of life; the nature and the manner of the way of life make it clear as to what governs a man in his being and acting. Therefore, the vb., which in itself is neutral, is always more precisely fixed (by *kata*, according to, *en*, in, *axiōs*, worthily, or a dat.) and thus qualified positively or negatively.

1. In the Pauline writings two ways of life stand fundamentally opposed to one another: the (former) heathen way of life (Eph. 2:2; walking "according to the flesh", Rom. 8:4; "like ordinary men", 1 Cor. 3:3), and the (present) walk in Christ (Col. 2:6; walking "according to the Spirit", Rom. 8:4; "in the Spirit", Gal. 5:16; "guided by love", Rom. 14:15 [NEB]; "in love", Eph. 5:2; "as children of light" Eph. 5:8).

Since the proclamation of Christ desires to lead man from a life turned away from God and dominated by a self-seeking "I" (Gal. 5:16), into a new life (Rom. 6:4) which is dominated and stamped by God and his will, "how you ought to live and to please God" (1 Thess. 4:1) is also part of this preaching, as is reflected in various ways in the Pauline exhortation.

Paul starts from the position that man under the law is under bondage, and is therefore not able to fulfil the will of God. By faith in Christ he is promised freedom from the compulsion of the norm and from his captivity to himself as a gift from God (Eph. 2:1 ff.). He can now serve God and his neighbour (Rom. 7:6; cf. 14:7 ff. and Gal. 5:13). But he must again and again be exhorted to live in this new reality, because he too as a believer still lives "in the flesh" (2 Cor. 10:3 AV) and thus

remains open to the temptation to walk "according to the flesh" (1 Cor. 3:3), i.e. to act in a self-seeking way.

As long as the Christian walks "by faith and not by sight" he is to endeavour to please his Lord (2 Cor. 5:7 ff.). He must continually be re-examining "what is pleasing to the Lord" (Eph. 5:8 ff., 15), so that he may conduct his life in a way that corresponds with his calling (Eph. 4:1; 1 Thess. 2:12; Col. 1:10). This also means an attitude which pays attention to those who do not belong to the congregation, and to their judgments (1 Thess. 4:12; Col. 4:5), an approach which is not devious (2 Cor. 4:2), but "becomingly as in the day" (Rom. 13:13), so that there is no need to shun the light of day and the outside world. In 2 Thess. 3:6 the Thessalonians are urged to "keep away from any brother who is living in idleness and not in accord with the tradition that you received from us." *emperipateō*, walk about, move, occurs only in 2 Cor. 6:16 quoting the promise of Lev. 26:12 that God will move among his people. Paul sees this → covenant promise fulfilled in the Christian community. Therefore, the community is now the temple of God, which also means that Christians must not indulge in pagan ungodliness.

2. In the Johannine writings *peripateō* occurs in both literal and figurative senses. Whereas in Jn. 11:9 f. Jesus is apparently speaking in the literal sense of walking about in day- or night-time, there is already a hint of the figurative sense of the vb. and the later gnostic-dualistic terminology, which John uses in order to bring into relief the two possibilities for human existence: the life of faith and life in unbelief. The expressions "to walk in the light", "to walk in the truth", and "to walk in darkness" do not mean moral or immoral behaviour, but existence governed by God and existence governed by the world. To walk in the light means to live with one's face turned to God, by faith in Jesus Christ (Jn. 12:35 f.); to walk in darkness means to have one's life closed to God.

The man who has his life closed to God misses real → life (Jn. 12:35; 1 Jn. 2:11). Jesus, however, has come as the light of the world, so that man may find real life through him (Jn. 8:12). He finds it when he hears the call of Jesus and follows him.

Walking in the light (in 2 Jn. 4, cf. v. 6, and 3 Jn. 3 f., the expression is "walk in truth") has an ethical side. The Epistles of John show this clearly. Not mere words, but the whole way one lives one's life proves fellowship with God (1 Jn. 1:6 f.). "He who says he abides in him ought to walk in the same way in which he walked" (1 Jn. 2:6; cf. 2 Jn. 6). This was clear for all to see in Jesus (Jn. 13:14; 1 Jn. 4:11, 19). This also means having fellowship amongst one another (1 Jn. 3:16 f.). It is thus a matter of total surrender to God and to fellow human beings.

Correspondingly, walking in darkness characterizes an expression of living which does not correspond with fellowship with God (1 Jn. 1:6), and is therefore not determined by love, but by hate (1 Jn. 2:11). *G. Ebel*

πορεύομαι

πορεύομαι (*poreuomai*), go, to journey, to travel, to walk; *τρέχω* (*trechō*), run, move quickly; *δρόμος* (*dromos*), course, race; *πρόδρομος* (*prodromos*), running before, forerunner.

CL 1. *poreuomai* (Soph. onwards), to go, journey, travel, march, denotes by contrast with → *peripateō*, going in a particular direction or with a particular intention.

Figuratively – in phrases of travelling along the path of life (Plato, *Rep.* 2, 365b) or in ethical statements (Soph., *OT* 883) – it is found only rarely.

2. *trechō*, attested from Homer (*Od.* 23, 207; *Il.* 23, 392 f.) onwards, means to move quickly, to run, especially at a contest in the stadium (→ Fight, art. *agōn*). Influenced by the philosophical criticism of over-estimation of purely physical contests, *trechō* is also found in statements which express effort or achievement in respect of mental and spiritual matters.

OT 1. *poreuomai*, to go, to walk, is found some 750 times in the LXX, chiefly for Heb. *hālaḵ*, to go, but also for other Heb. vbs.

(a) It often has the literal sense of going, journeying, travelling (e.g. Gen. 12:4 f.; Deut. 1:19, 33). Linked with *opisō tinos*, behind someone (Jdg. 13:11), it takes on the figurative sense of following someone (→ Disciple, art. *opisō*), i.e. obeying him (e.g. 1 Ki. 14:8). It occurs as a command of God, which sends man on a particular path (e.g. Gen. 22:2; 2 Sam. 7:5). It can also denote departure from life (1 Ki. 2:2; 2 Sam. 12:23) and in later times the journey to Sheol or Hades (→ Hell), as in Job 10:21; 16:22; Eccl. 9:10.

(b) By contrast with secular Gk. (see above, CL 1) the vb. frequently stands in the LXX in the figurative sense of way of life (e.g. 1 Ki. 3:14), especially in the characteristic combination with *hodos*, way, and "ways of God" or → commandments, used to designate the conduct ordained by the will of God (e.g. Deut. 8:6; 10:12; Jer. 7:23), which can also quite generally be called "walking before God" (1 Ki. 8:25). Corresponding to the figurative meaning of way (OT 1 (c), 2 (b)), other terms can also stand alongside *poreuomai*, such as "the law of the LORD" (Ps. 119[118]:1), "righteousness" (Isa. 33:15; Pss. Sol. 14:2), "truth" (Prov. 28:6) etc., mostly with *en* followed by the dat.

(c) This use of *poreuomai* is also found (in part further reinforced) in Test. XII, whereas Philo only has the figurative meaning on rare occasions, e.g. in the picture of the path of life (*Migr. Abr.* 133) or of the two ways (*Migr. Abr.* 204), and in connexion with the conception of travelling on the royal way of virtue.

2. *trechō* is attested some 60 times in the LXX mostly for Heb. *rûṣ*, to run, in the literal sense (e.g. Gen. 18:7; 1 Ki. 18:46). In the figurative sense it occurs in only a few passages: for the way of life according to the commandments of God in connexion with the typical OT concept of way (Ps. 119[118]:32), of "running into lies" (Ps. 61:5 LXX) and in the expression "running in the way of immortality" (4 Macc. 14:5, in the account of the martyrdom of the seven brothers).

NT 1. *poreuomai* is attested about 150 times in the NT, of which 83 are in the Synoptic Gospels, 37 in Acts, 13 in John's Gospel, 8 in Paul, 9 in the other letters; the vb. is only used in the middle and passive. It mostly has the literal sense of to go (e.g. Mk. 9:30; the sending out of the disciples in Matt. 10:6 f.; and 28:19). It never occurs in connexion with the call to discipleship (→ Disciple art. *akoloutheō*). It also means to travel, to journey (e.g. Lk. 9:5); details of direction and goal are often given.

(a) The general use is variable and many-sided: for going in the sense of dying (Lk. 22:22); in Jn.'s Gospel for the departure of Jesus from his own and his return to the Father (Jn. 14:2 f., 12, 28; 16:7, 28; cf. → Heaven, art. *anabainō*); for departing

into the eternal fire at the final judgment (Matt. 25:41); and in statements concerning the ascent of Jesus (Acts 1:10 f.; 1 Pet. 3:22) or his going to the "spirits in prison" (1 Pet. 3:19; → Hell, art. *hadēs*).

(b) By contrast with the LXX usage, *poreuomai* has the sense of walk surprisingly rarely in the NT. Apart from Lk. 1:6 and Acts 9:31 (possibly also Acts 14:16), where walking "in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord" or "in the fear of God" is spoken of, in the OT form of expression, the figurative use is lacking in the Synoptics, in John, and above all, in Paul, who uses → *peripateō* instead (32 times). In 1 Pet. 4:3; 2 Pet. 2:10; 3:3; and Jude 11, 16, 18 the vb. occurs in statements concerning a bad way of life.

2. *trechō*, to run, is found in the NT in the literal sense, including the disciples' running to the empty tomb (e.g. Matt. 27:48; 28:8; Mk. 5:6; 15:36; Lk. 15:20; 24:12; Jn. 20:2, 4; Acts 19:28). In 2 Thess. 3:1 it is used of the word of the Lord (cf. Ps. 147[146]:4). It is found in Paul predominantly in the figurative sense. By using the vb., he expresses how the Christian life as a whole, like his apostolic service, is directed towards a goal (Gal. 2:2; 5:7; Phil. 2:16) and that, as in a contest in the stadium (see CL 2), what matters is applying all one's strength and holding out to the end (1 Cor. 9:24 ff.; cf. Heb. 12:1). Rom. 9:16, by pointing to the mercy of God – which in the last resort, is alone decisive – represents the necessary corrective. It also occurs in Heb. 12:1 and Rev. 9:9. *syntrechō*, run together, occurs in Mk. 6:33; Acts 3:11 (of people); 1 Pet. 4:4 (fig. of people plunging together into the same stream of debauchery).

3. *dromos*, course, is used of a race in 2 Tim. 4:7, of Paul's career and work as an apostle which is also compared with a fight; cf. Acts 13:25, of the course of John the Baptist's life; Acts 20:24, of the course of Paul's life, his sole object being to complete his ministry. *prodromos*, forerunner, occurs only at Heb. 6:20, where Jesus is seen as a forerunner on our behalf, having become a high priest for ever after the order of → Melchizedek. In the context, he has entered the inner sanctuary, i.e. the immediate presence of God, which is here pictured under the symbolism of the day of atonement ritual, according to which the high priest entered on behalf of the people annually (Lev. 16; → Tent; → Temple). By being a priest after the order of Melchizedek, Jesus belongs to an order superior to that of the Levitical high priests, who were mortal men who had to perform the rite annually. Christ's priesthood is unique; his priestly work requires no repetition. *G. Ebel*

→ Conversion, → Turn Away, → Virtue

(a). O. Bauernfeind, *trechō, dromos, prodromos*, *TDNT* VIII 226–35; G. Bertram, *strephō* etc., *TDNT* VII 714–29; R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, I, 1952, 330–40; II, 1955, 15–21; G. Dalman, *Sacred Sites and Ways: Studies in the Topography of the Gospels*, 1935; S. M. McCasland, "The Way", *JBL* 77, 1958, 222 ff.; W. Michaelis, *hodos* etc., *TDNT* V 42–114; H. Seesemann and G. Bertram, *pateō* etc., *TDNT* V 940–44.

(b). A. Kuschke, "Die Menschenwege und der Weg Gottes im Alten Testament", *StTh* 5, 1951, 106 ff.; F. Nötscher, *Gotteswege und Menschenwege in der Bibel und in Qumran*, 1958; S. Wibbing, *Die Tugend- und Lasterkataloge im Neuen Testament und ihre Traditionsgeschichte unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Qumran-Texte*, *BZNW* 25, 1959; G. Wingren, "Weg, Wanderung und verwandte Begriffe", *StTh* 3, 1951, 111 ff.

Wall, Hedge, Palisade

τεῖχος

τεῖχος (*teichos*), wall around city; τοῖχος (*toichos*), wall of house; μεσότοιχον (*mesotoichon*), partition-wall.

CL *teichos*, wall, espec. around a city (Homer); hence a castle, fort (Hdt.), fortified town (Xen.). *toichos*, wall of a house, temple, enclosure, side of a tent; plur., the sides of a ship; proverbially, on the winning side. The distinction between *teichos* (city-wall) and *toichos* (house-wall) is usually maintained, just as in Lat. *murus* and *moenia* differ from *paries*. *mesotoichon*, partition-wall of a house, is found only in an inscription at Argos, where it is masc., and fig. of a boundary-line, in a fragment of Eratosthenes.

OT *teichos* occurs 193 times on the OT, and almost always translates the Heb. *ḥômâh*, derived from *ḥāmâh*, to surround, and usually meaning the wall of a town or city (Isa. 22:10), occasionally of other buildings (Lam. 2:7), and metaph. of a chaste maiden difficult to approach (Cant. 8:9 f.). The dual *ḥōmōṯayim* is used for the double series of walls with which Jerusalem was protected on the south (2 Ki. 25:4).

toichos is found 88 times, and usually renders *qîr*, and means the wall of a house or room (Amos 5:19), of the temple (1 Ki. 6:5), or occasionally of a vineyard (Num. 22:25). The origin of *qîr* is uncertain, but possibly derives from the wall's transverse beams (*qôrâh*). *mesotoichon* does not occur in the LXX. Josephus uses the separate words *ho mesos toichos* for the inner wall of the temple (*Ant.* 8, 71).

NT In the NT *teichos* consistently means a city wall. To allow him to escape from Damascus, the local disciples lower Saul of Tarsus in a basket through a window in the city wall (*teichos*, Acts 9:25; 2 Cor. 11:33). In Heb. 11:30 *teichos* is used for the walls of Jericho collapsing before Joshua's army. In Rev. 21 *teichos* occurs six times in reference to the city wall of the new Jerusalem. The wall is described as great and high (21:12), symbolizing the eternal security of the inhabitants, and excluding those outside (22:15). The twelve foundations of the city and its twelve gates are inscribed with the names of the twelve apostles and the twelve tribes of Israel respectively, signifying the completeness of the number of the people of God under the two covenants. Twelve angels are on duty at the gates in the wall, but more to honour than to guard the entrances (21:25). The measuring of the wall by an angel (21:17) not only draws attention to its extraordinary height, but once more alludes to protection. When John himself had earlier been given a measuring-rod and told to measure the sanctuary, it was made clear that whatever he did not measure would be left exposed to godless attack (11:1 f.). The wall is said to be built of jasper and adorned with twelve different jewels (→ Precious Stones in Revelation), with each gate being made of a single → pearl (21:17–21). See G. R. Beasley-Murray, *The Book of Revelation*, *New Century Bible*, 1974, 320–6.

toichos occurs only at Acts 23:3, in Paul's rebuke of the high priest Ananias as a whitewashed wall. The one who dispensed justice ought to be a wall firm and true, supporting the house of Israel, its laws, and all who lived within its shelter. The metaphor of the whitewashed wall suggests a structure whose precarious condition has been disguised by generous coats of whitewash (Ezek. 13:10–16). In spite of ap-

pearances, a man who behaved as Ananias did was bound to come to grief: his was the haughty spirit of Prov. 16:18 that goes before a fall (F. F. Bruce, *The Book of Acts*, 1968, 451). Nine years later, at the beginning of the Jewish rebellion against the Romans, Ananias, the son of Nedebaeus, a notoriously unscrupulous and rapacious politician, was dragged out of his hiding-place in an aqueduct and assassinated, probably by Zealots, on account of his pro-Roman policies.

mesotoichon is found only in Eph. 2:14. Paul declares that Christ has in his own person, by his incarnate life and death, destroyed the dividing-wall (*mesotoichon*) of (gen. of content: which consisted of) the barrier (→ *phragmos*) of separation, i.e. he has destroyed the enmity between men and God, and between Jews and Gentiles. Paul may have had in mind the four-foot wall (*ḥêl*) which separated the court of the Gentiles from the main part of the Jerusalem temple. That barrier carried warnings in Greek and Latin, inscribed in bold red letters on white limestone: Let no Gentile enter within the balustrade and enclosure about the sanctuary. Anyone who is caught doing so will have himself to blame for his ensuing death (Josephus, *War* 5, 193). Although Ephesus was a mainly Gentile city and far from Jerusalem, Paul's allusion to the *mesotoichon* in the temple would not have been lost on all the Ephesian Christians. They would know that Paul himself had narrowly escaped death two or three years before, when it was rumoured that he had violated the sanctity of the holy place in Jerusalem by taking the Gentile Trophimus, an Ephesian, into one of the inner courts (Acts 21:28 f.). (See also Temple, art. *to mesotoichon*; cf. M. Barth, *Ephesians, Anchor Bible*, I, 1974, 282–87; W. Hendriksen, *Ephesians*, 1967; C. Schneider, *mesotoichon*, *TDNT* IV 625.)

The barrier in the temple was a figurative reference to the Mosaic law (Eph. 2:15), and in particular to the setting up of boundary-marks at Sinai when that law was being given (Exod. 19:12). The function of the boundary then was to protect the people from the wrath of God. Later rabbis reversed the point of view: the fence (as it was now taken to be, rather than a mere boundary-mark) was deemed to be necessary to protect the law itself from the evil world. That fence was then interpreted by the rabbis, in its contemporary application, as the traditions of the elders, protective measures to safeguard the law itself from being transgressed, even if unwittingly.

The fall brought to men a twofold enmity, an enmity between themselves, and an enmity towards God (Eph. 2:16). The law clearly showed up both, on the one hand, by revealing the impossibly high standard demanded by God of men, if left to their own efforts, and on the other hand, by separating Jews from Gentiles, since salvation could not be attained without submitting to the legal requirement of circumcision. From the perspective of a Gentile Christian, the law with its commandments and ordinances had no positive, protective force. Rather, it was seen as a dividing wall, creating enmity between the Jews and the rest of mankind. Therefore, breaking through this wall, and indeed utterly destroying it, is no more to be understood as a crime, but as a saving deed of Christ. He did this "in his flesh" (2:14) "through the cross" (2:16), which means that he too had to pay for his action with his own life (O. Betz, "The Eschatological Interpretation of the Sinai-Tradition in Qumran and in the New Testament", *Revue de Qumran* 6, 1967–9, 105).

The wording of Eph. 2:14 presupposes a conception of *phragmos* which calls for the image of the cross as its counterpart. Paul's text in fact assumes a double *phragmos*, one that separates Jew from Gentile, and the other that separates the

world below from the world above. This was a stock conception in the early church. It appears in a letter of Ignatius, in which he says that Christ "has made a breach in the wall of separation" (*Trall.* 9:4, long recension). Christ restores unity, therefore, in a double sense. He destroys both the vertical wall separating Jew from Gentile, and the horizontal wall separating man from God. He does this by the cross, representing the double work of Christ extending both vertically and horizontally (J. Daniélou, *A History of Early Christian Doctrine. I: The Theology of Jewish Christianity*, 1964, 279 f.). *N. Hillyer*

φραγμός

φραγμός (*phragmos*), fence, wall, hedge; φράσσω (*phrassō*), fence in, stop, close.

CL *phragmos*, a fencing in, blocking up (Soph.), thence a fence, paling, palisade (Hdt.), enclosure; fig. a bristly beard. The corresponding verb *phrassō*, Attic *phrattō*, means to fence in, hedge around, esp. for protection or defence; to fortify.

OT The 18 appearances of *phragmos* in the LXX translate a variety of Heb. nouns. *gāḏēr* and the fem. *gᵉḏērâh* are used for a literal hedge of briers and thorns (Mic. 7:4), a verse which also refers to the narrow path between the vineyards, "with a hedge on this side and a hedge on that". The thorny hedge was needed to keep intruders at bay, especially the wild boar (Ps. 79:15; MT 80:13), jackals and foxes (Cant. 2:15), which, given the chance, would trample the vines and eat the grapes. Metaph. *gāḏēr* is used of a weak character, who is like an unsteady fence, and so a tempting target for evil to attack (Ps. 62:3). In the parable of Israel as the vine, hedge is *mᵉśûkkâh*, from *śāḵaḵ*, to weave (Isa. 5:5). In Job 38:31 Yahweh demands to know whether Job is able to loose the cords (*môśᵉḵôṯ*) of Orion; i.e., has he the ability, as God has, of moving the stars around at will? The LXX text reads *phragmon Ōriōnos ēnoixas*? Have you opened the barrier of Orion (i.e., let the stars loose)?

pereṣ (from *pāraṣ*, to break) means a breaking forth, i.e., in Gen. 38:29, to be the first from the womb at birth; hence, by wordplay, the child is named Perez. The LXX wording is a little different from the MT and asks, Why has the *phragmos* (barrier, i.e., of the womb) been broken through on your account? In 1 Ki. 11:27 the MT says that Solomon closed up the breach (*pereṣ*) of the city of David, whereas the LXX speaks of completing the fortification (*phragmos*). The more usual meaning of *phragmos* as a hedge appears as the translation of *pereṣ* in Ps. 143(144):14.

Although *phrassō* occurs only 8 times in the LXX, it renders 6 different Heb. words. *'āṭam* (Prov. 21:13) means to stop up (the ears), i.e. refuse to listen. *sûḡ* in Cant. 7:2(3) means lit. to shrink back, as from a prickly hedge, hence to be hedged about, and so, surrounded. A similarly sounding term *śûḵ* appears in Hos. 2:6(8), to hedge the way as with thorns, i.e. to block all movement. When Yahweh tells Job (38:8) that it is he who shuts in, fences in, the sea, the Heb. verb is the hiphil of *śāḵaḵ*, lit. to weave, especially boughs in order to make a hedge. Daniel (8:26) is instructed to seal up (*sāṯam*, shut up, hide) the vision, i.e. keep its message secret. In Prov. 25:26 *phrassō* is used in the LXX to mean to stop a well, and corresponds to the MT *nirpaś*, niphal of *rāpaś*, lit. to tread, i.e. muddy, the water.

NT *phragmos* is used in Matt. 21:33 and Mk. 12:1 for the fence or hedge set up to protect the vineyard in the parable of the wicked tenants (cf. Isa. 5:2). This and the other precautions taken by the owner underline his care for his vineyard and his absolute proprietary rights over it (D. Hill, *The Gospel of Matthew*, 1972, 299). The parable alludes to a common practice of the day, for the upper Jordan valley and much of the Galilean highlands were in the hands of foreign landlords at this time (W. L. Lane, *The Gospel of Mark*, 1974, 417).

The messianic age will be inaugurated with a banquet (Isa. 25:6). In Jesus' parable alluding to this great feast, the master, on being rebuffed by those originally invited (= Jews), instructs his servant to go out to the highways and hedges (*phragmous*, Lk. 14:23), i.e. to those outside the city (= Gentiles) and to compel (*anankason*) all he found, however apparently ineligible, to come to the banquet. Physical force is not in mind (impossible for a single servant), but persuasion (cf. Mk. 6:45). The passage gives no sanction to religious persecution or to forcible proselytizing.

phrassō occurs three times in the NT. In Rom. 3:19 Paul concludes that one purpose of Scripture is to show that all men, Jews no less than Gentiles, stand condemned before God, so that every mouth may be stopped (*phragē*), i.e. silenced: no one can have anything to say by way of excuse or justification for his way of life when set against the standards required of him by a holy and perfect God. In 2 Cor. 11:10 Paul declares that no man will put a stop (*phragēsetai*) to his boasting, a metaphor from damming a river (Chrysostom; Prov. 25:26; Jdg. 16:3) or barricading a road (Hos. 2:6; Lam. 3:9). Heb. 11:33 refers to those who by faith drew upon the resources of the spiritual realm and so stopped (*ephraxan*) the mouths of lions, as in the case of Daniel (6:22; 1 Macc. 2:60; 4 Macc. 16:3, 21; 18:13), i.e. transmuted, at least for a sufficient time, the wild beasts' natural instincts, a foretaste of the messianic age (Isa. 11:6). *N. Hillyer*

χάραξ

χάραξ (*charax*), pointed stake, palisade, rampart, mound.

CL *charax*, from *charassō*, to sharpen, means a pointed stake, especially a wooden support for vines; then, by extension, the collective singular noun means the timber used in constructing a palisade surrounding a city or camp.

OT *charax* occurs 15 times and renders 5 Heb. terms. Hezekiah is promised deliverance from the Assyrians threatening Jerusalem. Against the city the enemy shall not so much as make a rampart, *sōlᵉlâh*, from *sālal*, cast up into a heap or mound (Isa. 37:33). *sōlᵉlâh* appears also in Jer. 40(33):4; Ezek. 4:2; 26:8. In Ezek. 21:22(27) *charax* translates *kar*, battering-ram, derived, on account of the weapon's swinging movement, from *kārar*, to repeat, attack again, advance and retreat. Artificial mounds were raised up against the walls of cities by the Assyrians as a platform, from which they could employ their battering-rams to greater advantage against the upper and weaker portion of the wall. *muṣṣāḇ*, station, place where anything stands (Isa. 29:3), comes from *nāṣaḇ*, to take an upright position. In Deut. 20:19 instructions are given to the people of Israel that when besieging an enemy city they are not, in a manner of speaking, to build a siege-mound (*māṣôr*) around the

local fruit-trees, i.e. they are not to attack and destroy them even though this was contemporary custom. Israel's enemy was men not trees.

mᵉṣôḏîm is more often used in the sense of nets, but in Eccl. 9:14 it means siegeworks, entrenchments, so called from being the place in which the besieging troops lie in wait to seize (*ṣûḏ*) the besieged as their prey.

NT *charax* occurs only at Lk. 19:43, where Jesus laments over Jerusalem's coming fate. Her foes will surround the city and cast up a *charax* about her, a protection for themselves and a site from which to launch their attacks. The prophetic element in Jesus' words is not in the vocabulary, for that could describe the usual course of any siege (Isa. 29:3), but in their application to Jerusalem. Forty years later the prophecy was fulfilled when the Roman army surrounded the city with siegeworks (Josephus, *War* 5, 262, 264), which must have contained much timber, for the Jews destroyed them with fire (*War* 5, 469 ff.), and the Roman general Titus had to replace the *charax* with a wall. This he threw up in three days, thus cutting off all hope of escape. *N. Hillyer*

Want, Lack, Need

ὕστερος

ὕστερος (*hysteros*), what is behind, after, the latter, later; ὕστερον (*hysteron*), in the second place, later than, thereafter, finally; ὑστερέω (*hystereō*), come too late, to miss, fail to reach; to be in need of, lack; to be less than, inferior to; to fail, give out; to be lacking, come short of; ὑστέρημα (*hysterēma*), need, want, deficiency, lack, shortcoming; ὑστέρησις (*hysterēsis*), need, lack, poverty.

CL From the time of Homer the adjective *hysteros* has the basic sense of what is behind or after, especially in reference to time. It comes to mean the second of two (Aristotle, *Politics* 5, 10, 1312A, 4), the "next" year (Xenophon, *History of Greece* 7, 2, 10), or "later". The adverbial use of *hysteron* runs parallel to the adjective throughout this period, meaning secondly, after, later, and finally in the spatial, temporal, or logical sense. The same range of nuances is amply attested for the Hellenistic period from the papyri.

The cognate verb *hystereō* was coined from the adjective, and occurs first in Euripides (*Phoenicians* 94 f.) and Herodotus with the meaning to come after or to come too late (Herodotus 6, 89: "they came one day after the appointed day"; Xenophon, *Anabasis* 1, 7, 12: "they came too late for the battle by five days"; cf. Oxyrhynchus Papyrus I, 118, 30 ff.: "it is no use if a person comes too late for what required his presence"). From this primary sense a metaphorical use of the verb developed, meaning to lag behind or to be inferior (Plato, *Republic* 484d, 539e), and a secondary nuance appears, signifying failure in something (Thucydides, 3, 1, 2: "he came too late to save Mytilene"; Hibeh Papyri 1, 43[7]: "take care that the oil-presses do not fail"). By the Hellenistic period *hystereō* comes to mean to lack something (Josephus, *Antiquities* 1, 98; 5, 214; 15, 200: "they lacked neither wine nor water").

No examples have been preserved of the nouns *hysterēma* and *hysterēsis* in classical literature or in Hellenistic literature earlier than the LXX. Among later examples of *hysterēma* may be cited two from the *Corpus Hermeticum* (4, 10; 13, 1),

the second of which is particularly interesting because the initiate asks the mystagogue, "Will you supply [lit. fill up] those things which are lacking to me. . .?" The Greek version of the Testament of Benjamin 11:5, which speaks of a descendant of the patriarch who "will fill up that which is lacking to the tribe" is clearly a Christian interpolation intended to honour Paul and indebted to the apostle for the formulation (cf. 2 Cor. 11:9; Col. 1:24). Dio Cassius 44, 48, 2 states that no titles were spared Caesar. What any single title lacked as a complete expression of honour and authority was supplied by what the others contributed for mutual completion. In all of these instances the noun bears the sense of want, lack, need.

OT In the LXX *hysteros* (4 times) and *hysteron* (15 times) are always used in a temporal sense, after, later, then. The verb *hystereō*, however, which occurs 21 times, means primarily to have a deficiency, to lack, to have a need. In the year of release the prosperous Israelite is to lend generously to his poor brother who has a need (Deut. 18:5). The Israelites of the wilderness generation were sustained by God and lacked nothing (Neh. 9:21). God gives a man wealth, possessions and honours "so that he lacks nothing of all that he desires" (Eccl. 6:2). Of the fool, however, it must be said that his heart lacks sense (Eccl. 10:3). The Hebrew clause "let me know how fleeting my life is!" (Ps. 39:4 MT) is rendered "that I may know what I lack" (Ps. 38:5), i.e. that I may appear approved before God. Belshazzar's kingdom has been weighed in the balances and has been found to be deficient (Dan. 5:27). The same nuances occur in the Greek translation of the Book of Sirach. Ben Sira reflects upon the man who toils but finds he is in want; yet an impoverished man, who lacks strength, is sustained by God in his need (Sir. 11:11–13). The scribe was moved to indignation by the sight of a warrior in want through poverty (Sir. 26:28).

Closely related to the idea of experiencing a lack is that of coming too late or failing. Certain men who have been defiled through contact with a corpse ask, "Why have we come too late for offering the Lord's sacrifice at the appointed time?" (Num. 9:7). The man who fails to observe the Passover will be cut off (Num. 9:13). Although the fulfilment of what God has promised appears to delay, Israel must confidently wait for God to act (Hab. 2:3).

Although the noun *hysterēma* does not occur in contemporary secular literature, there are six examples in the LXX, where it means lack or need. A good land is a place where there is no lack of anything (Jdg. 18:10; cf. 19:19 f.). On the other hand, what is lacking cannot be numbered (Eccl. 1:15), i.e. when there is nothing present there is nothing to list. In two instances the nuance of *hysterēma* shades to want or poverty, as in the admonition "there is no want to those who fear the LORD" (Ps. 34:10 [MT 34:9]). In the second instance, the contrast between want and abundance is explicit in the antithethic parallelism of Prov. 21:5: "The plans of the diligent lead to abundance, but everyone who is hasty comes only to poverty." The related noun *hysterēsis*, which occurs only in the Hexapla (e.g. Job 30:3 Aquila), always means want, need.

NT The adjective *hysteros* occurs only twice in the NT. In the parable of the two sons it bears a comparative sense, "the second one" of two, the latter son (Matt. 21:31 Codex B). In the other instance, however, 1 Tim. 4:1 it is used as a superlative, "in the last times" and is parallel to the recognizably eschatological formula "in the last

days" which introduces a similar warning in 2 Tim. 3:1. The perspective is toward a future time when the church will be torn by false teachers intent upon subverting the faith of believers. The use of *hysteros* in this superlative sense became technical in a later period, as in the reference to "Christ ... who is coming in the last times [*hysterois kairois*] for our salvation" (*Acta Carpi* 5).

The adv. *hysteron*, which occurs 10 times, is always used in a temporal sense. The dominant thought is of something which takes place afterward or later. It was after Jesus had fasted for forty days that he became hungry (Matt. 4:2; cf. 21:29, 32, 37; 22:27; 25:11; Jn. 13:36). All fatherly discipline is at the actual time painful, but later it produces righteousness in those who have been subject to correction (Heb. 12:11). In this instance *hysteron* stands in opposition to the present time. In Matt. 26:60 the adverb takes on a superlative nuance, in that *hysteron* means "at last", "finally" two witnesses came forward whose testimony was regarded as significant by the court.

The verb *hystereō*, which occurs 16 times in the NT, has a broad range of nuances.

1. The basic sense is to come too late through one's own fault, to fail to reach, and so to be excluded from privilege. After referring to the wilderness generation which forfeited its place in the promised land through rebellion and unbelief (Heb. 3:7 ff.), the writer to the Hebrews pleads with his readers to take care lest any one of them should fail to attain God's promised rest (Heb. 4:1). What excludes a man is a persistent lack of faith in God's word of promise (Heb. 4:2). Near the end of the letter the writer repeats this admonition, employing the parallel expression "fail to obtain the grace of God" (Heb. 12:15). The failure contemplated in each instance identifies a man as one who disparaged God and so excluded himself from participation in the divine provision. Paul concludes that there is no essential difference between Jews and Gentiles, for all men fall short of participation in the divine glory (Rom. 3:23). Once it is understood that salvation is achieved on the level of the glory of God, it becomes clear that it can never be man's achievement but must be bestowed as the gift of God (cf. Rom. 3:21–26).

2. With reference to circumstances, *hystereō* means to lack. In Matt. 19:20 a wealthy young man affirmed to Jesus that he had kept the commandments and asked, "What do I still lack?" He has no awareness of an absolute lack which would exclude him from eternal life but only of some unfulfilled remainder which may be completed through the assumption of some task. In the parallel account in Mark, however, it is Jesus who speaks of a deficiency: "You lack one thing: go, sell all that you have ... and come, follow me" (Mk. 10:21). The one thing the man lacked was the self-sacrificing devotion which characterizes every true disciple of Jesus. For this reason Jesus invited him to follow him and to experience the demands of life in the kingdom with the Twelve. Jesus' summons in this context means that true obedience to the law is rendered ultimately in discipleship.

Perhaps the most common idea in the majority of cases in the NT is expressed in the contrast between abundance and lack. When famine struck, the prodigal son experienced a lack; he began to be hungry (Lk. 15:14; cf. Phil. 4:12). Although Jesus sent out his disciples on their preaching mission without purse or provisions, they did not lack anything (Lk. 22:35). The Corinthians had been enriched through the grace of God (1 Cor. 1:5) with the result that they did not lack anything in the realm of spiritual gifts (1:7). When Paul was in Corinth and experienced need, what he lacked

was provided by the generosity of the brothers who came from Macedonia (2 Cor. 11:9). From the perspective of his own life Paul can speak of having learned the secret of enjoying abundance or experiencing lack with contentment (Phil. 4:12).

3. The verb also occurs in the derivative sense to be less than, inferior to followed by the genitive of comparison. When Paul affirms he is not "in the least inferior to" the superlative apostles (2 Cor. 11:5; 12:11) he means that he needs nothing to compensate for some deficiency exhibited by a comparison with them. In comparing the church to a human body Paul observes that God has so adjusted the body that greater honour is bestowed upon the inferior part (lit. "the part which is lacking", 1 Cor. 12:24).

The cognate nouns *hysterēma* and *hysterēsis* are interchangeable, as a comparison of Mk. 12:44 with Lk. 21:4 will exhibit. Jesus contrasts the gifts to the temple treasury of the wealthy who gave from their abundance with the gift of an impoverished widow who gave everything she had. In this context *hysterēsis* (Mark) or *hysterēma* (Luke), as the antonym of abundance, does not denote the relative lack of something but rather want in general, poverty. A similar contrast between abundance and poverty is drawn by Paul in the context of encouraging Corinthian participation in the collection project (2 Cor. 8:14; 9:12). The general sense of need, lack, poverty is evident when the apostle responds to the gift he has received from Philippi. He does not complain of want, for he has learned the secret of self-sufficiency in every circumstance (Phil. 4:11).

hysterēma occurs twice in the stylized expression "to fill up the lack of someone" or of a larger group, where in each case the meaning is to make up for the absence by representing others who could not be present. Through their visit the elders of Corinth have made up for the absence of the Corinthians for whom Paul feels both affection and concern (1 Cor. 16:17). The Christians at Philippi were genuinely concerned for Paul, but it was their emissary Epaphroditus, who supplied what had been lacking to the community, the opportunity to labour by his side (Phil. 2:30). In that sense he has completed the service of the Philippians to the Apostle by compensating for their absence.

On two occasions Paul used *hysterēma* in the plural. In response to the report of Timothy, Paul wrote to the Thessalonians, affirming his deep desire to return to Thessalonica that he might complete the work he had begun there (1 Thess. 2:17–3:13). He states that he is praying earnestly night and day that he may see them once again "that we may supply what is lacking [Gk. *ta hysterēmata*] in your faith" (3:10). In this context the plural embraces specific areas in which their faith needed to be matured. Precisely which areas are indicated by 5:14 where Paul refers to the morally weak (cf. 4:1–8), the idle (cf. 4:9–12), and the faint-hearted (cf. 4:13–5:11). The employment of the singular would have suggested that the Thessalonians' faith as such was defective. It was the apostle's intention, however, to indicate certain deficiencies in the experience of faith, which he addresses with pastoral concern in the remainder of his letter. For that reason he cast the noun into the plural form. The clause may be rendered, "to help your faith in specific areas where there is still something lacking."

The second passage, Col. 1:24, is difficult and its meaning continues to be debated. In the context of speaking of his share in the reconciling work of Christ, Paul affirms that he rejoices in the sufferings he has endured, for he is completing

what is lacking in the afflictions of (the) Christ for the sake of his church. The deficiency contemplated cannot have reference to Christ's vicarious sufferings and death on the cross in the accomplishment of redemption. Paul makes it emphatically clear that reconciliation was truly and validly achieved through the death of Christ; no need exists for any supplementation from the apostle or any other (cf. Col. 2:11–14). Moreover, nowhere in the NT is the term "afflictions" (*thlipsis*) applied to the sufferings of Jesus during his ministry or upon the cross.

The key to the interpretation is provided by the phrase "the afflictions of [the] Christ," which occurs only here in the NT. The phrase is intelligible within the conceptual framework provided by early Christian apocalyptic, which spoke of the catastrophes and sufferings which preceded the end of the age and heralded the coming of the messiah (cf. Mk. 13:8). The measurement and extent of these afflictions, or messianic woes, has been determined and limited by God (Mk. 13:5–27; cf. Eth. Enoch 47:1–4; 2 Bar. 30:2). Once the decreed measure has been attained the old aeon, characterized by sin and suffering, will pass away and the new age will dawn. For the present, however, something is still lacking in the plurality of appointed sufferings which must be experienced prior to the end. In the sufferings which Paul endures in his own flesh in the course of his apostolic ministry to the Gentiles, he performs a vicarious service on behalf of the churches, completing what is lacking in the messianic afflictions appointed by God. By doing so, he brings closer the dawning of the new age in which Christ will return in glory (Col. 1:28 f.; 3:4). It is this prospect which accounts for Paul's joy. *W. L. Lane*

χρεία

χρεία (*chreia*), need, necessity, lack, want; χρή (*chrē*), there is a need, it is necessary; χρήζω (*chrēzō*), to have need of.

CL The noun *chreia* occurs from the time of the tragedians in the sense of need, want, necessity (Aechylus, *Prometheus* 170, "will have need of my help"; Sophocles, *Oedipus Tyrannus* 1143, "considering in what great need we are"; *Oedipus Coloneus* 191, "to war with necessity"). The proverb that necessity is the mother of invention stems from the statement of Euripides that "necessity teaches wisdom even to the sluggish" (*Fragment* 715; cf. *Electra* 376). From this primary notion of need developed the derivative concepts of office, duty, service, business, or the matter at hand, as when Aristotle speaks of "the business of war and of peace" (*Politics* 254 B 32). This same range of nuance is amply attested for the Hellenistic period as well, where *chreia* designates need or necessity. Thus the king is instructed never to compel others to minister to his needs without compensation (Letter of Aristeas 258), while the patriarch Zebulun affirms that he offered fish to all men, "as every man had need" (Testament of Zebulun 6:5). But the noun also signifies now occasion of need, as in the instruction "send him some fish, for we have occasion of need of him" (Fayûm Papyri 117[8]). In conjunction with the verb "to have" *chreia* is treated as an active verb (Oxyrhynchus Papyri VII, 1068[20], "with anything else they may need from you").

The verb form *chrē*, meaning it is necessary, it needs, one must or ought to, is common in classical literature from the time of Homer, where it occurs in a variety of

constructs (*Odyssey* 1, 124; 3, 14, 209; 4, 463, and often; *Iliad* 1, 216; 4, 57; 5, 490, and often). In Hellenistic Greek, however, it recedes into the background and is almost totally displaced by *dei*, which occurs in Homer only once (*Iliad* 9, 337, "why need the Argives fight?"). Its rare occurrence, as in the Letter of Aristeas 231 ("he ought never to do those things which cause his failure") or a Berlin papyrus cited by A. Deissmann (*Light from the Ancient East*, 1927[3], 367: "it is necessary . . . that the goddess be celebrated in festal procession") suggests literary style. Not until Marcus Aurelius is *chrē* again used with relative frequency.

The parallel verb *chrēzō* occurs throughout the period with the meaning want, lack, and to have need of something (Homer, *Iliad* 11, 835; *Odyssey* 17, 121, 588). From the Hellenistic period we find the observation that the man who drinks wine needs much discretion (Testament of Judah 14:7) or the ethical injunction that if you have nothing to give to a man who has a need, show him compassion (Testament of Zebulun 7:3). In participial form the verb describes one who is poor or needy (Homer, *Odyssey* 11, 340; Hesiod, *Works and Days* 351).

OT The noun *chreia* is relatively rare in the canonical books of the LXX, but occurs with a high frequency in the books of the Apocrypha (20 times in Sirach alone). The primary meaning is necessity or need, often in the sense of having a need for something or of someone. Thus the Medes have no need of gold (Isa. 13:17); a fool has no need of wisdom (Prov. 18:2); Jeconiah is treated as a vessel for whom no one has a need (Jer. 22:28; cf. 48:38 where Moab is described in identical terms); God has no need of a sinful man (Sir. 15:12, and often). The secondary meaning of office, duty, service is also amply attested in the books of the Apocrypha, where we read of the service of the temple (1 Esdras 8:17; 2 Esdras 7:20; 1 Macc. 10:42), the fulfilment of duty (Sir. 32:2), the administration of public affairs (1 Macc. 10:37; 2 Macc. 7:24; cf. 15:5 "finish the king's business"), or the holding of office (1 Macc. 13:15). From this last nuance it was easy to shift the focus from the office to the office-holders or officials who are designated by *chreia* (1 Macc. 12:45; 13:37; Judith 12:10).

Consistent with the linguistic evidence for the disuse of *chrē* in Hellenistic Greek, the verb occurs only once in the LXX, in the statement "it is not good to eat much honey, but it is necessary to honour with complimentary words" (Prov. 25:27; cf. 4 Macc. 8:26 Codex A). The more usual form *chrēzō* occurs only twice, in the question, "Why do you come to me now when you have need?" (Jdg. 11:7 Codex B) and in the instruction given to David to see how his brothers were faring (lit. "that you may know whatever they need", 1 Sam. 17:18 Codex A). The relative disuse of *chrēzō* is supported by the Hexapla where the verb is attested only in Job 21:21; 22:3; Eccl. 12:1 Symmachus and 1 Sam. 17:18 Theodotion.

NT In the NT the noun *chreia* occurs both absolutely, with the meaning need, lack, want, difficulty, and in conjunction with verbal forms which signify the need for something or of someone.

1. In the primary sense of need, lack, want we read of David who was in need and was hungry (Mk. 2:25), of distribution made to Christians in Jerusalem, "as any had need" (Acts 2:45; 4:35), and of seeing one's brother who has a need (1 John 3:17). Epaphroditus is described as the one who supplied Paul's need (Phil. 2:25; cf. 4:16,

19). In the plural the noun designates needs or necessities (Acts 20:34, "these hands ministered to my needs"; 28:10; Rom. 12:13; Tit. 3:14).

2. In combination with the verb "to have", *chreia* functions as an active verb "to need", or literally "to have need of". The healthy have no need of a physician (Mk. 2:17 par.); the owner has need of his animals (Mk. 11:13 par.); the court has no further need for witnesses (Mk. 14:63 par.). The church of Laodicea boasts, "I am rich . . . and have no lack of anything" (Rev. 3:17). This treatment of the noun as an active verb is widely attested in the papyri and accounts for the vast majority of occurrences of the expression in the NT.

3. The secondary meaning office, duty, service, which is common in the books of the Apocrypha and the papyri, is found only once in the NT, in reference to the seven Hellenistic leaders "whom we may appoint to this duty" (Acts 6:3).

The rare term *chrē* occurs only once in the NT, in the comment of James that "these things ought not to be so" (Jas. 3:10). The more usual verbal form *chrēzō*, to have need of, occurs only five times (Matt. 6:32 par. Lk. 12:30; 11:8; Rom. 16:2; 2 Cor. 3:1). It is evident that when speaking of need, it was far more common for the writers of the NT to employ the construction "to have a need" than it was to use the verbal form. *W. L. Lane*

(a). J. A. Findlay, "Eph. 4:29", *ExpT* 46, 1934–35, 429; W. R. G. Moir, "Colossians 1:24", *ExpT* 42, 1930–31, 479 f.; N. B. Stonehouse, "The Rich Young Ruler," in *Origins of the Synoptic Gospels*, 1963, 93–112; U. Wilckens, *hysteros*, *TDNT* VIII, 592–601; R. Yates, "A Note on Colossians 1:24", *EQ* 42, 1970, 88–92.

(b). M. Bouttier, "Remarques sur la conscience apostolique de St. Paul", in *OIKONOMIA Heilsgeschichte als Thema der Theologie, Festschrift O. Cullmann*, 1967, 100–108; M. Carrez, "Souffrance et Gloire dans les Épîtres Pauliniennes: Contribution à l'Exégèse de Col. 1, 24–27", *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses* 31, 1951, 343–353; G. Le Grelle, "La plénitude de la Parole dans la Pauvreté de la Chair d'après Col. 1:24", *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* 81, 1959, 232–250; E. Kamlah, "Wie beurteilt Paulus sein Leiden? Ein Beitrag zur Untersuchung seiner Denkstruktur", *ZNW* 54, 1963, 217–232; G. Kittel, "Kol. 1, 24", *ZSTh* 18, 1941, 186–191; J. Kremer, *Was an den Leiden Christi noch mangelt. Eine interpretationsgeschichtliche und exegetische Untersuchung zu Kol. 1:24* [b], 1956; J. Schmid, "Kol. 1, 24", *BZ* 21, 1933, 330–344; J. Schmid, "Das textgeschichtliche Problem des Parabels von den zwei Söhnen, Mt. 21:28–32", *Festschrift M. Meinertz*, 1951, 68–84; M. Schmid, *Die Leidensaussage in Kol. 1:24* (Dissertation, Vienna), 1956; B. N. Wambacq, " 'Adimpleo ea quae desunt passionum Christi in carne mea . . .' (Col. 1, 24)", *Verbum Domini* 27, 1949, 17–22; W. Zimmerli, "Die Frage des Reichen nach dem ewigen Leben", *EvTh* 19, 1959, 90–97.

War, Soldier, Weapon

πόλεμος

πόλεμος (*polemos*), war, battle, fight, strife, conflict, quarrel; πολεμέω (*polemeō*), make war, fight; στρατεία (*strateia*), expedition, campaign; στράτευμα (*strateuma*), army, detachment, troops; στρατεύω (*strateuō*), serve as a soldier; στρατηγός (*stratēgos*), general, chief magistrate, praetor; στρατιά (*stratia*), army; στρατιώτης (*stratiōtēs*), soldier; στρατολογέω (*stratologeō*), gather an army, enlist soldiers; στρατοπέδαρχης (*stratopedarchēs*), military commander, commandant of a camp; στρατόπεδον (*stratopedon*), camp, body of troops, army; ἑκατοντάρχης (*hekatontarchēs*), ἑκατόνταρχος (*hekatontarchos*), κεντυρίων (*kentyriōn*), centurion; μάχαιρα (*machaira*), sword; μάχη (*machē*), battle, fighting, quarrels, strife, disputes; μάχομαι

(*machomai*), fight, quarrel, dispute; *Ἁρμαγεδ(δ)ών* (*Harmaged(d)ōn*), Armageddon; *Γώγ* (*Gōg*), Gog; *Μαγώγ* (*Magōg*), Magog; *ὅπλον* (*hoplon*), weapon; *ὁπλίζω* (*hoplizō*), equip, arm; *πανοπλία* (*panoplia*), full armour, panoply; *θώραξ* (*thōrax*), breastplate; *θυρεός* (*thyreos*), shield; *περικεφαλαία* (*perikephalaia*), helmet; *βέλος* (*belos*), arrow, dart; *ῥομφαία* (*rhomphaia*), a large, broad sword; *παρεμβολή* (*parembolē*), fortified camp, barracks or headquarters, army in battle array, battle line; *παρεμβάλλω* (*paremballō*), throw up a palisade.

The purpose of this article is to draw attention to the rôle of warfare and military terms in Scripture. It does not attempt to make a comprehensive survey of war and military practice in the ancient world. For the sake of convenience, in the case of terms which occur only rarely in the NT, relevant information about the term's significance in the ancient world will be given in the context of the NT section. An appendix discusses *Jesus and Revolution.*

CL The Homeric epic testifies to the close link between war and the rule of the gods, though it is an open question whether one can speak of gods of war in the strict sense (cf. O. Bauernfeind, *polemos*, *TDNT* VI 503; W. F. Otto, *Die Götter Griechenlands*, 1947 [3], 244). The shield of Achilles depicted Ares and Pallas Athene going before the host (Homer, *Il.* 18, 516). Hesiod reported how Athene rejoiced in war and battle (*Theogony* 926). Ares was a god of the earlier period who was never elevated into an Olympian deity. Alongside the glorification of the heroism of war may be found a detestation of the lack of fidelity which causes war through the breach of a treaty. "Zeus wills that men should be friends the one to the other and that none should be the enemy of another" (Dio Chrys., *Orationes* 1, 40). Bauernfeind sums up the ancient Gk. attitude by saying: "the guiding principle was that every peace was painfully won from the general state of war, and was like an island continually threatened by its floods" (*TDNT* VI 506). He goes on to link the establishment of the *pax Romana* by Augustus with emperor-worship. "It was not surprising, then, that the experience of peace was accompanied everywhere by a powerful resurgence of the worship of the divine rule which was by no means alien to Hellenism" (*TDNT* VI 507; → Gospel, art. *euangelion* CL 2 (c)). *C. Brown*

OT 1. In the LXX *polemos* commonly translates the Heb. *milḥāmâh*, war, battle; the corresponding vbs. are *polemeō* and *lāḥam*. *machomai* and *machē* are much less frequent. Also found is the Heb. *ṣāḇâh*, to assemble, muster troops, and the noun *ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ*, armies, hosts. For the title *YHWH ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ* Yahweh of hosts, or LORD of hosts, → God, art. *theos* OT 2.

2. War was a common experience of the peoples of the OT. Israel like the surrounding nations knew few periods of real peace. From the raiding party of the five kings against the cities of the plain (Gen. 14) to the siege of → Jerusalem by the armies of → Babylon's king (2 Ki. 25) the accounts of battles and wars extend. For the methods of warfare of the times and of their neighbours see L. E. Toombs, "War, Ideas of", *IDB* IV 791–801 and Y. Yadin, *The Art of Warfare in Biblical Lands*, I–II, 1963.

The main theological interest centres on the rôle that God is shown to fill in war. The books of Deut., Jos., Jdg. and Sam. describe a form of warfare in which Yahweh

takes the initiative and instructs the Israelite tribes to participate under strict and extraordinary conditions: they are to prepare themselves as they would for worship, and they are to take neither booty nor prisoners (cf. Deut. 7:1 f., 19–24; Jos. 6:1–8:29; 10:1–11:43; Jdg. 4:6–23; 6:33–7:25). This has come to be termed "holy war". The form which such wars took varied considerably. Moreover, the practice of wars on these terms apparently ceased about midway through the reign of → David.

The "holy war" in David's time and earlier was the voluntary collaboration of tribes related to one another in religious covenant to gain and defend "the living space of an egalitarian independence movement" (N. K. Gottwald, "War, Holy", *IDB Supplementary Volume*, 1976, 942). With the consolidation of the state and the established authority of the king, the character of war changed, as did the nature of the society which supported it. Yahweh's purposes could no longer be seen to be the essence of the king's wars.

While the practice of "holy war" changed, the ideas which had supported it did not die. The view of God as "the Divine Warrior" (cf. Ps. 24[23]:8) continued in the title "Yahweh of hosts". Yahweh was the commander of all supernatural powers as well as the armies of Israel.

This found expression in the earliest religious and cultic poetry as well as in the Pss. Deliverance from → Egypt is sung in such terms (Exod. 15). The phrase used of the exodus so many times, "with strong hand and outstretched arm", fits the same category (cf. Jdg. 5:4 f.; Deut. 32:2 f.; Ps. 68[67]:8 f.; and later Hab. 3:3–6). The victories over Sihon and Og have the same emphasis (Num. 10:35 ff.).

The Pss. use the same language about the exodus and the occupation of Canaan (Ps. 132[131]:12, 16, 18). But they also begin to hint of primordial victories on which world order is based (Pss. 89[88]:9 f.; 93[92]:1–4; 98[97]:1).

Prophets continued to be consulted before joining battle (cf. 1 Ki. 20 and 22). They were also concerned about Yahweh's control of world politics. They preached judgment to be accomplished through wars that he controlled and used (Amos 1–2; Isa. 13–23; Jer. 46–51; Ezek. 25–32). "Holy war" was originally conceived as Yahweh's battle on behalf of his people. Prophetic insight challenged Israel's right to continue to claim that status. Then they announced that Yahweh, the Divine Warrior, would direct battles against Israel to accomplish his downfall in judgment (cf. Amos 2:6–14; Ezek. 5; and Jer. generally). This, they announced, would be accomplished with the fall of → Jerusalem and the exile, which took place in 586 B.C. (cf. Isa. 40:2).

Israel's relation to war changed after the exile. Israel was a religious group with very little political autonomy. Except for the brief Hasmonean period of independance after 165 B.C. and the revolts against Roman rule in A.D. 70 and 132, there was no need of or opportunity for military experience. But the ideology of the Divine King and Warrior did not fade. The faith that Yahweh ruled the powers of heaven and exercised authority over those of history continued. He was shown to control their political masters (cf. the books of Daniel and Esther). Yahweh's care for his people could be accomplished even through such men as Cyrus of Persia (cf. Isa. 45).

With the birth of apocalyptic thinking, "holy war" and the concept of the "Divine Warrior" came into their own again, depicting God's final triumph over all his enemies on behalf of those who confessed his sovereignty (cf. the Book of Daniel;

and Isa. 24–27; Zech. 11–14; see further P. D. Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic*, 1975). *J. Watts*

3. The intertestamental period saw no new guidelines, though there is sometimes considerable overlap of messianic and apocalyptic ideas. "Thus the war of extirpation against ungodly might (Test. Dan 5:10 f.; Test. Ash. 7:3) and against sin (Eth. En. 94) sometimes seems to be identical with the final day of judgment, or at least to be so closely related to it that one cannot differentiate between the situation of war and the act of judgment" (O. Bauernfeind, *TDNT* VI 511; cf. Eth. Enoch 94:7, 9; 100:1–5; and cf. 46, 51, 53 with 55 f. and 62). Sometimes men are summoned to participate (Eth. Enoch 90:19; 95:3; Jub. 23:30; Apc. Abr. 29; Test. Sim. 5:5; 1QSa 1:21, 26). But angels could also take part (1QSa 2:8 f.; 1QM 12:1). Both visible and invisible wars are mentioned together (Test. Reub. 6:12). But sometimes the war is waged by God (Eth. Enoch 94:10; Ass. Mos. 10:7–10; Test. Ash. 7:3) or the messiah (Pss. Sol. 17:21 ff.; 2 Esd. 12:33; Syr. Bar. 40:2 f.; CD 7:20 f.; 1QH 6:28 ff.; 1QSb 5:25) alone.

The Maccabean revolt was not an eschatological war but a fight to secure the integrity of Judaism from the control of the Syrian Seleucid empire in the 2nd cent. B.C. It began in 168 B.C. when an aged priest Mattathias killed an apostate Jew who was about to offer sacrifice on an idolatrous altar in the town of Modia. The four Books of Maccabees are named after the hero of the first two, Judas Maccabeus. The first three are included in the Apocrypha. For various resistance movements in the 1st cent. A.D. → Zeal.

The War Scroll of the Qumran community (1QM) consists of nineteen mutilated columns, proclaiming war against the Kittim (1QM 1), and giving details of the reorganization of temple worship (1QM 2), programme for the forty years' war (1QM 2), details of trumpets, standards, dispositions, ages, the camp, duties of priests and Levites (1QM 3–9), addresses and prayers (1QM 10–14), and an account of the battle. The work draws inspiration from Dan. 11:40–12:3, and describes the final battle against the Kittim. It may have incorporated an account of a forty years' war against the Gentiles (cf. G. Vermes, *Scrolls*, 122 f.; for fuller discussion of the scroll see Y. Yadin, *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness*, 1962). It is thought that the scroll was written in the middle of the 1st cent. B.C. in view of the influence of Roman equipment and practice in the description of the battle order. The symbolism of physical war depicts the eschatological battle between the "Sons of Light" (the Qumran community) and "the Sons of Darkness, the army of Satan" (1QM 1:1). The battle is predestined. The two sides are evenly matched. It is only by the intervention of God that the wicked are finally vanquished. *C. Brown*

NT 1. *polemos*, which occurs in cl. Gk. from Homer onwards, means (a) war, battle, and (b) fig. strife, conflict, quarrel.

(a) According to Heb. 11:34, it was through faith that the great figures of the OT "quenched raging fire, escaped the edge of the sword, won strength out of weakness, became mighty in war, put foreign armies to flight." The various phrases here doubtless allude to events in Israelite history as recorded in the OT and later writings (cf. F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, *NLC*, 1964, 335 f.). The allusion to fire

recalls Dan. 3:18. Several prophets escaped the edge of the sword: Elijah (1 Ki. 19:2 ff.), Elisha (2 Ki. 6:31 ff.), Jeremiah (Jer. 36:19, 26). Gideon was the least in his father's house and his family the poorest in Manasseh, yet Yahweh delivered Israel by Gideon and his three hundred (Jdg. 6:15 ff.). In commenting on Heb. 11:34, 1 Clem. 55:3 ff. instances Judith and Esther. But the author of Heb. may well have been thinking of numerous instances of victory from the days of Joshua down to the time of Judas Maccabeus. The Israelite belief that victory was in the last analysis the work of Yahweh is expressed by Jonathan: "For nothing can hinder the LORD from saving by many or by few" (1 Sam. 14:6). The battle was not theirs but Yahweh's (2 Chr. 20:15). One man could therefore put a thousand to flight and two ten thousand (Jos. 23:10; Deut. 32:30; Lev. 26:8).

Wars and rumours of wars (Matt. 24:6 par. Mk. 13:7, Lk. 21:9) are foretold in Jesus' eschatological discourse (→ Present, art. *The Parousia and Eschatology in the NT* 2 (a)). They precede the → judgment. This theme is also taken up by Rev., where war is also said to be made upon the saints (Rev. 11:7; 12:17; 13:7, cf. Dan. 7:21 Theodotion; 19:19).

Among the features of the eschatological conflict in Rev. is the reference to Armageddon: "And they assembled them at the place which in Hebrew is called Armageddon" (Rev. 16:16). There is some discrepancy in the readings of the various MSS as to the form and spelling of this term. The Westcott and Hort text construes it as *Har Magedōn*, and it has been thought to mean the Mountains of Megiddo and in particular Mount Carmel. Zechariah is the only prophet to mention Megiddo (Zech. 12:11). Zechariah spoke of all the nations battling against Jerusalem (Zech. 14:2), and afterwards of living waters flowing from Jerusalem (Zech. 14:8; cf. Ezek. 47:1–12; Rev. 22:1 f.). Zechariah deeply influenced the author of Rev., but the battle symbolism of Rev. is also influenced by the imagery of Ezekiel. The gathering of the kings at Armageddon takes up the picture of Ezek. 38–39 with its reference to Gog and Magog (cf. also Rev. 20:7–10), where Gog is the prince of Magog. The land of Gog is mentioned in Jub. 8:25; cf. 7:19; 9:8; Sl. Enoch 56:5 ff.; 2 Esd. 13:5 ff. and woes against Gog and Magog are proclaimed in Sib. 3:319 ff., cf. 662 ff. Perhaps in Ezek. Gog is intended also to personify a land or nation. Gog is used as early as the Tell el-Amarna tablets as a name for the nations of the North, and in Ezek. and Jewish apocalyptic writers it stands for the nations generally which combined in assault on Israel (G. R. Beasley-Murray, *Revelation*, *New Century Bible*, 1974, 297; cf. J. M. Ford, *Revelation*, *Anchor Bible*, 1975, 356 f. for Gog and Magog in rabbinic literature). This is the final eschatological battle after the release of Satan following his thousand-year bondage (Rev. 20:7). The enemies of the people of God will be destroyed by fire from heaven, and the devil will be thrown into the lake of fire with the beast and the false prophet.

polemos stands for a single battle in Rev. 9:7, 9; 12:7; 16:14; 20:8. In 1 Cor. 14:8 Paul asks: "And if the bugle gives an indistinct sound, who will get ready for battle?" The context is a discussion of speaking in tongues (cf. v. 6), and the illustration is one of several examples of unintelligibility, which therefore are of no practical value to the hearer. The gift of tongues may edify the speaker, but no one else unless there be someone to discern the significance of the tongue and interpret it for the edification of the hearers (cf. vv. 11 f., 23 f., 27 ff.).

(b) *polemos* is used in the fig. sense of strife, conflict, quarrel in Jas. 4:1: "What

causes wars [*polemoi*], and what causes fightings [*machai*] among you? Is it not your passions that are at war [*strateuomenōn*] in your members?" For *polemos* in the sense of strife and quarreling cf. Philo, *Gig.* 51; Test. Sim. 4:8; Test. Gad 5:1; 1 Clem. 3:2; 46:5, and for *machē* in a similar sense cf. Test. Jud. 16:3; Test. Ben. 6:4; 2 Tim. 2:23; Tit. 3:9 (cf. M. Dibelius and H. Greeven, *James*, *Hermeneia*, 1976, 216).

2. (a) The cognate vb. *polemeō* means to fight, make war (Rev. 2:16; 12:7; 13:4; 17:14; 19:11). These passages all have strong symbolic overtones, and the subject can be either the opponents of the church or believers, the Spirit of Christ or the exalted Christ. *machomai* is used in the lit. sense of fight (between two persons) in Acts 7:26 (cf. Exod. 2:11–15; 21:22). The hapax legomenon *theomachos* means one who strives against God (Acts 5:39).

(b) *polemeō* is used of the disputes among Christians in Jas. 4:2 (cf. also Gal. 1:13 *v.l.*; 1:23 *v.l.*). Likewise *machomai* is used fig. in Jas. 4:2 and Jn. 6:52.

3. *strateia* is found in secular Gk. onwards and the LXX in the sense of an expedition or campaign. In 2 Cor. 10:4 it means warfare: "For the weapons of our warfare are not worldly [*ta gar hopla tēs strateias hēmōn ou sarkika*] but have divine power to destroy strongholds [*ochyrōmatōn*]." C. K. Barrett thinks that the verse is a probable allusion to Prov. 21:22: The wise man attacks strong (*ochyras*) cities, and destroys the stronghold (*ochyrōma*) in which the ungodly trusted (*The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, *BNTC*, 1973, 251). A similar figure is used in attacks on sophistry (Philo, *Conf. Ling.* 129 ff.). The picture is that of a siege engine attacking an embattled position. Paul's opponents had evidently accused Paul of operating in a worldly way (cf. 2 Cor. 1:17), whereas they themselves were "spiritual" (cf. 1 Cor. 3:1). Paul's reaffirmation of his own preaching, work and life in the Spirit is comparable with 1 Cor. 2:4. Here in 2 Cor. 10:4 f., Paul is turning the tables on his opponents, implying that a pseudo-spirituality is an obstacle to the knowledge of God. Rebellious thoughts are taken captive to Christ. The cognate vb. *strateuō*, do military service, serve as a soldier, carry on a war, is found in the previous verse (2 Cor. 10:3). Both noun and vb. occur again in 1 Tim. 1:18, where Timothy is urged to fight the good fight (*strateuesthai tēn kalēn strateian*). M. Dibelius and H. Conzelmann think that the use of such imagery arose against the background of the Qumran community's conception of the holy war, as set out in *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness* (*The Pastoral Epistles*, *Hermeneia*, 1972, 32). If this is so, Paul is deliberately developing the imagery in conscious contrast to that of Qumran. But, as Dibelius and Conzelmann observe, the idea of God as a commander-in-chief is amply attested in the Gk. world (Epictetus, *Dissertationes* 3, 23, 31; Sextus Empiricus, *Adversus Mathematicos* 9, 26; Philo, *On Providence* 2, 102; Maximus Tyrius, 4, 9; 10, 9; 13:3 ff.), as is that of the moral life as military service (Plato, *Apol.* 28; Epictetus, *Dissertationes* 3, 24, 34).

In addition to 2 Cor. 10:4, *hoplon*, weapon, occurs in Rom. 13:12: "The night is far gone, the day is at hand. Let us cast off the works of darkness and put on the armour of light." This mixed metaphor picks up the twin ideas that armour is worn during the daytime, as battles could be fought only while it was light, implying that the Christian is to take the offensive, and also that the Christian should wear armour appropriate to the light, in contrast with the works of darkness. In 2 Cor. 6:7 Paul speaks of "the weapons of righteousness for the right hand and for the left" in the

context of a discussion of Christian virtues and attitudes in the face of opposition and adversity. *hoplon* is used lit. of weapons in Jn. 18:3, but in Rom. 6:13 it means a tool. The cognate vb. *hoplizō* occurs in 1 Pet. 4:1: "Since therefore Christ has suffered in the flesh, arm yourselves with the same thought, for whoever has suffered in the flesh has ceased from sin." The thought is explained in the preceding verses. The Christian is to follow Christ who has died, and is risen and ascended (1 Pet. 3:18–22). He belongs to him, and thus to a different way of life from that of the ungodly (cf. 1 Pet. 3:13–17; 4:2 ff.; see the discussion in E. Best, *1 Peter, New Century Bible*, 1971, 150 ff.).

In 1 Cor. 9:7 Paul asks: "Who serves as a soldier at his own expense [*tis strateuetai idiois opsōniois pote*]? Who plants a vineyard without eating any of its fruit? Who tends a flock without getting some of the milk?" The questions come in the course of an argument against his detractors which maintains the right of the Christian worker to be supported by the Christian community. At the same time Paul points out that he has refrained from exercising his rights so that he could "make the gospel free of charge" (1 Cor. 9:18). In 2 Tim. 2:3 f. the same imagery occurs in an exhortation to single-hearted devotion: "Take your share of suffering as a good soldier [*stratiōtēs*] of Christ Jesus. No soldier on service [*strateuomenos*] gets entangled in civilian pursuits, since his aim is to satisfy him who enlisted [*stratologēsanti*] him."

Elsewhere *stratiōtēs* occurs in the lit. sense for Roman soldiers in Matt. 8:9; 27:27; 28:12; Mk. 15:16; Lk. 7:8; Jn. 19:2; Acts 10:7. *strateuma* means an army (Rev. 19:14, 19), a detachment (Acts 23:10, 27), and troops (Matt. 22:7; Lk. 23:11; Rev. 9:16). The vb. *strateuō* is used of the struggles of the passions in the Christian: "Beloved, I beseech you as aliens and exiles to abstain from the passions of the flesh that wage war [*strateuontai*] against your soul" (1 Pet. 2:11; cf. Jas. 4:1, see 1 (b) above; and also Rom. 7:7 ff.; and 1QS 3:17 ff.). *stratēgos* is found in the double sense of the popular name for the praetors or chief magistrates in the Roman colony of Philippi (Acts 16:20, 22, 35 f., 38; cf. Arndt, 778) and the captain of the temple (Lk. 22:4, 52; Acts 4:1; 5:24). *stratia*, army, is used in the sense of the heavenly host of angels (Lk. 2:13), and the host of heaven as an object of idolatrous worship (Acts 2:42; cf. Amos. 5:27 ff.). The fact that God gave the Israelites over to such worship is seen by Stephen as a divine judgment, illustrating his theme that throughout history Israel has repeatedly limited God by refusing him true spiritual worship. *stratopedarchēs*, military commander, commandant of a camp, occurs only in Acts 28:16 *v.l. stratopedon* means lit. a camp, and then a body of troops, an army, or legion (Lk. 21:20).

The Roman centurion (Lat. *centurio*, officer in charge of a hundred men) generally appears in a positive light in the NT. Three terms for the rank are given: *hekatontarchēs* (Acts 10:1, 22; 24:23; 27:1, 31); *hekatontarchos* (Matt. 8:5, 8, 13; 27:54; Lk. 7:2, 6; 23:47; Acts 21:32; 22:25 f.; 23:17, 23; 27:6, 11, 43; 28:16); and the transliteration *kentyriōn* (Mk. 15:39, 44 f.). Lk. even records the pronouncement on the faith of the centurion at Capernaum: "I tell you, not even in Israel have I found such faith" (Lk. 7:9 par. Matt. 8:10). The centurion had drawn an analogy between his own authority and that of Jesus. In both cases it was sufficient merely to give the word of command. Jesus could, therefore, heal merely by giving the word; the centurion did not consider himself worthy to receive Jesus under his roof. The

Jews, by contrast, sought signs and argued with Jesus. Matt.'s account adds a comment which was particularly relevant to the Jewish nation: "I tell you, many will come from east and west and sit at table with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven, while the sons of the kingdom will be thrown into the outer darkness; there men will weep and gnash their teeth." The comment of the centurion by the cross, "Truly this man was a son of God" (Mk. 15:39) stands in marked contrast with that of the chief priests and scribes (Mk. 15:31 f.). The version in Lk. 23:47, "Certainly this man was innocent", suggests that the comment in Mk. was not intended to be a full confession of divinity, but rather that Jesus was righteous and a true son of God in the sense in which believers address God as "our Father". By contrast the Jews, from the chief priests and scribes down to the crucified malefactors, had forfeited the right to be sons of God.

Military service is never something which is condemned *per se* in the NT. The soldiers who arrested and crucified Jesus were acting on order from their superiors who in turn were complying with the desires of the Jewish leaders. When soldiers came to John the Baptist to ask what they should do, he did not tell them to abandon their profession. Instead he said: "Rob no one by violence or by false accusation, and be content with your wages" (Lk. 3:14).

4. *parembolē* means a camp, especially a fortified camp. It is used of the Israelites' camp (e.g. Exod. 29:14; Lev. 4:12, 21; 10:4 f.), and has this sense in Heb. 13:11, 13: "For the bodies of those animals whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the high priest as a sacrifice for sin are burned outside the camp. So Jesus also suffered outside the gate in order to sanctify the people through his own blood. Therefore let us go forth to him outside the camp, bearing abuse for him" (cf. Lev. 16:27). The author thus sees a heightened symbolism in the crucifixion of Jesus outside Jerusalem. The believer, therefore, should be willing to suffer the same rejection by the Jews. Instead of Jewish sacrifices, he is to offer the sacrifice of praise (v. 15). The present Jerusalem is "no lasting city" (v. 14); it is in fact a camp (v. 13). It is therefore better to suffer rejection with Christ, and be part of the true pilgrim people of God. The church is described as "the camp of the saints and the beloved city" in Rev. 20:9 which is surrounded in the final eschatological battle (see above, 1 (a)). Elsewhere *parembolē* means the barracks or headquarters of the Roman troops in Jerusalem (Acts 21:34, 37; 22:24; 23:10, 16, 32). The vb. *paremballō* is common in secular Gk. and the LXX, and has various meanings. In Lk. 19:43 it means to throw up a palisade, and occurs in the eschatological teaching of Jesus in the pronouncement of judgment on Jerusalem (→ Present, art. *The Parousia and Eschatology in the NT* 2 (a)).

5. Various weapons and items of armour are mentioned in the NT particularly in connexion with defence against spiritual attack. The theme of "the breastplate of faith and love" and the helmet of "the hope of salvation" (1 Thess. 5:8) is elaborated in Eph. 6:10–17 into a comprehensive description of the Christian's warfare and weapons in the fight against the supernatural powers of evil. The idea may have been suggested by the fact that Paul was himself a prisoner at the time (Eph. 4:1, cf. v. 8), and would no doubt be guarded by Roman soldiers. The "whole armour of God [*tēn panoplian tou theou*]" is needed in order to stand against the wiles of the devil (Eph. 6:11, cf. v. 13). *panoplia* means the full equipment of the soldier, including both offensive and defensive weapons. It is found at the introduction of lists of weapons or

as a comprehensive term for them (Thuc., 3, 114; Isocrates 16, 29; Polyb., 6, 23; cf. M. Barth, *Ephesians*, II, *Anchor Bible*, 1974, 761). There is no exact Heb. equivalent. Barth thinks that the emphasis here is on the quality of the weapons rather than their complete number, and prefers the translation "splendid armour" (op. cit., 793 ff.). The loins are to be girded with truth (Eph. 6:14). Barth notes three types of girdle worn by Roman soldiers that Paul may have had in mind: a breech-like leather apron worn to protect the lower abdomen; the sword belt which was buckled together with the sword and also the dagger in the case of an officer; or the belt or sash designating an officer or high official. Barth prefers the last suggestion, as he sees the verse as an allusion to Isa. 11:5: "Righteousness shall be the girdle of his waist, and faithfulness the girdle of his loins." Truth is to be both the defence and mark of the Christian. In Eph. 6:14 Paul speaks of "the breastplate of righteousness [*ton thōraka tēs dikaiosynēs*]"; in 1 Thess. 5:8 he refers to "the breastplate of faith". In view of the link between righteousness and faith in Paul's thought, no doubt the same piece of armour could be viewed from these complementary perspectives. For → righteousness is the gift of God appropriate by faith. The same noun is used in the LXX for the high priest's breastpiece of judgment (Exod. 28:15 ff.; 39:8 ff.). If Paul is thinking about the Roman foot soldier's equipment, the *thōrax* probably denotes the metal breastplate which protected the soldier's chest. But if, as Barth contends, Paul is thinking of the saints as rich heirs and noblemen, he may have had in mind scale or chain mail that covered the chest and hips (op. cit., 769; cf. Eph. 1:8; 2:6; 3:8, 12; 4:1).

Eph. 6:15 speaks of the feet being "shod with the equipment of the gospel of peace [*en hetoimasia tou euangeliou tēs eirēnēs*]". *hetoimasia* normally means readiness or preparation. But equipment (i.e. boots) as in modern Gk. (Arndt, 316) is a widespread interpretation. However, Barth prefers to translate the phrase "steadfast because the gospel of peace is strapped under your feet" (op. cit., 770, cf. 797 ff.). He argues that the Gk. stem *hetoim-* frequently translates the Heb. *kûn*, to establish, and thinks that Paul had in mind the Roman *caliga*, or half-boot, which was made of leather but left the toes free, enabling him to move readily but also giving him a firm grip. He argues that Paul is thinking of Roman military equipment rather than the practice of running barefoot for speed, despite the allusion to Isa. 52:7 (cf. also Ps. 121:3; and also Isa. 59:7; Rom. 3:15 ff.). The "shield of faith [*ton thyreon tes pisteōs*], with which you can quench all the flaming darts of the evil one" (Eph. 6:16) is an allusion to the Roman *scutum*. It had an iron frame and sometimes a metal boss. *thyreos* is linked etymologically with *thyra*, door. It was a large door-shaped or vaulted shield in contrast with the small, round *aspis* or *pelta*. With its several layers of leather soaked in water before battle it was formidable protection against flaming darts (*belē . . . pepyrōmena*). For God as a protecting shield see Ps. 7:10, 13; Zech. 12:8; Wis. 5:19; and the protection of Yahweh sung in Ps. 18. The "helmet of salvation [*tēn perikephalaian tou sotēriou*]" (Eph. 6:17; cf. 1 Thess. 5:8) appears to combine the thought of Isa. 59:17 with the Roman soldier's armour. The helmet could be of leather or metal, lined with sponge or felt. Barth suggests that Paul has in mind the more ornamental helmet of victory, demonstrating that the battle has been won (op. cit., 775), though the need for the other armour indicates that heavy fighting must still be expected.

Finally, the believer is to take "the sword of the Spirit which is the word of God

[*tēn machairan tou pneumatos ho estin rhēma theou*]." The word *machaira* occurs at Matt. 10:34; 26:47, 51 f., 55; Mk. 14:43, 47 f.; Lk. 21:24; 22:36, 38, 49, 52; Jn. 18:10 f.; Acts 12:2; 16:27; Rom. 8:35; 13:4; Eph. 6:17; Heb. 4:12; 11:34, 37; Rev. 6:4; 13:10, 14. The word *rhomphaia* which denotes a large, broad sword is used in Rev. 2:12 ("The words of him who has the sharp two-edged sword"; cf. 2:17) and Rev. 1:16 ("from his mouth issued a sharp two-edged sword"). It is used symbolically for anguish and pain (Lk. 2:35) and literally in Lk. 21:24D and in the visions of Rev. 6:8; 19:15, 21. There is a certain irony in that men came against Jesus armed with swords and the fact that the sword is a symbol of authority (Rom. 13:4). Jesus responded to men with words; but his words are seen in the later NT writings as words of authority and judgment. Heb. 4:12 speaks of the word of God as "living and active, sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing to the division of soul and spirit, of joints and marrow, and discerning the thoughts and intentions of the heart." Jesus' reply to Peter in Lk. 22:38 is no doubt ironical. His initial remark about going out to buy a sword is probably an intimation of what is about to happen. Jesus is being treated as a transgressor (Lk. 22:37; cf. Isa. 53:12). The disciples must be ready for it. The production of two swords might suggest that some of the disciples had links with the zealots, or at least they were ready to resort to arms. The words, "It is enough", may imply that that is enough of that kind of talk, or they may mean that the kind of resistance the disciples could put up with two swords against the trained Roman soldiers is so pathetically negligible as to be self-evidently futile and wrong. (On this saying and Mk. 10:34 par. Lk. 12:51 see below, *Jesus and Revolution* 3 (b) (iii).)

In the case of Eph. 6:17, the gen. *tou pneumatos*, "of the Spirit", may be the equivalent of the adj. spiritual (cf. Eph. 1:3; 5:19; 1 Cor. 14:1) or it may be the gen. of origin (i.e. "the sword given by the Spirit"). Elsewhere Paul stresses faith and testimony as the gift of the Spirit (1 Cor. 2:1–16; 7:40; 12:3; ch. 14 passim; Gal. 3:1–5; Eph. 3:5), and if these are parallel to the present passage, it would support the gen. of origin (cf. M. Barth, op. cit., 776 f.). The fact that *rhēma* rather than *logos* is used here (cf. also Eph. 5:26) may focus attention on the weighty, revelatory, creative and prophetic utterances of the Spirit. Prophetic speech, hymns and prayers cannot be excluded (Eph. 4:25, 29; 5:13, 18 f.). But *rhēma* can mean the words of God found in the OT and the words of the Lord quoted by Paul (1 Thess. 4:15; 1 Cor. 7:10; cf. Acts 20:35; → Word, art. *rhēma*). There is a par. with Heb. 4:12 and Isa. 49:2 ("He has made my mouth like a sharp sword"). "Just like the Messiah in Isa. 11, so all the saints in Ephesus can wield the sword of the word only because they are inspired" (M. Barth, op. cit., 777). *C. Brown*

Jesus and Revolution

1. *The Contemporary Debate.* Paul Tillich could say that theology must be done again in every age. This is primarily what the theologies of hope, revolution and liberation attempt to do. Born in a world of acute change, where history is being increasingly experienced as revolution (rooted in the tremendous upheavals taking place in every area of modern life, resulting from science and technology, and evident particularly in the west in the student unrest and civil rights movements of the 1960s and in the so-called Third World in the struggles against social and economic injustice and racial oppression around the globe, these theologies seek to focus atten-

tion on *faith in action*. Theology is not, so they say, concerned with reflecting on and interpreting faith, but reflecting on and interpreting faith in action. In this vein the Augustinian theology of history can be appealed to for support and *The City of God* cited as an example of theology based on "a true analysis of the signs of the times and the demands with which they challenge the Christian community" (Gustavo Gutiérrez, *A Theology of Liberation*, 1974, 6). It is at this point of action and change that exponents of these theologies find themselves in agreement with Karl Marx: although Marx owed a great deal to Ludwig Feuerbach, he had to criticize him for remaining a thinker instead of turning thought into action, a criticism epitomized in Marx's famous dictum: "The philosophers have only *interpreted* the world, in various ways; the point, however, is to *change* it" (*Theses on Feuerbach*, XI). So too, theologians must not stop at making theological assertions about the world; they must do something to change it.

(a) *Theology of Hope*. (i) *Context*. The theology of hope is primarily associated with the name of Jürgen Moltmann, although it gives inspiration to the thought of a variety of modern theologians, for example Josef Pieper (*Hope and History*, 1969), Rubem Alves (*A Theology of Human Hope*, 1969), and Major J. Jones (*Black Awareness: A Theology of Hope*, 1971).

One of the younger German theologians, Moltmann was a theological student in the years immediately following World War II. He sat at the feet of Gerhard von Rad, Ernst Käsemann, Hans Joachim Iwand, Ernst Wolf and Otto Weber at the University of Göttingen. While there, in his own words, he "imbibed the theology of the Confessing Church, inspired by Karl Barth and preserved throughout the years of struggle between the church and the Nazi state." Imbued with hope for a new, more humane Germany, and for a liberated, liberating church of Christ, he could not become enthusiastic about the debate on existentialism and secularity provoked by Bultmann. His distinctive kind of theology was to await the stimulus of the Dutch Catholic writer, Arnold van Ruler, in 1957, followed soon afterwards by Ernst Bloch on the hope principle (Ernst Bloch, *Das Prinzip Hoffnung*, 1959). From Bloch he found himself recalled to understanding Christian faith as both *world-transforming* and *world-overcoming*. Moltmann then published his *Theology of Hope* (*Theologie der Hoffnung*, in German) in 1964.

The decade of the sixties had brought a new cultural and social situation where technology promised to provide an open future: great possibilities lay ahead in terms of economic planning, population control and direction, development and social projection. These years were years of hope, and it is no accident that they gave rise to "a theology of hope". Moltmann would be the first to admit this: it is what he calls the *context* of his theology.

(ii) *Text*. Although it may arise in and from a concrete situation, in no sense is Moltmann's theology of hope shaped by that situation, but rather by its text, the Bible.

The Bible is the text of the theology of hope. In the writings of the Old and New Testaments is to be found the history book of God's promises. And these promises of God have been incarnated in the "promissory history" of Israel and in the "promissory history" of Jesus of Nazareth. The Bible tells the story of one who fulfils promises, the coming God. It is thus a story of hope for the world.

But if we begin to read the Bible as the book of God's hope then in Moltmann's

words we will find that it is a highly revolutionary and subversive book: "The hope about which it speaks is valid for the hopeless and not for the optimists. It is valid for the poor and not for the rich. It is valid for the downtrodden and the insulted so that they will learn to walk uprightly, and all this as it will be in heaven, so already here on this earth. As the book of the promises of God, the Bible . . . points beyond itself into the future which does not yet fill our present" ("Introduction to the 'Theology of Hope' ", in Jürgen Moltmann, *The Experiment Hope*, ed. and translated by M. D. Meeks, 1975, 46).

(iii) *God of Hope – God of the Future.* Christian theology speaks of God *historically*. It speaks of the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, of the God of the Exodus, of the God of the prophets, and of the God who raised Jesus from the dead. By so speaking it remembers these events and experiences and calls them to mind. But Christian theology also speaks of this history *eschatologically*: a future is awaited. What is unique then in the biblical message about God is this: it is a message which emerges from history and has the future and the end of history, that is liberation, as its goal.

Abraham heard God's promise and heeded it. To do this he had to leave his fatherland, forsaking the familiar patterns of life which had provided him with a home and security. And, in Moltmann's own words: "The Bible calls this 'faith': leaving the dwelling places of reality where one has peace and security and giving oneself over to the course of history, to the way of freedom and danger, the way of disappointment and surprise, borne along and led solely by God's hope" (loc. cit., 47 f.). Likewise, the tribes of Israel experienced in Egypt the reality of Yahweh in Promise and Exodus. When Moses asked the name of this God he was given the answer: "I am who I am" (Exod. 3:14). This formula can be translated, "I will be who I will be", and contains the future of God – a "God who has the future as the mode of his being" (Ernst Bloch).

So then, Abraham's God, Israel's God, was a "God with the future as the mode of his being" – a "God of hope". This biblical way of describing the divinity of God – the "coming God" – is very different from the essentially Greek description of the "eternal God" taken over by Christian theology. If we are to speak of the "coming God" his future becomes the source of the times. His coming continually creates new time in history. If his creation at the end of history means "Behold, I make all things new", we are able to anticipate in it that his grace is "new every morning".

(iv) *Messiah of Hope.* It is now right to ask whether this future orientation of the theology of hope is in accord with the New Testament, says Moltmann. He finds that it is. For the proclamation of Jesus: "The kingdom of God has come near. Repent; and believe in the gospel" is in fact *eschatological proclamation.* Moreover, its form is also *eschatological anticipation.* Jesus anticipates through his words, his deeds, and his life shared with others, what, according to the Old Testament expectancy, can only happen on the last day. Jesus does already today what is supposed to come tomorrow. He did not promise the kingdom only to the just and judgment to the unjust, as was usually the case (e.g. John the Baptist), but clearly and preferentially promises the kingdom to the poor and the unjust, not because of their injustice, but because of God's grace. He proclaimed the kingdom as prevenient and unconditional grace to the sinners and tax collectors, and his blessedness to the poor, to those who

were grieving, and to those who were hungry. And thus he announced the kingdom, not as judgment but as joy.

But on what basis has he so proclaimed the kingdom? On the basis of being totally directed toward confirmation by God in the future. There was an inner contradiction "between Jesus' claim of anticipating God's kingdom" and his own poverty, as well as his association with the outcast and poor.

There is another side, however, to the story of Jesus: he was crucified because he proclaimed the justice of grace and, thereby, violated the religious, as well as the political, law and order. Yet in the light of Easter, the Christian proclamation becomes once more eschatological and thus proleptic proclamation of the coming of God. The resurrection of the crucified Christ reveals a new justice, the justification of the godless. Through the crucified Christ the future of resurrection and life, of freedom, joy and justice is opened up to those who live in guilt without hope and who must die in fear without a future. The future is inaugurated, not by way of examples and commands, but through the love, the patience, and the sacrifice of God.

(v) *Community of Hope.* Hope is to be seen in the "sons of Abraham", those who have made an *exodus* from the religious and political establishments which oppress the world today. These "sons of Abraham", the community of the people of God, follow Abraham, who left his fatherland for the sake of a promise of blessing for all people; Israel, who abandoned religious and political captivity in Egypt in order to find the land of freedom and righteousness; and the man of Nazareth, who was crucified by the priests and politicians of his people and by the imperial power of Rome.

The community of hope must not be "conformed to this world", as Paul says, but be "transformed by the renewal of their minds" (Rom. 12:2), for there is no "lasting city" but "one which is to come" (Heb. 13:14) – either in Rome, Germany, England or America. But if we seek the "city which is to come", the "promised land", where shall we go? To this question Moltmann promptly replies: "One does not move to another country to find freedom and God. One remains where one is in order to correspond to the conditions of the coming kingdom of God through the renewal of the heart and by practical transformation of social circumstances. The front line of the exodus is not emigration, but liberation through the transformation of the present. For in the present, where we always are, the powers of the past wrestle with the powers of the future, and fear and hope struggle for domination. By changing ourselves and the circumstances around us, by anticipating the future of God, we emigrate out of the past into the future" (loc. cit., 59).

(b) *Theology of Revolution.* (i) *Praxis.* When the optimism of the early years of the sixties gave way to the despair of its later years (1968 witnessed not only the end of the "Prague Spring" but the Paris student riots and the beginnings of violence in Northern Ireland), it was easy to dismiss the theology of hope as fine reading and call for action in its place. Moltmann did in fact commit himself. Quoting Walter Rauschenbusch's challenge to Christianity: "Ascetic Christianity called the world evil and left it. Humanity is waiting for a revolutionary Christianity which will call the world evil and change it", he declared: "The new criterion of theology and of faith is to be found in praxis" (action). To this end, in the struggles for freedom and justice, Christians were called on to side with the humanity of the oppressed.

(ii) *Violence and Non-violence.* Aware that such a summons raised the question of the use of violence, Moltmann was willing to go even further and assert that the problem of violence and non-violence is but an illusory problem for there is only the question of whether the means are proportionate to the ends. In order to see how he went on to develop this thesis it is worth quoting from his essay "Racism and the Right to Resist" translated, significantly, by the World Council of Churches (in *The Experiment Hope*, 131–46): "It is not the idealistic principle of nonviolence that is consonant with the gospel, but the responsible action of love. Love is divine power-in-weakness (2 Cor. 12:9). Responsible political action in love is selfless to the point of sacrifice of personal innocence, to the point of incurring guilt. From this we are led to the following conclusions: first, nonviolence in the sense of nonresistance cannot be justified in tyrannical situations, because it permits and encourages violence. It does not save the personal innocence of the individual, but leads to 'more irredeemable guilt'. Second, violence, construed as the love which desires to put an end to evil, cannot be approved but it can be answered for. Resistance may not triumph over its victims. It is revenge, not love, which does that. Guilt remains guilt, but in faith we can live with this guilt and need not commit suicide. The engagement to resist remains a 'bitter engagement'. But in this instance too the incurring of guilt in the responsible love which has recourse to counterviolence cannot be restricted to the case of resistance. It is only that the example of resistance reveals the factors which, secretly and often unconsciously, determine all political action. Third, it follows from this that action and failure to act are not the same in such situations in the sense that either way one incurs guilt. There is the 'more irredeemable guilt' which in most cases consists of sins of omission" (loc. cit., 143).

(iii) *Marxist Analysis and a Socialist Society.* But as Stephen Neill aptly remarks, in his recent book, *Salvation Tomorrow*, 1976, 85, Moltmann did not go far enough for some. For example, José Míguez Bonino, an Argentinian, serving in the Evangelical Faculty of Theology at Buenos Aires, and one of the presidents of the World Council of Churches, in his *Revolutionary Theology Comes of Age*, 1975, 144–52, makes one exception in his general condemnation of the European theological tradition: Jürgen Moltmann. Moltmann, we are told, at first appeared to share the vision of those having revolutionary thoughts and was in the process of becoming their prophet. But in his second major book, *The Crucified God*, 1973, he appears to Bonino to be receding from his previous position and to be uncertain of his revolutionary theology. Bonino summarizes the theology of hope succinctly by calling Christian hope "a constant disturbance of reality as it is and a call to move ahead to the future" and the theology of the crucified God clearly but not so succinctly: "God in Christ identifies himself utterly with man oppressed, destituted, and abandoned. He dies the death of the blasphemer, the subversive, the God-forgotten man. His cross marks therefore the bankruptcy of political and religious power, indeed of God conceived as a protective assurance against destitution and death. Here we meet the powerless, suffering, Godforsaken man as the last reality of God himself. Therefore all false optimism, all utopian hope is definitively shattered. But at the same time, we are called to this same identity in the double identification with the crucified Christ, and therefore with those with whom he himself was identified: the outcast, the oppressed, the poor, the forsaken, the sinners, the lost. This is the cradle of the Christian's identity and relevance. To be crucified together with Christ means

to stand with those for whose sake God himself died the death of the sacrilege, the subversive, the Godforsaken one" (op. cit., 145f.).

Bonino concludes that Moltmann intends to become concrete, but that this would involve coming down on one side or the other in a given political situation. This Moltmann is clearly not prepared to do. He declares: "The crucified God is really a God without country and without class. But he is not an unpolitical God; he is the God of the poor, of the oppressed, of the humiliated" (*The Crucified God*, 305 [329]). Replies Bonino: "But the poor, the oppressed, the humiliated *are a class* and *live in countries*." Therefore, for Bonino personally, in the context of Latin American politics, it means coming down on the side of a Marxist analysis and a socialist society as the humanly right thing to do. One may not, says Bonino, as Moltmann does, "claim a solidarity with the poor and . . . hover above right and left as if that choice did not have anything to do with the matter" (*Revolutionary Theology Comes of Age*, 148).

Since Moltmann, many theologians have addressed themselves to the question of revolution, some in support, others from varying critical stances: in Germany Trutz Rendtorff (*Theologie der Revolution. Analysen und Materialien*, 1968), in North America Harvey Cox (*The Secular City*, 1965, 1968), in England José Míguez Bonino delivering the first of the *London Lectures in Contemporary Christianity* (later published as *Christians and Marxists: The Mutual Challenge to Revolution*, 1976).

(c) *Theology of Liberation.* (i) *Context.* The theology of liberation is connected particularly with the Latin American scene. It is primarily a movement, mainly associated with reflection groups which grew out of the Catholic Episcopal Congress held at Medellín, Colombia, in 1968. It is not unrelated to the theologies of hope and revolution, and José Míguez Bonino, for example, has claim to being called a theologian of liberation as well as of revolution.

For Latin Americans the latter years of the sixties became years of disillusionment with the pursuit of "developmentalism" as answering the needs of the Third World. Qualitative rather than quantitative change was needed. Even in Europe this was recognized in the use of the term "revolution" to describe transformation needed from within. It was because "revolution" held out for Europe frightening prospects that "developmentalism" caught on in the first place. Conversely in the Third World it was embraced because, as Frantz Fanon (*The Wretched of the Earth*, 1963) seemed to be saying, it was a more comprehensive way of dealing with the issue, at least when it was about humanization. But as the Third World began to realize that development was about quantitative rather than qualitative change, and that along the well-trodden paths of the developed world, it became necessary to coin a new term for a new concept. For in actual fact this is what "liberation" proved to be, a concept going further than development in being for qualitative as against mere quantitative change and being less superficial than revolution in the understanding of its nature and implications. Liberation would wrench the underdeveloped countries away from economic dependence on the rest, thus liberating them for development along their own lines. At this point liberation must include an element of revolution as there ought to be no illusions about the force which will be brought into play against the breaking of dependence. However, there are other forms of dependence

apart from the economic, for example, the cultural dependence on alien thought and value systems: these too must be broken.

Orlando E. Costas (*The Church and its Mission: A Shattering Critique from the Third World*, 1974) notes the distinctive contributions of three theologians of liberation theology. Rubem Alves (*A Theology of Human Hope*, 1969) he calls the *prophet* of the movement; Hugo Assmann (*Opresión-liberación: Desafío a los cristianos*, 1971, *Teología desde la praxis de la liberación*, 1973) he terms the *apologist* of the movement; and Gustavo Gutiérrez (*Teología de la liberación, Perspectivas*, 1971) he distinguishes as the *systematic theologian* of the movement. It is to the last-named that we shall turn for an understanding of the theology of liberation.

(ii) *Theology as Critical Reflection on Praxis.* The classical tasks of theology Gutiérrez sees as spirituality and rational knowledge. To this he would want to add *theology as critical reflection on praxis.* He sees this latter function as rooted in the first centuries of the church's life. For example, as we have already noted in our introduction, the Augustinian theology of history found in *The City of God* is based, according to Gutiérrez, on a "true analysis of the signs of the times and the demands with which they challenge the Christian community." As over against its comparative neglect in the immediate past, the method is coming once again into its own with the more recent stress on the existential and active aspects of the Christian life. He cites several factors worth mentioning, as contributing to this:

(1) the rediscovery of *charity* as the centre of the Christian life, leading to a more biblical view of faith as a going out of one's self, a commitment to God and neighbour;

(2) the search for a spirituality of the laity and its culmination in studies on the religious value of the profane and in *the spirituality of the activity of the Christian in the world*;

(3) a general sensitivity to the *anthropological aspects* of revelation, viz. the discovery that "the Word about God is at the same time a promise to the world";

(4) the participation of Christians in important social movements, so that the presence and activity of the church in the world becomes a starting point for theological reflection and *the very life of the church* appears ever more clearly as a *locus theologicus*;

(5) *philosophical trends* reinforce the importance of human action as the point of departure for all reflection;

(6) to these factors can be added the influence of *Marxist thought*, focusing on praxis and geared to the transformation of the world;

(7) finally, the rediscovery of the *eschatological dimension* in theology has led to the consideration of the central role of historical praxis. If human history is, above all, an opening to the future, "then it is a task, a political occupation, through which man orients and opens himself to the gift which gives history its transcendent meaning: the full and definitive encounter with the Lord and with other men" (*A Theology of Liberation*, 10).

And so, for Gutiérrez, all these factors have contributed to a more accurate understanding that encounter with the Lord "inescapably means a Christian life centered around a concrete and creative commitment of service to others" (op. cit., 11). And they have led to the formulation of the function of theology as critical reflection.

In an effort to define theology as critical reflection on praxis Gutiérrez continues:

"Theological reflection would be . . . a criticism of society and the Church insofar as they are called and addressed by the Word of God; it would be a critical theory, worked out in the light of the Word accepted in faith, and inspired by a practical purpose – and therefore indissolubly linked to historical praxis" (loc. cit.). The church proclaims the kingdom, the Christian community professes the "faith which works through charity". Theology is reflection; it follows; it is the second step. Theology does not produce pastoral activity but rather reflects on it. Therefore, a privileged *locus theologicus* for the understanding of the faith will be the life, preaching, and historical commitment of the church. But to reflect on the presence and action of the church in the world means to go beyond that. It means departing from the use of only revelation and tradition as starting points (as has been generally the way of classical theology) and beginning with facts and questions derived from the world and from history.

Such then is theology as critical reflection on praxis, the starting point and method of the theology of liberation. But where does it lead? According to Gutiérrez: "This kind of theology, arising from concern with a particular set of issues, will perhaps give us the solid and permanent albeit modest foundation for the *theology in a Latin American perspective* which is both desired and needed." We cannot go into all this; what we can do is look at one of his conclusions.

(iii) *Christ the Liberator.* Gutiérrez' conclusion is that "salvation embraces all men and the whole man; the liberating action of Christ – made man in this history and not in a history marginal to the real life of man – is at the heart of the historical current of humanity; the struggle for a just society, is in its own right very much a part of salvation history" (op. cit., 168).

It is Christ who liberates and he liberates from sin. But sin is not considered as an individual, private, or merely interior reality; it is a social historical fact, the breach of friendship with God and other men. There may be three levels of meaning to liberation – political liberation, the liberation of men throughout history, and liberation from sin – but these three levels mutually affect one another, and it is the third, sin, which is the fundamental obstacle to the kingdom and at the root of all misery and injustice. This root can only be dealt with through the acceptance of the liberating gift of Christ, but inversely, all struggle against exploitation and alienation is an attempt to banish selfishness, the negation of love, and is therefore liberating and a salvific work – although, of course, it is not all of salvation.

Both temporal progress (or the liberation of man) then and the growth of the kingdom are directed toward complete communion of men with God and of men among themselves. The same goal is sought but neither parallel nor even convergent paths are followed to achieve it: the growth of the kingdom occurs historically *in* liberation. Liberation becomes a precondition for the new society, although the new society is liberation *plus* the coming of the kingdom which is above all a gift.

Nothing escapes the salvific process, nothing is outside the pale of the action of Christ and the gift of the Spirit. This gives human history its profound unity. Those who reduce the work of salvation are those "who think that the work of Christ touches the social order in which we live only indirectly or tangentially, and not in its roots and basic structure" (op. cit., 177).

2. *Implications of the Debate.* (a) *Situational Theologies.* All three of the theologies considered are basically situational theologies. They arise in and take their

bearings from specific situations. Moltmann acknowledges as much when he distinguishes between the living or historical context of his theology of hope and its text, the Bible. But not all of his followers do so and indeed the theologians of liberation can be said to go a step further and impose on their hermeneutical method a particular political stance, for example, the Marxist analysis, as does Gutiérrez, and to some extent, Bonino. It is this kind of hermeneutic which leads to what has become a widespread phenomenon, the use of the Exodus motif – for example in various *black theologies* – as a paradigm for liberation: "Let my people go!" The method is not new and irony arises when one observes the identical concept of "an oppressed chosen people" among Afrikaaners in South Africa at the turn of the century in their struggle with the British, and among the "blacks" of Southern Africa today in their struggle against the "whites"! (Cf. Irving Hexham, *Totalitarian Calvinism in the Reformed (Dopper) Community in South Africa 1902–1919*, Dissertation, Bristol, 1975.)

(b) *Jesus the Liberator.* However, it is not only the Exodus which is used as a paradigm but also the life and death of Christ. Note that Moltmann referred to Jesus' dying as "blasphemer", "rebel", and "godforsaken". Hence the criticism of Moltmann that not only was his theology too optimistic and utopian but that it was too biblicist and historicist. (Cf. M. D. Meeks, *Origins of the Theology of Hope*, 1974, 13.) Moltmann refers to Jesus Christ in his person and history as the touchstone by which to distinguish the spirit of eschatology from that of utopia. Surely, his person and history provide us also with the touchstone by which to judge revolution (or liberation), not only its nature but the means by which it is to be achieved. Is there not an inherent contradiction in the idea of a God crucified because he was a blasphemer, a rebel and godforsaken and a God who at the same time remains a God of love, justice and peace? The question must be faced: "Was Jesus a violent revolutionary?"

(c) *The Whole Gospel.* There is economic injustice, there is racial prejudice, there is suppression of human rights, there is political oppression. This is the kind of world the church finds itself in. Christians live in a world where the developed countries are on average twelve times richer than the underdeveloped – where the gross national product of Sweden is fifty times that of Malawi; where racism is not only tolerated but legislated for, as in *apartheid*; where Christians are committed to psychiatric hospitals because of their faith; where individuals are denied political and individual freedoms. Revolution can be defined as a transformation of the foundations of a system, whether of economics, politics, morality, or religion. The theologians of hope, revolution and liberation call for such a change, and appeal to the nature of the gospel as demanding it. If the person and history of Jesus Christ provide us with the touchstone has he anything to say to this? There is no doubt but that the Christian church has been found wanting: a major distinction has often been made between change in the individual and the change of a system. How far did Jesus go? Was Jesus a revolutionary? (Cf. P. Hebblethwaite, "How Liberating is Liberation Theology?" in *Frontier*, Winter 1975–6, where he claims that at the heart of Gutiérrez' work lies "a refusal of all dualisms": there is only one history in which God acts, there is only one gospel.)

3. *Jesus and Violence.* Was Jesus a violent revolutionary? My own belief, frankly, is that he was not and that, moreover, what he was not in his incarnation he did not

expect his body, the church, to be. However, we must state and examine seriously the evidence put forward by those who claim that he was. To this end we shall consider S. G. F. Brandon's thesis (*Jesus and the Zealots*, 1967) and, among others, the counter-thesis of Martin Hengel (*Die Zeloten*, 1961; *Was Jesus a Revolutionist?*, 1971 [Ger. 1970]; *Victory over Violence*, 1973 [Ger. 1971]).

(a) *The Concept of "the Pacific Christ"*. Brandon's thesis is dependent on certain theories concerning the composition of the Gospels. His theories relate to the place of origin, dating and purpose of each Gospel and diverge considerably from the consensus of scholarly opinion.

Mark is the earliest Gospel, written from Rome during a time of persecution. So far Brandon is in agreement with others. However, although Mark was written in a time of persecution it was not written just to comfort persecuted Christians but rather to show that Jesus had been loyal to Rome, and it was written after the Jewish War of A.D. 66–70 (not so most scholars; cf. John A. T. Robinson, *Redating the New Testament*, 1976). Mark is thus interpreted as having already suppressed material in the tradition which might be interpreted politically. For example, he omits references to Jesus' relationship to the Zealots and the disturbances caused by Pilate's government, thereby imposing an a-political and pacific interpretation on his source material. But because Mark's portrait of Jesus was the first to acquire literary form it became definitive for all subsequent portrayal.

Matthew's and Luke's Gospels then became modelled on Mark's and although they contribute two distinctive developments, they inherit Mark's characterization of Jesus as the pacific Christ. Matthew is claimed to be of Alexandrian origin, written between A.D. 80 and 85, with a very overt pacifist intent, because of the danger which was likely to be felt by Christians and Jews in Alexandria after the disaster that befell Israel in A.D. 70. The main shift of emphasis for Matthew comes in the trial of Jesus when blame is laid squarely on the shoulders of the Jewish people: the Romans could not be held responsible for the crucifixion of Jesus. Concludes Brandon: "Thus, motivated by the *Sitz im Leben* of the Christian community in Alexandria in the critical years following the fall of Jerusalem, Matthew was led to develop the Markan thesis, that Jesus had been innocent of sedition against Rome, into one more suited to the needs of his own church, namely, that of the pacific Christ who renounced all resort to armed force, whether human or angelic" (op. cit., 308). As Matthew, so Luke (written from Achaia some fifteen or twenty years after Mark). Although moved by different motives, he too was interested to emphasize the pacific character of Jesus. As shown by the Acts, he was concerned to present Christianity as a faith which the Gentiles welcomed and the Roman magistrates protected from Jewish malignity! However, he was not so near to the fall of Jerusalem as to feel threatened like Mark, and so recorded that one of Jesus' disciples was a Zealot and that Jesus allowed his disciples to arm themselves before going to Gethsemane. Yet from the very beginning of his Gospel, Luke sounds a note of peace, and his portrait of Jesus as pacific is not achieved by overt suppression of material but by utilizing such eirenic traditions as the parables of the Good Samaritan and the Prodigal Son, Jesus' rebuke to the disciples on their wanting to call down fire on the unwelcoming Samaritan villagers, his warning against the consequences of violence in the Tower of Siloam discourse, the sounding of the note of peace in the story of the triumphal entry to Jerusalem, and the lament over the city's coming fate.

Finally, John gives the definitive endorsement to the concept of the pacific Christ by recording the dominical pronouncement: "My kingship is not of this world; if my kingship were of this world, my servants would fight . . ." (Jn. 18:36–7, Brandon's rendering; op. cit, 318).

Brandon himself sums up the thesis as follows: "The authors of Matthew, Luke and John, each in his own way and for his own purpose, elaborated the Markan portrait of Jesus, as one innocent of sedition against Rome, into that of the pacific Christ, who taught his followers to love their enemies and rejected all resort to armed violence" (op. cit., 320).

It is important to note two things as we proceed to examine specific passages in the Gospels appealed to by Brandon, and often accepted uncritically by others: (i) acceptance of the thesis outlined above is crucial to his arguments; (ii) the thesis lacks support at many critical junctures (for a list of scholarly reviews, predominantly critical, see Martin Hengel, *Was Jesus a Revolutionist?*, 5 f.).

(b) *A Violent Jesus?* S. G. F. Brandon was by no means the first scholar to argue for an essentially violent revolutionary interpretation of Jesus' mission. He was preceded by Hermann Samuel Reimarus (*The Goal of Jesus and His Disciples*, published in German in 1778; ET ed., G. W. Buchanan, 1970; and also in *Fragments*, ed. C. H. Talbert translated by R. S. Fraser, 1971) and Robert Eisler (*Iēsous Basileus ou basileusas*, 1929–30). A summary of their combined findings gives us the following main points: Little evidence is to be found in the proclamation of Jesus, so the events of the last days in Jerusalem are pursued relentlessly. The impetus was given by Jesus' triumphal entry into Jerusalem, "a demonstration of Jesus' messiahship, carefully planned by him in advance" (Brandon) and thus a clear challenge to the leaders of the people and the Romans. An even greater provocation was the assault on the temple, in which he was assisted by the disciples and the masses, an assault attended by bloodshed and pillage. At the same time, apparently also at the instigation of Jesus, a Zealot revolt took place in the city, during which Barabbas and the "criminals" who were crucified with Jesus were taken into custody. True, Jesus could not remain in the temple and consequently withdrew with his disciples, but the farewell discourse, recorded in Lk. 22:36 ff., when Jesus urges his disciples: "Let him who has no sword sell his cloak and buy one", indicates that he reckoned with an armed confrontation. In Gethsemane, the disciples, surprised by their opponents, offered appropriate armed resistance, the extent of which can no longer be precisely determined. After a hearing before the Jewish authorities in which, above all, his attack on the temple and his messianic claims were discussed, Jesus was condemned to death by Pilate as a self-confessed "originator of sedition", for, according to all four Gospels, Jesus answered in the affirmative Pilate's enquiry as to whether or not he was the king of the Jews. Hence he merited the punishment of any resident of the provinces who might be convicted of insurrection, and accordingly suffered crucifixion, the most gruesome death known to antiquity, and that between two apparently Zealot criminals.

What can we say in reply? Let us look briefly at some selected passages.

(i) *The Cleansing of the Temple.* At this time in the history of Palestine there was stationed a Roman cohort of at least 500–600 men in the tower of Antonia to the north-west of the outer court of the Herodian temple. The precincts of the temple were easily accessible to the soldiers by way of a broad staircase connecting the An-

tonia tower and the temple. There is therefore no doubt that any considerable uproar would have led inevitably to intervention by Pilate, as he was not squeamish on such points. Moreover, it would not have been possible for Jesus to have thrown out all those who sold and the money-changers without a large contingent of troops and a corresponding general riot. The purpose of the cleansing is not our immediate concern but it is most likely that it was concerned with what Jesus considered the proper use of the temple courts; thus he revealed his theocentric concern. (Cf. M. Hengel, *Was Jesus a Revolutionist?*, 15–18; E. Schweizer, *The Good News according to Mark*, 1971, 230 ff.).

(ii) *The Arrest in Gethsemane.* Basically, the solitary sword-thrust in Gethsemane, as recorded in Mk. 14:47, is a sign that no meaningful, organized resistance of any kind was offered (Hengel, op. cit., 18 f.). Indeed, as Eduard Schweizer says: "It seems ... reasonable to understand this move as symbolic of Jesus' deliberate defenselessness since it was so ridiculously ineffective" (op. cit., 318). Furthermore, the disciples fled without being apprehended: Jesus alone stood trial. And for forty years until the Neronian persecution only the Jewish, and not the Roman, authorities opposed the spread of Christianity.

(iii) *The "Dagger" Sayings.* After the death of Jesus the disciples must no longer go out unequipped, without money, traveller's bag, or sandals, but rather with everything, including a sword (Lk. 22:35–8). There is a simple answer for those who appeal to this passage in support of violence. The dagger or short sword belonged to the Jewish traveller's equipment as protection against robbers and wild animals. Even the "peace-loving" Essenes took "weapons on account of robbers" when they journeyed (Josephus, *War* 2, 8, 4 [2, 125]). As for Eisler's wholly congenial interpretation of the disciples' reply "Lord, here are two swords", viz. "They answer by showing him – each of them, naturally – two swords", Alan Richardson (*The Political Christ*, 1973, 48) dismisses it as "absurd" with the remark: "Eleven men encumbered by a sword in each hand would soon have been despatched by the soldiers."

The second saying of Jesus concerning a dagger (or sword), "Do not think that I have come to bring peace on earth; I have not come to bring peace but a sword" (Matt. 10:34), is generally-speaking indisputably taken to mean that Jesus came not to bring peace but "division" – an interpretation given support by a translation variant of the original Aramaic (in Lk. 12:51), viz. *diamerismos*, meaning "division" or "conflict".

(iv) *The "Social" Sayings.* All the sayings of Jesus concerning poverty and riches – take for example the beatitude "Blessed are the poor ..." (Matt. 5:3; Lk. 6:20), the warning about riches and the kingdom (Mk. 10:17 ff.), the parables of the rich man and Lazarus (Lk. 16:19–31) and the rich farmer (Lk. 12:16–21) – although they attack the greed and corruption of riches, are best interpreted as directed towards man's attitude to riches and the attendant effect on a person's relationship with God. Jesus' teaching appears to be theocentric at this point and not addressed specifically to socio-ethical issues. In stark contrast was the teaching of Zealots who included a strong social component corresponding to the social message of the OT.

(v) *The Saying about Tribute Money.* The saying is a familiar one: "Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's" (Mk. 12:17).

Brandon believes that, as originally stated by Jesus, this saying was intended "to rule that the payment of tribute to Caesar was an act of disloyalty to Yahweh" (op. cit., 348). Once again he is in disagreement with most scholars. The method by which he comes to his conclusion is basically to be seen in the following three steps: (1) Mark has good apologetic reasons for depicting Jesus as being tested on the most vital issue in Roman-Jewish relations at the time – the question of paying the poll tax imposed since A.D. 6: he wants Jesus to endorse the payment of tribute to Rome; (2) therefore Mark introduces the Pharisees and Herodians "to entrap" Jesus (to support this point Brandon appeals to Bultmann who considered vv. 14–17 a unity, incidentally contra C. E. B. Cranfield, *The Gospel according to St Mark*, 1959, 369, who considers the whole passage comprising vv. 13–17 a unity); (3) every devout Jew had no doubt about what belonged to God, and the usual reason advanced by Zealots for not paying tribute money was that it meant giving to Caesar what belonged to God.

To go along with Brandon here would mean rejecting the consensus of scholarly opinion and, moreover, making the first sentence of the saying redundant.

A much more likely interpretation is that of Martin Hengel (op. cit., 33 ff.), supported by Eduard Schweizer (op. cit., 242–5) and at places by C. E. B. Cranfield (op. cit., 371 f.). First to be noted is that no Zealot would have taken in his hand a silver Roman denarius, as Jesus did. Secondly, if the conjunction *kai* is taken in its adversative sense, the saying is more satisfactorily translated: "Render to Caesar what belongs to Caesar, *but* to God what belongs to God." It then follows that, although conceding Caesar his due (like any other person entitled to the return of his property whether acquired justly or not), Jesus is saying that the second statement takes precedence over the first – everything belongs to God, he must be at the centre of our concern. Thereby, unlike Zealots and Apocalyptists, Jesus refuses to recognize separate spheres of "sacred" and "profane". He also refuses to give a ready-made answer, a fact which calls forth the following comment from Eduard Schweizer: "Ultimately, neither the Pharisees' truce with the Romans nor the rebellion of the Zealots, neither political conservatism nor revolution, is justified in every situation .... Jesus does not relieve man of the responsibility to choose.... Instead, he confronts him with God before whom man must decide" (op. cit., 244; → Tax).

(vi) *Jesus' Conscious Rejection of Violence.* In his temptation Jesus rejected outright the bringing in of the kingdom by means of political force (Matt. 4:1–11; Lk. 4:1–13). Similarly, in addressing his disciples on the subject of "position" in the kingdom he declared that, as he came to serve, so their authority must be exercised through service (Lk. 22:25–7 and parallels Mk. 10:42–5, Matt. 20:25–8; cf. Mk. 9:35; Lk. 9:48; 13:32 f.). Furthermore, in a society in which a Jew's friend was his neighbour, and an Essene's duty was to "love all the children of light ... and hate all the children of darkness", Jesus' command to turn the other cheek and to love one's enemies was a rejection of violence, to say the least (Matt. 5:38 ff.; Lk. 6:27 ff.).

4. *Jesus and Revolution.* If then we must reject the thesis that Jesus was a violent revolutionary, must we also reject the view that his message had social implications? I think not. Jesus was unmistakably a revolutionary for his time. It is evident both from what he said and from what he did. So often, in our efforts to redress the lost balance resulting from inadequate emphasis on atonement in some theologies, we have been pre-occupied with the death of Jesus to the almost total neglect of the significance of his life. Yet, if we examine his sayings and deeds we shall observe his

peculiar concern for the so-called "outsiders" or social outcasts of Palestine in his day.

(i) *Jesus and Sinners.* The Gospels are shot through with Jesus' unorthodox behaviour in eating and drinking with tax collectors and sinners. Numbered among his disciples were a tax collector and a Zealot (Lk. 5:27–32; 6:12–16); numbered among his friends and acquaintances were adulterers and robbers, for example Mary Magdalene and Zacchaeus (Matt. 26:6–13 and parallel Mk. 14:39, Lk. 19:1–10). Incidentally, no self-respecting Jewish nationalist would have any dealings with tax collectors who were denounced as traitors by the Zealots.

(ii) *Jesus and Foreigners.* In Jewish society both → Samaritans and → Greeks were considered outsiders and despised for racial and religious reasons. Jesus, on the other hand, was prepared to go out of his way to have dealings with both. He spoke to the Samaritan woman at the well (Jn. 4:1–42); he refused to call down fire from heaven on the unwelcoming Samaritan villagers (Lk. 9:51–6); and he singled out for commendation the "foreign" Samaritan leper (Lk. 17:11–19); and as if this were not enough, he told a parable in which the hero was a "good Samaritan" (Lk. 10:25–37). Likewise, he responded favourably to the request of the Syro-phoenician woman whose daughter was ill (Mk. 7:24–30 and parallels) and to the centurion whose servant was paralysed (Matt. 8:5–13). And again, incidentally, Zealots had a special loathing for the mixed-blooded Samaritans.

(iii) *Jesus and Women.* It is seldom realized what a blow Jesus dealt for the "liberation" of → women. To go out in public unveiled, to speak to men in the street, to initiate divorce proceedings – all of these and more were forbidden to women except in very exceptional circumstances. (Cf. Joachim Jeremias, "The Social Position of Women", in his *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus*, 1969, 359–76.) Jesus' teaching on divorce (Mk. 10:2–9; Matt. 5:31f.; 19:1–9), his relationship with women – the woman at the well of Samaria (Jn. 4:1–42), Mary and Martha and the "other women" (Jn. 11; 12:1–11; Lk. 23:26–31, 50–56) – are all examples of his flagrant flouting of convention and thus indicative of his sense of "justice and equality". When, on the issue of divorce, Jesus appealed to the Genesis creation narratives (Gen. 1, 2) it was to point out that man and woman were made in the image of God. It was not simply a question of whether or not divorce was possible but whether easy divorce such as that allowed by the school of Hillel was a basic infringement of human rights. "Male and female created he them", said Jesus, quoting Genesis 1:27.

(iv) *Jesus and the Needy.* The whole ministry of Jesus is an example of care for the sorrowful, the sick, and the suffering. He preached a whole gospel and he practised it: "For truly, I say to you, whoever gives you a cup of water to drink because you bear the name of Christ, will by no means lose his reward" (Mk. 9:41 par. Matt. 10:42).

5. *Conclusion.* If revolution has a habit of "devouring its children" and violence tends to breed violence there is reason enough, humanly speaking, for rejecting violent revolution, except in extreme circumstances. If, furthermore, having explored the subject of Jesus and revolution, we have come to the same conclusion as Hans Küng (*On Being a Christian*, 1976, 570): "No strategy of violence, but only one of non-violence, can be deduced from the example of Jesus Christ"; there is even more reason, theologically speaking, for rejecting violence. However, we would not be true, either to the example and teaching of Jesus Christ, or to the demands of a God of

justice and love, if we did not seek to advance the kingdom by recognizing the rule of God and by working for a more just and humane society. *M. Langley*

→ Fight, → Peace, → Present, → Zeal

On *polemos* etc.:
(a). F. E. Adcock, *The Greek and Macedonian Art of War*, 1957; R. H. Bainton, "The Early Church and War", *HTR* 39, 1946, 189–212; and *Christian Attitudes to War and Peace: A Historical Survey and Critical Re-evaluation*, 1960; K. Barth, *CD* III, 4, 450–70; M. Barth, *Ephesians*, *Anchor Bible*, I–II, 1974; O. Bauernfeind, *polemos, polemeō*, *TDNT* VI 502–15; *machomai* etc., *TDNT* IV 527 f.; and *strateuomai* etc., *TDNT* VI 701–13; C. J. Cadoux, *The Early Christian Attitude to War*, 1925[2]; H. von Campenhausen, "Christians and Military Service in the Early Church", in *Tradition and Life in the Church: Essays and Lectures in Church History*, 1968, 160–70; D. L. Christensen, *Transformations of the War Oracle in Old Testament Prophecy*, 1975; F. M. Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, 1973; "The Song of the Sea and Canaanite Myth", *Journal for Theology and the Church* 5, 1968, 1–25; and "The Divine Warrior in Israel's Early Cult", in A. Altman, ed., *Biblical Motifs*, 1966, 11–30; N. K. Gottwald, "Holy War in Deuteronomy", *Review and Expositor* 61, 1964, 296–310; and "War, Holy", *IDB Supplementary Volume*, 1976, 942 ff.; G. H. C. Macgregor, *The New Testament Basis of Pacifism*, 1953; P. D. Miller, *The Divine Warrior in Ancient Israel*, 1973; A. Oepke, *hoplon* etc., *TDNT* V 292–315; G. von Rad, *Studies in Deuteronomy*, *SBT* 9, 1953; *Deuteronomy*, 1966; R. Smend, *Yahweh, War and Tribal Confederacy*, 1970; L. E. Toombs, "War, Ideas of", *IDB* IV 791–801; Y. Yadin, *The Art of Warfare in Biblical Lands in the Light of Archaeological Study*, I–II, 1963; and *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness*, 1962.
(b). O. Betz, "Jesu heiliger Krieg", *NovT* 2, 1957, 116–37; W. Bienert, *Krieg, Kriegsdienst und Kriegsverweigerung*, 1952; E. Bilabel, "Strategos", Pauly-Wissowa, IVa, 183–252; W. Caspari, "Was stand im Buch der Kriege Jahwes", *ZWT* 54, 1912, 110–58; H. Fredriksson, *Jahweh als Krieger*, 1945; A. Fridrichsen, *Krig och Fred i Nya Testamentet*, *Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift* 3, 1940; H. Fuchs, *Antike Gedanken über Krieg und Frieden*, 1946; A. von Harnack, *Militia Christi*, 1905; P. Honigsheim, H.-J. Kraus, O. Michel, H. Gollwitzer and H. H. Schrey, "Krieg", *RGG*[3] IV 62–77; O. Kern, *Krieg und Kult bei den Hellenen, Rektoratsrede Halle*, 1915; H. Kruse, *Ethos Victoriae in Vetere Testamento*, 1951; J. Lasserre, *Der Krieg und das Evangelium*, 1956; M. Launey, *Recherches sur les Armées Helléniques*, I–II, 1949–50; J. Leipoldt, "Das Bild vom Kriege in der griechischen Welt", in *Gott und die Götter. Festgabe für Erich Fascher*, 1958, 16–30; D. Loenen, *Polemos. Een Studie over Oorlog in de Griekse Oudheid, Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde*, NR 16, 3, 1953; E. Müller, *Friedens- und Wehrbereitschaft der Christen*, 1956; W. F. Otto, *Die Götter Griechenlands*, 1947[3], 222–56; G. von Rad, *Der heilige Krieg im alten Israel*, *AThANT* 20, 1958[3]; A. Schlatter, *Die beiden Schwerte*, *BFChTh* 20, 6, 1916; W. Schwahn, "Strategos", Pauly-Wissowa, Supplement 6, 1071–1158; F. Schwally, *Semitische Kriegsaltertümer*, I, *Der heilige Krieg im alten Israel*, 1901; E. Seckel, *Über Krieg und Recht in Rom*, 1915; F. Stolz, *Jahwes und Israels Kriege*, *AThANT* 60, 1972; H. Trümpy, *Kriegerische Fachausdrücke im griechischen Epos*, (Dissertation, Basel) 1950; M. Weippert, "Heiliger Krieg in Israel und Assyrien", *ZAW* 84, 1972, 460–93; H. Windisch, *Der messianische Krieg und das Urchristentum*, 1909.
On *Jesus and Revolution*:
(a). R. Alves, *A Theology of Human Hope*, 1969; and *Tomorrow's Child*, 1972; H. Arendt, *On Revolution*, 1965; H. Assmann, *Practical Theology of Liberation*, 1976, U.S. edition *Theology for a Normal Church*, 1976; K. Barth, *The Church and the Political Problems of our Day*, 1939; and *CD* IV, 1–4, see index; L. Boff, "Salvation in Jesus Christ and the Process of Liberation", *Concilium* 6, 10, 1974, 78–91; J. M. Bonino, *Revolutionary Theology Comes of Age*, 1975, U.S. edition *Doing Theology in a Revolutionary Situation*, 1976; and *Christians and Marxists: The Mutual Challenge to Revolution, The London Lectures in Contemporary Christianity*, 1976; S. G. F. Brandon, *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church*, 1951; and *Jesus and the Zealots: A Study of the Political Factors in Primitive Christianity*, 1967; H. Camara, *Church and Colonialism*, 1969; E. Castro, *Amidst Revolution*, 1975; J. H. Cone, *A Black Theology of Liberation*, 1970; *Black Theology and Black Power*, 1969; and *God of the Oppressed*, 1975; O. E. Costas, *The Church and its Mission: A Shattering Critique from the Third World*, 1974; J. G. Davies, *Christians, Politics and Violent Revolution*, 1976; J. Ellul, *Hope in Time of Abandonment*, 1973; and *Violence: Reflections from a Christian Perspective*, 1970; F. Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth*, 1963; J. Ferguson, *The Politics of Love: The New Testa-*

ment and Non-Violent Revolution, n.d.; A. Fierro, *The Militant Gospel*, 1977; P. Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, 1970; S. Galilea, "Liberation as an Encounter with Politics and Contemplation", *Concilium* 6, 10, 1974, 19–33; J. Goldingay, "The Man of War and the Suffering Servant: The Old Testament and the Theology of Liberation", *TB* 27, 1976, 79–113; G. Gutiérrez, "Liberation, Theology and Proclamation", *Concilium* 6, 10, 1974, 55–77; M. Hengel, *Was Jesus a Revolutionist?*, 1971; *Victory over Violence*, 1973; and *Christ and Politics*, 1977; A. van den Heuvel, *These Rebellious Powers*, 1966; A. Holl, *Jesus in Bad Company*, 1972; A. Kee, *A Reader in Political Theology*, 1974; P. Lehmann, *The Transfiguration of Politics*, 1974; J. M. Lochman, "Ecumenical Theology of Revolution", *SJT* 21, 1968, 170–86; J. B. Metz, "The Church's Social Function in the Light of 'Political Theology' ", *Concilium* 6, 4, 1968, 3–11; and *Theology of the World*, 1969; J. Moltmann, *Theology of Hope*, 1964; *Hope and Planning*, 1971; *The Experiment Hope*, 1975; *The Crucified God; The Cross of Christ as the Foundation and Criticism of Christian Theology*, 1974; and *The Church in the Power of the Spirit*, 1977; B. Moore, ed., *Black Theology: The South African Voice*, 1973; J. Miranda, *Marx and the Bible: A Critique of the Philosophy of Oppression*, 1974; A. Richardson, *The Political Christ*, 1973; J. A. T. Robinson, *On Being a Christian in the World*, 1960; J. L. Segundo, "Capitalism – Socialism: A Theological Crux", *Concilium* 6, 10, 1974, 105–23; and *The Liberation of Theology*, 1976; J. R. W. Stott, *Christian Mission in the Modern World*, 1975, 15–34, 82–108; P. Tillich, *Love, Power and Justice*, 1967; J. H. Yoder, "Exodus and Exile: The Two Faces of Liberation", *Missionalia* 2, 1974, 29–41; and *The Politics of Jesus: Vicit Agnus Noster*, 1972.

(b). H. Assman, *Opresión-Liberación: Desafío a los Cristianos*, 1971; and *Teología desde la Praxis de la Liberación*, 1973; G. Gutiérrez, *Teología de la Liberación. Perspectivas*, 1971; M. Hengel, *Die Zeloten. Untersuchungen zur Freiheitsbewegung in der Zeit von Herodes I bis 70 nach Christi, Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Spätjudentums und des Urchristentums* 1, 1961; T. Rendtorff, *Theologie der Revolution. Analysen und Materialen*, 1968.

Water, Lake, Sea, Well, River

Resembling somewhat the ambivalence of → fire, which the ancients encountered as a beneficial force providing light and heat, but also as a deadly and consuming destructive power, water was regarded under the double aspect of life-bringing and thirst-quenching, on the one hand, and fearful and threatening on the other. It is, like fire, for the whole of the pagan and ancient world both the site and the accompanying manifestation of an epiphany of the High God and also the abode, vehicle and attribute of demonic powers. As the element of → demons, water – again like fire – could be employed in the ancient world in homoeopathic, apotropaic magic for purposes of healing or cultic purification: the baleful demons and defilers were put to flight by having their own weapons turned against them. In the Bible water (*hydōr*) is not only necessary to life. Special interest is attached to its natural manifested forms in rain (e.g. Lev. 26:4), sea (*thalassa*), spring (*pēgē*) and river (*potamos*). In the dreaded flood-catastrophe (*kataklysmos*), rainfall and rivers work together (e.g. Gen. 7:11 f.; Matt. 7:25, 27); the anti-demonic purificatory and medicinal water of lustrations (ablutions) is mostly the "living" (flowing) water of rivers and springs, more rarely the still water of cisterns and ponds.

θάλασσα	θάλασσα (*thalassa*), sea, lake.

CL *thalassa*, Attic *thalatta*, obviously identical with *dalancha*, which Hesychius hands down as a Macedonian word, appears to be of pre-Gk. origin. From Homer onwards (*Il.* 2, 294), it denotes in Gk. the ocean, the open sea. Attempts at

etymological clarification, such as a derivation from the root *dhala*, to deepen (cf. *thalamos*, haunt, lair) remain hypothetical.

OT In some 370 passages the LXX translates Heb. OT statements about the sea with the Gk. word *thalassa*; in by far the greater majority of cases (some 360 times) it corresponds with Heb. *yām*, sea. There is a particular accumulation of references in Exod. (36), Jos. (46), Pss. (39), Isa. (29) and Ezek. (55).

The OT linguistic usage does not differentiate between the open sea and inland lakes. The Mediterranean (e.g. Jos. 1:4; 19:26 LXX; Ezek. 48:28) and the Red Sea (Exod. 23:31; Num. 33:10 f.; Jdg. 11:16; 1 Ki. 9:26) are called *thalassa*, but so also are the Dead Sea (Gen. 14:3) and the Lake of Gennesaret, the Sea of Chenara (Chinnereth, Num. 34:11; Jos. 12:3; 13:27; cf. Matt. 4:18 par. Mk. 1:16), the Sea of Galilee.

1. (a) In accord with the general conception of the ancients, the OT pictures the earth as disc-shaped, surrounded by sea (Gen. 1:9) or water (→ *hydōr*). Itself a creation of God (Pss. 104[103]: 24 ff.; 146[145]:6; Neh. 9:6), water once covered the whole earth (Gen. 1:2; cf. Ps. 104[103]:6), but Yahweh drove it back and put it in check (Gen. 1:9 f.; Ps. 104[103]:7; Job 38:8 ff.). God has founded "his" earth firmly on the seas and rivers (Ps. 24[23]:2).

(b) Because of its relation to Chaos (Gen. 1:2, Gk. *abyssos*, the abyss, the underworld for Heb. *t'hôm*, primeval water, ocean; cf. Gen. 7:11; 8:2) the sea became the embodiment of the sphere of disaster. In the sea the power of water hostile to God and men opposes the people of Israel (cf. Jer. 51:42; Pss. 46[45]:3 f.; 65(64):8). The sea is the habitat of the → Dragon who is God's enemy (Job 7:82), and of the four demons in the form of beasts in Daniel's vision (Dan. 7; cf. Rev. 13:1).

(c) But the sea has to tremble before Yahweh (Hab. 3:8; Ps. 77[76]:17) who fights and vanquishes its demonic monsters, Leviathan and the Dragon (Isa. 27:1; 51:9 f.; Ps. 74[73]:13 f.). Yahweh is the Lord of the sea (cf. Isa. 50:2; Pss. 65[64]:8; 146[145]:6; Prov. 8:29; Job 9:8; 38:8–11; Neh. 9:6). God can command the annihilating flood to liberate the earth in judgment from a humanity which has lapsed into wickedness (Gen. 6–8). Indeed, Yahweh makes use of the sea in order to drown his enemies (Exod. 14:23, 28; 15:1, 4 f., 10, 21). Conversely, the pious man experiences Yahweh's help in dangers of water and → fire (Isa. 43:2; Ps. 66[65]:12), salvation by the hand of Yahweh "out of great waters" (Ps. 18[17]:17).

2. In the literature of Judaism, the sea retains its threatening rôle for men, only now demonic powers are named even more clearly as having command over the sea, partly on behalf of God (cf. Eth. Enoch 60:16; 61:10; 66:2; 69:22; Sl. Enoch 19:4; rabbinic examples in SB III 819 f.). The wave of the sea which sinks a ship is demonic, and the magical practices of a threatened seafarer are anti-demonic (Baba Bathra 73a; cf. SB I 490). By analogy with the victory of Yahweh over the sea, the power of chaos in primeval time (Sir. 43:23[25]; Man. 3 f.), Judaism expected the destruction of the might of the sea monsters (such as Leviathan, Eth. Enoch 60:7) by God in the final time, whereas the waters of the sea and rivers will rage against the godless (Wis. 5:22[23]).

NT The occurrences of *thalassa* in the NT are distributed very unevenly among the individual books. A profusion of references in Matt., Mk., Acts and Rev. contrast with only a very few in Lk., Jn. and the NT epistles.

1. In the NT, as in the OT and in Judaism (cf. SB I 184 f.), open sea and inland lake are not differentiated. The Mediterranean Sea (Acts 10:6, 32; 17:14; 27:30, 38, 40; 28:4) and the Red Sea (Acts 7:36; 1 Cor. 10:1; Heb. 11:29, each time with reference back to the OT → miracle of the crossing of the Red Sea; 1 Cor 10 is typologically interpreted with reference to → baptism) and the Sea of Galilee, the Lake of Gennesaret (Matt. 4:18 par. Mk. 1:16; Mk. 4:1, 35 ff.; cf. Matt. 13:1; 8:23; Lk. 5:1; 8:22; Matt. 8:32 par. Mk. 5:13, Lk. 8:33; Matt. 14:22–23 par. Mk. 6:45–52; Jn. 6:1, 16 ff.; 21:1) are all equally called *thalassa*. Only Lk. deliberately calls the Lake of Gennesaret a → *limnē*, an inland lake, which explains the small number of occurrences of *thalassa* in Lk. *thalassa* consistently means the Lake of Gennesaret in Mk. and the Matthean parallels, but the Mediterranean in Acts. An abundance of references to *thalassa* are provided for the Gospels by life on sea and lake alike (cf. Matt. 17:22 par. Mk. 9:42; and Matt. 23:15 or the parabolic language of Matt. 21:21 par. Mk. 11:23, Lk. 17:6).

2. The cosmological rôle of the sea is essentially the same as in the OT. God is the Creator of the tripartite world consisting of heaven, earth and sea (Acts 4:24; 14:15; Rev. 10:6; 14:7). The sea of glass, *thalassa hyalinē* (Rev. 4:6; 15:2; cf. Gen. 1:7; Pss. 104[103]:3; 148[147]:4; Sl. Enoch 3:3; Test. Levi 2:7; Jub. 2:4), is the transparent surface of the vault of heaven with the heavenly ocean which was thought to be the source of rain; the fire of this sea (Rev. 15:2) is the flashing lightnings of the heavenly thunderstorm, here probably understood as the introduction to the → judgment. (See further R. H. Charles, *The Revelation of St. John*, *ICC*, 1920, I, 117 f.; II, 34.) The scene of the victors standing on the heavenly sea recalls Israel's song of triumph over → Egypt by the Red Sea (Exod. 15).

3. In the NT, too, the sea threatens life (e.g. that of a seafarer, Acts 28:4; 2 Cor. 11:26) and so belongs on the side of the demonic (→ Demon) and that which opposes God. The Revelation of John, in particular, extends traditions of Jewish apocalyptic, in its conception of the sea as a personal power (Rev. 7:2 f.) which will be overcome in the last days, so that it, too, like Thanatos (→ death, art. *thanatos*) and Hades (→ Hell, art. *hādēs*), must surrender its dead (Rev. 20:13) and finally possess no more right to existence (Rev. 21:1). As in Jewish apocalyptic (cf. Dan. 7:3), so for Rev. the sea is the home of demonic monsters (Rev. 13:1; cf. the → dragon discharging water, Rev. 12:13 ff.). In the plagues of the final times, the water of the sea will be turned into → blood (8:8; 16:3; cf. the rivers and springs 8:10; 16:4); the plagues in → Egypt from the early days of the nation figure in the background here (cf. Exod. 7:14 ff.).

Lk. also passes on apocalyptic traditions when he (by contrast with the parallels Matt. 24 and Mk. 13) introduces the "roar and surge of the sea" (Lk. 21:25 NEB) amongst the eschatological powers of chaos.

4. Like the open sea, the "Sea" of Galilee is also controlled by demonic powers which, together with the storm (for the combination of sea and storm cf. also Jas. 1:6; Rev. 7:1; for the combination of river and storm, Matt. 7:25, 27), endeavour to destroy Jesus' disciples, but are obliged to obey Jesus' authoritative word in the stilling of the storm (Matt. 8:23–27 par. Mk. 4:35–51, Lk. 8:22–25). Jesus' walking on

the sea (Matt. 14:22–33 par. Mk. 6:45–52, Jn. 6:16–21) may also be understood as a victory over the demonic powers localized in the water (cf. also the drowning of the Gadarene swine in Matt. 8:32 par. Mk. 5:13, Lk. 8:33). The pericope also shows that, according to the NT conception, water is a specially favoured locality for a theophany. This may be compared with the calling of the first disciples at the Lake of Gennesaret (Matt. 4:18–22 par. Mk. 1:16–20; cf. Lk. 5:1–11; Jn. 1:35–51), and the story of the stater in the fish's mouth which is peculiar to Matt. (Matt. 17:24–27; → Tax).

5. There is evidently also symbolic meaning in the sea (Lk. *limnē*; Jn. *thalassa*) when Peter was given such a magnificent catch of fish (Lk. 5:1–11; Jn. 21:1–11). E. Hilgert sees it as symbolizing the apostle's mission-field ("Meer", *BHHW* II 1181). On the other hand, allegorizing speculations on the stilling of the storm (Matt. 8:23–27 par. Mk. 4:35–41, Lk. 8:22–25) as the world ruled by evil powers, and Jesus walking on the sea (Matt. 14:22–33 par. Mk. 6:42–52, Jn. 6:16–21) as death defeated by Christ (cf. Hilgert, ibid.) are misjudged. It is true only in general terms that Jesus' power means the end of the domination of demonic and Satanic powers (cf. Matt. 12:28 par. Lk. 11:20). *O. Böcher*

πηγή

πηγή (*pēgē*), spring, source; ποταμός (*potamos*), river, stream.

CL *pēgē*, current in Gk. from Homer onwards (e.g. *Il.* 20, 9) as a designation for the source of streams or rivers, has not yet been given any satisfactory etymological explanation. From Homer (e.g. *Il.* 21, 196) onwards, *potamos* denotes flowing water, primarily greater and, in certain cases, dangerous rivers or streams. Rivers, *potamoi*, rise from springs (*pēgai*, Eur., *Hercules Furens* 1297). *pēgē* can thus assume the general figurative meaning of source. Early on in popular Gk. belief, rivers and springs were personified as inferior divinities.

OT *pēgē*, spring, is the LXX rendering some 50 times for Heb. expressions which etymologically mean much the same as eye (*'ayin*, and the derivative *ma'yān*). This may be because springs were once regarded as the weeping eye of mother earth. In 14 places in the LXX *pēgē* corresponds with Heb. *māqôr* (twice in Lev., 4 times in Jer., twice in Pss., 4 times in Prov.), 3 times (Isa., Eccl.) with *mabbua'*, meaning spring, and twice (Pss.) with *'apîq* (originally river-bed, channel).

potamos, river, stands in the LXX 112 times for Heb. *nāhār*, stream, river, and 14 times (Dan.; Ezr.) for the corresponding Aram. word *nᵉhar*. In 54 passages *potamos* replaces Heb. *yᵉ'ōr* and *yᵉ'ôr* (equally meaning river) of which 27 alone are in Gen. and Exod.; Heb. *naḥal*, originally torrent-valley, wady, is rendered by *potamos* 9 times.

1. (a) For Israel rivers possessed special significance in geographical, political and civilizatory respects. Settlements were established by rivers; which were often bitterly fought over as boundaries and providers of water. The rivers most frequently called *potamoi* are the Nile (14 times alone in Exod; then e.g. Isa. 7:18; 19:5–8), the Euphrates (e.g. Isa. 7:20; 8:7; 11:15; 27:12; Ps. 72[71]:8), the Jordan (Num. 13:29;

cf. 2 Ki. 5:12), the Chebar (LXX *Chobar*, e.g. Ezek. 1:1, 3; 3:15, 23; 10:15, 20), or, more generally, the rivers of the Babylonian exile (Ps. 137[136]:1).

(b) Springs and rivers, together with the sea, belong to the mass of water created by God, on which he has founded the earth (Ps. 24[23]:2), and over which he rules as he wishes (Exod. 7; cf. Ps. 78[77]:44; Isa. 41:18; 42:15; 43:20; 44:27; 50:2; Pss. 74[73]:15; 107[106]:33). But if the rôle of the sea is qualified chiefly in negative terms, it is understandably different with the water of springs and rivers. Here the positive aspect predominates; fresh ("living") and sweet water makes human, animal and plant life possible, and so men see in it a gift of the deity. Yahweh causes the springs to flow, and men and beasts to quench their thirst (Ps. 104[103]:10 f.); the river of God waters the land and provides nourishment and prosperity (Ps. 65[64]:10). A wealth of water-springs denoted the fertility of an area (e.g. Exod. 15:27; Num. 33:9; Deut. 8:7), and important decisions were made at the well (*pēgē* or *phrear*: Heb. *b^{e}'ēr*), as in Gen. 24:11–18; 29:1–4; Exod. 2:15–21. Through bathing in the Jordan, Naaman was healed of his → leprosy (2 Ki. 5:1–19). Popular belief localized inferior divinities – originally the possessors and providers of the water – in springs and rivers. Later Israel ascribed such possession and provision to Yahweh (Gen. 16:7–14; 32:23–33). By the river Chebar the prophet Ezekiel received his call-vision (Ezek. 1:1 ff.) and message (Ezek. 3:15 ff.). As creations of Yahweh, rivers are summoned to join in praising their Creator (Ps. 98[97]:8).

(c) Several times in its history Israel had experience of Yahweh as the Lord of springs and rivers, and gratefully testified to these facts of its salvation-history (Ps. 66[65]:1, the miracle of the Red Sea and the crossing of the Jordan). In particular, the provision of water to drink for the generation in the wilderness from the spring in the rock (Exod. 17:5 f.) is the object of continually repeated praise (Pss. 74[73]:15; 78[77]:16; 105[104]:41; 114[113]:8). The hope of thirst-quenching water in plentiful abundance forms, by analogy, an essential component part of eschatological statements concerning the coming reign of peace (Isa. 12:3; 30:23–25; 35:7; 41:18; 49:10).

2. (a) Spring-water is also part of the OT conception of → Paradise. According to Gen. 2:10–14, the river which rises in Eden divides into the four branches of Pishon, Gihon, Hiddekel (the Tigris) and Euphrates. Since the last days are depicted in terms analogous to the original state (though of course auspiciously excelling it) the eschatological speculations of OT and Jewish literature attach themselves to this river in Eden. The eschatological river rising in the temple and banked by trees of life (Ezek. 47:1–12) serves for purification and irrigation (Joel 4:18 [EVV 3:18]; Zech. 13:1 f.; 14:8). Without direct reference to Gen. 2:10–14, there are prophecies in Isa. 12:3; 43:19–21; 44:3 (cf. Joel 3:1 [EVV 2:28]); 55:1; 58:11 (cf. Ezek. 47:1–12 and Joel 4:18 [EVV 3:18]) of the irrigating and thirst-quenching function of rainfalls, rivers and streams in the last days (cf. also Sir. 24:30–33 [40–46]; Eth. Enoch 48:1; 1QH 8:4–14). The prosperity of the last days will also surpass the garden of → paradise in respect of the plentiful supply of fresh water.

(b) The demonic and destructive power of water can also be ascribed to rivers. The life of the psalmist is threatened by stream and river-water (Pss. 18[17]:5; 124[123]:4 f.; cf. Ps. 69[68]:2 f., 15 f.); but here, as in the raging of the sea, the righteous man can expect the help of Yahweh (Ps. 18[17]:7; cf. Isa. 43:2).

3. Finally, there is the figurative use of spring and river to consider. God's bless-

ings flood his people and land like the irrigating river (Isa. 66:12), and the God-given peace of the righteous is like a peacefully flowing river (Isa. 48:18); Yahweh himself can be called a fountain of living water (Jer. 2:13), whereas the compassionate man can be compared with a well-watered garden and a never-failing spring of water (Isa. 58:11). Of course, God's wrath (LXX; the Heb. text reads God himself) comes "like a rushing stream" (*potamos biaios*) upon his enemies, sweeping them away with elemental power (Isa. 59:19).

pēgē, too, is used to mean source, in a substantially weakened sense, largely disconnected from the picture of water. Frequently encountered is the phrase *pēgē zōēs*, fountain of life; God is the source of life (Ps. 36[35]:10), but the Torah (teaching), understanding, wisdom and the fear of God are also a fountain of life (Prov. 10:11; 13:14; 14:27; 16:22; 18:4 LXX). For the prophetic identification of water and Spirit (Isa. 44:3; Ezek. 36:25–27) → *hydōr* OT 2.

NT In the NT by far the largest number of attestations of both *pēgē*, spring, and *potamos*, river, are found in Rev. (5 times and 8 times respectively). The Synoptic Gospels contain 6 instances of *potamos*. Mk. 5:29 (*pēgē* of the woman's haemorrhage) does not belong in this context. Jn.'s Gospel produces *pēgē* twice and *potamos* once. "Spring" appears once each in Jas. (3:11) and 2 Pet (2:17), and "river" once each in Acts (16:13) and 2 Cor. (11:26).

1. *potamos*, river, as a purely geographical designation, is found for the Jordan (Matt. 3:6 par. Mk. 1:5), the Euphrates (here already in the context of eschatological pictures of the future, Rev. 9:14; 16:12) and the little stream, the Angites, on whose banks there was the place of prayer in Philippi (Acts 16:13).

2. (a) As far as theological statements about springs and rivers are concerned, they are clearly dependent on the OT-Jewish background. God has not only created heaven, earth and sea but also the fountains of water (*pēgai hydatōn*, Rev. 14:7). God has full right of disposal over rivers and fountains of water, so that in the eschaton he can either in part or in whole revoke the blessing and gift of drinking-water (Rev. 8:10; 16:4; cf. 11:6 and Exod. 7:14–25) or cause rivers to dry up (Rev. 16:12; cf. Ps. 107[106]:33). Jesus reveals himself to the → Samaritan woman at Jacob's Well (*pēgē tou Iakōb*, Jn. 4:5 ff.). From the water in the well he refers her to the water of life which is eternally brimming over (Jn. 4:13 f.; → *hydōr*). The Jordan, celebrated from the Elisha tradition as having healing and purifying powers (2 Ki. 5:1–19) becomes the place for the prophetic symbolic action of the Baptist (Matt. 3:6 par. Mk. 1:5) and thus also the scene of Jesus' baptism (Matt. 3:13 par. Mk. 1:9) and God's self-revelation in Spirit and in Word (Matt. 3:16 par. Mk. 1:10 f., Lk. 3:22, Jn. 1:32 f.; cf. Ps. 2:7; Isa. 42:1).

(b) The experience of the dangerous threat to life caused by swollen rivers (Matt. 7:25, 27 par. Lk. 6:48 f.; cf. 2 Cor. 11:26) leads to regarding streams of water as the instrument of demonic powers (Rev. 12:15 f.). Here the hapax legomenon *potamophorētos*, swept away by a river, which is found in the papyri, is used to describe the dragon's intention to do away with the woman who has borne the male child who symbolizes the mother of Jesus and the church.

(c) Eschatological speculation, linking on to prophetic promises (Ezek. 47:1–12; Joel 4:18 [EVV 3:18]; Zech. 13:1 f.; 14:8), is naturally more interested in the healing character of the river which surpasses the river of → paradise in Gen. 2:10–14 and

will at the end of time both quench thirst and spread abroad life, salvation and purity (Rev. 22:1 f., 17; cf. 7:17; 21:6).

The throne of God and of the → Lamb (Rev. 22:1) takes over the place of the → temple of Ezek. 47:1 as the source of the river: God himself henceforth pours out in Christ the water of life (Rev. 21:6). Jn. 7:37 f. should be similarly understood (as in RSV mg. punctuation): "If anyone thirst, let him come to me, and let him who believes in me drink. As the scripture has said, 'Out of his heart shall flow rivers of living water.' " The scriptural word (Ezek. 47:1) is interpreted of Jesus (cf. also Isa. 44:3; 55:1; 58:11). This water of life quenches thirst for all time and, as a spring of life, flows out from the one who has previously drunk it (Jn. 4:13 f.).

(d) The literal meanings of the terms spring and stream have clearly been left behind long ago. Earlier prophecy had already used irrigation as a picture of an eschatological endowment of God's Spirit (Isa. 44:3; Ezek. 36:25–27). It is, therefore, not surprising that Jn. 7:39 expounds the streams of living water expressly in terms of the → Spirit, which passes from Jesus to those who believe in him. Traces of the OT identification of water and Spirit also remain when the NT compares heretics with waterless (2 Pet. 2:17) or salt springs (Jas. 3:11 f.): the heretics lack God's Spirit, since they are possessed by a false (brackish) devilish spirit (cf. 1 Jn. 4:1; Rev. 16:13).

O. Böcher

ὕδωρ

ὕδωρ (*hydōr*), water.

CL *hydōr* is attested from Homer (*Il.* 16, 385; *Od.* 3, 300) as a designation for water.

The word belongs to the common stock of Indo-European words: Eng. water, Ger. Wasser and Lat. *unda*, wave, are all cognates. The plur. *hydata* generally denotes in cl. Gk. the waters (of a river), only rarely (as in Rev. 11:6; 16:5) water generally.

OT *hydōr* is used some 460 times in the LXX to render Heb. *mayim*, water; twice (Exod. 15:8; Ps. 78[77]:16) *hydōr* represents the pl. part. (= streams) of Heb. *nāzal*, to flow. Over 100 instances are accounted for by the Pentateuch alone, and over 50 by the Pss.

1. (a) Water (drinking-water) is a vital necessity for men (for bread and water as basic presuppositions of human life see, e.g., Exod. 23:25; 1 Sam. 30:11 f.; 1 Ki. 18:4, 13) and cattle (e.g. Gen. 24:11–20; 30:38), but also for irrigating vegetation (for the high esteem of rain see Deut. 11:11; 1 Ki. 18:41–45). Therefore men think of the precious water as the beneficial gift of Yahweh. It is he who, according to the account of creation in Gen. 2:10–14, turned the previously dead earth into fertile land by means of surging spring-water (→ *pēgē*), just as it is precisely the abundance of water, indicated by the four-branched river of Paradise, which characterizes the orchard of Eden. From the period of the wandering in the wilderness Israel gratefully acknowledges Yahweh's miraculous provision of water (Exod. 17:5 f.) which is remembered again and again in paraenesis (e.g. Deut. 8:15; Ps. 78[77]:15 f.) and in songs of praise (e.g. Ps. 74[73]:15). As for the promise of the land (Num. 24:7; Deut. 8:7; 11:11), so for eschatological statements, abundance of sweet fresh water is of decisive significance (cf. Isa. 12:3; see the previous articles).

(b) At the same time *hydōr* is viewed under the negative demonic aspect of something threatening. In the roar of the sea and the waves of rushing rivers Israel discovered deadly powers of which God can make use when he causes the annihilating flood to cover his adversaries (cf. Gen. 6–8; Exod. 14 f.). Such a flood (*abyssos*) and so much water (*hydōr poly*) is synonymous with the kingdom of the dead (Ezek. 26:19 f.).

2. Not least for this reason, therefore, water (along with blood, oil and fire) is in the OT, as in the whole of the ancient world, the most preferable means of lustration (cf. homoeopathic magic). Ablutions (→ Baptism, art. *louō*; → Pure) are part of the consecration rules for → priests and → Levites before entering on their vocation (Exod. 29:4; Num. 8:5–22). In the cultic cleansing of the priest's hands and feet, water is used (Exod. 30:17 ff.; 40:30 ff.); similarly his lustration on the Day of Atonement (Lev. 16:4, 24; cf. 16:26, 28). After sexual discharge (Lev. 15; cf. Deut. 23:11 f.), after a birth (Lev. 12:1 ff.) and → leprosy (Lev. 14:8 f.; cf. 2 Ki. 5:10, 14) water-baths erased the impurity; and the defilement which had arisen through contact with corpses was removed with water to which had been added the ashes of the red heifer (Num. 19:11 f.). Judaism understood the flood (Gen. 6–8) as a comprehensive lustration for an earth contaminated by sexual wickedness. For the final future of their nation the prophets hoped for an eschatological sprinkling with God's purifying water which would cleanse both land and people, set idolatry aside and put a new Spirit in their hearts (Isa. 44:3; Ezek. 26:25 ff.; Zech. 13:1 f.). Here water has become a picture for the Spirit of Yahweh who brings cleansing and eradicates wickedness.

3. The prophetic spiritualization of cleansing continued in Hellenistic and apocalyptic Judaism. Philo and Josephus interpret purification by water as a symbol for the purification of the soul and the conscience (cf. Philo, *Vit. Mos.* 2, 138), and the Essenes, with all their strictness in cathartic observance (cf. Josephus, *War* 2, 129 and 149), stress the superiority of the converted way of life to the lustral water-bath (1QS 3:4–12; cf. 4:21 f.; 5:13 f.; cf. L. Goppelt, *TDNT* VIII 321). By contrast, the Pharisees and their disciples built up the OT prescriptions of Lev. 11–15 into a complicated system of ritual lustrations (cf. the Mishnah tractates Tohoroth, Mikwaoth, Niddah), which has retained its validity in orthodox Judaism right up to the present day.

NT The NT offers more than 70 attestations for *hydōr*, water. The word occurs with particular frequency in the Johannine literature (20 times in the Gospel, twice in 1 Jn., 17 times in Rev.), in greater number than in the whole of the rest of the NT. *hydōr* is not infrequently found connected with → *pēgē*, spring (e.g. *pēgai hydatōn*, fountains of water, Rev. 8:10 ff.; 14:7; 16:4) or *potamos*, river (cf. Rev. 12:15; 22:1) and can also be used synonymously with → *thalassa*, sea (cf. Mk. 4:39, 41 par. Lk. 8:24 f.).

1. (a) The NT essentially reflects the OT findings. Drinking-water is still as ever a highly-treasured commodity (Mk. 9:41; cf. Matt. 10:42 *v.l.*; Lk. 16:24). Giving a drink to the thirsty, therefore, counts as a work of particular compassion (Matt. 25:35, 42). The use of water for secular cleaning is also attested (Lk. 7:44; cf. Jn. 13:5). The preciousness of water and its vital necessity for life suggest various pictorial usages of the word (Jn. 4:7, 13 f.; Rev. 7:17).

(b) That God also created water is no less obvious in the NT than it was in the OT, even if express considerations on the subject are lacking. Nevertheless, Rev. 14:7, after mentioning heaven, earth and sea, also names the fountains of water as God's creation, and 2 Pet. represents OT cosmology (cf. Gen. 1:2, 6, 9; Ps. 24[23]:2). Heaven and earth derived their existence, through God's word, from water and by water, until the then-existing world perished in the waters of the flood.

(c) As in Judaism, angelic or demonic powers shelter under the waters (Rev. 16:5, *angelos tōn hydatōn*, the angel of the waters). The healing power of individual springs or pools is the gift of these supernatural beings (Jn. 5:4, 7). The picture of many waters, *hydata polla*, is the seer's description of the numinous power of heavenly voices (Rev. 1:5; 14:2; 19:6; cf. Ezek. 1:24; 43:2). The demon throws the possessed lad into fire and water in order to injure him (Matt. 17:15 par. Mk. 9:22), and the demons plunge into the water – as it were, their own original and particular element, drowning the animals in which they dwell at the same time (Matt. 8:32; cf. the par. Mk. 5:13, Lk. 8:33). The walking on the "sea" (Matt. 14:22–33 par. Mk. 6:45–52; Jn. 6:16–21, of Jesus) was for Peter a walk on the waters (*epi ta hydata*, Matt. 14:28–31). Peter's walk is recorded only in Matt. The Master allowed his disciple, in so far and so long as he maintained faith, to share in his victory over the demonic powers personified in the water and wind (Matt. 14:30).

2. (a) The significance of water as a Jewish means of lustration is also familiar in the NT (Jn. 2:6; cf. Mk. 14:13 par. Lk. 22:10). Water in particular serves for the ritual washing of the hands (Mk. 7:3 f.; → Pure) and vessels (Matt. 23:25 f. par. Lk. 11:39 f., Mk. 7:4). Pilate's symbolic washing of his hands is also in keeping with OT custom (Matt. 27:24 f.; cf. Deut. 21:6; Pss. 26[25]:6; 73[72]:13). The place of prayer near the river (Acts 16:13) may mean that ritual baptism was practised. The baptism of John (see *potamos* in art. → *pēgē*) carried out with the water of the Jordan (Matt. 3:13–17 par. Mk. 1:8 ff., Lk. 3:21, Jn. 1:26, 31, 33; Acts 1:5; 11:16), despite its ethical intention, retains formal affinities with the lustral dippings, especially the proselyte baptism of Judaism.

(b) Whereas Jesus absolved his disciples from the Pharisaic prescription of hand-washing before and after meals (Matt. 15:1–20 par. Mk. 7:2–23, Lk. 11:37–41; → Hand), and according to Jn. 2:1–11 even changed the water of Jewish purification into wine, the baptismal practice of John the Baptist found its continuation in Christian → baptism. It, too, takes place in water (Acts 8:36, 38 f.; 10:47), and its effect is still described as cleansing (Eph. 5:26; Heb. 10:22; cf. Acts 22:16; 1 Cor. 6:11). Prophetic eschatological hopes are thus fulfilled; the cleansed person receives God's → Spirit (cf. Acts 2:38; 1 Cor. 6:11; Heb. 6:4). Water (baptismal water) develops in the NT its greatest dignity, although of course no longer in the sense of a means of lustration, in 1 Cor. 10:1 f. where the Red Sea and, in 1 Pet. 3:20 f., the flood, appear as prototypes of the water of baptism. A magical understanding of the sacraments (cf. 1 Cor. 15:29) is expressly repudiated (cf. 2 Pet. 2:22), since baptism does not take place to eradicate fleshly impurities (1 Pet. 3:21).

(c) Instead, the Johannine literature in particular sees the decisive significance of baptism in its christological and pneumatic aspects. The pericope of the foot-washing (Jn. 13:1–20) has been understood as a disguised account of an institution of baptism by Jesus. "Blood and water" – Lord's Supper and Baptism – flow from Christ himself (Jn. 19:34; cf. 1 Jn. 5:6, 8). The → Lamb leads us (Rev. 7:17) to springs of

living water which rise from the throne of God and of the Lamb (Rev. 22:1, 17; cf. 21:6). Christ pours out this water (Jn. 4:10–15; 7:37 f.), which is God's Holy Spirit (Jn. 7:39). In this way Jewish eschatology reaches its goal; for all who believe and are baptized, the river of the water of life is already flowing now – free of charge (Rev. 21:6; 22:17). *O. Böcher*

κατακλυσμός — κατακλυσμός (*kataklysmos*), a deluge, flood.

CL This term was used after the time of Homer in both a literal and figurative sense to signify a deluge, and this meaning has survived into modern Greek. One doubtful occurrence in the papyri is possibly contained in a document written close to the time of Christ's birth.

OT The LXX employed *kataklysmos* in almost consistent reference to the Noachian flood (Gen. 6:17 etc.; Ps. 29[28]:10; Sir. 40:10; 44:17 ff.), but in Ps. 32[31]:6; Sir. 21:13; 39:22 the references are of a metaphorical nature. The two Hebrew words used for deluge were *mabbûl*, describing the Noachian flood in terms of the "waters above the earth", and then of the entire inundation, and *šeṭeṗ* (Ps. 32:6; Ps. 27:4, etc.; → Noah).

NT The word occurs four times only in the NT (Matt. 24:38 f.; Lk. 17:27; 2 Pet. 2:5) referring in each instance to the devastation of the Noachian deluge.
R. K. Harrison

Ἰορδάνης — Ἰορδάνης (*Iordanēs*), the river Jordan.

OT This was the Gk. name for the river which descended from Lake Huleh through the deepest rift-valley depression on earth. It was the principal river of Palestine, and outnumbered all others in the Near East in biblical references and allusions.

As found in the LXX, the name is the Greek equivalent of the MT *yardēn*, an Aramaic form derived from an earlier Canaanite *yardôn*. This latter evidently comprised the basis of the Egyptian *ya-ar-du-na*, which occurred in Nineteenth Dynasty lists. The meaning of the MT *yardēn* depends on whether it is considered Indo-Aryan or west Semitic in origin. If the former it would mean (perennial) river, but if the latter, descender, from the root *yrd*, to go down. Both of these meanings can be supported philologically. Of the OT incidents relating to the Jordan, its crossing by the Israelites was the most notable (Josh. 3:16). Its waters were also used in the miraculous healing of Naaman (2 Ki. 5:14).

NT In the NT, the celebrated river was the site of John the Baptist's ministry (Matt. 3:6; Mk. 1:5; Jn. 1:28; 3:26), and the place where Jesus was baptized (Matt. 3:13; Mk. 1:9; Lk. 4:1). Aside from references to Christ exercising his ministry on the far side of Jordan (Matt. 19:1; Mk. 10:1), and returning on one occasion to the site of his baptism (Jn. 10:40), there is no other NT passage which directly involves the Jordan in any events important for early Christianity. *R. K. Harrison*

λίμνη

λίμνη (*limnē*), lake.

CL Originally *limnē* probably described a salt-water marsh or a lagoon formed by the ocean. In Homer and elsewhere the term was used of a fresh- or salt-water pool or marsh, but in addition, Homer and other Greek poets used *limnē* of the sea. Gk. papyri from the 3rd century B.C. onwards employed the word in the more modest sense of lake.

OT *limnē* occurred occasionally in the LXX, as in Pss. 107[106]:35; 114[113]:8; Cant 7:4[5]; 1 Macc. 11:35; 2 Macc. 12:16. In the references in the Psalter the Hebrew word *'agam*, swamp, pool of reeds, was used, while *b'rēkâh*, pond (cf. Egypt. *brkt*, Lat. *piscina*) occurred in Cant. 7:5.

NT In the Lucan writings *limnē* was used of fresh-water lakes, being associated with the Sea (→ *thalassa*, so the references in Matt. and Mk.) of Galilee (Lk. 5:2; 8:22 ff.) and the Lake of Gennesaret (Lk. 5:1). Metaphorically, *limnē* occurs in Rev. 19:20; 20:10 ff.; 21:8, to describe the fiery lake of brimstone established for the destruction of the ungodly. *R. K. Harrison*

→ Baptism, → Fire, → Hand, → Pure

(a). B. W. Anderson, "Water", *IDB* IV 806–10; D. Baly, *The Geography of the Bible*, 1974 [2]; A. Büchler, "The Law of Purification in Mk. vii. 1–23", *ExpT* 21, 1909–10, 33–40; T. Canaan, "Water and the 'Water of Life' in Palestinian Superstition", *Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society* 9, 1929, 57–69; S. Cohen, "Jordan", *IDB* II 973–78; C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, 1953, 297–300; M. Eliade, *Patterns in Comparative Religion*, 1958, 188–215; *The Sacred and Profane: The Nature of Religion*, 1959; and *Birth and Rebirth: The Religious Meanings of Initiation in Human Culture*, 1958, reprinted as *Rites and Symbols of Initiation*, 1965; N. Glueck, *The River Jordan*, 1946; and "The Geography of the Jordan", *National Geographic Magazine* 86, 1944–45, 719–44; L. Goppelt, *hydōr*, *TDNT* VIII 314–33; L. H. Grollenberg, *Atlas of the Bible*, 1956; R. W. Hamilton, "Water Works", *IDB* IV 811–16; A. King, *Holy Waters: A Short Account of the Use of Water for Ceremonial and Purificatory Purposes in Pagan, Jewish and Christian Times*, 1926; W. Kornfeld, "Water", *EBT* III 961 ff.; J. J. McGovern, "The Waters of Death", *CBQ* 21, 1959, 350–58; H. G. May, "Some Cosmic Connotations of *MAYIM RABBÎM*, 'Many Waters' ", *JBL* 74, 1955, 9–21; K. H. Rengstorf, *potamos, potomophorētos, Iordanēs*, *TDNT* VI 595–623; J. A. T. Robinson, "The Significance of the Footwashing", in *Neotestamentica et Patristica. Eine Freundesgabe Herrn Professor Dr. Oscar Cullmann überreicht zu seinem 60. Geburtstag, Supplements to NovT* 6, 1962, 144 ff.; P. Wernberg-Møller, "Water, Wind and Fire (Lk. 3:16) and Orphic Initiation", *NTS* 3, 1956–57, 69–79.

(b). J. P. Audet, "La Soif, l'Eau et la Parole", *RB* 66, 1959, 379–86; G. Bertram, "Le Chemin sur les Eaux Consideré comme Motif de Salut dans la Piété Chrétienne Primitive", *Jubilé A. Loisy*, I, 1928, 137–66; O. Böcher, "Wasser und Geist", in O. Böcher and K. Haacker, eds., *Verborum Veritas*, Festschrift G. Stählin, 1970, 197 ff.; H. Bonnet, "Die Symbolik der Reinigungen im ägyptischen Kult", *Angelos* 1, 1925, 103–21; W. Brandt, *Die jüdischen Baptismen oder das religiöse Waschen und Baden im Judentum mit Einschluss des Judenchristentums*, *BZAW* 18, 1910; and *Jüdische Reinheitslehre und ihre Beschreibung in den Evangelien*, *BZAW* 19, 1910, 5–55; F. M. Braun, "L'Eau et l'Esprit", *Revue Thomiste* 49, 5–30; J. Chaine, "Cosmogonie aquatique et Conflagration finale d'après la Deuxième Épître de S. Pièrre", *RB* 46, 1937, 207–16; J. Daniélou, "Le Symbolisme de l'Eau Vive", *Revue des Sciences Religieuses* 32, 1958, 335–46; O. Eissfeldt, "Gott und das Meer in der Bibel", *Studia Orientalia J. Pedersen Dicata*, 1953, 76–84; H. Frisk, *Griechisch etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 1960 ff., I, 649; II, 525, 585, 957 f.; I. Goldziher, "Wasser als Dämonen abwehrendes Mittel", *ARW* 13, 1910, 20 ff.; H. Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, 1893; F. Hartung, "Das Wasser im alten und neuen Ägypten", *Naturwissenschaftliche Rundschau* 10, 1957, 373–78; A. Herrmann, "Der

Nil und die Christen", *Jahrbuch für Antike Christentum* 2, 1959, 30–69; M. L. Henry, "Meerungeheuer", *BHHW* II 1181; E. Hilgert, "Meer", *BHHW* II 1181; T. J. Jones, *Quellen, Brunnen und Zisternen im Alten Testament, Morgenländische Texte und Forschungen*, I, 6, 1928; O. Kaiser, *Die mythische Bedeutung des Meeres in Ägypten, Ugarit und Israel, BZAW* 78, (1959) 1962 [2]; E. R. Lange, "Quellen", *RGG* [3] V 734 f.; F. M. T. Liagre-Böhl, "Lebenswasser", *RGG* [3] IV 257 ff.; M. Ninck, *Die Bedeutung des Wassers in Kult und Leben der Alten*, 1921; H. Pfannenschmidt, *Das Weihwasser im heidnischen und christlichen Kultus*, 1869; E. Rácz, *Kultische Waschungen bei den Ägyptern und Juden und ihr Verhältnis zur urchristlichen Taufe mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Qumran-Sekte*, (Dissertation, Vienna) 1958; P. Reymond, *L'Eau, sa Vie, et sa Signification dans l'Ancien Testament, Supplements to VT* 6, 1958; and "Wasser", *RGG* [3] VI 1549 ff.; G. Spaltmann, *Das Wasser in den religiösen Anschauungen der Völker*, (Dissertation, Bonn) 1939; J. Thomas, *Le Mouvement Baptiste en Palestine et Syrie*, 1935; C. Westermann, *t[e]hôm*, *THAT* II 1026–31; R. Wolf, *Aqua Religiosa. Die religiöse Verwendung von Wasser im frühen Christentum und in seiner Umwelt*, (Dissertation, Leipzig) 1956; A. Wünsche, *Die Sagen vom Lebensbaum und Lebenswasser*, 1905.

Weakness, Sickness, Disease, Paralysis

Weakness is the opposite of → strength, and embraces the full range of physical, emotional, social, economic and even spiritual incapacity. All these notions can be expressed by the words of the *asthenēs* group. A particularly important part is played by bodily weakness, i.e. disease, which is dealt with in a separate article under the heading of *nosos*.

ἀσθένεια

ἀσθένεια (*astheneia*), weakness, sickness, disease, timidity; ἀσθενής (*asthenēs*), without strength, weak; ἀσθενέω (*astheneō*), to be powerless, weak; ἀσθενῶν (*asthenōn*), sick person.

CL This group of words is formed from its opposite *sthenos*, strength, with the *Alpha*-privative prefixed. It conveys the meaning of powerlessness, weakness, lack of strength, and includes particularly the vb. *astheneō* (Eur., Thuc.), the noun *astheneia* (Hdt., Thuc.) and the adj. *asthenēs* (Pindar, Hdt.). All three denote primarily bodily weakness, i.e. sickness (Hdt., 4, 135; cf. also Josephus, *War* 1, 76), and overlap here with the specific meaning of → *nosos*. In more general contexts, the *astheneia* word-group can be used in a wider sense as the opposite of *dynamis*, power (→ Might), or *ischyros*, strong, to express other sorts of weakness, e.g. the frailty of woman, the weakness of human nature (Plato, *Leges* 854a), or of human life (Hdt., 2, 47; 8, 51), but also economic weakness, i.e. lack of influence, or poverty (Hdt., 2, 88). Only rarely is it used for lack of conviction, moral weakness (Thuc., 2, 61, 2; Epictetus, *Dissertationes* 1, 8, 8; cf. Aristotle, *Eth. Nic.* 1150b 19).

OT 1. In the LXX *astheneō* and *asthenēs* are used to render a confusingly large number of Heb. equivalents; *astheneia* occurs only 7 times. In the Pentateuch *asthenēs* occurs only twice (Gen. 29:17, Leah's weak eyes; Num. 13:18, the question whether the inhabitants of Canaan are strong, *ischyroi*, or weak). The remaining historical books likewise use this group of words infrequently, and in very different contexts. The sense of sickness is not attested, and is found in other parts of the OT only very rarely (e.g. Dan. 8:27; cf. → *nosos*); but we do find the general meaning, human weakness (Jdg. 16:7, 11, 17). Jdg. 6:15 refers to the social insignificance of

Gideon's family; 2 Sam. 3:1 to the political weakness, of the house of Saul.

2. *astheneō* first acquires a specific character in the prophetic literature. Here it is used chiefly to translate verbal forms of the root *kāšal*, to stumble, stagger, while *astheneia* renders the corresponding noun *miḵšôl*, hindrance, stumbling-block (Jer. 6:21; 18:23). In prophetic texts the vb. is found chiefly in prophecies of → judgment, describing in a figurative sense the people which has rebelled against Yahweh and which will therefore stumble and fall (Hos. 4:5; 5:5; Jer. 6:21; 18:15). Frequently it is expressed in the future tense as an announcement of judgment to come: *asthenēsousin*, they will be weak, i.e. stumble, fall (e.g. Nah. 2:5; 3:3; Zeph. 1:3).

3. In the Pss. and in the Wisdom literature, *astheneō* is sometimes used as in the prophets to express the stumbling of the ungodly and of enemies (Pss. 9:3; 27[26]:2; 58[57]:7; 107[106]:12; cf. Job 28:4). On other occasions it expresses human poverty and human wretchedness (Pss. 6:2; 31[30]:10; 88[87]:9; 109[108]:24; cf. Job 4:4; Prov. 21:13; 22:22). It remains to be noted that Theodotion is clearly particularly fond of using *astheneō* (e.g. Dan. 11:14, 19, 33 ff., depicting the fate of wise and powerful men in the end-time). The fact that *astheneō* is used in the LXX to denote human stumbling, disaster, a sense which goes beyond the genuinely Gk. meaning of human weakness, is probably to be explained by the link-word in the translation, the Aram. *t^{e}qal*, which means both to stumble and to be weak (cf. G. Stählin *asthenēs*, *TDNT* I 490).

NT Broadly speaking, we may say that the *astheneia* word-group is found in its literal sense chiefly in the Synoptic Gospels and in Jn., whereas the figurative sense, resulting from theological reflection, occurs predominantly in the Pauline literature.

1. *asthenēs* is used in the general sense of weakness, when in 1 Pet. 3:7 women are spoken of as the weaker sex (cf. P. Lond. 971, 4), and when Paul's personal appearance in Corinth (2 Cor. 10:10) is described as weak. The general weakness of man is the subject of the epigrammatic saying in Matt. 26:41 par. Mk. 14:38, which is not to be understood in terms of Pauline theology, but rather of OT anthropology: "The spirit is willing, but the flesh is weak" (cf. 1QS 3:24 ff.; D. Hill, *Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings*, *Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series* 5, 1967, 242). Gal. 4:9 (cf. Arndt, 115) is probably also to be included in this category: the elemental spirits of the cosmos are here described as poor (or wretched) and weak, i.e. disarmed and therefore powerless (cf. Col. 2:14). Economic weakness in the sense of need, poverty, is meant in Acts 20:35: the wealthy are to take care of the needy, for "it is more blessed to give than to receive" (→ Poor; → Possessions).

2. The Gospels use the words in the great majority of cases in the specific sense of bodily weakness or sickness (e.g. Matt. 10:8; Lk. 13:11; Acts 9:37; Jn. 4:46). In this aspect, *astheneia* is identical in meaning to → *nosos*. The words of the *asthenēs* group are usually used absolutely; only occasionally is an explanatory *tēs sarkos*, of the flesh, added (Gal. 4:13). The present part. is also found as a noun; *asthenōn*, sick person (Jn. 5:7), usually in the plur. *asthenountes*, sick people (e.g. Mk. 6:56; Jn. 6:2).

3. In Paul, the terms in this group have undergone far-reaching theological reflection, and are developed in relation to man's sinful nature, to christology, and to ethics.

(a) In Rom. 6:19 *astheneia tēs sarkos*, weakness of the flesh, refers – as is made

clear by the phrase *anthrōpinon legō*, I speak as a man, in the context – to the natural weakness of → man (cf. R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, I, 1952, 232–39). Rom. 8:26 defines *astheneia* as human powerlessness over against God, needing the help of the Spirit's power (*dynamis*). 1 Cor. 15:43 extends these sayings about the nature of man to the → creation: weakness is made parallel to *phthora*, impermanence, while its opposite, the → might of God, is made parallel to *aphtharsia*, imperishability.

In Rom. 8:4 Paul develops the concept of weakness still further by bringing it into association with the → law: "For God has done what the law, weakened by the flesh, could not do." The basic relation between flesh, weakness and law is summed up in a sentence by O. Michel: "Man's inability to do what is good necessarily reveals a weakness also in the law" (*Der Brief an die Römer*, *KEK* 4, 1966 [13], 160). The epexegetic construction relating *ēsthenei*, it was weak, showed itself weak, to *adynaton*, impotent, makes it clear that Paul does not use weakness in the sense of a relative quantity, but of an absolute one: incapability (cf. the corresponding statements about the weakness of the law in Heb. 7:18). Paul's strongest formulation comes at Rom. 5:6, where he equates the *astheneis*, weak, with *hamartōloi*, sinners (v. 8, the same gen. absolute construction), and *asebeis* (v. 6), ungodly (cf. also Heb. 4:15 and 7:28, where weak, i.e. sinful, men are contrasted with the perfect Son).

(b) While, on the one hand, Paul points to *astheneia* as the sphere of impermanence in the created order, powerlessness of the law, and human incapability in the face of God, he introduces another train of thought in seeing it as the place where God's might is exhibited. In the course of arguing against his opponents in Corinth, for whom the cross of Christ is no longer of decisive importance, the apostle unfolds, as is well known, his *theologia crucis*, theology of the cross. In this context Paul interprets *astheneia* as the → suffering and → death of Christ and his disciples. Christ was crucified in (lit. from) weakness and in this Crucified One the weakness of God comes to light, which to men's eyes appears to be powerlessness and folly (1 Cor. 1:25, 27). Since, however, God has demonstrated his might in weakness, i.e. in the death of Christ, by raising him from the dead (2 Cor. 13:4), it is in the very sufferings of his followers that God's creative, life-giving power is revealed. Paul regards his own weakness, which is under severe attack from his opponents in Corinth, as a mark of discipleship and fellowship in Christ's sufferings (1 Cor. 2:2 f.; 4:10; 2 Cor. 13:4). At the same time the power (→ Might), *dynamis*, of God is at work in the weakness amid the conditions of suffering and alienation. Thus Paul arrives at the paradoxical statement that he would rather boast of his weakness (2 Cor. 11:30; 12:5, 9 f.; 13:9), for God's "power is made perfect in weakness" (2 Cor. 12:9; on Paul's thorn in the flesh → Fruit, art. *skolops*).

(c) In a third line of thought, in hortatory contexts, Paul distinguishes between the strong (Rom. 15:1, *dynatoi*) and the weak (Rom. 14:1, *asthenōn*, or plur. *asthenounte*s) in faith. In this context weakness does not mean either (a) human powerlessness when compared to God, or (b) the sufferings of Christ or his disciples. Rather (c) it follows from the direct use of the terms strong and weak, in the form of catchwords or familiar slogans that Paul is here taking up, which were used by the various groups within the churches of Corinth and Rome (cf. 1 Cor. 8:10; Rom. 14:1–15:13). The group known as the "weak" is characterized by a weak → conscience (*syneidēsis*, 1 Cor. 8:7), and has not yet reached a full knowledge of the faith

(1 Cor. 8:11). This is expressed in abstinence from meat and perhaps wine (Rom. 14:2), especially from meat offered to idols (1 Cor. 8:7), in observance of certain days (perhaps → sabbaths and fast days; Rom. 14:5), and also in certain ascetic and legalistic tendencies. The strong, on the other hand, have come to realize that nothing is unclean in itself (Rom. 14:14), since they know only one Lord, from whom all things come (1 Cor. 8:6). Hence, they will eat anything (Rom. 14:2), even meat offered to idols (1 Cor. 8:1), and they regard all days alike (Rom. 14:5). Although Paul regards himself as belonging to the "strong" group (1 Cor. 8:4; Rom. 14:14; 15:1), he does not in this case engage in further discussion of the content of the respective → knowledge (*gnōsis*) of the two groups, but stresses the importance of strong and weak living together in love (1 Cor. 8:1 ff.) before their common Lord (Rom. 14:6 ff). The important thing for the strong is that they should not place a stumbling-block (*proskomma*, 1 Cor. 8:9; Rom. 14:13, 20) in the way of the weak, nor cause them → offence (*skandalon*, Rom. 14:13), thus troubling their conscience (1 Cor. 8:13), leading them astray (1 Cor. 8:10; Rom. 14:23), causing them to fall (Rom. 14:21), and finally bringing about their ruin (1 Cor. 8:11; Rom. 14:21). The association of *astheneia* with *proskoptō*, to give offence, and *skandalizō*, to set up a stumbling-block, recalls the prophetic use of *astheneia* (cf. OT 2). Over and above the differences in knowledge between strong and weak, Paul sets the power uniting the two groups, → love. *H.-G. Link*

νόσος

νόσος (*nosos*), illness, sickness; *νοσέω* (*noseō*), to be ill, be ailing.

CL 1. The noun *nosos* (Homer) and the vb. *noseō* (Aesch., Hdt.) carry primarily the concrete meaning of illness (e.g. Homer, *Od.* 9, 411; Hdt. 1, 22; Hesiod, *Works* 92; cf. also → *malakia*, softness), and to be ill (e.g. Hdt., 1, 105; 3, 33; Plato, *Gorgias* 496a). *nosos* can be used specifically to mean calamity (Soph., *Antigone* 421; cf. also *mastix*, scourge, e.g. Homer, *Il.* 12, 37), torment (Hesiod, *Theogony* 527), addiction (Plato, *Theaetetus 169b*), lasciviousness (Eur., *Hippolytus* 765 f.), madness (Aesch., *Persae* 750). On the other hand, it can be used in a general sense or figuratively, e.g. for a plague afflicting a city (Plato, *Protagoras* 322d), chronic disease of the state (Plato, *Laws* 919c), weakness of character, depravity (so frequently in Philo). The later and rarer noun *nosēma* (tragic poets and Thuc.) can be used both in literal and transferred senses (e.g. Plato, *Gorgias* 480b) as a synonym for *nosos*, and is found particularly often in the writings of Philo (but cf. also Josephus, *Ant.* 8, 45; *Ap.* 1, 282). *noseō* occurs more frequently than *nosos* in general contexts and in metaphorical expressions, e.g. to suffer from lack of education or wickedness (Eur., *Ion* 620; Xenophon, *Memorabilia* 3, 5, 18; Hdt. 5, 28), to be filled with a feverish longing for glory (Plutarch 2, 546 f.; cf. also Philo, *Leg. All.* 3, 211; Josephus, *Ant.* 16, 244; 18, 25).

2. With their prescientific mythical view of the world, the Greeks drew the analogical conclusion that visible diseases were to be attributed to the attacks of invisible deities (e.g. Homer, *Il.* 1, 9 ff.), whose wrath they sought to appease by means of sacrifice and similar ritual practices (cf. Diog. Laert. 1, 110, 3). This conclusion was modified by critical reflection on the part of the philosophers, who explained dis-

ease in anthropological terms: the outward (accidental) disease corresponds to an inward (substantial) → suffering (*pathos*), which consists of ignorance (*agnoia*) (Plato, *Republic* 10, 609c ff.; *Sophista* 228a). Medicinal therapy and philosophical instruction and virtue are thus closely related (cf. → Heal, art. *iaomai*).

OT 1. In the LXX *nosos* occurs surprisingly seldom (some 15 times), and *noseō* only 3 times. The thing signified, sickness and being ill, is rendered in the LXX rather more often by *malakia*, but chiefly by *arrōsteō* and the nouns *arrōstia* and *arrōstēma*, occasionally by *enochleō*, to molest, and → *astheneō*; in Amos 6:6 by *paschō*. The fact that the term illness is not found very frequently in the LXX may be due to the OT tendency to be concerned less with the general phenomenon than with its concrete manifestation (e.g. leprosy, *lepra* in the LXX, cf. Lev. 13 f.). Behind the above-mentioned Gk. terms there is most often a verbal or substantival form of the Heb. root *ḥālâh* (noun *ḥ°lî*), which in almost every case carries its literal, concrete meaning, and only rarely (e.g. Hos. 5:13) a figurative one. This observation enables us to see how difficult Israel found it to come to terms with the fact of disease: so difficult, that it was scarcely possible to rise to a figurative or spiritualized understanding of illness.

2. The OT view of sickness fits first and foremost into the pattern of the general understanding of disease in the ancient orient. Thus in the OT disease, like sexual discharges, and death, belongs to the sphere of the unclean (→ Pure, art. *katharos* OT). When healing takes place, there has to be a corresponding purificatory rite (cf. the treatment of lepers, Lev. 13 f.; Lk. 17:12). There is a further link, for example, with the Babylonian penitential Psalms (cf. A. Oepke, *nosos*, *TDNT* IV 1093 f.), in that sin and disease are brought into causal relation with each other (Pss. 32[31]:1 ff.; 38[37]:3 ff.; 41[40]:4; 107[106]:17 ff.; cf. G. von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, I, 272–89). The prophets compare Israel in his sin to a man who is mortally ill (Isa. 1:5 f.; Jer. 30:12 f.; Hos. 5:13). Sin and disease are very nearly inseparable as a condition outside of salvation (cf. A. Oepke, *TDNT* IV 1093). This recognition that even disease is ordained, or at least permitted, by Yahweh leads the OT believer to see disease as a divine judgment upon sin (2 Sam. 12:15 ff.; 24:10 ff.; Pss. 39[38]:9, 12; 88[87]:7 f., 15 ff.). Recovery, on the other hand, leads to thanksgiving for the forgiveness of sin (Isa. 38:17; Ps. 103[102]:3; cf. → Heal, art. *iaomai*).

The subject of Job's complaints is the problem why the righteous have to suffer disease and pain. Job's rebellion against the retribution theory of his friends demonstrates the limitations of the view of disease and sin as causally related, a view which could not remain the final answer.

3. In Judaism the dogma of retributive suffering reaches its most consistent extreme (cf. Jn. 9:2). From the effect, conclusions are drawn as to the cause. The rabbis were able to name the sin which corresponded to every disease, a teaching which led to grotesque and absurd theories, such as regarding the sin of the embryo in the womb as a cause of illness (SB II 193 ff., 527 ff.).

At the same time, however, the Jews developed the concept of discipline imposed out of love; and with this came encouragement to visit the sick, to pray for them, and to help them, since God is especially near to those who are ill (SB I 495; IV 573 ff.).

NT 1. In the NT *nosos* and the other words normally used to describe sickness (cf. OT 1) occur almost exclusively in the Gospels and Acts. Whereas *nosos* is found only in the literal sense, the single occurrence of *noseō* (1 Tim. 6:4) has a figurative meaning. The NT thus retains the realism of the OT: the problem of disease is primarily that which concerns its concrete manifestations. Other elements taken over from the OT view are the idea of the influence of demonic powers (Lk. 13:11, 16; 2 Cor. 12:7; Acts 12:23; Rev. 16:2), and the connexion between disease and sin (Jn. 5:14; 1 Cor. 11:30).

2. Although sickness is viewed occasionally in the NT as a divine punishment or judgment (Jn. 5:4, *nosēma*, though the best MSS omit this verse; 1 Cor. 11:32; Rev. 6:8; cf. → Death), the NT also contains the Gk. concept, familiar to the rabbis, of beneficial chastening resulting from God's love (Heb. 12:4 ff., *mastigoō*, to chasten, and *paideia*, discipline, chastening; cf. Prov. 3:11 f.). The primary insight of the NT, however, is that disease and disease-bringing demons, even if they are permitted to act by God (Acts 12:23; 2 Cor. 12:7 ff.), have to do with the power of hostile forces which oppose the rule of God (Mk. 1:23 f.; 3:27). Jesus' fight against disease accords with this. On the one hand, he breaks through the terrible connexion of sin and disease (Mk. 2:5 ff.) by his assurance of → forgiveness; on the other, he brings in the dawn of God's kingdom by casting out demons and healing the sick (Mk. 5:1 ff.; especially Lk. 11:20; cf. → Heal, art. *iaomai* NT).

3. (a) In Matt. 9:12f. par. Mk. 2:17, Lk. 5:31, sinners (*hamartōloi*) are described figuratively as the sick (*kakōs echontes*) (cf. Isa. 1:5 f.). Jesus' commission in coming to the earth (*ēlthon*, "I came") is to transform the plight of man which expresses itself in sin and disease, by his call to repentance and his works of healing, into the salvation which belongs to God's kingdom.

(b) Matt. 8:17 takes up Isa. 53:4, summing up Jesus' work of healing in the sentence: "He took our illnesses [*astheneias*] and bore our diseases [*nosous*]." Matt. interprets this verse as referring not to the suffering of disease by the Servant, or Jesus, but to the removal of disease by the power of Jesus (cf. H. J. Held in G. Bornkamm, G. Barth and H. J. Held, *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew*, 1963, 171 f.). K. Stendahl holds that Matt. himself translated the Heb. of Isa. 53:4 literally (*The School of St Matthew and its Use of the Old Testament*, 1954, 106 f.). As R. H. Gundry points out, for both the prophet and the evangelist sin was the root cause of disease (*The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel, Supplements to NovT* 18, 1967, 230).

(c) In Jn. 9:2 ff. the Jews' question about the cause of the man's blindness is dismissed as inappropriate, and replaced by an indication of the purpose of the disease: the blind man was not blind from birth because he or his parents sinned, but rather "that the works of God might be manifest" (cf. Jn. 11:4; Lk. 13:1 ff.).

(d) Paul regards his infirmity (Gal. 4:13 f.; 2 Cor. 12:7 ff.) which has been interpreted as some form of epileptic or hysterical attacks (cf. H. Schlier, *Der Brief an die Galater*, *KEK* 7, 1971[14], 211; but → Fruit, art. *skolops* NT on his "thorn in the flesh"), along with persecutions and other troubles (cf. 2 Cor. 11:23 ff.), as part of the → suffering laid upon the followers of Christ (cf. 2 Cor. 1:5 ff.), in which by a dialectic process God's power becomes apparent: "For when I am weak, then I am strong" (2 Cor. 12:10; → *astheneia*, NT 3 (b)).

(e) The use of *noseō* in 1 Tim. 6:4 corresponds to the Hellenistic use of the vb.

Craving for controversy and disputes about words point to a sick condition in the inner man (cf. Plato, Philo; see above, CL). The comparison of the spreading nature of false teaching with the progress of a cancerous tumour (2 Tim. 2:17) likewise belongs to the realm of Hellenistic thought. *H.-G. Link*

μαλακία — *μαλακία* (*malakia*), weakness, softness, sickness.

CL In the cl. authors the term originally meant softness, but it also came to be used of effeminate men. In the medical writers it described generalized weakness or illness. Late Greek usage connected it with *nosos*, disease, to indicate bodily sickness.

OT *malakia* occurs in the LXX as a general term for sickness (cf. Deut. 7:15; 28:61; Isa. 38:9; 53:3), and was represented by several Heb. words as follows: *'āsôn*, serious accident; *maḥ^{a}lâh, maḥ^{a}luyîm*, disease(s); *taḥ^{a}lû'îm*, ailments; *ḥ^{o}lî*, weakness, sickness, serious illness; *maḵ'ôḇ*, pain. References such as Deut. 7:15 emphasize the punitive function of illness, but this view was modified in the work of the divine Servant (MT Isa. 53:4) who bore our diseases and carried our pains. If this is a foreshadowing of the vicarious atonement of Christ on Calvary, as the traditional Christian interpretation of that passage has maintained, it indicates that divine healing is an integral part of his saving work (cf. Matt. 8:17; → *nosos* NT 3 (b)).

NT The term is found 3 times only in the NT (Matt. 4:23; 9:35; 10:1) in the sense of weakness or sickness. The healing of the physical conditions involved was for Matt. an important feature of the Gospel of the kingdom. He also associated *malakia* with *nosos* to describe illness in a comprehensive manner. *R. K. Harrison*

παραλυτικός — *παραλυτικός* (*paralytikos*), paralytic.

CL This word was seldom used in secular Gk., and appears only once in the papyri. Where paralytic disability was being described, medical authors such as Hippocrates and Galen preferred the more technical term *paralelymenos*, a word used also by Luke (5:18, 24; Acts 8:7; 9:33). The kind of paresis indicated by these references is uncertain, but the passive form of the verb *paralyō* suggests a chronic condition with concomitant organic degeneration.

OT *paralytikos* does not occur in the LXX, the nearest approximation to the condition being conveyed by the verb *xērainō*, to dry up, shrivel, wither, as in the account of Jeroboam's paralysis (LXX 1 Ki. 13:4). The MT equivalent of this was *yāḇēš*, to become dry, wither.

NT In the NT, *paralytikos* as descriptive of one form or another of paresis occurs only in the first two Gospels (Matt. 4:24; 8:6; 9:2, 6; Mk. 2:3 ff.). In Matt. 8:6; (cf. Lk. 7:1 ff.) the paralysis may have been that described by Landry, in which the disability commences in the legs and proceeds quickly to the arms and neck, generally terminating fatally within three weeks. The paralysis of Matt. 9:2 (cf. Mk.

2:3 ff.; Lk. 5:18 ff.) was probably an instance of paraplegia, in which the paralysis affected the lower half of the person's body. *R. K. Harrison*

→ Blind, → Deaf, → Ecstasy, → Fruit, art. *skolops*, → Heal, → Lame, → Leper, → Offence

(a). G. Bornkamm, G. Barth and H. J. Held, *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew*, 1963; C. J. Brim, *Medicine in the Bible*, 1936; R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, I, 1952, 232–39; R. K. Harrison, "Disease", *IDB* I 847–54; and "The Christian Interpretation of Disease", *The Churchman* 62, 1953, 220–27; L. Köhler, *Hebrew Man*, 1956, 46–60; F. MacNutt, *Healing*, 1974; F. Mussner, "Sickness", *EBT* III 846 f.; H. P. Newsholme, *Health, Disease and Integration*, 1929; A. Oepke, *nosos* etc., *TDNT* IV 1091–98; J. C. Peddie, *The Forgotten Talent*, 1961; W. Schmithals, *Gnosticism in Corinth*, 1971; A. R. Short, *The Bible and Modern Medicine*, 1953, 47–123; C. R. Smith, *A Physician Examines the Bible*, 1950; G. Stählin, *asthenēs* etc., *TDNT* I 490–93; R. R. Willcox, "Venereal Disease in the Bible", *British Journal of Venereal Disease* 25, 1949, 28 ff.; H. W. Wolff, *Anthropology of the Old Testament*, 1974.
(b). H. Doebert, *Das Charisma der Krankenheilung*, 1960; K. F. Euler, *Die Verkündigung vom leidenden Gottesknecht aus Jesaja 53 in der griechischen Bibel*, 1934; F. Fenner, *Die Krankheit im Neuen Testament*, 1930; H. Greeven, *Krankheit und Heilung nach dem Neuen Testament*, 1948; E. Güttgemanns, *Der leidende Apostel und sein Herr*, *FRLANT* 90, 1966; E. Haenchen, *Der Weg Jesu*, (1966) 1968²; J. Hempel, " 'Ich bin der Herr dein Arzt' (Exod. 15:26)", *TLZ* 82, 1957, 809–26; "Heilung als Symbol und Wirklichkeit im biblischen Schrifttum", *Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philosophisch-historische Klasse*, 1958, 3, 237–314; J. Köberle, *Sünde und Gnade im religiösen Leben des Volkes Israel bis auf Christum*, 1905; A. Lods, *Les Idées des Israélites sur la Maladie, ses Causes et ses Remèdes*, *BZAW* 41, 1925; J. Preuss, *Biblisch-talmudische Medizin*, 1911; M. Rauer, *Die "Schwachen" in Korinth und Rom nach den Paulusbriefen*, *BSt* 21, 2/3, 1923; J. Scharbert, *Der Schmerz im Alten Testament*, 1955; F. J. Schierse, "Hat Krankheit einen Sinn?", *Stimmen der Zeit* 84, 1959, 241–55; E. Stiglmayr, N. H. Søe, D. Rössler, "Krankheit", *RGG*³ IV 36 ff.; G. Uhlhorn, *Die christliche Liebestätigkeit in der alten Kirche*, 1882.

Weather

ἀστραπή

ἀστραπή (*astrapē*), lightning; *ἄνεμος* (*anemos*), wind; *βρέχω* (*brechō*), to rain; *βροχή* (*brochē*), rain; *βροντή* (*brontē*), thunder; *εὐδία* (*eudia*), fair weather, a good day; *ἶρις* (*iris*), rainbow; *λαῖλαψ* (*lailaps*), a tempestuous wind; *νεφέλη* (*nephelē*), cloud; *νότος* (*notos*), south wind; *ὄμβρος* (*ombros*), rain storm; *ὁμίχλη* (*homichlē*), mist, fog; *ὄψιμος* (*opsimos*), late (rain); *πρόϊμος* (proïmos), early (rain); *ῥιπίζω* (*rhipizō*), blow; *ὑετός* (*hyetos*), heavy shower; *χάλαζα* (*chalaza*), hail; *χιών* (*chiōn*), snow.

CL & OT In neither Greek nor Hebrew is there a word corresponding to our word "weather", but the ancients used a variety of terms with which they discussed aspects of weather and clearly some of those aspects mattered to them very much. To the Greeks weather appeared as a secular phenomenon and we miss the thought so typical of the OT that God uses the weather to bring about his purposes. This is not to say that the Greek gods did not make use of meteorological phenomena. They did. They might use clouds for concealment when watching a battle here on earth or when making love on a mountain top, or they might use them as chariots. Sometimes meteorological phenomena are personified as with Iris ("rainbow") the messenger goddess, or Nephele ("cloud"), mother of the Centaurs.

But there is much more than this in the OT. There God makes constant use of the

weather to set forward his purposes. An instructive example is Deut. 11:13 ff. where Yahweh says that if the people love him and serve him well he will give them rain, both the early and the latter rain to yield crops and pasturage, whereas if they worship other gods he will withhold rain, the land will give no fruit and they will perish. This link between the people's religious life and the weather is often found. Great deliverances like that under Deborah and Barak are due to storms (Jdg. 5:20 f.; cf. the hailstones of Jos. 10:11). The Psalmist sums it up with, "fire and hail, snow and frost, stormy wind fulfilling his command!" (Ps. 148:8). Meteorological phenomena such as clouds are associated with theophanies, as when the Lord said to Moses, "Lo, I am coming to you in a thick cloud" (Exod. 19:9; cf. Exod. 24:16; 34:5; Lev. 16:2; Ps. 97:2). God makes the clouds his chariot and the winds his messengers (Ps. 104:3 f.). Isaiah sees him as riding on a swift cloud (Isa. 19:1) and Joel speaks of the coming great "day of the LORD" as "a day of clouds and thick darkness" (Joel 2:2; → Present, art. *hēmera*). The lightning is his weapon (2 Sam. 22:15; Ps. 144:6) and the thunder his voice (Job 37:5; cf. Pss. 77:18; 104:7). He is often pictured as sending the wind or using it, as the east wind that brought up the locusts upon Egypt (Exod. 10:13) and the west wind that blew them away (Exod. 10:19), the wind that caused the Egyptians to be drowned (Exod. 15:10), and the wind that brought up the quails (Num. 11:31). He flew on "the wings of the wind" (Ps. 18:10), and used the east wind to break the ships of Tarshish (Ps. 48:7). Wind is the instrument of his wrath (Ezek. 13:13). Rain was vital to the life of the people of Palestine and when it came, God had sent it (Lev. 26:4; 1 Ki. 17:14; Ps. 68:9; Jer. 5:24). When the people sinned he sometimes withheld it (Amos 4:7; 1 Ki. 8:35). The OT is full of the thought that God is ceaselessly active and often he uses the weather to set forward his purpose.

NT 1. The word *astrapē* means "lightning", but it is also used of a beam of light. It has classical use, but Moulton and Milligan can cite it only in a magical papyrus. In the OT lightning is God's weapon, and it brilliantly lightens up the world (Ps. 77:18), or it may be connected with rain (Jer. 10:13). In the NT it denotes the suddenness and the visibility of the coming of the Son of man (Matt. 24:27; Lk. 17:24) and occurs in comparisons as when Satan's fall (Lk. 10:18) or an angel's countenance (Matt. 28:3) is likened to it. Once a lamp is said to give light with its *astrapē* (Lk. 11:36). There are four occurrences of the term in Revelation (4:5; 8:5; 11:19; 16:18) and each time it is linked with other phenomena; in all four with voices and thunders, in two with an earthquake as well (8:5; 16:18), and once with an earthquake and hail (11:19). One of these expressions comes at the end of each of the three great series of judgments, the seals (8:5), the trumpets (11:19) and the bowls (16:18), so they have some connexion with the climax and with God as Judge (cf. the connexion with God in the OT). The God who is supreme over the forces of nature is the God who judges men. There are some resemblances to the accounts of the plagues in Egypt and this may be meant to bring out the truth that God has judged great nations before. He will surely do it again.

2. The normal use of the term *anemos* is for the winds that blow on the earth, whether this be in the Greek writings generally, in the OT or the NT. This is far and away the most common use of *anemos* in the NT as for the storms that beat against the houses built on rock and on sand (Matt. 7:25, 27 and parallels) or the great storm

that shipwrecked Paul (Acts 27:4, 7, 14, 15). But we should notice that the Synoptists make it clear that Jesus was supreme over the elements as they tell the story of the stilling of the storm (Matt. 8:26 f.; Mk. 4:37, 39; Lk. 8:23 ff.) and of Jesus coming to the disciples walking on the sea (Matt. 14:24 ff.; Mk. 6:47 ff.). That God is in control of the winds comes out also in the passage in Revelation in which angels are depicted as holding back the four winds so that they should not blow on the earth (Rev. 7:1). The word is used metaphorically of "every wind of doctrine" (Eph. 4:14) where the thought is that one who is not well established in the faith may well depart quickly from sound doctrine without great cause, like something light driven by the wind.

3. In all our sources rain (*brochē*; cf. the vb. *brechō*) is normally used for precipitation from the clouds, and metaphorically for what comes upon men in abundance. In the NT there are two metaphorical uses, when there is a reference to the "fire and brimstone" that rained upon Sodom (Lk. 17:29) and when Luke speaks of the sinful woman whose tears "rained" on Jesus' feet (Lk. 7:38, 44). In all the other passages literal rain is meant. Jesus uses the fact that God makes rain fall on the just and the unjust alike to teach the universality of God's love (Matt. 5:45). Rain is here symbolic of God's gifts in general. Sometimes there is the thought that God is in control as when Elijah prayed that it might not rain and it did not (Jas. 5:17). With this we should class the power of the two witnesses to prevent rain (Rev. 11:6) for the meaning surely is that it is in this way that the purpose of God is worked out.

4. *brontē*, thunder, normally refers to the meteorological phenomenon in all our sources (though Moulton-Milligan do not find it in the papyri; derivatives are found, however). In the NT the term is used for a mighty voice on a number of occasions, as Jn. 12:29, where the voice from heaven is taken by some of the bystanders to be thunder and several times in Revelation (6:1; 10:3 f.; 19:6). In that book it is linked with "lightning" on four occasions (4:5; 8:5; 11:19; 16:18). The one other use of the term is as an explanation of the name "Boanerges" applied to the sons of Zebedee (Mk. 3:17). The accuracy of the translation scarcely concerns us here: the meaning "thunder" is plain enough, though there is room for discussion about what "thunderous men" might mean.

5. The term *eudia* appears to be derived from *eu* and *Dios*, genitive of *Zeus*, to give the meaning "a good sky" and so "fair weather". Its only NT occurrence is as a *v.l.* in Matt. 16:2 where it refers to the ability of the Pharisees and the Sadducees to predict the coming of good weather as contrasted with their inability to discern what are much more important, "the signs of the times". There is important theological meaning in the passage, but it does not come from *eudia*. That term signifies no more than "fair weather", "a good day".

6. The word *iris* is used for the rainbow from early times, and figuratively for a halo or for the "iris" of the eye or for a plant (the only one Moulton and Milligan find in the papyri). The Greeks personified the bow round heaven and earth as the messenger goddess Iris. In the OT the rainbow appears as a sign of God's → covenant that he will no longer send floods to destroy the earth (Gen. 9:13). There seems no doubt that the rainbow is meant, but the Hebrew term is *qešeṯ*, which is normally used for the bow of a warrior. In line with this LXX has *toxon*, not *iris*. In fact LXX has *iris* once only, as the name of a plant in Exod. 30:24. The use of the warrior's bow set in the clouds may be to indicate that the bow is put away, so to speak, and

there will be peace. Be that as it may, the context clearly indicates that the rainbow is to be taken as a sign of God's covenant, a sign that God is gracious to his people and will continue to be so. It is this that gives us the clue to its use in the NT. There it is found only in Rev. 4:3; 10:1. The first of these speaks of a rainbow (or halo) round God's throne "in appearance like an emerald" which seems to mean that it was green. The second refers to a strong angel robed in a cloud with a rainbow round his head. We should probably understand the rainbow in both places to symbolize the permanence of God's covenant and his will to be gracious to men. K. H. Rengstorf can say, "the witness of this sign is that one alone brings salvation, namely, God. The goodness and patience of God precede all the good works of man" (*TDNT* III 342).

7. The word *lailaps* indicates a tempestuous wind, whipping up so great a storm that the boat began to fill (Mk. 4:37), and the disciples were in danger (Lk. 8:23). The only other NT occurrence of the term is that in which certain false teachers are likened to mists driven by a *lailaps* (2 Pet. 2:17).

8. *nephos* means a cloud or cloud mass. As we noted earlier, clouds are linked with the divine in both the classical writers and the OT. It is thus significant that in the NT clouds are most often associated in some way with Jesus Christ. This is not invariable, for we have a reference to the weather (Lk. 12:54), to false teachers as like clouds without water (Jude 12), and to the cloud under which the fathers were baptized into Moses (1 Cor. 10:1 f.). But all three Synoptists tell of the cloud at the → Transfiguration which was plainly linked with the presence of God and from which the heavenly voice greeted Jesus as "my beloved Son" (Matt. 17:5; Mk. 9:7; Lk. 9:34 f.). At the ascension a cloud received Jesus out of the sight of the disciples (Acts 1:9). And when he comes again at the parousia there will be clouds (Matt. 24:30; 26:64; Mk. 13:26; 14:62; Lk. 21:27; 1 Thess. 4:17; Rev. 1:7). There are further references to a reaper sitting on a cloud at the judgment (Rev. 14:14 ff.) which some identify with Christ, but probably wrongly.

9. *notos* means "the south wind" and from that "the south". The term does not appear to have a heavy freight of theological meaning in the NT. It is used of the south wind (Lk. 12:55; Acts 27:13; 28:13), of the south as a direction (Lk. 13:29; Rev. 21:13), and of a land to the south (Matt. 12:42; Lk. 11:31).

10. The term *ombros* signifies a "rain storm" and it is used in this way as a weather note in its only NT occurrence (Lk. 12:54).

11. The word *homichlē* means mist or fog, being used of something not as dense or heavy as a cloud (*nephelē*). It is used of the false teachers who are compared to mists driven around by a strong wind and who accordingly have nothing substantial about them (2 Pet. 2:17).

12. The term *opsimos* simply means "late", but it was commonly used in the LXX in conjunction with *proïmos* to indicate the late (and early) rains. In Palestine the early rains are important to get the crops started and the late rains to mature the grain before the dry season starts when there will be no more rain. Both are important. The only NT occurrence of either is in Jas. 5:7 of these two rains, quite in the OT manner.

13. The word *rhipizō* conveys the notion of "blow" (of winds etc.) and its one NT occurrence likens the doubter to a wave blown about by winds (Jas. 1:6). The thought is that of instability.

14. *hyetos* denotes a heavy shower as against *ombros* (which is continuous rain)

and *psekas* (drizzle) as Liddell and Scott point out. In the NT it is once used of rain as unpleasant (Acts 28:2), but otherwise in one way or another it is a good gift of God. Thus it is given by God from heaven (Acts 14:17), in response to prayer (Jas. 5:18). It is linked with the blessing of God (Heb. 6:7) and it is withheld in fulfilment of God's purpose for his witnesses (Rev. 11:6).

15. Hail (*chalaza*) is mentioned in the NT only in Revelation. There it follows the blowing of the first trumpet (Rev. 8:7), is one of the meteorological phenomena which followed the opening of the ark of God's covenant in heaven (11:19) and specially heavy hail is the last of the horrors that followed the pouring out of the seventh bowl (Rev. 16:21). The violence of a mighty hailstorm is a suitable picture of the power of God and underlines the truth that his judgments are irresistible.

16. Snow (*chiōn*) is used in the NT only as a way of indicating whiteness. It is the colour of the angel's robe (Matt. 28:3) and that of the hair of the glorious Lord (Rev. 1:14). *L. L. Morris*

Wilderness, Desert, Lay Waste, Mountain, Plain

ἔρημος

ἔρημος (*erēmos*), abandoned, solitary, desolate, deserted; ἔρημος (*erēmos*), ἔρημος τόπος (*erēmos topos*), ἐρημία (*erēmia*), desolate place, desert, wilderness; ἐρημόω (*erēmoō*), lay waste, devastate, make desolate, depopulate; ἐρήμωσις (*erēmōsis*), devastation, desolation, destruction.

CL The etymology of *erēmos*, solitary, desolate (adj.), or a desert (noun) – a word used from Hom. onwards (e.g. *Il.* 10, 520) – has not been clarified with precision. Suggested roots are *era, ra, ar*, to separate. Cognates include Lat. *rarus*, scattered, rarely, and Old High German *aram*, poor, needy. *erēmia*, a desolate area, is attested in the Tragedians (e.g. Aesch., *PV* 2; Eur., *Troades* 26). *erēmōsis*, devastation, is first found in the LXX. The vb. *erēmoō* in non-biblical Gk. can also mean to set free, to hand over, to leave alone (e.g. Aesch., *Supp.* 516). "Desert" (*erēmos* and *erēmia*), for the ancient world, is not only land that is without water and vegetation and therefore uninhabited, but also an area that has been laid waste and depopulated, a settlement or pasture that has been abandoned, a derelict site. The ancient Graeco-Roman world awaited the revelation of the divinity in a lonely spot (e.g. Eur., *Bacch.* 874 ff.), and it feared the desert as the habitat of demons (e.g. Lucian, *Vitarum Auctio* 9).

OT 1. (a) The LXX uses *erēmos* to render 241 of the total 345 occurrences of Heb. *miḏbār*, desert (which also means a steppe, grassland, e.g. Gen. 37:22). *erēmos* also stands 32 times for derivatives of the Heb. root *ḥārēḇ*, be waste, desolate, 25 times for *šāmēm*, be appalled, devastated, desolate, and its derivatives, and 10 times for *negēḇ*, parched land. 120 of the uses of *erēmos* are found in the Pentateuch, since Exod. to Deut. (109 attestations) recount Israel's wandering in the wilderness. In the Pss. too (21 times), Isa. (45 times), Jer. (28 times) and Ezek. (38 times) the term *erēmos* plays an important rôle.

(b) *erēmia*, by contrast, appears in the LXX extremely rarely. In the writings of

the canonical OT this form is encountered in only 3 places: in Isa. 60:12 and Ezek. 35:4 for Heb. *ḥārōḇ* and *ḥorbâh*; and in Ezek. 35:9 for Heb. *šim ᶜmâh*.

(c) The vb. *erēmoō*, to devastate, appears in the LXX a total of 60 times for Heb. words, of which the most predominant are forms of the Heb. root *ḥārēḇ* (29 times) and *šāmēm* (17 times). The vb. is most frequently attested in Isa. (17 times), Ezek. (17 times) and Jer. (6 times).

(d) The noun *erēmōsis*, devastation, derived from *erēmoō*, is encountered in 18 passages in the OT canon of the LXX; of these 18, 6 are in Jer. and 8 in Dan. The LXX renderings are of Heb. *ḥorbâh* (6 times) and derivations of the Heb. root *šāmēm* (11 times).

2. Just as with mountains and → water, the desert in the OT has the double aspect of the holy: it is the place where Yahweh reveals himself (→ Revelation), but it is also the abode of → demons, who threaten human beings with impurity, sickness and death.

(a) The positive valuation which is given to the "holy place", the desert, is represented by the numerous accounts which concern theophanies in the desert. In the desert an → angel strengthened → Elijah with nourishment, as he fled from Jezebel (1 Ki. 19:4–6). God's appearance at Horeb (Exod. 3:1 ff.; 1 Ki. 19:11–18) and Sinai (Exod. 19) is not only a mountain- but a desert-theophany. Israel's forty years of wandering in the wilderness (Exod. to Deut.; cf. Deut. 8:2) was counted as a time of particular closeness to Yahweh (Hos. 9:10; cf. 11:1; 12:10[12:9]; 13:4 f.); and above all in the Pss., Jer., Isa., and Ezek. The paraenetic references back to Yahweh's faithfulness (and Israel's unfaithfulness: Pss. 78[77]:17, 40; 95[94]:7–11; 106[105]:13–33; Ezek. 20; cf. Num. 13 f.) in the wilderness take up a comparatively large amount of space (e.g. Pss. 78[77]:15, 19, 40, 52; 95[94]:8; 106[105]:7–12; Isa. 48:21; 63:13; Jer. 2:6; Ezek. 20:10–26,36). The → hope of eschatological salvation is also linked with speculations involving the desert (Isa. 40:3; Jer. 31[38]:2; Ezek. 34:25; Hos. 2:16–25). Anyone who wished to live close to Yahweh at that moment chose a life in an artificial desert-situation like the Rechabites, whose origins lie in a prophetic revival movement of Elijah's time. They lived in → tents instead of in houses (Jer. 35:7, 9 f.). At least once a year all Israelites lived as if in the desert, as their forefathers did, when they celebrated the Feast of Tabernacles in "tents" (Lev. 23:34–36, 42 f.; Deut. 16:13–17).

(b) At the same time the desert is a place of deadly danger, of separation from God, and of demonic powers (Deut. 8:15; cf. Num. 21:4–9; Isa. 30:6). The tension between cultivated land and desert becomes the contrast between the lands of Canaan and → Egypt; "Egypt" can be used specifically as a synonym for the (demonic) desert (Tob. 8:3; cf. Ezek. 20:36 and Matt. 2:15; though cf. also Hos. 11:1). Yahweh's terrifying east wind, like all winds which are conceived in personal terms, comes out of the desert (Hos. 13:15). The scapegoat is chased into the desert to the demon Azazel (Lev. 16:10, 21 f.). Desert demons take possession of the ruins of Babylon (Isa. 13:21 f.) and Edom (Isa. 34:13–15). Contemporary desolation and misery are seen as devastation (e.g. Isa. 1:7; 54:3; Jer. 2:15; Ezek. 19:13), and future destruction of cities and land is threatened in the form of imminent devastation (e.g. Isa. 5:9; Jer. 4:26 f.; Ezek. 5:14). The drying up of the → water, in particular, characterizes the transformation into desert (Isa. 37:25; 44:27; 51:10; Jer. 51[28]:36; Ezek. 29:10; 30:12).

The words *erēmoō*, to devastate, and *erēmōsis*, devastation, are used almost exclusively of punitive destruction of houses, cities and lands (e.g. Isa. 6:11; 54:3; Jer. 4:7; 7:34; Ezek. 26:19).

The statements of Daniel concerning the *erēmōsis* of the sanctuary in Jerusalem (Dan. 8:13) show that such devastation is to be understood as the victory of demonic powers; the Gk. *bdelygma [tēs] erēmōseōs* or *tōn erēmōseōn*, → abomination of desolation(s) in Dan. 9:27; 11:31; 12:11; 1 Macc. 1:54 is a trans. of the Heb. equivalent *šiqqūṣ (mᵉ)šōmēm*. This refers to the transference under Antiochus IV Epiphanes (167 B.C.) of the altar of Yahweh at Jerusalem to that of Zeus Olympios (*baʿal šāmēm*), who was equated with Yahweh. In Aram. there is a play on words – *šᵉmayîn*, heaven, and *mᵉšōmēm*, desolating (E. Nestle, "Zu Daniel", *ZAW* 4, 1884 248), implying that pagan gods are demons.

On the basis of its demonistic qualifications the desert, exactly like the "many waters" of Ezek. 26:19 f., can stand as a picture for the underworld ("eternal solitudes", Ezek. 26:20 JB). One can think of Yahweh's punishing demons which reside in the desert (Num. 21:4–9), when Yahweh finally threatens to settle accounts with his people in the desert once and for all (Ezek. 20:35). It is of course true that Israel will finally find salvation in the desert (cf. Ezek. 34:25; Hos. 2:16; see above, 2 (a)); but this can only mean that the desert will be for ever overcome. It will become arable land, water will flow in it, roads will be opened, desolated towns re-built (Isa. 32:15 f.; 35:15 f.; especially the later chapters of Isa., e.g. 41:18; 43:19 f.; 58:12; 61:4; 62:4; Jer. 33[40]:10–12; Ezek. 36:10, 33 ff.; 38:8, 12; Dan. 9:27; cf. Hos. 14:5–10). In this context belongs a passage like Isa. 40:3 (→ Walk, art. *hodos* OT 1 (a)). Where roads are constructed through the desert (Isa. 43:19), there Yahweh's lordship has dawned. If God also pleases to reveal his glory in the wilderness, it is still, in the last resort, a place which is hostile to God, an evil, demonic locality. God's victory over his enemies and the enemies of his people is thus also a victory over the desert.

(c) When post-biblical Judaism works within the compass of the Hoseanic desert-typology, it awaits the redemption of Israel from the desert (rabbinic attestations in SB I 85–88). That is why messianic disturbances originate in the desert (Josephus, *War* 2, 258–63). The Essenes understood their secession into the wilderness of Qumran eschatologically, i.e. in the sense of preparing the way (cf. 1QS 8, 12 ff.; 9:19 f.), and the same applied to John the Baptist (Josephus, *Ant.* 18, 116–119). Similarly, according to Mart. Isa. 2:8–11, the prophets Isaiah, Micah and others migrated to a "mountain in desolate surroundings". In the messianic speculation of Judaism concerning the desert, particular significance is attached to the passages Hos. 2:16; 12:10, Job 30:4 and Isa. 40:3, the latter being encountered in Qumran as well as in John the Baptist. After the destruction of the temple the Jews prayed for an untroubled departure with wife and children "into the desert" (Josephus, *War* 6, 351), doubtless in order to be especially close to God there.

But demons, too, live in the desert. Behemoth (cf. Job 40:15–24) is, according to Eth. Enoch 60:8, a desert demon. Malevolent spirits which are being punished are sent into the desert by way of its being a compulsory place of residence (Tob. 8:3; Eth. Enoch 10:4; cf. Matt. 12:43 par. Lk. 11:24).

The fact that fear of desert demons and the high theologico-eschatological regard for the desert are not mutually exclusive is shown both by the Qumran sect, with its

continual anti-demonic ablutions (→ Water; → Baptism, art. *louō*), and by the secession of the prophets of Mart. Isa. 2:8 ff., who by prayer and fasting, struggle for (anti-demonic) purity. In the desert the ascetic fights with evil spirits in order to be deemed worthy of an appearance of the Godhead.

NT 1. In the NT the word group *erēm-* is represented 46 times (counting Synoptic par. instances as only one attestation each). Of these, 37 are of *erēmos*, desert, 3 of *erēmia*, desert, 4 of *erēmoō* (only in the pass. form *erēmousthai*, to be devastated), and 2 for *erēmōsis*, desolation. By far the largest number of occurrences (20) is offered by the Synoptics (including *erēmos* 16 times and *erēmia* once, for desert), followed by Acts (9 times) and Rev. (3 times each for noun and vb.). Three attestations each of the word-group are found in Paul and Heb.; *erēmos* is found 5 times in Jn.'s Gospel.

2. (a) The NT estimation of the desert (chiefly *erēmos* or *erēmos topos*; *erēmia* only in Matt. 15:33 par. Mk. 8:4; 2 Cor. 11:26; Heb. 11:38) is none other than that of the OT and Judaism. As ever, Israel's forty years of wandering in the desert is counted as a momentous fact of God's historical activity (Jn. 3:14; 6:31, 49; Acts 7:30 ff.; 13:18; 1 Cor. 10:5; Heb. 3:8, 17), and the idea that eschatological movements begin in the desert is still alive (Matt. 24:26; Acts 21:38). The apocalyptic flight of the woman into the desert (Rev. 12:6, 14) is to be explained from the high regard in which Israel's time in the wilderness was held, and simultaneously attests the expectation that the messiah will come from the desert (cf. Matt. 2:15; Hos. 11:1; → Egypt for the ambivalent rôle of Egypt in Scripture). The youthful John the Baptist is hidden in the desert (Lk. 1:80), and he then develops his area of effective work in the desert (Matt. 3:1 par. Mk. 1:4, Lk. 3:2; but cf. Isa. 40:3; Matt. 11:7 par. Lk. 7:24). As in Judaism prophets belong in desert places and on mountains, as was proper for ascetics (Mart. Isa. 2:8–11), so Heb. 11:38 localizes the OT prophets and ascetics in deserts, mountains and caves. Linking up with the desert-wanderers and desert-dwellers of the OT the new Israel is able to understand itself, by way of antitype, as the wandering people of God (Heb. 3 f.; 11:8–10; 12:18–24; cf. 1 Cor. 10:1–13; cf. E. Käsemann, *Das wandernde Gottesvolk. Eine Untersuchung zum Hebräerbrief*, 1957²).

(b) In so far as Jesus' significance is described as prophetic and messianic, the desert also has its place. Jesus comes forth in analogy to → Moses, in the prophetic interpretation of this leader-figure of Israel's time in the wilderness (Acts 3:22 f.; 7:37; though cf. Deut. 18:15), but of course, as an antitype, surpassing him (cf. Heb. 3:1–6). The Synoptic stories of Jesus' childhood have his messianic honour proclaimed to the men of the steppes and solitude, the "shepherds in the field" (Lk. 2:8–14), and, by means of the flight to Egypt (Matt. 2:13–15, 19–21), render possible the arrival of the messiah from the Egyptian desert (the messianic interpretation of Hos. 11:1 by Matt. 2:15; in Tob. 8:3 Egypt signifies the desert). It is in the desert that Jesus defeats the Satanic temptation (Matt. 4:1–11 par. Mk. 1:12 f., Lk. 4:1–13; → Tempt), and it is there that Jesus miraculously (cf. 2 Ki. 4:42–44 with Elisha) feeds his followers (Matt. 14:13 par. Mk. 6:32; in addition Lk. 9:12, and Matt. 15:33 par. Mk. 8:4). Several times Jesus lingers in the desert to pray and fast there (apart from Matt. 4:1 f. par. Lk. 4:1 f.; cf. Mk. 1:35, 45 par. Lk. 4:42; 5:16) – and not only in order to come particularly close to God, but also in order to break the power of the

demons (Mk. 1:12 f. par.). The desert is still a favourite place for visions (Rev. 17:3; cf. Acts 8:26). Perhaps it was for this reason that Paul sought out the Arabian desert (Gal. 1:17), but perhaps also simply in order to escape from the clutches of his opponents (cf. 1 Ki. 19:3 ff. and Rev. 12:6).

3. The desert is qualified negatively where the sin and failure of the wilderness-generation (see above OT, 2) is spoken of (Acts 7:41–43; 1 Cor. 10:5; Heb. 3:8, 17). Demonic dangers threaten in the desert (2 Cor. 11:26; cf. Lk. 15:4), for that is where demons (Matt. 12:43 par. Lk. 11:24, Mk. 1:12 f.) and madmen (Lk. 8:29) live. The aetiological demon-saga seizes on desolate localities (Acts 1:18–20; but cf. Ps. 69:26 [Matt. 27:3–10 otherwise]; cf. Papias, *Frag.* 3).

As in the OT devastation (*erēmoō*, to lay waste, pass. *erēmousthai*, to be devastated) of houses, cities and land is reckoned to be conquest by demonic powers carrying out God's → judgment of → punishment (Matt. 12:25 par. Lk. 11:17; cf. Matt. 23:38 par. Lk. 13:35 and Acts 1:20). The wanton, i.e. idolatrous, city of → Babylon (= Rome) will be devastated (Rev. 17:16; 18:17, 19) by punishing demons (Rev. 18:2; cf. 17:16): again there are OT models in the background (cf. OT 2 (b)).

Abhorrence of pagan divinities, equated with demons (1 Cor. 10:20; Rev. 9:20; cf. 2:13), also gave form to the expression → "abomination of desolation" (*bdelygma tēs erēmōseōs*, Matt. 24:15 par. Mk. 13:14). The literary original (see above, OT 2 (b)) is taken by Matt. and Mk. to be a prediction of the eschatological handing-over of → Jerusalem to the demons of the pagans; the par. passage Lk. 21:20 has abandoned the OT reference and thinks of military devastation (*erēmōsis*) of the city of Jerusalem. The fulfilment of Jesus' prediction against Jerusalem (Matt. 23:37 f. par. Lk. 13:34 f.; cf. Jer. 9:10 f.) will thus compare the disobedient city of God with the whore of Babylon (Rome; cf. Rev. 17:16–18; 18:2–24).

Apart from those passages in which reference is made to the saving period of Israel's wandering in the wilderness, the desert in the NT is more of a demonic place. Even where Jesus reveals his glory in the desert, it is in his victory over demonic powers that this takes place. Only where God's judgment has fallen is there victory over the desert and its maleficent spirits. *O. Böcher*

The topographical descriptions in the New Testament provide both historical realism and theological symbolism. Perhaps none is more striking in both respects than that which refers to the presence or absence of mountains. Further, the writers of the Synoptic Gospels stand in contrast to each other in several notable places with respect to their mention or omission of reference to a mountain and possibly also, in a measure, with respect to their concepts of symbolic imagery.

ὄρεινος

ὄρεινος (*oreinos*), hilly, mountainous.

oreinos is often used substantivally without the accompanying *chōra*, countryside. It signifies territory with rugged features in contrast to level ground (e.g., Jos. 9:1 LXX). Its only New Testament use is in Luke's birth narratives. Twice (Lk. 1:39, 65) it describes the area where John the Baptist was born. This hill country of Judea lies to the west and north of the Dead Sea and includes Jerusalem and Bethlehem. It was

to here that Mary travelled to visit Elizabeth, and, after John's birth, word of what God was doing spread throughout that territory. *W. L. Liefeld*

τόπος πεδινός	*τόπος πεδινός* (*topos pedinos*), level place.

This expression is used in contrast to "mountain" (Jer. 17:26 LXX), to "hill country" (see the above paragraph) and to the rocky terrain which characterized the Judean desert (Deut. 4:43 LXX). Its one occurrence in the New Testament, Lk. 6:17, has properly received much attention. If the Beatitudes of Lk. 6 were spoken on the same occasion as those of Matt. 5, as is generally supposed, one must take note of the fact that while Matthew only says that Jesus went up "on a mountainside" (NIV), Luke indicates that he came down to a level place from a higher location where he had spent the night in prayer (Lk. 6:12, 17). It has often been supposed that the two accounts are in contradiction, though the Lucan account allows for the Beatitudes (and the ensuing Sermon on the Mount) to have been given at a level part of the mountainous territory described by Matthew. Recently, however, the difference between Matthew and Luke has been taken by many to be a deliberate theological construction. (See the discussion below under the term *oros*.) It is important to note that theological symbolism need not rule out geographical accuracy, although that assumption is often made, for one must realize that not only can a symbolic meaning be attached to an actual place or event, but also the place may have been deliberately chosen, by Jesus in this instance, for its potential symbolic value.

W. L. Liefeld

ὄρος, ὑψηλός	*ὄρος* (*oros*), mountain, mountain chain or region; *ὑψηλός* (*hypsēlos*), high.

CL & OT 1. The Mesopotamians were conscious of the height and power of the mountains and the Greeks viewed Olympus as the supreme home of the gods (cf. W. Foerster, *oros*, *TDNT* V 475–79). In the Ras Shamra texts, Zaphon, a hill north of Ras Shamra, is the abode of Baal.

2. In the LXX *oros* generally translates *har*. On the significance of Mount Sinai → *Sina*. Mountains and ravines could be an obstacle to communication (2 Ki. 19:23; Isa. 37:24). Growth of grass on them for pasture is a sign of God's love (Ps. 147:8). Most of the hills in Palestine do not rise above 3000 ft., and so could be used for beacons. The use of the beacon as a signal of invasion is used in an oracle of judgment (Isa. 13:2; cf. 30:17). The view which Moses had from the top of Pisgah was a revelation of all that God would give Israel (Deut. 34:1–4), though Moses was not allowed to set foot in the promised land. Prophecy and parable could be delivered from mountains (Jdg. 9:7) and people addressed from them (2 Sam. 2:25 f.; 2 Chr. 13:4). Mountains could be places of refuge (Jdg. 6:2; Ps. 11[10]:1).

3. Mountains are frequently associated with Yahweh's presence. Isaac was to be offered on a mountain (Gen. 22:2). During the battle with the Amalekites Moses prayed on top of a hill (Exod. 17:9 f.). Elijah climbed to the top of Mount Carmel to pray (1 Ki. 18:42). Blessing and curse were invoked from Mount Ebal and Mount

Gerizim (Deut. 11:29; 27:12 f.; Jos. 8:33). The circumcision of the Israelites took place on Haaraloth (Jos. 5:3). The ark was set on a hill (1 Sam. 7:1; 2 Sam. 6:3), and sacrifice was offered on high places, *bāmôṯ* (1 Sam. 9:12 ff.; 19:25; 1 Ki. 3:4; 1 Chr. 16:39; 21:29; 2 Chr. 1:3, 13). "The prophetic protest against the cult in high-places, which led to cultic centralization in Jerusalem (Deut. 12:2–9), was not directed against the siting of cultic centres on mountains but against Canaanite ideas and acts associated with the centres" (W. Foerster, *TDNT* V 481 f.). David had captured the Jebusite fortress at Jerusalem (2 Sam. 5:6–10) which subsequently became the site of the → temple erected by Solomon. (For Zion → Jerusalem.)

4. Especially in the Pss. and the prophetic writings mountains are expressive of Yahweh's power. He made them and was before them, and has power to destroy them even though they are rooted in the earth (Job 28:9; cf. Deut. 32:22; Jdg. 5:5; 1 Ki. 19:12; Job 9:5; Pss. 65[64]:6; 83[82]:14; 90[89]:2; 95[94]:4; 104[103]:32; Isa. 40:4, 12; 41:15; 63:19 f.; Jer. 4:24; 51:25; Ezek. 38:20; Mic. 1:4; Nah. 1:5; Hab. 3:6).

5. Mountains also figure in eschatological expectation. They will drip with wine as a symbol of plenty (Amos 9:12; Joel 3:18). The levelling of hills and valleys is a symbol of God's overruling in return from exile (Isa. 40:4; 45:2). The Mount of Olives, overlooking the temple, will be split (Zech. 14:4). Mount Zion will be higher than other hills and the Gentile nations will stream to it (Isa. 2:2–4; Mic. 4:1–3). Here Zion is seen as the focal point of meeting with Yahweh. The Gentiles will be included with Israel as they seek the ways of Yahweh, and universal peace shall reign.

C. Brown

NT 1. The adjective "high" modifies the word "mountain" four times in the New Testament, once to describe the mount of → temptation (Matt. 4:8), twice in reference to the mount of → transfiguration (Matt. 17:1; Mk. 9:2) and once to describe a vantage point to which, in a vision, the seer John was taken (Rev. 21:10). Used alone, *hypsēlos* twice describes the sphere of Christ in his present exaltation in Hebrews: absolutely, in 1:3 ("in heaven", NIV) and as a comparative, in the phrase "above the heavens" (7:26, NIV). In Rev. 21:12 it describes the high walls of the new Jerusalem. Several times it has a metaphorical use (Lk. 16:15; Acts 13:17; Rom. 11:20; 12:16).

2. The use of the term "mountain" itself ranges from the simple geographical, including several references to the Mount of Olives, to passages of great theological significance. Jesus apparently often sought the isolation of rugged elevated locations in order to pray or to be alone with his disciples (Lk. 6:12; Matt. 14:23; Mk. 3:13; 6:46, paralleled in Matt. 14:23, where the words "by himself" are added). In Lk. 9:37 it is observed that, on leaving the mount of transfiguration, Jesus is confronted by crowds, a comment which emphasizes his previous isolation which, according to Lk. 9:28, was for the purpose of prayer. The identification of the mount of transfiguration is unknown. Mt. Tabor was occupied by a fortress in Jesus' day and Mt. Hermon seems too far away both for the great crowd at its base, which included some scribes (Mk. 9:14), and for the reference to the return trip being "through Galilee" (Mk. 9:30). The highest mountain in Galilee (and in the boundaries of modern Israel) is Mt. Meron (3,926 feet), which fits the description of Matt. 17:1; Mk. 9:2. The

definite article "the" in Lk. 9:28 represents too common a use for a specific mountain or a mountain range to suppose that it hints at a well-known location.

3. More important is the question of whether this or other mountains mentioned in the Gospels have a distinctively theological symbolism. Certainly the associations with Mount Sinai are strong in the transfiguration narrative: the appearance of Moses, the cloud, reference to tabernacles and mention of Jesus' approaching death (Lk. 9:31, lit. "exodus") among others. Other associations can be established with an eschatological motif, but these would not invalidate the clear allusions to Sinai. Likewise, the mountain on which Jesus gave his Sermon with its authoritative comments on the law (Matt. 5–7) may represent a new Sinai (→ *Sina*), though this association rests on other assumptions regarding the intention of Matthew to establish an exodus motif in his narrative, with some uncertainties in this regard preventing a dogmatic conclusion (cf. W. D. Davies, *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount*, 1964, 99).

The question of a distinctive viewpoint on Matthew's part enters at this point. Luke, as noted above, does not mention a mountain in his introduction to the sermonic material (Lk. 6:16). He also omits reference to the Mount of Olives when introducing the apocalyptic discourse (compare Lk. 21:5–7 with Matt. 24:1–3 and Mk. 13:1–4). The account of Jesus' final words to his disciples at "the mountain where Jesus had told them to go" (Matt. 28:16) is not found in Luke. Do Matthew and Mark present a symbolism of the mountain as a place of revelation? It is interesting to note also that the sequence of Jesus' temptations in Matt. 4:1–11 concludes with the vision from the "very high mountain", with Jesus being alone and receiving the ministry of angels. Luke concludes with the temptation in Jerusalem (Lk. 4:9–12), a focus which may have significance in connexion with Luke's special concern elsewhere for Jerusalem.

4. Is it significant that Luke mentions swine on a hillside, as does Mark (Lk. 8:32; Mk. 5:11), while Matthew does not locate these unclean animals there, only saying that the pigs were "some distance from them" (Matt. 8:30), almost as though he were reluctant to think of them in (holy?) mountainous territory? In such cases, one must always allow for merely stylistic or even more prosaic reasons for omissions and emphases.

5. Luke's reference, through his quotation of Isaiah 40:3–5, to the levelling of mountains and hills at the coming of the Lord (Lk. 3:4–6) and his omission of the Mount of Olives in Lk. 21:5–7 have raised the question as to whether he envisions an eschatological landscape without mountains. It seems more reasonable to assume that he shares the biblical view of God's sovereignty over even the majestic mountains. As the Lord brings "salvation" (Lk. 3:6, emphasizing a major theme in Luke's theology), everything must make way for his coming. Flight to the mountains in time of eschatological distress (Matt. 24:16; Mk. 13:14; Lk. 21:21) is a normal reference to hills and their caves as places of refuge. The metaphorical reference to moving even towering mountains by faith in prayer is also a figure which would be understood by Jesus' contemporaries who, more than we, were dwarfed and awed by their majesty and seeming permanence. This underscores the strong imagery of mountains in the Bible, where geography and symbolism seem to be blended together.

W. L. Liefeld

6. The saying about the power of faith to remove a mountain (Matt. 17:20) may well have as its background a proverbial expression for overcoming difficulties (cf. Isa. 40:4; 49:11; 54:10), but in context "this mountain" may signify the mount of the transfiguration, to which all three Synoptic evangelists refer (Matt. 17:1 par. Mk. 9:2, Lk. 9:28; Matt. 17:9 par. Mk. 9:9, Lk. 9:37). The saying is, however, omitted by Mk. and the mountain is replaced by "this sycamine tree" in Lk. 17:6. The mountain is traditionally Mount Tabor, but some scholars prefer Hermon or Meron. In view of the associations with the transfiguration, the power ascribed to faith to remove "this mountain" is all the more striking. Mk., however, gives the saying in connexion with the cursing of the fig tree and the power of prayer (Mk. 11:20–26; → Fruit, art. *sykē*; → Prayer, art. *proseuchomai* NT 2). The context in Mk. suggests that "this mountain" is the Mount of Olives; W. Manson saw an allusion here to Zech. 14:4 (*Jesus the Messiah*, 1943, 29f.). H. Anderson conjectures that the Marcan form of the saying might at first seem to imply that lively faith is a human accomplishment: "make the effort of faith and obstacles will be overcome" (*The Gospel of Mark*, *New Century Bible*, 1976, 268). But such an inference, he points out, is avoided by that Matthean version which, he thinks, may be more original, though Mk. says essentially the same thing. For there faith is compared with the minute mustard seed. The call is not to a greater or stronger faith but to "a faith to which everything has been promised just because it expects everything from God and nothing from itself" (E. Schweizer, *Jesus*, 1971, 234). In Mk. the fig tree withers because of the power and judgment of God. Faith is the response of man to God who invites intercessory prayer and mutual forgiveness among men (which in context removes sins which are comparable with removing mountains).

7. The Sermon on the Mount contains the statement: "A city set on a hill cannot be hid" (Matt. 5:14b). It immediately follows the saying: "You are the light of the world." It is followed by the saying about putting a lamp on a lampstand and the exhortation: "Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works and glorify your Father who is in heaven" (Matt. 5:16). The saying about → salt (Matt. 5:13) focuses on the usefulness of salt. The sayings about light and the city focus on the *raison d'être* of the disciples. Because of their calling they cannot remain obscure; the character of their lives should be such that men will have cause to glorify God. There is a hint of Isa. 2:2, 5: "It shall come to pass in the latter days that the mountain of the house of the LORD shall be established as the highest of the mountains, and shall be raised above the hills; and all the nations shall flow to it. . . . O house of Jacob, come, let us walk in the light of the LORD" (cf. Mic. 4:1–3). The eschatological promise is to be fulfilled in the body of disciples. Perhaps too we are to see here the fulfilment of the promise to Abraham, that in him all the nations of the earth would be blessed (or bless themselves) (Gen. 12:3; 18:8; 22:18; 26:4; 28:14; cf. Acts 3:25; Gal. 3:8). As the light is manifested in the community of disciples as the people of God, so the nations will come to them as the new Jerusalem to receive blessing and glorify God.

The saying in P. Oxy. appears to be a mistaken gloss on this text: "A city which is erected on the top of a high mountain and firmly established can neither fall nor remain hidden" (Henn. Schn., I, 109 f.; cf. D. Hill, *The Gospel of Matthew*, *New Century Bible*, 1972, 116). For it places emphasis on the invincibility of the church,

whereas the saying in Matt. emphasizes the fulfilment of prophecy and the glorification of God.

8. Rev. 8:8 is probably an allusion to the eruption of Vesuvius in A.D. 79, seen as a fulfilment of Jer. 51:25 (cf. also the vision of the angel casting the great millstone [*mylinon megan*] into the sea, as a symbol of the overthrow of Babylon, Rev. 18:21; → Rock). Rev. 17:9 takes up into the symbolism of world-powers the seven hills on which Rome was founded. Rev. 6:14 and 16:20 go beyond the OT expectation of the levelling of the mountains; they will disappear, heralding a new heaven and earth (cf. Rev. 20:11; 21:1). *C. Brown*

Σινά	*Σινά* (*Sina*), Sinai.

OT The indeclinable proper name *Sina* is derived from the Heb. *sînay*. As such it occurs in Exod. 16:1; Deut. 33:2; Jdg. 5:5; Pss. 68:8; 69:9; Sir. 48:7. Other expressions for Mount Sinai are: *to oros to Sina* (Exod. 19:11, 20, 23; 24:16); *(to) oros Sina* (Exod. 19:16; Lev. 7:38; 25:1; 26:46; Num. 3:1; 2 Esd. 19:13; Sib. 3, 256). Sinai is the name of the sacred mountain used in passages attributed to J and P, before which Israel encamped when Yahweh made Israel his → covenant people (Exod. 19–24). Moses ascended the mountain in order to speak with God (Exod. 19:3, 10; 24:9), and descended in order to communicate God's word to the people (Exod. 19:14). After the conclusion of the covenant Moses ascended another forty days and nights (Exod. 24:18; cf. ch. 32). In revealing his presence to the people, Yahweh did so with thunders and thick cloud, with trumpet blast to warn the people not to touch the mountain (Exod. 19:16–24). This is the setting of the Ten Commandments (Exod. 20; cf. Deut. 5). While Moses was on the mountain the people induced Aaron to make the golden calf (Exod. 32). Yahweh's glory was revealed to Moses in a cleft of a rock (Exod. 33:17–23). A second set of tablets was made on the mountain to replace those broken on the foot of the mountain, when Moses saw the golden calf (Exod. 34:1 ff.; cf. 32:19).

In passages ascribed to the Elohist stratum and in Deuteronomic literature the sacred mountain is called Mount Horeb (Heb. *ḥôrēḇ*; LXX *Chōrēb*). No distinction between the two mountains can be discerned in the geographical descriptions, and the two names are synonyms (cf. Exod. 3:1; 18:5; Deut. 1; 4:10; 5:2). Deut. 1:2 says that it was eleven days' journey from Horeb by way of Mount Seir to Kadesh-barnea. Num. 33:16–36 gives a detailed list of stations between the mountain and Kadesh, which may have been preserved for the sake of pilgrims. Elijah found refuge in Horeb in his flight from Jezebel after his contest with the priests of Baal on Mount Carmel (1 Ki. 19:1–18). Here he found restoration, a fresh revelation from Yahweh and his final commission.

The exact site of Mount Sinai has been much debated. Traditionally it is located at Jebel Musa among the high mountains at the apex of the Sinai peninsula. Alternative sites include Ras es-Safsaf, and the region of north-west Arabia, near the biblical land of Midian. This has been favoured because of the volcanic activity in the area which fits the descriptions of Exod. 19, and because of Moses' association with the Midianites (Exod. 3:1; 18:1). A third site is one of the mountains in the region of

Kadesh-barnea (cf. Deut. 33:2; Jdg. 5:4 f.; Num. 20:16). (For summary of the arguments see G. E. Wright, *IDB* IV 376 ff.)

NT Sinai is mentioned twice each in Acts and Gal., and is alluded to in Heb. 12.

1. The speech of Stephen prior to his martyrdom gives a résumé of Israel's history which E. Lohse thinks may well have been taken over from Jewish tradition with only slight adaptation (*TDNT* VII 285). In both passages an → angel is mentioned as speaking to Moses, first at the burning bush in the wilderness of Mount Sinai (Acts 7:30; cf. Exod. 3:1 f.), and then in the giving of "living oracles" (Acts 7:38; cf. Exod. 19; Deut. 32:47). Sinai thus plays a prominent part in the salvation history of Israel. The implication which Stephen draws from his survey is that the present Jewish leaders have failed to understand the workings of God.

2. In Gal. 4:21–31 Paul identifies the present stubborn and disobedient Israel with Hagar (Gen. 16:15; 21:2, 9) and Mount Sinai (Gal. 4:24 f.) as symbols of standing outside the covenant promises and being in bondage to the law, respectively. Together they are typified by the present Jerusalem which is in bondage, as contrasted with "the Jerusalem above" which is "free" and our "mother" (v. 26). (For discussion → Parable, art. *parabolē*, NT 9.)

3. In Heb. 12:18–29 Mount Sinai (though it is not mentioned as such by name) is contrasted with Mount Sion, representing the old and new covenants. The description of the former, drawn from the account of Exod. 19 and 20, stresses the holiness and inaccessibility of the mount for ordinary people, whereas the latter stresses that believers have come to the great host of the assembly of "the first-born who are enrolled in heaven" (v. 22), "and to Jesus, the mediator of a new covenant, and to the sprinkled blood that speaks more graciously than the blood of Abel" (v. 24, the latter crying out for vengeance, Gen. 4:10). There is, therefore, all the more reason not to "refuse him who is speaking" (v. 25). "Therefore let us be grateful for receiving a kingdom that cannot be shaken, and thus let us offer to God acceptable worship, with reverence and awe; for our God is a consuming fire" (vv. 28 f.). *C. Brown*

→ Elijah, → Height, → Jerusalem, Zion, → Moses, → Tempt, → Walk

(a). M. Avi-Yonah, "Mount Carmel and the God of Baalbek", *Israel Exploration Journal* 2, 1952, 118–24; D. Baly, *The Geography of the Bible*, 1974 [2]; G. W. Van Beek, "Carmel, Mount", *IDB* I 538; G. W. Coats, "The Wilderness Itinerary", *CBQ* 34, 1972, 135–52; G. I. Davies, "The Wilderness Itineraries: A Comparative Study", *TB* 25, 1974, 46–81; W. Foerster, *oros*, *TDNT* V 475–87; R. W. Funk, "The Wilderness", *JBL* 78, 1959, 205 ff.; G. Kittel, *erēmos* etc., *TDNT* II 657–60; W. Kornfeld, "Mountain", *EBT* II 297 f.; E. Lohse, *Sina*, *TDNT* VII 282–87; J. Mánek, "On the Mount – On the Plain (Mt. v.1.–Lk. vi. 17)", *NovT* 9, 1967, 124–31; V. U. Mauser, *Christ in the Wilderness: The Wilderness Theme in the Second Gospel and its Biblical Tradition*, *SBT* 39, 1963; E. W. Nicholson, *Exodus and Sinai in History and Tradition*, 1973; G. von Rad, "City on a Hill", in *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays*, 1966, 232–242; H. Riesenfeld, "The Messianic Character of the Temptation in the Wilderness", in *The Gospel Tradition*, 1970, 75–94; G. E. Wright, "Sinai, Mount", *IDB* IV 376 ff.

(b). F. von Andrian, *Der Höhenkultus asiatischer und europäischer Völker*, 1891; H. Bardtke, "Wüste und Oase in den Hodajoth von Qumran", in *Gott und die Götter*, Festschrift E. Fascher, 1958, 44 ff.; R. Beer, *Heilige Höhen der alten Griechen und Römer*, 1891; O. Böcher, *Dämonenfurcht und Dämonenabwehr. Ein Beitrag zur Vorgeschichte der christlichen Taufe*, *BWANT* 90, 1970, 65 ff., 311 ff.; P. Bonnard, "La Signification du Désert selon le Nouveau Testament", in *Hommage et Reconnaissance . . . à Karl Barth*, 1946, 11 ff.; O. Eissfeldt, *Baal Zaphon, Zeus Casios und der Durchzug der Israeliten durchs Meer*, 1932; and *Der Gott Karmel*, 1953; R. Frieling, *Der heilige Berg*, 1930; V. Fritz,

Israel in der Wüste. Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung der Wüstenüberlieferung des Jahwisten, Marburger theologische Studien 7, 1970; K. Galling, "Der Gott Karmel und die Achtung der fremden Götter", in *Geschichte und Altes Testament*, Festschrift A. Alt, 1953, 105–25; M. Hengel, *Die Zeloten. Untersuchung zur jüdischen Freiheitsbewegung in der Zeit von Herodes I. bis 70 nach Christi*, 1971, 255 f.; S. Herrmann and B. Reicke, "Wüste", *BHHW* III 2193 f.; J. Jeremias, *Der Gottesberg*, 1919; H. H. Mallau, *Die theologische Bedeutung der Wüste im Alten Testament*, (Dissertation) 1963; F. Mussner, "Hagar, Sinai, Jerusalem – Zum Text von Gal. 4, 25a", *ThQ* 135, 1955, 56–60; S. Riva, "Il Sinai egizio e cristiano", *Ricerche Religose* 9, 1933, 12–31; M. Rohrer, *Berglieder der Völker*, 1928; W. Schmauch, "In der Wüste", in *In Memoriam E. Lohmeyer*, 1951, 213 ff.; and *Orte der Offenbarung und der Offenbarungsort im Neuen Testament*, 1956, 27 ff., 51 ff.; P. A. van Stempvoort, *De Allegorie in Gal. 4, 21–31 als hermeneutisch Probleem*, 1953; G. Westphal, *Jahves Wohnstätten nach den Anschauungen der alten Hebräer*, *BZAW* 15, 1908, 98–118; W. Wiebe, *Die Wüstenzeit als Typos*, 1943.

Will, Purpose

Human will or volition can be represented, on the one hand, as a mental act, directed towards a free choice. But, on the other hand, it can be motivated by desire pressing in from the unconscious. Both kinds of volition are rendered by the word-groups associated with *boulomai* and *thelō*. A clear terminological distinction between *boulomai* (originally volition as a mental act) and *thelō* (originally instinctive desire) is no longer possible after the very early overlap of the areas covered by the words and is excluded at the time of the NT by their largely synonymous usage.

βούλομαι

βούλομαι (*boulomai*), to will, wish, want, desire; *βουλή* (*boulē*), will, resolve, purpose; *βοῦλημα* (*boulēma*), will, intention, purpose.

CL 1. *boulomai*, attested from Homer onwards, meant originally to prefer, to favour (*Il.* 1, 117), then to want, to have in view (*Il.* 1, 79), to elect, to be determined to (Eur., *Iph. Taur.* 61), to decide (Demetrius 2, 20; 19, 23). It is suggested that *boulomai* was originally more the willing which arises out of conscious consideration free from emotion, an endeavour, by contrast with the more emotionally stressed willing rendered by *ethelō*. Thus, *Il.* 1, 112: I did not wish (*ouk ethelon*) to accept any substitute, for I intend (*boulomai*) to have her at home with me; and Plato, *Gorg.* 522c: if you want (*ei de boulei*) . . . I am ready (*ethelō*). But *boulomai* and *ethelō* were soon used synonymously. Whereas *boulomai* still occurs relatively rarely in Homer, it is prominent from Hdt. onwards (especially in prose), and then again largely suppressed by *ethelō* in Hellenistic Gk.

2. The noun *boulē*, similarly Hom. onwards, derived from *boulomai*, denotes an intention, a deliberation. It also stands for the result of a deliberation in the sense of a decision of the will, a resolution, a counsel or an edict. So already in Homer (*Il.* 2, 53) an assembly of men is called a *boulē*, when it became an institutional body (e.g. the Council of the Five Hundred in Athens, Hdt. 5, 72; 9, 5).

A later derivation is *boulēma* (Aristotle onwards), describing the will more as a purpose, an intention, a tendency (Plato, *Leg.* 6, 769d; Isoc., 3, 15, Aristotle *Eth. Nic.* 2, 1).

OT 1. *boulomai*, like → *thelō*, is found over 100 times in the LXX. This almost equal distribution "is not merely due to the fact that the LXX belongs to the age when the distinctions were being obliterated by the struggle between the terms. It also owes something to the fact that the Canon includes both historical and poetical sections, so that the words preferred by both the prose authors (... Polyb., Diod. S.) and the poets are accepted" (G. Schrenk, *TDNT* I 630). *boulomai* is thus encountered more frequently in Exod., 1 Sam. and Job. It stands in particular for Heb. *ḥāp̄ēṣ* (26 times), to like, to want (Isa. 1:11; Job 21:14), to find pleasure in (e.g. 2 Sam. 24:3; Isa. 65:12; 66:4; Jer. 6:10), to desire (Job 13:3; Isa. 53:10); *'āḇâh* (17 times), to want, to be willing (e.g. Gen. 24:5; Exod. 10:27; 1 Sam. 15:9; 22:17; 31:4), and – with the negative – for *mā'ēn* (13 times), be unwilling, refuse (e.g. Exod. 4:23; 9:2; 10:3 f.; 16:28; Ps. 78[77]:10).

boulomai can express the most varied nuances of meaning in general human volition, but is also very commonly used for the will of God (e.g. Isa. 1:11; 53:10, 1 Sam. 1:25).

boulē also occurs well over 100 times in the LXX by contrast with *thelēma* (only some 25 times), mainly for Heb. *'ēṣâh* (74 times). It denotes (a) the weighty preconsideration which precedes the effecting of the will (e.g. Deut. 32:28). It can even be found in the sense of "wisdom" (e.g. Prov. 2:11; 8:12). The Spirit "of counsel", i.e. of considered reflection, is a gift of God (Isa. 11:2); (b) counsel (e.g. Isa. 9:6 as a characteristic of the messiah) and advice, whether good (Gen. 49:6; 1 Ki. 12:8) or foolish (Ps. 1:1; Isa. 19:11); (c) as in secular Gk., the council as a political institution, e.g. the assembly of the people (1 Macc. 14:22), the deliberations of such a board (Jud. 2:2), and the resolution of an assembly (3 Macc. 7:17); (d) also, and above all, the counsel or purpose of God (e.g. "The LORD brings the counsel of the nations to naught ... the counsel of the LORD stands for ever", Ps. 33[32]:10 f.; "Thou dost guide me with thy counsel", Ps. 73[72]:24). God's purposes are trustworthy and true; Israel can therefore rely on them (Isa. 25:1). His purpose includes Israel's salvation (Isa. 14:26; cf. also Isa. 5:19; Mic. 4:12).

2. The divine will and purpose plays a special part in the Dead Sea Scrolls. In the "fellowship of unity", the elect according to God's will represent the true Israel (1QS 7:6; 9:15). In the precepts and commands they find the will of God which they must perform (1QS 9:13, 23, CD 3:15). The thought of a fixed predestination is again and again expressed in the words: "Apart from thy will nothing takes place" (cf. 1QS 11:17; 1QH 10:2); "... nothing is known" (1QH 1:8; 10:9). God's will is thus the irrevocable prerequisite for every insight into right action (1QH 14:13); the one who does his will is the elect man (4Qp Ps. 37:5).

NT 1. As in secular Gk. literature, so in the NT *boulomai* (37 times) has been heavily suppressed by *thelō* (207 times). The terms are thus almost entirely interchangeable. But it is nonetheless striking that it is Acts that produces most attestations (14). "This is linked with the fact that Ac. is stylistically more akin to narrative prose such as that of Polybius, Diod. S. and Josephus, who still like *boulomai* even in the period of transition to *ethelō*" (G. Schrenk, *TDNT*, I 632).

In the NT *boulomai* can designate both sorts of volition, as it does in Hellenistic Gk. and in the LXX.

(a) *boulomai* can thus denote conscious volition in consequence of definite reflec-

tion, a decision of the will. Such volition always presupposes the possibility of freedom of decision. (i) It denotes human volition (1 Tim. 2:8; 5:14; Tit. 3:8, "I desire you to . . .", the apostolic demand); but mostly without any theological significance (Mk. 15:15, "Pilate wishing to satisfy the crowd . . ."; Acts 12:4, "intending after the Passover to bring him out to the people"; Jas. 4:4, "whoever wishes to be a friend of the world makes himself an enemy of God"). (ii) But it can also denote the volition of God (Lk. 22:42; Heb. 6:17; Jas. 1:18; 2 Pet. 3:9) or Jesus (Matt. 11:27 par. Lk. 10:22) or the Holy Spirit (1 Cor. 12:11). (Cf. below, 2).

(b) It can designate a wish determined by personal inclinations (Acts 25:22, "I should like to hear the man myself"; Phlm. 13, "I would have been glad to keep him with me"; 1 Tim. 6:19, "those who desire to be rich fall into temptation").

boulē is also found in the latter sense in 1 Cor. 4:5 (the Lord will "reveal the secret intentions of men's hearts" (JB), i.e. the volitional impulses concealed in the innermost depths of the psyche, of which men do not necessarily have to be conscious). As a rule, however, it is used as a noun from *boulomai*, referring to the free decision of the will which is prepared to carry it out: (i) of human beings, e.g. the ship's crew (Acts 27:12) and the mercenaries (Acts 27:42) and a plan; Joseph of Arimathea had dissented from their resolution (Lk. 23:51); (ii) of the counsel or purpose of God (in 7 out of the total of 12 occurrences: Lk. 7:30; Acts 2:23; 4:28; 13:36; 20:27; Eph. 1:11; Heb. 6:17; cf. Lk. 23:51; Acts 5:38; 19:1; 20:27; 27:12). It is particularly used in this sense by Lk. (5 out of 9 references; cf. below, 2). In the NT, as outside it, *boulēma* (only 3 times), by contrast with *boulē*, stresses the will more as mental direction and is therefore to be translated by intent, intention (Acts 27:43; Rom. 9:19; cf. below, 2; 1 Pet. 4:3).

2. Theological significance is found especially in those passages where the word-group speaks of the counsel, intention or will of God (or Jesus or the Holy Spirit). It is always a case of an irrefragable determination.

(a) In the Lucan writings the terms *boulomai* and *boulē* elucidate vital aspects of Lk.'s christological proclamation as the fulfilment of God's purpose.

Lk. 10:22 ("anyone to whom the Son chooses to reveal him"; cf. Matt. 11:27) shows the indivisible unity between Father and Son. In the weakness and humiliation of Jesus – the point at which the wise and clever go astray (cf. v. 26) – man encounters God's sovereign purpose and will. The death on the → cross does not contradict the divine authorization of Jesus; it is God's own purpose, foretold in the Scripture (Acts 2:23; 4:28, both times *boulē*). But though Jesus fell into the hands of the Jews in accordance with God's will, this specifically does not absolve them from the fact that they crucified him (Acts 2:21). The leaders of Israel could have perceived God's purpose already in the appearance of John the Baptist (Lk. 7:30). But their closed hearts showed that they were blind to God's further plan. The Jews did not realize, for instance, that the promises given to → David (Acts 13:34 ff.; cf. Ps. 13:10; → Resurrection) point away beyond him to God's plan with Jesus; for David fell asleep according to the will of God (*tē tou theou boulē*) and was gathered to his fathers and saw corruption. But the One whom God raised did not see corruption (13:36 f.).

It is one's attitude to the Humiliated and Crucified One which now decides to whom the revelation will be disclosed. "To whom the Son will reveal him" (Lk. 10:22) means, therefore, first, that with respect to knowledge of God, all human willing here reaches its limits; and secondly, here is no rule of arbitrary predestination,

but rather, in the encounter with the message of Jesus the decision about the revealed will of God is made. Lk. 22:42 makes it clear that Jesus in unity with the Father carries out only the divine will: "Father, if thou art willing [*ei boulei*] remove this cup from me; nevertheless, not my will [*thelēma*], but thine be done" (cf. Acts 13:22).

In the Lucan *apologia* of Paul (Acts 20:26 ff.), the apostle, taking leave of his congregation, emphatically points out yet again with regard to threatening heresies that he in his preaching testified to the whole purpose of God (*tēn boulēn tou theou*, v. 27), namely, God's gracious approach to sinners in the sacrifice of his Son (v. 28). "The *boulē* fills up the whole content of the apostolic preaching" (G. Schrenk, *TDNT* I 635).

(b) In the whole of the rest of the NT the word-group is used only a further 7 times for the will and purpose of God (or Jesus or the Holy Spirit; → *thelō*). In Rom. 9:19 it is noticeable that, when Paul has the Gentiles speaking of the will of God, he makes use of *boulēma* (the opponent gives the excuse "Who can resist his will?") whereas in v. 18 where he himself speaks as a believer of the double will of God, he uses *thelō* (or, in other places, *prothesis*, → foreknowledge, Rom. 8:28; 9:11). Since *boulēma* expresses more an intent or intention, which is often found to be dark and impenetrable, the word can often take on the tone of arbitrary wilfulness, or caprice in the mouth of an opponent (Rom. 9:19). In 1 Cor. 12:11 Paul points out that all gifts in the community derive from the one Spirit of God. They are apportioned to the individual charismatics in the freely willed decision of the Spirit (*kathōs bouletai*). *boulē* is found in Eph. 1:11 and Heb. 6:17, meaning the purpose of God (cf. 2 (a)). "In him [Christ], according to the purpose of him [*kata prothesin tou*] who accomplishes all things according to the counsel of his will [*kata tēn boulēn tou thelēmatos autou*], we who first hoped in Christ have been destined and appointed [*prohoristhentes*] to live for the praise of his glory" (Eph. 1:11 f.). H. Schlier is probably right in seeing this as a reference to the Jewish Christians who had already been destined for the inheritance according to God's purpose, even before Christ came (cf. Eph. 2:11–22; *Der Brief an die Epheser*, 1963⁴, 66 ff.). The life of faith under the old → covenant already points to Christ. That was God's will (→ *thelēma*) which fixed God's purpose (*boulē*), according to which everything is now being fulfilled. The purpose of divine election far precedes the act of historical election. Heb. 6:17 uses *boulē* similarly for the irrefragable purpose of God: the troubled community is told that God wanted (*boulomenos*) to reinforce the inviolability of his saving will (*to ametatheton tēs boulēs*) by an oath (→ Swear). The conception of the inviolability of God's saving will is found especially in the Dead Sea Scrolls.

God's promise has not been made questionable by the long lapse of history; his will is the salvation of all (2 Pet. 3:9). We have been born of his saving will (Jas. 1:18), and because God himself is the unalterable one (cf. Jas. 1:17), his gracious will cannot be overthrown. *D. Müller*

θέλω

θέλω (*thelō*), wish, want, desire, will, take pleasure in; *θέλημα* (*thelēma*), will, intention; *θέλησις* (*thelēsis*), will.

CL *thelō* – originally and especially in Hom. and in early Attic inscriptions *ethelō* – means: (a) to be ready (Homer, *Il.* 7, 364; Epict., *Dissertationes* 1, 119); to

prefer, to be inclined (Homer, *Il.* 23, 894; Plato, *Theaet.* 143g); (b) to wish (Hdt. 2, 2), to desire (e.g. "he desired to see", Homer, *Od.* 11, 566; also in the sexual sense, Homer, *Od.* 3, 272); (c) to have in mind (Homer, *Il.* 1, 549); (d) to will, both as determining and coming to a decision; and in particular (e) to will, in the sense of compelling, and overbearing the will (Homer, *Il*, 14, 120; 19, 274; Plato, *Phdr.* 80d). The noun *thelēma*, derived from *thelō* and attested from Antiphon the Sophist onwards, but used very rarely in secular Gk., correspondingly denotes intention, wish, and then chiefly will.

OT 1. In the LXX *thelō*, like → *boulomai*, is attested over 100 times (and very often of an aspect of God's character), and has essentially the same Heb. equivalents, chiefly: *ḥāp̄ēṣ* (44 times), to take pleasure in, delight in (e.g. Ps. 18[17]:19, "he [God] delighted in me"; Ezek. 18:23, "have I any pleasure in the death of the wicked?"); *'āḇâh* (33 times), to will, to be willing (Deut. 10:10, Yahweh "was unwilling to destroy you"); negative *mā'ēn* (20 times), to refuse (Gen. 37:35, "but he refused to be comforted"). *thelēma* (some 25 times) stands predominantly for the divine good-pleasure (e.g. Ps. 40[39]:8; Jer. 9:23; Mal. 1:10), but also for the will of God (Ps. 103[102]:7, Isa. 44:28), and especially of doing the will of God (e.g. Pss. 103[102]:21; 143[142]:10; cf. the use in Jn. and Heb., see below, NT 2 and 4). When *thelēma* is used of human beings, it can denote a wish (e.g. Ps. 107[106]:30), the will (e.g. of the king, Dan. 11:3 LXX), and also, negatively, ill-will, arbitrary behaviour (Jer. 23:26; Sir. 32:17).

2. For Qumran → *boulomai* OT 2.

NT *thelō* is attested 207 times in the NT (→ *boulomai* has already definitely receded into the background) and *thelēma* 62 times. It is found most frequently in the Synoptics (94 times; *thelēma* only 11 times) and the Pauline writings (61 times and 24 times). Since *thelēma* is the more theologically significant word (generally used for the will of God), the theological emphasis lies primarily in Paul and Jn. (23 times *thelō*, 11 times *thelēma*) who focus on this theme.

thelō frequently appears in the NT in a quite secular sense for general willing, desiring (e.g. Matt. 20:21; Matt. 26:17 par. Mk. 14:12), resolute willing (e.g. Matt. 25:15; Jn. 7:44), finding pleasure in, liking (e.g. Mk. 12:38 par. Lk. 20:46), claiming (2 Pet. 3:5); *thelēma*, by contrast, only rarely (e.g. 1 Cor. 7:37; 16:12).

1. (a) In the Pauline writings *thelō* and *thelēma* are frequently used to describe the will of God, and especially to describe the real source of the whole event of salvation in Christ. Christ's act of self-sacrifice for the sake of our sins is necessarily *kata to thelēma tou theou*, and is thus the act of God himself (Gal. 1:4). By this act we are called to sonship (Eph. 1:5) in accord with his comprehensive saving will (*to thelēma*), in order to have disclosed to us the → mystery of his saving will (Eph. 1:9), since it is his will that all things should be united in him (cf. v. 10). On the basis of this saving will, his own people have had their eyes opened to the wisdom of creation in Christ, which is now manifested in the communities formed out of both Jews and Gentiles. The resolve to make Israel his inheritance in his free predestination, and to succeed in his all-embracing working, is also consonant with his will (1:11). The *thelēma tou theou* denotes here God's eternal and providential saving will. It is to

this overall saving will of God alone that Paul owes his apostolate (cf. 1 Cor. 1:1; 2 Cor. 2:1; Eph. 1:1; 2 Tim. 1:1; → Apostle).

The exegesis of Rom. 9:14 ff. has always caused difficulties. How are the will of man and the will of God related to each other? The attempt has repeatedly been made to understand this passage from the perspective of human free will and responsibility. But Paul does not go into the question of human responsibility here at all (cf. for this Rom. 10:16 ff.). It is not human volition (*thelein*) which is decisive for God's action; it is God's saving will which is the pre-condition for all human volition. The freedom of divine compassion is not dependent on human exertion, and just as little dependent on human resistance (cf. v. 17). God accomplishes his will in history precisely in that he harnesses both obedient and obdurate into his saving plan (v. 18). "The Pauline exegesis is not open to rational analysis; it puts deliberate obstacles in the way. The statement 'God hardens' now threatens everyone, including the Jews (Rom. 9:24 ff.), just as God's compassion is now perceptible to everyone, including the reprobate (9:22). The OT stumbling-blocks enabled Paul to make intelligible the way of the Gospel in the present time. For it is in the stumbling-block that God's mystery lies (9:33)" (O. Michel, *Der Brief an die Römer*, *KEK* 4, 1966 [13], 241). The "[God] wanted" (*thelōn*) in 9:22 is not to be understood concessively ("although God, yet he has borne them patiently") but causally (because, with the intention of). The forbearance of God is the way which leads God to the revelation of his wrath (cf. G. Bornkamm, *Das Ende des Gesetzes*, I, 1966[5], 91). It is God's will to make known his compassion precisely in forbearance and wrath; the ultimate goal of his will is in fact not the "vessels of wrath". Rather he has borne them for the revelation of his grace. It is the goal of his will that all men should be helped and come to the knowledge of the truth (1 Tim. 2:4).

The fact that the ultimate intention of God's will is the revelation of his glory in Christ is stressed particularly in Col. 1:27. In the will of God this whole space-time continuum is moving towards the point when the mystery of God's saving will is to be unveiled for the believer in the Christ-event. Even if this will, for the time being, has been correctly apprehended only by the believer, yet it is still directed towards the redemption of all men (1 Tim. 1:14). By sharp contrast with the teaching of the Qumran community (→ *boulomai*, OT), the synagogue and the gnostics, the NT church does not acknowledge a double predestination in the will of God, whereby from the beginning one section of humanity is excluded from salvation.

1 Cor. 15:38 is concerned with God's will as Creator: the new resurrection body cannot be compared with anything that we can conceive of in nature; the will of God will be creatively active in a new way.

The revelation of the mystery, i.e. the understanding of the saving will of God, is for the believer the pre-condition of a right attitude and right behaviour in the age of salvation, which has already dawned. Those who are unwise and lack understanding miss the insight into the divine will and corresponding behaviour (Eph. 5:17 f.). Paul elaborates this with particular sharpness in Rom. 2:17 ff. with regard to Jewish teachers of the law. The scribe thinks that he knows God's will from the law, and that he is able to be a guide for the blind. But the very contradiction between his teaching and his own behaviour betrays the fact that God's will has not yet been understood here. For Christ is the day-break of the new age, and this requires a renewal of the mind (Rom. 12:2), i.e. thinking which is transformed by the bestowal of the Spirit,

which is part of a continual endeavour to understand the *thelēma tou theou*. What in God's will is good (*to agathon*), well-pleasing (*euareston*) and perfect (*teleion*) should lead the believer to appropriate behaviour (Rom. 12:2). Paul extols such an approach, deriving from the will of God, in the congregations of Macedonia (2 Cor. 8:5). Paul has to point out to the church at Corinth that their conduct in the matter of the charismatic gifts must not be understood as an achievement deriving from their own will. Since all such charismatic gifts stem from the determinative will of the Creator, no one in the community has any right to be arrogant (1 Cor. 12:18, cf. v. 11 → *boulomai*; cf. vv. 6, 24). Passages such as Rom. 1:10; 15:32; 1 Cor. 4:19 (cf. Acts 18:21) show that human volition in the believer is not simply invalidated, but rather embraced, by the will of God. Paul plans in accord with his own will, but expecting that God's will is able to place him in a quite different situation, which will demand from him an alteration of his own plans.

(b) (i) Where *thelō* is used in Paul with religious significance, referring to human beings, it is also always linked with verbs of doing: *poieō* (e.g. 1 Cor. 7:36; 2 Cor. 8:10; Gal. 5:17); *energeō* (e.g. 2 Cor. 8:11; Phil. 2:13; → Work). Since the believer no longer stands in contradiction to the will of God, God becomes the one who is acting in him. Willing and working become the gifts of God (Phil. 2:13). All human volition and behaviour are thus to take place out of obedience to God, and in accord with his saving will (e.g. 2 Cor. 8:10 f.; 1 Cor. 7:36). But where → Spirit and → flesh are still at variance with one another, i.e., where the Spirit has not yet fully gained acceptance, *thelein* does not turn into *poiein* (Gal. 5:17).

(ii) There is considerable disagreement over the understanding of the contrast between volition and action in the exegesis of Rom. 7:15 ff. According to the general view, the contrast is seen as being in the subject of man. On the one hand, he would like to fulfil the will of God which confronts him in the law, but on the other he again and again falls short of the will of God, because he is bound to the → flesh. "The fragmentation in man does not permit fulfilment of the law ... the split in man is to be sought for radically in his being man" (O. Michel, op. cit., 186). Man cannot overcome this fragmentation of himself (and even the believer can fall back into it); he can do so only when, according to the promise of God, he comes under the law of the Spirit, who gives freedom and life in Jesus Christ (Rom. 8:2). Bultmann, Bornkamm and others, however, take the contrast to be the discrepancy between what I, as an individual, deep down really want and what actually results in my actions. I want what is good (*kalon* vv. 18 f.), but the result of all my actions is evil (*kakon*, vv. 19, 21). The split in man does not consist in his consciousness, which can accuse itself or be detached from itself, but in the fact that man does the opposite of what he wills, that is to say of what he really, fundamentally wills – but not of what he from time to time wills in actual practice (cf. R. Bultmann, "Romans 7 and the Anthropology of Paul", *Existence and Faith*, 1960, 147–57).

It should, however, be remembered that the section Rom. 7:7–13 reaches the conclusion in the thought that sin works death in one through the good (G. Bornkamm, "Sin, Law and Death (Romans 7)", *Early Christian Experience*, 1969, 87–104). This may suggest that Paul is speaking of the unredeemed man, whose radical failure "is disclosed only in faith" (G. Bornkamm, op. cit., 96; cf. E. Fuchs, *Die Freiheit des Glaubens, Römer 5–8 ausgelegt*, 1949, 72) by the dichotomy between unwilled deeds

and unproductive volition. (For further discussion and literature → I Am, art. *egō eimi* NT 2(c).)

(c) *thelō* is encountered frequently as a declaration of the will of the apostle to his congregations in phrases such as: "I wish" (1 Cor. 7:7; 14:5; Gal. 3:12); "I do not want to leave you in ignorance" (e.g. Rom. 1:13; 1 Cor. 10:1); or "I want you to understand" (1 Cor. 11:3). In many places *thelō* assumes the weight of apostolic authority (e.g. Rom. 16:19; 1 Cor. 7:32).

2. *thelō* and *thelēma* play an especial rôle in John. Repeated stress is laid on the fact that Jesus, the One who is sent, does not act according to his own will (Jn. 5:30a; 6:38a), but that the will of the Father is accomplished in the work of the Son (Jn. 5:30b; 6:38b). Jesus is absolutely and entirely the bearer of the Father's will (Jn. 4:34). God's will is that Jesus, the Saviour (*sōtēr*, cf. Jn. 3:17), does not lose those who are appointed for life (Jn. 6:39); and those who are appointed for life in the divine will are those who perceive salvation in Jesus and take hold of it, i.e. believe on him (Jn. 6:40). Again, John can interpret faith as the doing of the divine will (Jn. 9:31; 1 Jn. 2:17), the congruence of human volition with the divine will being revealed in Jesus (1 Jn. 5:14 ff.). This is not possible by natural stimulation of the will (Jn. 1:17; cf. 2 Pet. 1:21). "The wind blows where it wills" (Jn. 3:8), i.e. salvation is impossible as a human possibility: but it is possible as divine possibility (cf. R. Bultmann, *The Gospel of John*, 1971, 138 ff.). This divine possibility confronts us in the Son. The Son gives life to whom he will (Jn. 5:21; cf. 6:27, 57). The sole criterion for establishing the legitimacy of the Revealer is the doing of his will (*poiein to thelēma autou*, Jn. 7:17). But it is not as though ethics take precedence over faith in John. Rather, the doing of his will again means the faith to which knowledge is given in obedience. It is for this faith that Jesus asks when he says to the sick man "Do you want to be healed [*theleis hygiēs genesthai*]?" (Jn. 5:6).

3. (a) In the Synoptic Gospels and Acts, apart from Matt. (*thelēma* 6 times for the will of God) the word-group is found only rarely for direct description of the will of God. In passages such as Matt. 7:21; 12:50 (par. Mk. 3:35) one meets as in Jn. the formula "he who does the will of God [or of the Father] . . ." (cf. Matt. 21:31). But here again one must not distinguish a will of God concerned with ethics and another one concerned with a saving purpose. There is only one all-embracing will of God with which alone corresponds an equally comprehensive attitude to life by the believer (*thelō* also has this sense in the OT quotation: Matt. 9:13; 12:7; cf. Hos. 6:6). So, too, the third petition in the Lord's Prayer (Matt. 6:10), as the prayer in Gethsemane (Matt. 26:39, 42; Mk. 14:36, Lk. 22:42), is not to be understood as an aquiescent accommodation to some unalterable power, but as an active affirmation which helps to realize the divine willing (his saving plan) and to lead towards the goal (→ Prayer, art. *proseuchomai* NT 2; so also Acts 21:4; cf. Matt. 21:31). Doing the divine will is closely knit with knowledge of the divine will (Acts 22:14; see above 1 (a)).

(b) *thelō* occurs with especial frequency in the Gospels in the mouth of Jesus. Alongside purely secular usage it stresses in some passages the authority of Jesus (e.g. Matt. 15:32; 20:32; Matt. 8:3 par. Mk. 1:41, Lk. 5:13; 3:13; 7:24) or the authority of the Lord recognized in the faith of other people (e.g. Lk. 5:12); but also the decision of the will which is demanded of the hearer on the basis of this authority (e.g. Matt. 16:24 f.; 19:17, 21; Mk. 10:43 f.).

4. In the non-Pauline writings of the NT *thelō* is found in Heb. 10:5, 8; Jas. 4:15; 1 Pet. 3:10, 17; 2 Pet. 3:5; Rev. 2:21; 22:17; *thelēma* in Heb. 10:7, 9f., 36; 13:21; 1 Pet. 2:15; 3:17; 4:2, 19; 2 Pet. 1:21; 1 Jn. 2:17; 5:14; Rev. 4:11; and *thelēsis* once (Heb. 2:4, of gifts of the Spirit distributed according to God's → Spirit).

The interpretation of Ps. 40:7 ff. in Heb. 10:5–10 corresponds with the Johannine thinking concerning the will of God and its fulfilment in the work of the One who has been sent. Some exegetes suppose that Heb. understands Ps. 40:7 ff. as a dialogue between the pre-existent Christ and God. This would mean that the principle is here enunciated by which Christ comes into his world and by which his whole earthly life is determined: exclusive fulfilment of the will of God (vv. 7, 9), i.e. repudiation of cultic sacrifice (vv. 5 ff.), fulfilment of Scripture (v. 7) and the presentation of his own life as a sacrifice (v. 10). In v. 10 our sanctification is grounded in the fulfilment of this will of God in Christ (→ Sacrifice, art. *thysia*; cf. F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, *NLC*, 1964, 231–36). In the sacrifice of Jesus Christ the will of God has been so completely fulfilled that a transformation of man in sanctification has become possible (Heb. 13:21). This transformation, i.e. fulfilment of the promise, is again the "doing of the will of God" by the believer (10:36). Very much as in John the doing of the will of God consists of undivided obedience to this will. 1 Pet., in particular, stresses that this obedience according to the will of God can include suffering (3:17; 4:2, 19). *D. Müller*

(a). G. Bornkamm, "Sin, Law and Death (Romans 7)", in *Early Christian Experience*, 1969, 87–104; F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, *NLC*, 1964; R. Bultmann, "Romans 7 and the Anthropology of Paul", in *Existence and Faith*, 1960, 147–57; and *The Gospel of John*, 1971; G. Schrenk, *boulomai* etc., *TDNT* I 629–37; and *thelō* etc., *TDNT* III 44–62.

(b). G. Bornkamm, "Paulinische Anakoluthe im Römerbrief", in *Das Ende des Gesetzes*, I, (1952) 1966[5], 91 ff.; L. Cerfaux, "La Volonté dans la Doctrine Paulinienne", *Recueil Lucien Cerfaux. Études d'Exégèse et d'Histoire Religieuse*, III, 1962, 297 ff.; E. Echternach, *Wille und Vorsehung*, 1951; K. E. Logstrup, "Wille", *RGG*[3] VI 1716 ff.; O. Michel, *Der Brief an die Römer*, *KEK* 4, 1966 [13]; H. Riesenfeld, *Zum Gebrauch von thelō im Neuen Testament, Arbeiten und Mitteilungen aus dem neutestamentlichen Seminar Uppsala* 1, 1936.

Wisdom, Folly, Philosophy

μωρία

μωρία (*mōria*), foolishness, folly; *μωραίνω* (*mōrainō*), make foolish, pass. be foolish; *μωρός* (*mōros*), foolish, stupid; *ἄφρων* (*aphrōn*), foolish, senseless; *ἀφροσύνη* (*aphrosynē*), lack of sense, folly, foolishness.

CL 1. *mōros* means foolish, stupid and, like *mōria*, foolishness (Soph. onwards) denotes inappropriate behaviour, thought or speech, both of single lapses of sense as well as in the sense of a permanent attribute. It is concerned as much with lack of knowledge as with lack of discernment. The use of the word for the state of mental derangement (Soph., *Aj.* 1150) or for a man's behaviour when acting under the influence of his desires (Eur. *Hippolytus* 966; Soph., *Ant.* 469 f.) suggests the thought of a power which dominates man. *mōrainō* means to be foolish or to act foolishly, and also (later, after the LXX) to make foolish, to show to be foolish. As a special

meaning with reference to food, *mōros* can mean insipid, the pass. *mōrainesthai*, to become insipid.

2. *aphrōn*, senseless, foolish and *aphrosynē*, lack of sense, foolishness (both words from Hom. onwards) indicate by the use of the *Alpha*-privative that the term is essentially defined by a lack or a negation, i.e. lack of insight and reason. But the possible development of a diseased mind is not excluded here either (Homer, *Od.* 23, 10–14). *aphrōn* can thus mean infatuated (Homer, *Od.* 21, 102) and *aphrosynē* can be referred back to mania (Aristotle, *Eth. Nic.* 7, 6, both times, incidentally, through active intervention of the gods). But the words chiefly describe deficient perception of value and truth.

OT 1. The Heb. words for fool, foolish and folly are predominantly rendered in the LXX by *aphrōn* (115 times, of which 19 have no equivalent) or *aphrosynē* (31, and 5 instances in the Apocrypha without equivalent). The commonest equivalents are the words derived from the root *kāsal* (possibly originally meaning sluggish, foolish, and only then insolent, godless), which occur altogether 64 times, of which 40 are in Prov., 21 in Eccl. With one exception (Ps. 94[93]:8 LXX) they are always translated by *aphrōn* or *aphrosynē*. The older *nāḇal*, also fairly common (same original meaning), is rendered by *aphrōn* only in Job and Pss., but always by *mōros* in Prov., Deut. and Isa. *mōros*, indeed, is found a total of only 6 times for a Heb. equivalent, but 28 times in the Gk., Sir. without equivalent and similarly the noun twice in Sir. without equivalent. The occurrences are as follows.

aphrosynē stands for *'iwweleṭ*, foolishness, at Pss. 38(37):5; 69(68):5; Prov. 18:13; 19:3 (18:22); 26:4 f.; 27:22; *kᵉsîl*, *kesel* or *kislâh*, stupidity, at Job 4:6; Eccl. 4:17, 25(26); 9:17; *nᵉḇālâh*, senselessness, at Deut. 22:21; Jdg. 19:23 f.; 20:6, 10; 2 Sam. 25:25; *sāḵal* or *siḵlûṭ*, fool(ish), folly, at Eccl. 2:12 f.; 10:1, 3, 13; *peṯî*, a simple youth, Prov. 9:6(4, 16); *tāp̄ēl* or *tip̄lâh*, tasteless, unseemliness, at Job 1:22; Lam. 2:14; and *zimmâh*, shameless conduct (mostly in sexual affairs), at Jdg. 20:6. It is without equivalent at 1 Sam. 25:5; Job 21:23; Prov. 5:5; 18:2; Wis. 10:18; 12:23; Sir. 8:15; 47:20, 23.

aphrōn stands for *ᵉwîl* or *'iwweleṭ*, awkward, useless, at Prov. 12:15 f.; 14:1, 3, 9, 29; 15:5; 16:22; 20:3; 27:3; *'āwen*, uncanny, wickedness, at Job 34:36; Isa. 59:7; *bôš*, put to shame, at Prov. 17:2(?); *bᵉliyya'al*, wicked, at Prov. 6:12; 16:27; 19:28; *bā'ar* or *ba'ar*, behaving as brutish or stupid, at Pss. 49(48):10 *v.l.*; 92(91):6; 94(93:8; Prov. 12:1; 30:2 (24:25); *lō' ḥāḵām*, not wise, at Prov. 20:1(?); *ḥ ᵉsar-lēḇ*, lacking in heart, i.e. without sense, at Prov. 17:18; *kᵉsîl* or *kᵉsîlûṭ*, insolent (in religion), stupid (in practical affairs), at Prov. 10:1, 18, 23; 12:23; 13:16, 20; 14:7 f., 16, 24, 33; 15:2, 7, 20; 17:10, 12, 16, 21, 24 f.; 18:6 f.; 19:10, 13, 29; 21:20; 23:9; 26:1, 4–11; 28:26; 29:11, 20; Eccl. 2:14 ff.; 4:5, 13, 17; 5:2 f.; 6:8; 7:4 ff., 9 (5 ff., 10); 10:2, 12, 15; *kᵉsîlûṭ*, insolence, stupidity, at Prov. 9:13; *lûṣ*, scoff, at Prov. 1:22; *nāḇāl*, senseless, foolish, stupid, at 2 Sam. 13:13; Job 2:10; 30:8; Pss. 14(13):1; 39(38):8; 53(52):1; 72(73):18, 22; Prov. 17:7, 18; Jer. 17:11; *sāḵal* or *seḵel*, fool(ish), at Eccl. 2:19; 10:3, 6, 14; Jer. 4:22; *'āṣēl*, sluggish, lazy, at Prov. 24:30 (45); and *pᵉṯî*, a simple youth, at Prov. 7:7; 9:4, 16; 14:18. It occurs (not always with equivalent) at Prov. 10:4, 23; 18:7; Eccl. 2:15; Wis. 1:3; 3:2, 12; 5:4; 12:24; 14:11; 15:5, 14; Sir. 16:23; 19:23; 20:7, 14, 22; 21:23; 22:13; 27:11; 34(33):1; 31(34):7, 30.

mōria is found only at Sir. 20:31 and 41:15 (for Heb. *'iwweleṭ* in the latter place). The vb. *mōrainō* is rare, standing in the niphal for *bā'ar*, behave as brutish or stupid (Isa. 19:11; Jer. 10:14; 51[28]:17), and *kāsal*, be stupid (2 Sam. 24:10; Isa. 44:25), and without equivalent (Sir. 23:14). *mōreuō* stands for *kāsal* at Isa. 44:25. *mōros* stands for *'ᵉwîl*, awkward, useless (Isa. 19:4); *nāḇāl* or *nᵉḇālâh*, senseless, foolish, stupid (Deut. 32:6; Isa. 32:5 f.); *sākal*, foolish (Jer. 5:21); and *śākal*, have insight (with negative, Ps. 94[93]:8). But most often *mōros* is found in Sir. where the Heb. original is not always extant (Sir. 4:27; 16:23; 18:18; 19:11 ff.; 20:13, 16, 20; 21:14, 16, 18, 20, 22, 26; 22:7 f., 11 f., 14, 18; 25:2; 27:13; 33[36]:5 f., 1; 42:8; 50:26).

The instances based on *nāḇal* are quite unequivocal in insisting that foolishness is not lack of knowledge but rebellion against God (→ Sin). Hence, the term fool gains the associated sense of one who denies God, a blasphemer (classic references are Pss. 14[13]:1; 53[52]:2; but cf. also Ps. 74[73]:18, 22; Job 2:10; Isa. 32:5 f.; Sir. 50:26). The fool who rebels against God also destroys fellowship with man: he lets the hungry starve (Isa. 32:6); earns riches by unjust means (Jer. 17:11); and slanders his fellow-men (Ps. 39[38]:9). In later Wisdom literature, too, where the term rather pales, the associated sense of culpable behaviour is still retained.

2. For the Qumran community the one who remains outside the fellowship is counted a fool (CD 15:15). Wisdom and folly lie struggling together in the heart of man (1QS 4:24). In the catalogues of sins (1QS 4:9–11) folly appears amongst others. The hope of the pious is for the ultimate annihilation of folly (1QS 4:8).

NT In the NT *aphrōn* is found 11 times, of which 7 instances occur in Paul (*aphrosynē* 4 times, of which 2 are in Paul), whereas the *mōria*-group numbers 14 attestations for the adj. (4 in Paul), 5 for the noun (all in Paul) and a further 4 for the vb. (2 in Paul). The striking point is its forceful usage by Paul and the predominance of the adj. *mōros* in Matt.

1. In the Synoptic Gospels (occurrences: 1 in Mk., 3 times in Lk., 7 times in Matt.; *mōros* 6 times) the words appear with varying meanings.

(a) The picture of → salt becoming insipid (*mōrainesthai*, Matt. 5:13; Lk. 14:34) might have as its background one of Jesus' words of promise: the → gospel, like salt, can never lose its force. Salt does not undergo any chemical change; one cannot season it. As it stands, the saying is shaped as a word of warning: take care that you do not let the salt become insipid.

(b) The interpretation of the term of abuse *mōre*, "you fool!" (Matt. 5:22) is disputed (cf. G. Bertram, *mōros TDNT* IV 839 ff.; → Curse, art. *rhaka*). The most natural interpretation still appears to be a filling-out of the word fool with the associated sense of "godless" (cf. Matt. 23:17; similarly *aphrones*, Lk. 11:40).

(c) *mōros* is used in parables by Matt. as an opposite to *phronimos*, wise (Matt. 7:24–27; 25:1–13). Here, too, the associated sense deriving from the OT content of the word could play a rôle: foolishness is not stupidity, but rebellion against God. It is not fate, but guilt. A man proves himself foolish when he declines God's offer. He falls into judgment. Obedience is the prudence of believers (a similar use of *aphrōn* in the parable of the rich fool, Lk. 12:20).

2. (a) Paul uses *mōria* and *mōros* to characterize the preaching of the → cross over against the wisdom of the world, which is exhibited in the rejection of the cross of Christ by Jews and Greeks (1 Cor. 1:23), and expressly in Corinth in the

authoritarian piety of the Corinthian spiritual party which despised the lowliness of the apostle. This wisdom God has turned into foolishness in Christ's death on the cross (1 Cor. 1:20; 3:19; on the whole context → *sophia* NT 2).

The other side of this is that the preaching of the cross, which appears so foolish to men, is in fact foolish. This is not, of course, in the sense that it is unintelligible, or that it demands a *sacrificium intellectus*. The foolishness of the preaching lies in its content, in the cross of Christ. "Christ the Crucified One is the radically Weak One, whence also the Christian who exists in him must of necessity be weak. . . . The cross is the radical crisis even of Christ himself" (U. Wilckens, *Weisheit und Torheit*, 1959, 218). But the Corinthian spiritual party cannot and will not allow this. Paul, therefore, contradicts them by saying that the "foolishness of God [*to mōron tou theou*]" (which is not an attribute of God, but his freely chosen way of dealing with the world in the cross of Christ) "is wiser than men, and the weakness of God is stronger than men" (1 Cor. 1:25). To share in the folly of degradation of the cross means to share in the power of God. "For the word of the cross [*ho logos gar tou staurou*] is folly to those who are perishing, but to us who are being saved it is the power of God [*dynamis theou*]" (1 Cor. 1:18). God's "power is made perfect in weakness" (2 Cor. 12:9; → Fruit, art. *skolops*). This is why Paul can offer the paradoxical advice that one should become foolish in order to become wise (1 Cor. 3:18), and why he can call himself a "fool for Christ's sake" (1 Cor. 4:10).

(b) The use of *aphrōn* and *aphrosynē* in 2 Cor. 11 and 12 is as undialectical as the use of *mōros* and *mōria* in 1 Cor. is dialectical. The boasting to which Paul's Corinthian opponents, who wish to be wise (*phronimoi ontes*, 2 Cor. 11:19), have forced him (2 Cor. 12:11) is designated by him as foolishness (2 Cor. 11:1, 16 f., 21). If it is all right, in a foolish way, to boast, the apostle can go along with them: but he boasts of his → weakness (2 Cor. 11:30), and that is enough (2 Cor. 12:9). Here also he makes a connexion with the preaching of the cross.

3. (a) In the paraenesis of Eph. the congregation is called upon not to be foolish, but to inquire after the will of the Lord (Eph. 5:17). *aphrones* stands here close to *asophoi*, unwise (which is found only at Eph. 5:15); obviously the Christians are intended to be guarded from undisciplined behaviour.

(b) 2 Tim. 2:23 warns against "stupid senseless controversies [*mōras kai apaideutous zētēseis*]" – unprofitable discussions over hair-splitting minutiae such as genealogies and the law (Tit. 3:9) which only lead to quarrels (cf. *mōrologia*, silly talk, Eph. 5:4). *apaideutos* which occurs only at 2 Tim. 2:23 means uninstructed, uneducated, hence, stupid.

(c) 1 Pet. 2:15 urges the congregation, by its good deeds, to "put to silence the ignorance of foolish men" and so to do God's will. *J. Goetzmann*

σοφία

σοφία (*sophia*), wisdom; σοφός (*sophos*) wise; σοφίζω (*sophizō*), make wise, teach, instruct; mid. to reason out, devise craftily.

CL The adj. *sophos*, used frequently from Pindar onwards, and the noun *sophia*, found from Homer onwards, always denote in Gk. an attribute, never an activity (in contrast with *synesis*, → reason). They indicate unusual ability and knowledge,

earlier in the practical sphere as well (the *sophia* of a carpenter, Homer, *Il.*, 15, 41 f.), but later concentrated on theoretical knowledge. The members of the college of the Seven Sages were renowned for their worldly wisdom and political discernment (Plato, *Prt.* 343a), whereas the *sophia* of a later time (the Sophists) was regarded as knowledge which could both be taught and acquired. Socrates' wisdom consisted in the fact that he knows that he knows nothing (Plato, *Ap.* 21). All authoritarian wisdom is in reality no wisdom at all. In Plato the content of wisdom is related to his view of forms or ideas. Ultimately, it is a property of the form of the good alone (*Symp.* 204a). For Aristotle, *sophia* and → *philosophia* were identical (*Met.* 1, 1; 5, 1). With the Stoics theory and practice coincide: wisdom is realized knowledge. The conduct of the wise man is *sophia*. The *sophos* himself, in his conduct, is the necessary subject of Stoic philosophy.

OT 1. As a rule, the word group occurs in the LXX as a rendering of words from the stem *ḥkm*. In accord with their significance almost three-fifths of the references are found in Wisdom literature (Prov., Job, Eccl. and Pss.; in Sir. and Wis. there are over 100 references with no Heb. equivalent in Wis., but not always in Sir.). Here the term acquires a specific stamp.

sophia stands predominantly for *ḥoḵmâh*: Exod. 28:3 *v.l.*; 31:3; 35:26, 31 *v.l.*; 35:35; 36:1; Deut. 4:6; 2 Sam. 14:20; 20:22; 1 Ki. 2:6; 5:9 f., 14 (4:29 f., 34); 5:26(12); 10:7; 1 Chr. 28:21; 2 Chr. 1:10 f.; 9:3, 5, 6 f., 22 f.; 2 Esd. 7:25; Job 4:21; 11:6; 12:2; 12 f.; 13:5; 15:8; 26:3; 28:12, 18, 20, 28; 32:7, 13; 33:33; 38:36 f.; 39:17; Pss. 37(36):30; 49(48):3; 51(50):6; 90 (89):12; 104(103):24; 107(106):27; 111(110):10; Prov. 1:2, 7, 20; 2:2, 6, 10; 3:13, 19; 4:5, 11; 5:1; 7:4; 8:1, 11 f.; 9:1, 10; 10:13, 23, 31; 11:2; 14:6, 8, 33; 15:33 (16:4); 16:16; 17:16; 21:30; 24:3, 7, 14; 28:26; 29:3, 15; 30:3 (24:26); Eccl. 1:13, 16, 18; 2:3, 9, 12, 13, 21, 26; 7:10 ff., 19, 23, 25 (11 ff., 20, 24, 26); 8:1, 16; 9:10, 13, 15 f., 18; 10:1, 10; Isa. 10:13; 11:2; 29:14; 33:6; Jer. 8:9; 9:22(23); 10:12; 49(29):7; 51(28):15; Dan. 1:4; 2:20 f., 23, 30; 5:14. It also stands for *bînâh*, understanding (Prov. 2:3; 3:5); *tᵉḇûnâh*, understanding (1 Ki. 3:1; cf. 5:9 [4:29]; Prov. 18:2); *da'at*, knowledge (Prov. 1:7, 29); *mûsar*, chastening, discipline, exhortation (Prov. 8:33 *v.l.* for *paidian*); *maḥᵃšeḇeṯ*, thought, device (Exod. 35:33); and *śeḵel*, insight, prudence (1 Chr. 22:12). But apart from occasional instances where there are no parallels in the Heb. text (Exod. 36:2; Job 8:10; 11:20; Prov. 6:8; 8:12; 17:28; 20:29; 22:24; 31:5 [24:73]; Isa. 50:4; Dan. 1:17), a large proportion of the instances occur in the apocryphal writings: 1 Esd. 3:7; 4:59 f.; 8:23; Wis. 1:4–6; 3:11; 6:9, 12, 20–23; 7:7, 12, 15, 22, 24, 28, 30; 8:5, 17; 9:2, 4, 6, 9, 17 f.; 10:4, 8 f., 21; 14:2, 5; Sir. prol. 4, 10; 1:1, 3 f., 4, 6, 14, 16, 18, 20, 24 ff.; 4:11, 24; 6:18, 22, 37; 8:8; 11:1; 14:20; 15:3, 10, 18; 18:28; 19:20, 22 f.; 20:30 f.; 21:11, 18; 22:6; 23:2; 24:1, 25; 25:5, 10; 27:11; 31(34):11; 34(31):8; 37:20 f.; 38:24; 39:1, 7, 10; 40:20; 41:14 f.; 42:21; 43:33; 44:15; 45:26; 50:27; 51:13, 17.

sophos stands chiefly for *ḥāḵām*, wise: Gen. 41:8; Exod. 28:3; 35:10, 25; 36:1, 4, 8; Deut. 1:13, 15; 4:6; 16:19; 32:6; Jdg. 5:29; 2 Sam. 13:3; 14:2, 20; 20:16; 1 Ki. 2:9; 3:12 *v.l.*; 1 Chr. 22:15; 2 Chr. 2:6 f., 11 ff. (7, 12 ff.); Job 5:13; 9:4; 15:2, 18; 34:2, 34; 37:24; Pss. 49(48):10; 107(106):43; Prov. 1:5 f.; 3:35; 9:8 f.; 10:1, 8, 14; 2:15, 18; 13:14, 20; 14:1, 3, 16, 24; 15:2, 7, 12, 20; 16:14, 21, 23; 18:15; 20:26; 21:11, 20, 22; 22:17; 23:24; 24:5, 23 (38); 30:24 (24:59); 25:12; 26:5, 12, 16;

28:11; 29:8 f., 11; Eccl. 2:14, 16, 19; 4:13; 6:8; 7:4 f., 7, 19 (5 f., 8, 20); 8:1 (7:30); 8:5, 17; 9:1, 11, 15, 17; 10:2, 12; 12:9, 11; Hos. 14:10; Obad. 1:8; Isa. 3:3; 19:11 f.; 29:14; 31:2; Jer. 4:22; 8:8 f.; 9:16, 22 (17, 23); 51(28):57; Ezek. 27:8 f.; 28:3. The Aram. equivalent in Dan. is *ḥāḵîm* (Dan 2:12, 21, 27 and further instances in the version of Theodotion). *sophos* is used to translate *bîn*, understand (1 Sam. 16:18); *ḥarṭôm*, soothsayer priest (Dan. 2:10); *nāḵōaḥ*, straight, right (Prov. 24:26[41]); *ḥāḵam*, be wise (Job 32:9; Prov. 6:12; 13:20; 20:1; cf. also the expressions in Prov. 1:5; 6:6; 9:9; 19:20; 23:15, 19; 27:11). It is without equivalent in 1 Ki. 4:20 (3:1); Job 21:22 *v.l.*; 33:31; Ps. 58(57):5; Prov. 10:4; 13:10, 13, 17; 14:7; 17:24; 24:7; 31:26(27); Ezek. 28:3. It is also found in the Gk. apocryphal books: 1 Esd. 3:5, 9; 4:42; 5:6; Wis. 4:17; 6:24; 7:15; Sir. 1:8; 3:29; 6:33 f.; 7:19; 8:8; 9:14, 17; 10:1, 25; 18:27; 20:5, 7, 13, 27, 29; 21:13, 15, 26; 27:11 *v.l.*; 33(36):2; 37:22 ff., 26; 44:4; 4 Macc. 7:23.

The vb. *sophizō* which is much less common stands chiefly for *ḥāḵam*, be wise: 1 Ki. 5:11 (4:31); Pss. 19(18):7; 105(104):22; 119(118):98; Prov. 8:33; Eccl. 2:15, 19; 7:16(17), 23(34). It stands for *bîn*, understand, at 1 Sam. 3:8; and has no equivalent at 1 Ki. 5:11(4:31); Prov. 16:17; Sir. 18:29; 32(35):4; 38:31; cf. Sir. 7:5; 10:26; 37:20; 38:24 f.; 47:14; 50:28, where there is a corresponding Heb. text.

Here one must note the spread of meaning in the word-group. *sophia* denotes e.g. specialist knowledge in a particular field, such as in handicraft or in art (Exod. 36:1 f.), but equally in economic shrewdness (Prov. 8:18, 21), the art of government (Prov. 8:15) or education (1 Ki. 5:9–14 [EVV 4:29–34]). Over and above this, it is concerned quite generally with the sagacious behaviour which enables a man to master life (Prov. 8:32–36). Here it depends on right conduct in obedience to the will of God rather than on theoretical insight. Wisdom is accordingly connected with the fear of Yahweh: "The fear of the LORD is the beginning of wisdom and the knowledge of the Holy One is insight" (Prov. 9:10; cf. 1:7; 15:33; Ps. 111[110]:10; Job 28:28). Here also is developed the distinctive aspect of the understanding of wisdom in Israel: wisdom is rooted in adherence to God. "The thesis that all human knowledge comes back to the question about commitment to God is a statement of penetrating perspicacity. . . . One becomes competent and expert as far as the orders in life are concerned only if one begins from knowledge about God" (G. von Rad, *Wisdom in Israel*, 1972, 67). "This idea is among the most characteristic of Israelite religion. Non-Israelite wisdom is unaware of this kind of almost programmatic rooting of wisdom in the fear of God" (op. cit., 66, n. 11; cf. S. Plath, *Furcht Gottes*, 1962, 70).

2. (a) The OT is aware, even if in critical utterances, of wisdom in the surrounding nations, e.g. in → Babylon (Jer. 50:35; 51:57; cf. Isa. 47:10) and in Egypt (1 Ki. 5:10). Astonishing parallels can be exhibited between Egyptian texts and Heb. Wisdom literature, e.g. between Prov. 22:17–23:11 and the Egyptian book of the Wisdom of Amenemope (cf. E. Würthwein, "Egyptian Wisdom and the Old Testament", in J. L. Crenshaw, ed., *Studies in Ancient Israelite Wisdom*, 1976, 113–33). In adopting these texts, of course, Israel brought them firmly into line with its own religious convictions. One can also recognize a kinship with ancient oriental phenomena in the fact that the royal palace may count as a special place for the growth of Wisdom literature and its organized transmission. As in Egypt wisdom texts served in the training and education of future palace officials, so at Solomon's court such texts were collected for the training and education of the rising generation

of royal advisers (cf. A. Alt, "Solomonic Wisdom", in J. L. Crenshaw, op. cit., 102–12). The beginnings of a descriptive natural science in the form of the so-called scientific catalogues (cf. 1 Ki. 5:12 f. [EVV 4:32 ff.]) have their place equally at Solomon's court as in Egypt and Mesopotamia. The figure of Daniel and his companions is also to be reckoned as belonging to these courtly circles (Dan. 2:48; 5:11 f.).

(b) Over all acquired and transmitted wisdom, however, stands the wisdom which is given as a gift by God to King → Solomon (1 Ki. 3:5–14), which finds expression in judicial shrewdness (1 Ki. 3:16–28) and also leads, in later minds, to admiring recognition by Israel's neighbours (1 Ki. 5:11, 14, 21 [EVV 4:31, 34; 5:7]; 10:1–9, 23 f.). Here is reflected not only the longing of later generations for the splendour and security of Solomon's reign, but also Israel's conviction of the transcendence of Yahweh over other gods. It is no wonder that the same tendency ascribed the authorship of Israel's proverbial wisdom to Solomon (1 Ki. 5:12). It is equally comprehensible that wisdom was expected in the hoped-for messianic king (Isa. 11:2).

(c) The concept of wisdom is theologically very pervasive in post-exilic times. Wisdom, conceived in personal terms, becomes the mediator of revelation and a teacher (Prov. 8:1–21) who summons (Prov. 1:20 ff.; 8:32 ff.) and invites men (Prov. 9:1 ff.). Created prior to all the works of creation (Prov. 8:22–31), she discloses to men the original order inherent in creation. She thus gains the rôle of a divine principle implanted in the world, which is nevertheless (according to Job 28) accessible to God alone.

3. (a) This understanding of wisdom found expression in the ideas of a generally wide-spread myth (as much Jewish as gnostic), in which wisdom sought for a dwelling among men, but, unable to find one, returned to heaven. In later times this myth was articulated without any embarrassment (Eth. Enoch 42) and re-interpreted to glorify the law. Wisdom finds a resting-place in Israel and is identified with the → law (Sir. 24:8 ff., 23 ff.). In Hellenistic Judaism the personification of wisdom is carried even further. The student of wisdom follows her like a lover, and wins all the bliss of dwelling with her (Sir. 14:20–27). In the Wisdom of Solomon wisdom is not only present at the creation but is herself creator as the "mother" of all good things and innumerable riches (Wis. 7:12). She sits on the throne of God (9:4), mediating God's salvation (7:27). Similar ideas are found in Philo (*Migr. Abr* 218; cf. U. Wilckens, *sophia*, *TDNT* VII 500 f.), whereas Josephus gives preference to an identification of wisdom and law (*Ant.* 18, 59 and 82; *War* 2, 118; cf. *TDNT* VII 502 f.).

(b) For rabbinic Judaism, wisdom and scriptural erudition are essentially identical. Pre-existent wisdom is understood to be the Torah and the relevant passages correspondingly interpreted (cf. SB I 7a ff., 974 f.; II 353 f.).

4. In the Dead Sea Scrolls the term *ḥokmâh* emerges relatively rarely and is influenced by the dualism of the sect's theology. God's all-embracing plan for the world, the goal of which is the annihilation of the wicked, is determined by wisdom (1QS 4:18). The elect are allotted the wisdom of the sons of heaven by the Spirit of truth (1QS 4:21 f.). By contrast, the terms related to *ḥokmâh – dā'at, bîn* and *śekel*, insight, knowledge – which in Qumran denote the wisdom of God or insight into God's saving plan, can be found extremely frequently. Commenting on 1QH 12:11 ff.; 2:13 f.; 1QS 4:20, 22, E. E. Ellis sees striking resemblance to the pneumatics of the Pauline community ("Wisdom and Knowledge in 1 Corinthians", *TB* 25, 1974, 95).

NT In the NT terms from this word-group are found chiefly in 1 Cor. 1–3 (25 times), whereas the Gospels use them relatively rarely and unevenly (Mk. only once; Jn. not at all; Matt. 5 times and Lk. 7 times; and in addition 4 times in Acts). The word-group is found 8 times in the later Pauline writings, 3 times in Jas., once in 2 Pet. and 4 times in Rev.

1. (a) The use of the word-group in the Gospels is in general tied to the traditional OT and Jewish conception, where wisdom is man's approach to life, arising out of his life in the covenant bestowed by God, and so must be regarded as the gift of God. Thus, according to Lk. 2:40, 52, the twelve-year-old Jesus grew in wisdom and insight, and distinguished himself by his exceptional knowledge of the law (a reminder of the Jewish idea that wisdom and knowledge of the law are identical). Mk. 6:2 depicts the astonishment of the inhabitants of Nazareth at the wisdom given to the carpenter's son (cf. Matt. 13:54). In Acts, too, Stephen is represented as a man equipped by God with the Spirit and wisdom, whose testimony cannot be contradicted for this very reason (Acts 6:3, 10). Express reference is made to OT precedents (Acts 7:10; cf. Gen. 39:2 f., 21; 41:40–46; Ps. 105:21). The promise of wisdom for defence speeches in the persecutions of the coming final days (Lk. 21:15) is also formulated in the same terms.

(b) Another – equally Jewish – conception had an effect on a group of sayings which possibly all originate from the Logia-source. The tradition of a personally understood Wisdom, who calls men to her, quite possibly lies behind the remarkable statement that "Wisdom is justified by her deeds" (Matt. 11:19, par. Lk. 7:35 "by her children"). Jesus (and John his witness) are understood as the mouth of Wisdom, who brings salvation. If one includes the introduction to the word of judgment on "this generation", which in Lk. 11:49 is introduced as a word of the Wisdom of God, but in the par. Matt. 23:34 ff. is understood as a word of Jesus, Jesus could be understood as Wisdom come to earth. When "this generation" is confronted with the Queen of the South who came from the ends of the earth in order to hear → Solomon's wisdom, the implied rebuke is corroborated with the comment, "Behold, something greater than Solomon is here" (Matt. 12:42 par. Lk. 11:31; cf. 1 Ki. 10:1–10; 2 Chr. 9:1–12). This can be understood most easily by thinking of the heavenly Wisdom whom men despise (cf. OT 3 (a)): in Jesus this wisdom has finally appeared. It seems justifiable to speak of a *sophia*-christology.

2. The same religio-historical material, though according to W. Schmithals and others, with stronger gnostic colouring, plays a rôle in Paul's confrontation with the Corinthian spiritual party whom Schmithals identifies as gnostics (*Gnosticism in Corinth*, 1971).

(a) In a fundamental and far-reaching exposition in which he develops his theology of the cross, Paul contrasts the wisdom of the world with the message of the cross. God has turned the wisdom of the world into foolishness (1 Cor. 1:20; cf. 3:19). This did not take place with words or arguments, where sentences of worldly wisdom were confronted with sentences of Christian wisdom. Rather, it was through an action, namely through the death of Christ on the → cross, that God has turned the wisdom of the world to foolishness. For as wisdom is not essentially the accumulation of a body of knowledge, but a mode of existence before God, so, too, folly is not a lack of knowledge, but the absence of this mode of existence. Since, however, in God's will "Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God" (1 Cor.

1:24; cf. 1:30) has been revealed, revealed in fact as the Crucified One, and only as the Crucified One (1 Cor. 1:23; 2:2), worldly wisdom which rejects the cross, whether in its Jewish or Greek variety, is objectively proved to be that which it always was: foolishness, i.e. rebellion against God, in the form of human self-exaltation and boasting (1 Cor. 1:29, 31). Men have closed their minds to the wisdom of God as they encountered it in the works of creation, and instead attempted to create their own wisdom (1 Cor. 1:21; cf. Rom. 1:18 ff.). But God has chosen to save those who believe through the foolishness of the preaching of the cross. Every attempt to demand a proof for the truth of God (1 Cor. 1:22) is as condemned to failure as is every attempt to boast of oneself (1 Cor. 3:18 ff.). "Believers are wise in the sense of 3:18 f. They do not advance beyond the situation of hearing and believing (2 Cor. 5:7)" (H. Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, *Hermeneia*, 1975, 48; cf. Rom. 1:16 f.). In this way, however, the very universality both of the event of salvation and of the offer of salvation is preserved. The expression *tous pisteuontas*, "those who believe" (1 Cor. 1:21), "sets aside every human barrier to salvation" (H. Conzelmann, op. cit., 46; → Faith).

Both the character of the Corinthian congregation and the manner of the apostle's preaching confirm his interpretation of the event of salvation. The election by God of the foolish, weak and despised, which can be seen from the composition of the community in Corinth, shows that God puts to shame those who count as wise by human standards (1 Cor. 1:26 ff.). God's will, announced in the OT word as judging man's pride (1 Cor. 1:19, 31; 3:19 f.), is thus fulfilled. Paul's renunciation of "lofty words of wisdom" (1 Cor. 2:1; cf. especially 2:4 f., 13; 2 Cor. 1:12) serves the sole saving work of the cross, which may not be emptied of its power (1 Cor. 1:17). Yet Paul can still say that he speaks wisdom "among the mature [or perfect, *teleiois*]", but it is God's wisdom, hidden in the mystery (1 Cor. 2:6 f.). This is due to the fact that Paul takes up ideas of his opponents and tries to put them to a positive use. This is why scholars see reminiscences of the gnostic myth and terminology of the mysteries in this section (1 Cor. 2:6–16). Paul obviously intends to say that rejection of the world's wisdom and emphasis on the cross of Christ does not exclude the experiences and endowment of the Spirit of God (cf. *logos sophias*, the word of wisdom, in the catalogue of the gifts of the Spirit, 1 Cor. 12:8). While making use of his opponents' scheme of revelation (→ Knowledge, art. *ginōskō*), Paul is insistent that God's hidden wisdom is revealed by the Spirit, and that those with the gift of the Spirit can discern everything, because they possess the mind of Christ (1 Cor. 2:10–16). Such wisdom, bestowed by the Spirit, does not, however, ignore the offence of the cross, but finds its criterion in it.

(b) This is also the place to inquire about the particular nature of the wisdom advocated in Corinth and contested by Paul. That Paul wished only to reject Gk. philosophy and rhetoric, i.e., that his fight is directed simply against percipient → reason, is difficult to accept. "It is not accidental that the teaching of 1 Cor. 1:18 ff. is found in a context where Paul is laying a carefully worked-out foundation. . . . The paradox of the divine activity is intended to be understood!" (G. Bornkamm, *Studien zur Antike und Urchristentum. Gesammelte Aufsätze*, II, 1963², 120 f.).

Perhaps one may suppose that the polemic of the apostle is directed against an over-subtle extension of the *sophia*-christology and the resultant disregard of the cross of Christ, along with the ensuing growth of factions. The Corinthians believed

that they shared in the wisdom which came into the world in Christ. As the people who had reached perfection, they had been exempted from the degradation of the cross. They therefore strove for personal perfection in the gifts of the Spirit, in knowledge and in wisdom, neglecting their responsibility to build up the whole congregation (1 Cor. 14). It was only Christ, who disregarded worldly concerns and drew others away from the world, who was of interest to them – not the Crucified One. Jesus thus served as an example of the earthly Pneumatic (a point disputed by Paul in 2 Cor. 5). This foolishness leads to pride and party division in a community. The preaching of the cross (and thus the paradoxical way to wisdom *via* the foolishness of preaching, 1 Cor. 3:18) is therefore the call to freedom from self-glorification and adherence to party division. It is thus the foundation and guarantee of the unity of the Christian community (1 Cor. 3:18–23).

(c) In the hymn which concludes the exposition of the mystery of Israel's election, Paul praises "the depth of the riches and wisdom and knowledge of God" (Rom. 11:33). It is revealed in his inscrutable judgments and ways (Rom. 11:33 f.; cf. Isa. 40:13 f.), and is thus not to be extolled in speculation, but experienced in history. This salvation-history reference, along with the reminiscences of Prov. 8, allows us to understand wisdom here as the work of the Creator, who is at the same time the Lord and Perfecter of history. There is then no contradiction with the statement in 1 Cor. 1:24, 30 that Christ is the wisdom of God.

(d) That Paul can use *sophos* in its ordinary non-technical sense is shown by 1 Cor. 3:10, where he describes himself as a "wise master-builder" of the community, and possibly also by the question in 1 Cor. 6:5, as to whether there was in the community no wise man able to give judgment, so that the community need not make a claim on heathen courts.

3. In the later Pauline Epistles, wisdom is understood as a gift of the grace of God (Eph. 1:8, 17; Col. 1:9, along with *synesis*, insight, understanding, and *phronēsis*, insight, understanding), in which the believer may grow. The content of this teaching of wisdom revealed by the Spirit, to which belongs a corresponding manner of life (Col. 1:10; 4:5; Eph. 5:15), is the → mystery of God – Christ, in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge (Col. 2:3). The christology developed here links on to the OT and Jewish conception of Wisdom hidden in God before the creation of the world (Prov. 8; Sir. 24). Within the scope of the divine economy (→ House, art. *oikonomia* NT), this wisdom will be revealed in the fullness of time in Christ through the church (Eph. 3:9 f.; 1:10).

4. For James wisdom is demonstrated in good behaviour by works of kindness (Jas. 3:13). The letter obviously has to deal with opponents who (like those in Corinth) claimed for themselves wisdom "from above", but caused wrangling and strife (Jas. 3:15 f.; cf. M. Dibelius and H. Greeven, *James*, *Hermeneia*, 1976, 210 ff.). Jas. does not go into the convictions underlying this claim, but describes wisdom as peaceable, full of compassion and without hypocrisy (Jas. 3:17; → Humility, art. *prayÿs*). For such wisdom one must pray to God (Jas. 1:5).

5. In Revelation *sophia* is praised in two hymnic texts as an attribute of God (Rev. 7:12; cf. also Rom. 16:27); it is also to be attributed to the slain Lamb at his exaltation (Rev. 5:12). The exalted Christ has the same power and wisdom as God. In the two other passages (Rev. 13:18; 17:9), *sophia* is the secret knowledge of

Christians, on the basis of which they can interpret the apocalyptic mysteries and events of their time. *J. Goetzmann*

6. For detailed examination of the idea of the pre-existence of wisdom see R. G. Hamerton-Kelly, *Pre-Existence, Wisdom, and the Son of Man: A Study of the Idea of Pre-Existence in the New Testament, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series* 21, 1973. The author defines pre-existence as "a mythological term which signifies that an entity had a real existence before its manifestation on earth, either in the mind of God or in heaven" (op. cit., 11). Some entities may be said to pre-exist because they exist with God before their own manifestation. The Logos in Jn., on the other hand, is seen as existing before the manifestation of anything at all. For Bultmann the pre-existence of Christ signifies only that the proclamation which Christ's presence caused has its origin outside this world (op. cit., 271; cf. R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, I, 1951, 305). Hamerton-Kelly sees the clearest expression of pre-existence teaching in Philo, Jn. and Heb., the two latter drawing directly on Jewish apocalyptic and wisdom traditions and also Hellenistic Judaism. But Jn. and Heb. are not the only sources of such interest in the NT. Summing up the rôle of wisdom in biblical thought, Hamerton-Kelly writes: "Wisdom in early Judaism might be said to be the essence of the creation, its inherent form. It was the blueprint according to which the universe was created. To that extent it could be regarded as a determinant of history from the beginning rather than the future. In this respect it should be compared with the idea of the plan of God in apocalyptic. The idea of a primordially given plan of which history is simply the outworking is indeed present in the thought of early Judaism and the New Testament. Does this rob history of its 'newness' and the future of its power? We think not. Wisdom as the essence of the universe and also the true man is chiefly to be revealed in the end. Its prior manifestation in Christ is preliminary and provisional – it does not impose a pattern on history 'from behind'.... Paul emphasized this especially – true humanity lies in the future and is not a return to a primordial state. There is also in apocalyptic the idea that all history has been arranged from the beginning, and this cannot be minimized. However, from the point of view of man in time, history is still spontaneous and new since the plan is not known to him" (op. cit., 279 f.).

7. The vb. *sophizō* is found in the act. in Pss. 19(18):8; 105(104):22; 119(118):98 in the sense of "make wise". It is used of wisdom in 1 Ki. 5:11; Prov. 16:17; Sir. 50:28, and with negative overtones in Eccl.7:16; Sir. 7:5; 32:4. Its use in 2 Tim. 3:14 f. is similar to that in the Pss.: "But as for you, continue in what you have learned and have firmly believed, knowing from whom you have learned it and how from childhood you have been acquainted with the sacred writings which are able to instruct you for salvation through faith in Christ Jesus [*ta dynamena se sophisai eis sōtērian dia pisteōs tēs en Christō Iēsou*]" (→ Scripture). It occurs in the pass. in 2 Pet. 1:16 in insisting that the faith proclaimed is not based on myths but on personal and historical encounter: "For we did not follow cleverly devised myths [*ou gar sesophismenois mythois exakolouthēsantes*] when we made known to you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but we were eyewitnesses of his majesty." *C. Brown*

φιλοσοφία

φιλοσοφία (*philosophia*), love of wisdom, philosophy; φιλόσοφος (*philosophos*), philosopher.

CL 1. *philosophia*, a compound of *philos*, friend, and *sophia*, wisdom, means love of wisdom, the sciences, or aspiration towards it. The noun *philosophos* can be found first in Heracl. (*Frag.* 35d), the vb. *philosopheō* in Hdt. (1, 30). However, according to ancient tradition (e.g. Diog. Laert., *Prooem.* 12; 8, 8), Pythagoras is said to have used the noun *philosophos* previously.

2. In Gk. and Hellenistic philosophy the following nuances in the meaning of the word *philosophia* can be shown:

(a) Amongst the Pre-Socratics *philosophia* initially means striving towards any kind of scientific activity. The term philosophy was then narrowed down and used for the question as to the origin of the world from a single primary substance (natural philosophy).

(b) Classical philosophy. (i) In Socrates the whole weight falls on the first half of the word *philo-sophia*, and so more on the act itself than on the result. Philosophy became the aspiration to wisdom, generally, of course, combined with the knowledge that one never attains to this. (ii) According to Plato, philosophy is the knowledge of reality, the eternal and immortal. He differentiated between Sophists, philosophers and wise men; the *sophistēs* is the one who believes that he possesses wisdom, and who pretends to be able to teach it. The *philosophos*, on the other hand, is the modest man who knows that he knows nothing, but seized by love for wisdom, searches after it his whole life long without ever entirely attaining to it. The designation *sophos*, wise, befits the gods alone. (iii) Aristotle understood philosophy in the narrowest sense to mean metaphysics, the investigation of the cause and principles of things or of the world of appearances (*Met.* 1, 3, p. 983b, 2 and p. 983a, 24 ff.).

(c) In Hellenistic philosophy the term *philosophia* acquired an almost religious significance. Its goal is happiness (Eudaimonism). This the philosophers (Stoics, Epicureans) propagate, wandering around as itinerant teachers. Philosophy as the way to happiness thus consists, for the Stoics, in striving for theoretical and especially practical excellence, i.e. for → virtue.

The Epicureans, on the other hand, define *philosophia* as the pursuit of happiness by means of, and allowing the possibility of, → reason. Here practical philosophy (ethics) dominates, to which rationality (logic) and the physical sciences are made subservient. (On philosophy in the ancient world generally see O. Michel, *philosophia* etc., *TDNT* IX 172–79; F. C. Copleston, *A History of Philosophy*, I, *Greece and Rome*, 1966².)

3. In the mystery religions and gnosticism *philosophia* is no longer concerned with the rational understanding of the world (in the sense of classical Gk. tradition) but depicts reality from the religious viewpoint. It therefore runs into religious speculation for which the gnostic Hermetic writings are exemplary. In the tractate *Asclepius* the true philosophy is defined as the quest for religious knowledge. Philosophy should thus fulfil the function of a spiritual worship and be entirely subsumed in such religious practice. It is hence the task of the prophet to nourish the soul by philosophy and magic (*Corp. Herm.* 23).

OT 1. Both the noun *philosophia* and the vb. *philosopheō* are found in the LXX only in 4 Macc. (1:1; 5:10, 22; 7:9, 21; and 5:6, 11; 7:21, 24 respectively). They are thus without Heb. equivalent. By contrast *philosophos* occurs as the equivalent of *'aššāp̄*, Aram. enchanter, in Dan. 1:20, where, judging by the context, conjurers must be meant. It is also found in 4 Macc. 1:1; 5:35; 7:7.

2. In developed Judaism *philosophia* is known as a word and a concept. Indeed, Hellenistic Judaism presented itself as philosophy:

(a) For Philo *philosophia* is synonymous with religion. He describes the Mosaic law as *hē patrios philosophia*, "the ancestral philosophy", i.e. the way of salvation (*Leg. Gai.* 156). He can therefore with pride call all Jews philosophers (*Mut. Nom.* 39).

(b) For Josephus, too, the Jewish religion and philosophy are identical. He therefore presents the communities of Pharisees, Sadducees and Essenes as three philosophical schools (*War* 2, 119; *Ant.* 18, 11).

(c) Philosophy and the Jewish religion are also equated in 4 Macc. The tyrant Antiochus is able to ridicule Judaism as "preposterous philosophy" (4 Macc. 5:10). Conversely, the martyrs appear as the representatives of "divine philosophy" (4 Macc. 7:9).

NT 1. In the NT the term *philosophia* occurs only in Col. 2:8, where a warning is given against it. The specific nature of this *philosophia* is characterized by the apposition *kata ta stoicheia tou kosmou*, "according to the elements of the world". (On the meaning of "elements" → Law, art. *stoicheia*; cf. also E. Lohse, *Colossians and Philemon, Hermeneia*, 1971, 94–99.) The elements of the world are thus the most important characteristic of this Colossian philosophy, which had become widespread in the Asia Minor community. With these elements of the world we are concerned not with natural components of Being, in the sense of scientific analysis and philosophical knowledge of the laws of the world, but with personal powers (Col. 2:18), which constrain people under fixed precepts. In the view of the representatives of this philosophy, the → body of Christ constitutes the unity of these elements of the world, i.e. Christ is the embodiment of the elements of the world.

The religio-historical background stems from a gnosticized Judaism, in which Jewish and Iranian-Persian ideas, and perhaps also Chaldaean astrology, have been intimately woven together and linked with Christianity. In Iranian thought, in particular, there is the myth of a divinity whose body is composed of the elements of the universe.

Paul therefore combats this Colossian philosophy, because its adherents looked for fulfilment in the elements of the world and not in the saving deeds of the death and resurrection of Christ. Thus the warning against philosophy in Col. 2:8 does not refer to classical Gk. philosophy, nor to the scholastic philosophy of Hellenism, but to a common speculative doctrine which found expression in gnosticism (cf. M. Dibelius, *An die Kolosser, Epheser, an Philemon, HNT* 12, 1953 [3]; E. Lohmeyer, *Die Briefe an die Philipper, an die Kolosser und an Philemon, KEK* 9, 1948 [14]; but for further discussion see M. D. Hooker, "Were there False Teachers in Colossae?", in B. Lindars and S. S. Smalley, eds., *Christ and Spirit in the New Testament. In Honour of Charles Francis Digby Moule*, 1973, 315–32, who contends that there was no Colossian error).

However, there may be allusions to *philosophia* in the NT even where the word itself is not mentioned. Perhaps, philosophy is meant in 1 Cor. 3:19; this is not a polemic directed against philosophical endeavour as such, but only against its being a way to salvation (*para tō theō*, with God, from God's perspective). The Bible does not reject philosophy *per se*: only its false self-assessment as a way of salvation.

2. The noun *philosophos* is used only in Acts 17:18 in the Lucan account of the Areopagus speech. The Epicurean and Stoic philosophers confronted Paul before the beginning of his speech on the Areopagus. Whereas one group (Luke probably thinks of the Epicureans) bluntly rejected the apostolic message, the others (the Stoics) showed a certain interest towards the Christian proclamation. But in the end it remained incomprehensible to them as well, and they rejected it. (For literature and interpretations of Paul's address → God, art. *theos* NT 4 (b); Knowledge, art. *agnoeō* NT 2 (a).) *H. Weigelt*

→ Curse, → Fear, → Knowledge, → Mind, → Reason, → Secret, → Spirit, → Think, → Truth, → Word

(a). G. Barth, "Matthew's Understanding of the Law", in G. Barth, G. Bornkamm and H. J. Held, *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew*, 1963, 58–164; G. Bertram, *mōros* etc., *TDNT* IV 832–47; and *phrēn* etc., *TDNT* IX 222–35; S. H. Blank, "Wisdom", *IDB* IV 849–61; G. Bornkamm, "Faith and Reason in Paul", in *Early Christian Experience*, 1969, 29–46; "The Revelation of God's Wrath (Romans 1–3)", ibid., 47–70; and "The Heresy of Colossians", in F. O. Francis and W. A. Meeks, eds., *Conflict at Colossae: A Problem in the Interpretation of Early Christianity Illustrated by Selected Modern Studies, Sources for Biblical Study* 4, *Society for Biblical Literature*, 1973, 123–46; R. E. Brown, *The Gospel according to John, Anchor Bible*, I, 1966, cxxii–cxxv; W. Brueggemann, *In Man We Trust*, 1972; G. E. Bryce, "Omen-Wisdom in Ancient Israel", *JBL* 94, 1975, 19–37; H. Conzelmann, *syniēmi* etc., *TDNT* VII 888–96; *1 Corinthians, Hermeneia*, 1975; "The Mother of Wisdom", in J. M. Robinson, ed., *The Future of our Religious Past. Essays in Honour of Rudolf Bultmann*, 1971, 230–43; and "Wisdom in the New Testament", *IDB Supplementary Volume*, 1976, 956–60; J. L. Crenshaw, ed., *Studies in Ancient Israelite Wisdom*, 1976; "Wisdom", in J. H. Hayes, ed., *The Old Testament and Form Criticism*, 1974, 225–64; and "Wisdom in the Old Testament", *IDB Supplementary Volume*, 1976, 225–64; W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology*, 1955², 147–76; M. Dibelius, "Paul on the Areopagus", in *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles*, 1956, 26–77; C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, 1953; T. Donald, "The Semantic Field of 'Folly' in Proverbs, Job, Psalms and Ecclesiastes", *VT* 13, 1963, 285–92; E. E. Ellis, " 'Wisdom' and 'Knowledge' in 1 Corinthians", *TB* 25, 1974, 82–98; R. Gordis, "The Social Background of Wisdom Literature", *Hebrew Union College Annual* 18, 1943–44, 77–118; E. I. Gordon, *Sumerian Proverbs*, 1959; and "A New Look at the Wisdom of Sumer and Akkad", *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 17, 1960, 122–52; R. M. Grant, "The Wisdom of the Corinthians", in F. C. Grant, *The Joy of Study*, 1951, 51–55; N. C. Habel, "The Symbolism of the Book of Proverbs", *Interpretation* 26, 1972, 131–57; R. G. Hamerton-Kelly, *Pre-Existence, Wisdom and the Son of Man*, 1973; J. R. Harris, "Athena, Sophia and the Logos", *BJRL* 7, 1922, 56 ff.; M. D. Hooker, "Were there False Teachers at Colossae?", in B. Lindars and S. S. Smalley, eds., *Christ and Spirit in the New Testament. In Honour of Charles Francis Digby Moule*, 1973, 315–32; D. A. Hubbard, "The Wisdom Movement and Israel's Covenant Faith", *TB* 17, 1966, 3–33; H. Jaeger, "The Patristic Conception of Wisdom in the Light of Biblical and Rabbinical Research", in F. L. Cross, ed., *Studia Patristica, TU* 79, 1961, 96–106; D. Kidner, *The Proverbs, TC*, 1964; J. A. Kirk, "The Meaning of Wisdom in James: Examination of a Hypothesis", *NTS* 16, 1969–70, 1–23; W. L. Knox, "The Divine Wisdom", *JTS* 38, 1937, 230–37; W. G. Lambert, *Babylonian Wisdom Literature*, 1960; M. Lichtheim, *Ancient Egyptian Literature*, I–II, 1973–76; D. B. Macdonald, *The Hebrew Philosophical Genuis*, 1936; W. McKane, *Prophets and Wise Men, SBT* 44, 1965; and *Proverbs: A New Approach*, 1970; J. L. McKenzie, "Reflections on Wisdom", *JBL* 86, 1967, 1–9; O. Michel, *philosophia* etc., *TDNT* IX 172–88; M. Noth and D. W. Thomas, eds., *Wisdom in Israel and in the Ancient Near East*, (Essays presented to H. H. Rowley) *Supplements to VT* 3, 1955; W. O. E. Oesterley, *The Wisdom of Egypt and the Old Testament*, 1927; H. P. Owen, "The

Scope of Natural Revelation in Rom. 1 and Acts 17", *NTS* 5, 1958–59, 133–43; B. De Pinto, "Word and Wisdom in St. John", *Script.* 19, 1967, 19–27; J. B. Pritchard, ed., "Didactic Wisdom and Literature", *ANET* 405–52; G. von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, I, 1962, 418–59; "Job XXXVIII and Ancient Egyptian Wisdom", in *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays*, 1966, 281–91; "The Joseph Narrative and Ancient Wisdom", ibid. 292–300; and *Wisdom in Israel*, 1972; O. S. Rankin, *Israel's Wisdom Literature*, 1936; H. Ranston, *The Old Testament Wisdom Books and their Teaching*, 1930; H. Ringgren, *Word and Wisdom: Studies in the Hypostatization of Divine Qualities and Functions in the Ancient Near East*, (Dissertation, Lund) 1947; J. M. Robinson, "*Logoi Sophōn*: On the Gattung of Q", in J. M. Robinson, ed., op. cit., 84–130; J. M. Robinson and H. Koester, *Trajectories through Early Christianity*, 1971; H. H. Rowley, *Job, New Century Bible*, 1970; J. C. Rylaarsdam, *Revelation in Jewish Christian Literature*, 1946; W. Schmithals, *Gnosticism in Corinth*, 1971; R. B. Y. Scott, *Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Anchor Bible*, 1965; "The Study of the Wisdom Literature", *Interpretation* 24, 1970, 20–45; and *The Way of Wisdom in the Old Testament*, 1971; R. Scroggs, "Paul: *Sophos* and *Pneumatikos*", *NTS* 14, 1967–68, 33–55; W. K. Simpson, ed., *The Literature of Ancient Egypt*, 1973²; J. G. Snaith, *Ecclesiasticus or the Wisdom of Jesus Son of Sirach*, 1974; P. W. Skehan, *Studies in Israelite Poetry and Wisdom*, 1971; N. B. Stonehouse, *Paul before the Areopagus and Other New Testament Studies*, 1957; M. J. Suggs, *Wisdom, Christology and Law in Matthew's Gospel*, 1970; R. N. Whybray, *Wisdom in Proverbs, SBT* 45, 1965; and *The Intellectual Tradition in the Old Testament, BZAW* 135, 1974; U. Wilckens and G. Fohrer, *sophia* etc., *TDNT* VII 465–528; R. J. Williams, "Wisdom in the Ancient Near East", *IDB Supplementary Volume*, 1976, 949–52; G. Ziener, "Wisdom", *EBT* III 969–76; F. Zimmermann, *The Inner World of Qohelet*, 1973.

(b). E. G. Bauckmann, "Die Proverbien und die Sprüche des Jesus Sirach. Eine Untersuchung zum Strukturwandel der israelitischen Weisheitslehre", *ZAW* 72 (Neue Folge 31), 1960, 33–63; C. Bauer-Kayatz, *Einführung in die alttestamentliche Weisheit*, 1969; R. Baumann, *Mitte und Norm des Christlichen, NTAbh* 5, 1968; W. Baumgartner, *Israelitische und altorientalische Weisheit*, 1933; J. Becker, *Gottesfurcht im Alten Testament*, 1965; G. Bornkamm, "Der Lobpreis Gottes (Röm. 11, 33–36)", in *Das Ende des Gesetzes. Paulusstudien. Gesammelte Aufsätze*, I, *BEvTh* 16, 1961³, 70–75; E. Brandenburger, *Geist und Fleisch, WMANT* 29, 1968; F.-M. Braun, *Jean le Théologien dans l'Ancienne Église*, II, 1964; and "Saint Jean, la Sagesse et l'Histoire", in *Neotestamentica et Patristica. Eine Freundesgabe, Herrn Professor Dr. Oscar Cullmann zu seinem 60. Geburtstag überreicht, Supplements to NovT* 6, 1962, 123–33; E. Bresciani, *Letteratura e Poesia dell'antico Egitto*, 1969²; A. de Buck, "Het religieus Karakter der oudste Egyptische Wijsheid", *Nieuw theologisch Tijdskrift* 21, 1932, 322–49; W. Burkert, "Platon oder Pythagoras? Zum Ursprung des Wortes 'Philosophie' ", *Hermes* 88, 1960, 159–77; W. Caspari, "Über den biblischen Begriff der Torheit", *Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift* 39, 1928, 668–95; F. Christ, *Jesus Sophia. Die Sophia-Christologie bei den Synoptikern, AThANT* 57, 1970; M. Conti, "La Sophia di 2 Petr. 3, 15", *Rivista Biblica Italiana* 17, 1969, 121–38; H. Conzelmann, "Paulus und die Weisheit", *NTS* 12, 1965–66, 231–44; J. J. A. van Dijk, *La Sagesse Suméro-Accadienne*, 1953; A. M. Dubarle, *Les Sages d'Israël*, 1946; L. Dürr, *Das Erziehungswesen im Alten Testament und im antiken Orient*, 1932; W. Eltester, "Gott und die Natur in der Areopagrede", *Festschrift für Rudolf Bultmann, BZNW* 21, 1957, 202–27; and "Schöpfungsoffenbarung und natürliche Theologie im frühen Christentum", *NTS* 3, 1956–57, 93–114; A. Feuillet, "Jésus et la Sagesse divine d'après les Évangiles Synoptiques; Le 'Logion Johannique' et l'Ancien Testament", *RB* 62, 1955, 161–96; and *Le Christ. Sagesse de Dieu d'après les Épîtres Pauliniennes*, 1966; J. Fichtner, *Die altorientalische Weisheit des Alten Testaments in ihrer israelitisch-jüdischen Ausprägung, BZAW* 62, 1933; J. de Finance, "La *sophia* chez S. Paul", *RSR* 25, 1935, 385–417; G. Fohrer, *Die Weisheit im Alten Testament, BZAW* 115, 1969; H. Gese, *Lehre und Wirklichkeit in der alten Weisheit*, 1958; and "Weisheit", *RGG*³ VI 1574 ff.; H. O. Gibb, *"Torheit" und "Rätsel" im Neuen Testament*, 1941; J. Guttmann, *Die Philosophie des Judentums*, 1933; P. Heinisch, *Die persönliche Weisheit des Alten Testaments in religionsgeschichtlicher Beleuchtung*, 1923; H. J. Hermisson, *Studien zur israelitischen Spruchweisheit*, 1968; P. van Imschoot, "Sagesse et Esprit dans l'Ancien Testament", *RB* 47, 1938, 23–49; E. Käsemann, "Die Legitimität des Apostels", *ZNW* 41, 1942, 33 ff.; J. C. Lebram, "Die Theologie des späten Chokma und häretisches Judentum", *ZAW* 77, 1965, 202–11; and "Nachbiblische Weisheitstraditionen", *VT* 15, 1965, 167–237; J. Leclant *et al.*, *Les Sagesses du Proche-Orient Ancien*, 1963; B. L. Mack, *Logos und Sophia, StUNT* 10, 1973; J. Marböck, *Weisheit im Wandel*, 1971; S. Plath, *Furcht Gottes*, 1962; O. Rickenbacher, *Weisheitsperikopen bei Ben Sira, Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis* 1, 1973; M. Saebo, *ʾāwîl, THAT* I 77 ff.; *ḥokmâh, THAT* I 557–67; *kᵉsîl, THAT* I 836 ff.; and *nābāl, THAT* II 26–31; H. Schlier, "Kerygma und Sophia", *EvTh* 10, 1950–51,

481 ff. (reprinted in *Die Zeit der Kirche*, 1956, 206 ff.); H. H. Schmid, *Wesen und Geschichte der Weisheit, BZAW* 101, 1966; C. Spicq, "La Vertu de Prudence dans l'Ancien Testament", *RB* 42, 1933, 187–210; W. Staerk, "Die sieben Säulen der Welt und des Hauses der Weisheit", *ZNW* 35, 1936, 232–61; R. Stecher, "Die persönliche Weisheit in den Proverbien, Kap. 8", *ZKT* 75, 411–51; U. Wilckens, "Kreuz und Weisheit", *KuD* 3, 1957, 77 ff.; and *Weisheit und Torheit. Eine exegetisch-religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu 1 Kor. 1/2, BHTh* 26, 1959; H. Windisch, "Die göttliche Weisheit der Juden und die paulinische Christologie", in *Neutestamentliche Studien für G. Heinrici*, 1914, 220–34; G. Ziener, "Die theologische Begriffssprache im Buche der Weisheit", *Bonner Biblische Beiträge* 11, 1956, 109–13; and "Weisheitsbuch und Johannesevangelium", *Biblica* 348, 1957, 416 ff.; W. Zimmerli, "Zur Struktur der alttestamentlichen Weisheit", *ZAW* 51, 1933, 177–204.

Witness, Testimony

μαρτυρία

μαρτυρία (*martyria*), testimony, testifying, attestation; *μαρτυρέω* (*martyreō*), bear witness, testify; *μαρτύριον* (*martyrion*), testimony, evidence, proof; *μαρτύρομαι* (*martyromai*), testify, bear witness, affirm; *μάρτυς* (*martys*), a witness; *διαμαρτύρομαι* (*diamartyromai*), charge, adjure, bear witness to, testify of; *καταμαρτυρέω* (*katamartyreō*), bear witness against, testify against someone; *συμμαρτυρέω* (*symmartyreō*), testify in support, confirm; *ψευδομαρτυρέω* (*pseudomartyreō*), bear false witness; *ψευδομαρτυρία* (*pseudomartyria*), false witness; *ψευδόμαρτυς* (*pseudomartys*), one who gives false testimony.

CL 1. (a) The noun *martyria* means making an active appearance and statements as a witness (*martys*), the earliest form of the basic noun being *martyros* in Homer, then later Aeolic *martyr. martyria*, denoting the confirmation of a fact or an event, is attested from Hom. *Od.* 11, 325 onwards, and cognate with *mermēros*, that which requires many minds, going back with this word to the common Indo-European root **smer*, to be mindful of, from which *merimnaō*, to be concerned, may also be formed (cf. Lat. *memor*, mindful of). Its lexical content may be more precisely defined as reflective, interrogative recollection, re-call, i.e. calling up into consciousness something one has experienced which cannot be ignored or forgotten, and which is now in this sense brought to the notice of others, in order to impart to them by means of appropriate statements the content of this experience: that which has been experienced shall become evident by means of the testimony (cf. Plato, *Symp.* 179b).

(b) From the 5th cent. B.C. there are found the derived vbs. *martyreō*, to bear witness, to be a witness for something, or to confirm something to someone's advantage by giving evidence (Hdt., 8, 95), or to testify that something is the case (Heracl., 34; Soph., *Ant.* 515; *OC* 1265), and *martyromai*, to call someone as a witness (Plato, *Phlb.* 12b). Also found are the nouns *martyrion* for the evidence, the proof, which, by contrast with the act of giving evidence, refers more to the content of the statement (Hdt., 2, 2; 8, 55) or to a piece of evidence (a victor's crown, Plato, *Leg.* 12, 943; a document or deeds; even objects such as tombs and archaeological finds as proof of earlier settlements; also quotations from famous authors or poets), and *martys* for the witness himself (evidenced in the earliest inscriptions). The gods can be invoked as witnesses in the form of oath (→ Swear; e.g. Pindar, *Pyth.* 4:167, of Zeus); but men can also be summoned or brought forward as witnesses to confirm a claim or to illuminate some fact (Plato, *Grg.* 471c; *Leg.* 836c; *Rep.* 364c).

Of the compounds *symmartyreō*, to be a witness with someone, testify in support, is already found in Soph. and Thuc. From Plato, *Leg.* 3, 680d, and Xen., *Hell.* 7, 135, it means to confirm in the sense of the correspondence of a second or further piece of evidence which is added to one already given. *katamartyreō* means to give evidence against someone (4th cent., Lysias and Isoc. onwards); *diamartyromai* to call in as a witness, then (Xen., *Hell.* 3, 2, 13) to certify, to attest, and even to urge strongly, to conjure (Diod. Sic., 18, 62, 2). The *pseudomartys*, the one whose statement does not accord with the truth, but who twists or covers it up, and the *pseudomartyria*, testimony which is incorrect or falsified, are also mentioned by Plato (*Grg.* 472b, where he cites the Sophists by way of example, Diels-Kranz, II, 300, 10; 398, 25 f.); likewise the cognate vb. *pseudomartyreō*, to bear false witness (*Leg.* 9, 939c). Thus on functional grounds the statement has become dissociated from the recollection, and the relationship from the championing of truthfulness.

2. (a) The original setting of the word-group in the Gk. world is clearly the legal sphere. Witnesses appear to give evidence in a trial in respect of events now lying in the past (cf. the analysis in 1(a)), or are called in as so-called formal witnesses in order to provide substantiation in the future, for legal transactions or for solemn confirmation in the finalizing and signing of agreements; in general these are mentioned by name and add their own signatures immediately below the text. The *martyria* in a trial is to be given freely, i.e. without constraint or against one's better knowledge (such as by torture), and is normally distinguished from the oath itself as a substantiation of one's statements by invocation of the gods when obvious proof is lacking (cf. the description of Anaximenes of Lampsacus in Aristotle, *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*, referred to in *TDNT* IV 476 n. 10). *martyria* is thus initially always action; but it can then take on the sense of *martyrion*, evidence, as the content of the statement made, whereas the latter can never have the sense of an action. The invocation of the gods as witnesses has its place, where human witnesses or given circumstances cannot be adduced. Thus in Plato, *Ap.* 31c, Socrates offers his poverty as evidence that he did not teach for the sake of profit. The words of the group originally always stood – in the legal sphere as in the wider world of public and private relationships – for "the establishment of events or actual relations or facts of experience on the basis of direct personal knowledge" (H. Strathmann, *TDNT* IV 478).

This is typical for the rational structure of Gk. thought. Only in grammar can one still see that the witness with his testimony always appears for and thus at the same time against someone (dat. of person; what he testifies is in the acc. or in a *hoti* clause). In primitive conceptions of the witness he combines his mental powers with the person for whom he is testifying, in order to help him to victory, thus interceding more for the person than – in the strict sense – for the case.

(b) Even before Aristotle, who in *Rhet.* 1, 15 submitted a different analysis, a proximate and additional use of the word had established itself, by which the *martyria* was no longer intended to substantiate something objectively given, but instead expressed moral or philosophical convictions. This use of the word can already be perceived in Plato's *Apology* with reference to Socrates, but it acquired its great importance primarily from the time of the Stoics. The Cynic or Stoic philosopher regarded himself as a witness called to give evidence on behalf of divine truth, in that he testified to the truth of his ideas and doctrines by his conduct in adverse cir-

cumstances – his endurance of suffering, and his acceptance of his conditions as training, not allowing himself to be shaken by them (cf. especially Epictetus, *Dissertationes* 1, 29, 46 ff.; 3, 22, 86 ff.). This kind of *martyria* is of course not identical with the later Christian concept of martyrdom, even though death may well be included.

OT 1. (a) It is immediately apparent in the LXX that the commonest member of the word-group is the noun *martyrion* (in total over 290 instances), by far the greater part of these cases being found in Exod. and Num., and 45 in Lev., Here as in some passages in the Chronicler (e.g. 1 Chr. 9:21; 23:32; 2 Chr. 5:5; 24:6), it may refer to the two tablets with the Sinaitic commandments (*dyo plakes tou martyriou*, Exod. 31:18; 32:15). It is also frequently used of the *skēnē tou martyriou*, the → tent of the testimony (AV, "the tabernacle of the congregation"; Exod. 29:4, 10 f.; 40:2 ff.; Lev. 4:4 ff.; Num. 4:25 ff.; cf. also the *kibōtos tou martyriou*, the box or ark of the testimony, Exod. 40:3; 5:21; Lev. 16:2; Num. 4:5). *martyrion* has here a sense which accords with its later usage in cl. Gk., namely that of the piece of evidence which calls to mind a particular event, or of the deeds (such as the founding of the → covenant or of the → Law).

The Heb. *mô'ēḏ*, rendered c. 130 times by *martyrion* in combination with *skēnē*, tent, means the time or place of appointment, implying that at this place Yahweh wished to meet his covenant-people. It is the Heb. noun *'ēḏût*, rendered equally (some 35 times) by *martyrion* in the phrase *kibōtos tou martyriou*, ark of the testimony, that denotes the solemnly given and accepted ordinance, the law with its recognized obligations. In that the same Gk. noun assimilated both meanings, its meaning almost inevitably had to shift from the act of encounter to the place of evidence, and from thence to the observance of the Law (the tablets standing as *pars pro toto* for the totality of the covenant ordering). Only where one could still hear the ring of the Heb. word could any knowledge – even for the Jews of the Diaspora – of the original intention, namely, the revelatory speaking of God, be retained. Strathmann has argued (*TDNT* IV 482) that in some places this translation completely distorts the sense of *mô'ēḏ* (1 Sam. 13:8, 11; 20:35), and that in others there has been a false reading of the Heb. word (Mic. 7:8; Prov. 29:14; Amos 1:11; Zeph. 3:8; Isa. 37[30]:20; Job 15:34).

While instances such as Gen. 31:44 (the covenant stele of Laban and Jacob) and Jos. 22:27 f.; 24:27 have the meaning of a monument, the material memorial, there is another usage of *martyrion* which, by virtue of the context, comes closer to the original intention of *mô'ēḏ*, and which occurs only in two small groups of instances: first, Hos. 2:12(14) and Wis. 10:7, where the desolations in the land are (a piece of) evidence for men's guilt and the ensuing judgment; and, secondly, passages in the Pss., namely the 23 attestations in Ps. 118(119). In this probably post-exilic writing, which is also stamped with the spirit of Deuteronomic and Wisdom thought (possibly the expression of a stronger tendency to individualize piety), the "document" character recedes behind that of "testimony", not only in the sense of the Torah as a given and fixed law, but especially as advice (almost at times personally addressed to the individual), as direction for his way of life, which the psalmist loves (v. 119), marvels at (v. 129) and will observe (vv. 88, 146, 167 f.). *martyrion*, as the embodiment and expression of the covenant, is here the means of knowing Yahweh.

(b) With 7 canonical and 5 apocryphal attestations, *martyria* is used comparatively rarely for the same equivalent Heb. words. Indeed, in 1 Sam. 8:24 Heb. *mô'ēḏ* would be better rendered by some temporal designation such as *kairos*, point of → time (art. *kairos*), whereas Prov. 12:19; 25:18 and Sir. 34(31):23 f. describe the act of giving testimony, which can be characterized as truthful, lying or unjust. The noun *martys* (54 occurrences, rendering of Heb. *'ēḏ*), on the other hand, is used in the classical sense for one who gives testimony on the basis of observation, or who in the legal sense is enlisted to confirm a state of affairs, an agreement. Examples include the contract of Boaz in Ruth 4:9 ff., where the elders of the town are called as witnesses, and especially the procedural stipulations in Deut. 17:6 f.; 19:15 ff.; Num. 35:30, whereby a decision may only be given on the basis of the evidence of more than one witness. In the agreement between Laban and Jacob (Gen. 31:44 ff.), and also in Samuel's rendering of account (1 Sam. 12:3 ff.) Yahweh the Lord is named and invoked as witness (cf. Jer. 42[49]:5; cf. Job 16:20; Ps. 89[88]:37; also Wis. 1:6). Similarly in the prophetic oracle, Jer. 36(29):23, Yahweh comes forward as a witness against Israel. On the whole, however, even these passages remain within the realm of statements which substantiate human behaviour. This is the reason why, especially in the Pss. (27[26]:12; 35[34]:11) and Prov. (e.g. 12:17, 19; 14:5, 25) and also in Isa. 8:2, the central question – as with *martyria* itself – is that of the trustworthiness or mendacity of the witnesses. The latter is abominated and stands under severe threat of punishment or even divine threat of judgment (cf. Exod. 23:1; Deut. 19:16 ff.). Only in the later chapters of Isa. does another understanding occur, when in Isa. 43:10, 12; 44:8 the members of the nation are ordered to come forward as witnesses amongst the nations to the uniqueness and righteousness of Yahweh. Even though the context takes the form of an eschatological lawsuit, the Servant Songs (Isa. 42:1–4; 49:1–6; 50:4–9; 52:13–53:12) suggest something like a missionary rôle for the nation.

(c) Of the verbal forms the simple *martyreō* is attested only 17 times: for legal testimony (Num. 35:30; Deut. 19:15, 18); but also for the commemorative function of a monument (Gen. 31:46 ff.) and the Song of Moses (Deut. 31:19, 21), which, as a document of the covenant, could become an indictment against those who break it. *katamartyreō* (occurring 5 times) is used in 1 Ki. 21(20):10, 13; Dan. 6:25[24]; and Prov. 25:18 in the sense of consciously false evidence, leading to the condemnation of the accused (in Job 15:6 by Eliphaz for the indictment which Job's own statements present against him). The meaning of *epimartyromai*, which is similarly used for *hā'ēḏ* (1 Ki. 2:42[3:1]; Neh. 9:29 f.; 13:15, 21; but also Amos 3:13; Jer. 32[39]:25), comes from the way that men are given cause to recall some previous directive, are obliged to confirm it, and thus are admonished or warned. *pseudomartyreō* means to bear deliberate false testimony only in the Decalogue (Exod. 20:16; Deut. 5:17[20] for *'ānâh*, to answer). The most important compound remains *diamartyromai* (equally used for *hā'ēḏ*), which originally meant to call up or to enlist someone as a witness (thus Deut. 4:26; 31:28; 2 Ki. 17:13; Jer. 32[39]:10; Mal. 2:14), but is thus also used for the passing on and enjoining the people of the instructions received from Yahweh (Exod. 18:20; 19:10, 21 in commands to Moses, but also Neh. 9:26, 34). It can then have the sense both of to warn, to exhort, to testify on oath (e.g. in the name of God, Ps. 50[49]:7), and also of to certify, to promise (e.g. Zech. 3:6[7]).

2. (a) The analysis of the use of the word shows that, apart from the special case

of the use of *martyrion* for Heb. *mô'ēḏ* (see above, 1 (a)), the words of this group essentially remain within the framework already adumbrated in classical Gk., or at least are not aware of the understanding shaped by the Stoics. One is a witness for something one has experienced, or one is enlisted as such for an event. It is something extraneous, something one has experienced or something entrusted to one for which someone may testify. Particularly where God is mentioned or invoked as witness, the partisanship of the witness for the right of the covenant can be clearly felt. The idea of testimony or of a witness derived from uncertifiable subjective convictions is not known in the OT, and also has no place in Judaism. Philo and Josephus, who follow the Gk. legal usage (cf. *TDNT* IV 487 f.), both (possibly consciously) forgo the doubtful expansion of *skēnē* and *kibōtos* by *tou martyriou*. In rabbinic usage *hē'îḏ* designates the teaching activity of the rabbis, and is cognate with the expression for → proclaim (for individual details cf. R. Asting, *Die Verkündigung des Wortes im Urchristentum*, 1938, 513 ff.). (For rabbinic teaching see A. A. Trites, *The New Testament Concept of Witness*, *Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series* 31, 1977, 231–39.)

(b) The thought of suffering involved in bearing witness to one's faith even to the point of death and the high esteem paid to martyrdom were widespread in Judaism (cf. the Books of the Maccabees, especially 4 Macc. 18:11 ff.; Mart. Isa.; Josephus, *War* 2, 151 ff.; and also the collected rabbinic material in SB I 221 ff.). Nevertheless, one must still note that terms like *martys*, *martyria* or *martyreō* and even *martyrion* were manifestly never used for such heroes of faith (cf. H. Strathmann, *TDNT* IV 487 f.). In his detailed and careful analysis, N. Brox has demonstrated conclusively that "the Old Testament and later Judaism are excluded as the place of origin of the title of martyr", as it developed in the early history of Christianity, and also that "no real equivalence between martyrs and prophets ... can be found" (*Zeuge und Märtyrer*, 1961, 172).

NT The word-group first acquired its specific importance in biblical theology in the NT, more precisely, in Acts and the Johannine literature.

Even a statistical survey of occurrences exhibits these emphases. Thus of the 76 instances of the vb. *martyreō*, 43 are found in John and the Johannine Epistles alone, a further 4 in Rev., 11 in Acts and 8 in Heb., whereas only 6 fall to Paul and only 2 to the Synoptics. Of the 37 instances of *martyria*, 21 belong to John and the Johannine Epistles, and 9 to Rev., whereas the word is entirely lacking in Paul and Heb. With 35 instances, the noun *martys* is found a total of 13 times in Acts, 9 in Paul (including 3 in the Pastorals) and 5 times in Rev. Of the compounds, *epimartyreō* is attested only in 1 Pet. 5:12 alongside *parakaleō*, to exhort in the sense of to remind; *katamartyreō* only in Matt. 26:62 (par. Mk. 14:60) and Matt. 27:13 in the questions directed to Jesus as to whether he did not wish to express an opinion with regard to the evidence borne against him; and *symmartyreō* is used exclusively by Paul in Rom. 2:15; 8:16; 9:1, expressing a confirmatory, reinforcing or accusatory co-testimony of the spirit or of human conscience. Finally, of the 15 cases where *diamartyreō* is used, 9 are in Acts, where the vb. is used as a special expression for → proclamation – as it is, incidentally, also in 1 Thess. 4:6, and 3 times in 1 Tim. 5:1 and 2 Tim. 2:14; 4:1. (For a fuller survey of these terms see A. A. Trites, op. cit., 66–77.)

1. The legal use of the word, common to cl. Gk. and the LXX, dominates the few examples in the Synoptics, of which, as well as the instances of *katamartyreō* already mentioned, the 4 occurrences of *martyria* (Mk. 14:55, 56, 59; Lk. 22:71) and the 2 passages with *martys* (Mk. 14:63 par., Matt. 26:65) also occur in the account of the trial of Jesus, and each time are related to the (false) evidence produced there. The quotations from Deut. 19:15 (Matt. 18:16, *martys*; Jn. 8:17, *martyria*) and Deut. 17:6 (Heb. 10:28; cf. 2 Cor. 13:1; 1 Tim. 5:19) are to be understood in the same sense; similarly the mention of witnesses in the proceedings against Stephen (Acts 6:13; 7:58). The colouring is altogether negative.

2. Paul's use of the words is also closely linked to the LXX usage. He uses *martyreō* in Rom. 10:2; 2 Cor. 8:3; Gal. 4:15; Col. 4:13 in speaking of the zeal of the Jews and the loving care of the church ("I bear them witness"). In 1 Cor. 15:15 Paul writes: "We are even found to be misrepresenting [*pseudomartyres*] God, because we testified [*emartyrēsamen*] of God that he raised Christ, whom he did not raise if it is true that the dead are not raised." In Rom. 3:21 he calls the law and the prophets those who testify to God's → righteousness. On the other hand, he uses the noun *martys* only in Rom. 1:9; 2 Cor. 1:23; Phil. 1:8; and 1 Thess. 2:5, 10 in contexts where he calls God as witness of his actions and speech (1 Thess. 2:10, you and God). But Paul is probably also the first to give the noun *martyrion* a new meaning and content, when he says in 1 Cor. 1:6: "Even as the testimony [*martyrion*] of Christ was confirmed among you." It can no longer here be a matter of a document, or of a piece of evidence or recollection giving encouragement or warning; the word is used in the sense of the → gospel, the proclaimed message of salvation in Christ. This is established by 1 Cor. 2:1 ("proclaiming to you the testimony of God [*katangellōn hymin to martyrion tou theou*]") and also by 2 Thess. 1:10. In 2 Cor. 1:12 the word stands for the witness which his own → conscience bears him.

3. In the Synoptic Gospels a further expansion of the conceptual area of witness over and above the legal usage can be recognized. While according to Mk. 1:44 par. Matt. 8:4 and Lk. 5:14, the sacrifice of the healed man is offered *eis martyrion*, for a testimony, i.e. in recognition and as proof that the healing had taken place (according to Moses' regulations, Lev. 13:49; 14:2–32), the same formulation in Matt. 10:18 (the sending out of the Twelve) – the arrest and the trial of the disciples would be *eis martyrion* to the Jews and Gentiles (cf. similarly Mk. 13:9; Lk. 21:13) – can scarcely be understood only in the sense of an accusation. It can include the point that such tribunals would provide opportunities for testifying to Christ in public. Tangible evidence for the prosecution (for a place in God's judgment) is provided by the dust which the rejected messengers of Jesus are to shake from their feet and to leave behind (Mk. 6:11 par. Lk. 9:15), as in Lk. 11:48 (cf. Matt. 23:31). By their behaviour, men become witnesses against themselves.

4. A new aspect of the concept of being a witness is revealed by Luke in Acts. Whereas *martyreō* is used in the sense of human attestation for good conduct, i.e. to confirm some situation (Acts 16:2; 22:5, 12), or for someone's good name (Acts 6:3, those who cared for the poor; 10:22, Cornelius; 26:5, Paul), and whereas *martys* is used in Acts 6:13 and 7:58 of the (false) witnesses brought against Stephen in accordance with the requirements of the Jewish law, *martyrēsai* occurs for the first time in Acts 23:11 without an obj., meaning "to bear witness" in the sense of proclaiming Christ. Paul is to continue in Rome to bear witness to his Lord. This corresponds ex-

actly with the meaning of *martyrion* in Acts 4:33 ("with great power the apostles gave their testimony") and takes up that conception of *martys*, witness, which is found for the first time in Lk. 24:48 (i.e. on the border-line between the Gospel and Acts). It is repeated almost immediately in Acts 1:8 in the commission of the risen Lord. For Luke it is the → apostles, the disciples, who have been commissioned by Jesus with the proclamation of the message of the kingdom, who are witnesses. They are more precisely defined in Acts 1:22 as witnesses of the → resurrection of Jesus (cf. Acts 2:32; 3:15; 13:31; 26:16 – Paul, because the risen Lord met him) and of his deeds (also predicted in Acts 22:15 of Paul). Thus Luke is no longer using the word witness for witnesses of facts, but specifically for the witnesses of the risen Lord, who by this very qualification are authorized and legitimated as his witnesses among the nations. From this two things become clear: first, that their way, the way of a witness, is a way of rejection, → suffering, and possibly also of death ("Stephen, the faithful witness", Acts 22:20); second, that it is distinguished not by the later understanding of martyrdom, i.e. of one who bears witness to the point of death, but by the full → proclamation of the message of Christ. For this testimony to Jesus as the Christ (Acts 18:5), the proclamation of the grace of God (Acts 20:24), the urgently wooing address of the gospel of Christ, Luke likes to use *diamartyromai* (Acts 4:20; 8:25; 28:23).

5. The discovery from the statistical survey that the words of this group are most frequently used in the Gospel of John and the Johannine Epistles suggests that the concept of witness has also a more central theological significance for this writer than for all the others (cf. R. Asting, op. cit., 697 f.). The very phrase *diamartyreō enōpion tou theou*, "I testify in the presence of God", as it is found three times in the Pastorals (1 Tim. 5:21; 2 Tim. 2:14; 4:1), had reinforced the binding obligation to make known the message and will of God along the lines of the simple *diamartyreō* of Acts, used side by side with other expressions for "proclaim", in that the rôle of the apostles is marked out as those who are acting for and before God as his representatives. John, who summarizes the content of the Christ-event and of the gospel in the concept of the *logos* (→ Word, art. *logos*), now in particular adopts the vb. *martyreō* and the noun *martyria* (i.e. both the words of the group which denote action), in order to express the event of the divine communication of revelation in all its aspects. This observation is also supported by the fact that he abandons the noun *martyrion*, which was more of a material designation, in exactly the same way that, though he is aware of the witnesses, he does not make use of the word *martys*, witness, so as to be able to concentrate attention on the event. *martys* occurs first in Rev. (5 times, see below (c)), and the compounds are also entirely lacking here.

(a) John too is aware of the classical use of the word in the sense of human attestation or testimonial. This is shown in Jn. 2:25, where Jesus is said not to need other men's testimony concerning a man in order to form an opinion; as also in Jn. 18:23, where he challenges the temple guard who struck him to give proof of his improper speech; in Jn. 12:17, where the people bear witness to the resurrection of Lazarus; and in Jn. 3:28, where John the Baptist calls his disciples as witnesses to the fact that he had not given himself out to be the messiah. This is also true of the citation of Deut. 19:15 in Jn. 8:17, even though this rule from the law is then in v. 18 put into the service of Jesus' testimony to himself. All the instances of vb. and noun in 3

Jn. (vv. 3, 6, 12), relating to Gaius and Demetrius, are also commendations of praiseworthy conduct within the lines of faith.

(b) But is is precisely against this background that the specific character of the Johannine concept of witness is brought into relief in its three aspects: witness is testimony to or of Christ (i) in pointing to Jesus (John and the Scriptures), (ii) in Jesus' testimony to himself and (iii) in reference to Jesus in the proclamation of the disciples.

(i) Much more strongly in Jn. than in all the other Gospels the figure of John the Baptist is delineated as that of the forerunner, the final prophet. To point to the Coming One, the Expected One, and finally to the One who is already present – this is his destiny and ultimate significance. "He came for a testimony [*eis martyrian*], to bear witness to the light, that all might believe through him" (Jn. 1:7; cf. v. 8). This is amplified in Jn. 1:15, 32 and Jn. 1:19 ff. John's *martyria* mentioned there is formulated in Jn. 1:34 in the form of a thesis: "And I have seen and have borne witness that this is the Son of God." In Jn. 3:26 it is once more confirmed from the mouth of John's adherents ("to whom you bore witness"), and in Jn. 3:31 f. precisely pointed and directed in the claim that "he who comes from heaven . . . bears witness to what he has seen and heard." This first aspect of the understanding of witness as that which points to Jesus (to which is probably also to be reckoned the remark in Jn. 5:39 from Jesus' own mouth that the real intention of the → Scriptures is to testify to him, Jesus, as the Revealer) finds its legitimating conclusion in the testimony of the Johannine Jesus in Jn. 5:33. John the Baptist carried out his witnessing activity *en alētheia*, on behalf of or in accord with the truth. Thus witness here is no longer substantiation of verifiable events but proclamation which points to Jesus as the Revealer of God.

(ii) One of the central, paradigmatic discussions in John's Gospel concerns the truth of that which Jesus testifies of himself, or, put another way, the question as to who this Jesus is. Linguistically it is characterized by the expression *martyreō peri*, to testify with reference to (mostly oneself). Against the → Pharisees, who maintain according to Jn. 8:13 that, because he is testifying to himself, his *martyria* cannot be true (with v. 17 cf. Deut. 19:15), is set Jesus' word in v. 14. When he says something about himself, this *martyria* is true, because he knows where he has come from and where he is going. John does not wish this testimony of Jesus – i.e. his claim to be the Revealer, the One in whom God's will and nature can be perceived, and who thus as the → light is the → life of men, giving meaning and basis to human existence – to be understood as self-glorification of Jesus on his own account. Indeed, this is expressly repudiated by Jesus in 5:31: "If I bear witness to myself, my testimony is not true", in apparent tension to Jn. 8:14. His legitimation, however, does not come about through men, by means of human logical modes of proof, but "the works that I do bear me witness" (Jn. 5:36; cf. 10:25). It is another witness (Jn. 5:32; cf. 10:32). "The Father who sent me has himself borne witness to me" (Jn. 5:37; cf. also Jn. 6:65). In Jn. 5:39 the Scriptures are then named as witnesses. What is meant is finally expressed in the trial scene before Pilate: "I have come to bear witness to the truth" (Jn. 18:37); and with reference to the source of this witness in Jn. 3:11: "we speak of what we know, and bear witness to what we have seen." Jesus himself is the mediator of the testimony, i.e. of the revelation of God to the world (*kosmos*, Jn. 8:14) which hates him, because he removes its claims to autonomy, and thus rejects his testimony (Jn. 3:11, 32). Therefore, it is not a matter here of witness borne to

verifiable matters of fact, but – along the lines of the prophets, even if in the linguistic clothing of gnosticism – of God's self-communication in Jesus, requiring response. Brox says that "the distinguishing mark of the Johannine theology of witness" is that "the legitimation of the testimony and the evidence for its truth . . . consist in the call to a non-verifiable authorization by means of revelation" (op. cit., 71). In form there certainly is a correspondence with men's demands for legitimation, but the confirmatory testimonies which are brought into play provide no proof in the customary sense, but affirm the very thing for which proof is required. "The object of faith makes itself known only to faith" (R. Bultmann, *The Gospel of John*, 1971, 266). The criterion for the message is the content itself.

(iii) Formally related to the Johannine use of *logos*, → word, this testimony of Jesus, for those who have accepted it and thus confirmed (sealed, Jn. 3:33) the truth of God, becomes testimony about Jesus. This is the case first of all in Jn. 4:39, where the → Samaritans confirm that their way to faith began with the testimony, the account of the personal experience which the woman at the well gave concerning him. The event of which one has experience still plays a part here. But the thought is extended in a typically Johannine way when, in Jn. 15:26, the Paraclete, the Spirit, is named as the One who testifies to Jesus. He opens the world's eyes to the truth of God and the truth about itself. Jesus immediately expands this in the phrase "and you also are witnesses" (Jn. 15:27; → Advocate). 1 Jn. 1:2 ("we saw [*heōrakamen*] it, and testify to [*martyroumen*] and proclaim [*apangellomen*] to you the eternal life which was with the Father and was made manifest to us") and 1 Jn. 4:14 ("and we have seen [*tetheametha*] and testify [*martyroumen*] that the Father has sent the Son as the Saviour [*sōtēra*] of the world") are likewise extensions of this thought. Similarly, 1 Jn. 5:6, speaking of the witness of the → Spirit, takes up Jn. 15:26. 1 Jn. 5:10 ("He who believes in the Son of God has the testimony in himself") is given added precision in the statement in v. 11 that the testimony of the → knowledge and the message of faith is this, "that God gave us eternal life and this life is in his Son." Here too the terminology is that of the testimony of something experienced, but this experience is not that of the senses, but being caught up into faith. The Gk. words for "see" are no different here.

(c) This *martyria* of Jesus Christ as the revelation of the significance of Jesus, communicated and accepted in faith, is for the seer of Revelation identical with the *logos tou theou*, "the Word of God" (Rev. 1:2, 9; in 12:11 both are also used and connected together). The *martyria* is more precisely qualified as the *pneuma tēs prophēteias*, "the Spirit of prophecy", which could mean testifying to what has been here revealed concerning the future. The thought is that to be touched by the testimony of Jesus Christ places one in the service of witness. It obliges one to pass it on, and reveals that there is an inherent power in the *martyria*, by means of which God does not merely give men intellectual knowledge, but also sets them in motion. The *martyria* allows one to share in the way, but also in the suffering and persecution of Christ, as the allusion in Rev. 6:9 to those who have been killed shows (cf. also the persecution by the → dragon in Rev. 12:17 with the persecution of the child in Rev. 12:4). That the *martyria* draws people who are grasped by it into Christ's life is also expressed in Rev. 12:11 by the way that they are promised triumphant victory (cf. Rev. 20:4). In Rev. 1:5, for the only time in Rev., Jesus is specifically called *ho martys ho pistos*, "the faithful witness" (cf. Rev. 3:14, the → Amen along with the

same title). As well as in Rev. 6:9, the first roots of the later conception of martyrdom are outlined in the way that the Antipas who has been killed in Pergamum is similarly called *ho martys mou ho pistos* in 2:13, just as the two witnesses in Rev. 11:3, though invincible for the time of their commission, are then (v. 7) killed by the beast, and the woman of Rev. 17 is drunk with blood of the witnesses of Jesus. To be sure, it is still not so much one's death, but one's appearance as a trustworthy witness of Jesus that stands in the foreground. Hence, one may not cite the martyr's death as the characteristic of witnesses, particularly as in Rev. 17:6 saints (*hagioi*) are mentioned with the *martyres* as having been similarly put to death on account of their faith (for details cf. Brox, op. cit., 102 f.).

6. The Epistle to the Hebrews is distinguished from the other writings of the NT in that it uses the vb. *martyreō* exclusively in the pass. and chiefly in Heb. 11. The one who bears witness, confirming the faith of the one named, is God himself – here concealed behind the pass. verbs (Heb. 11:2, 4, 5, 39). The men whose fate bears all the signs of the martyrdom of faith obtain a witness, i.e. are recognized by God. It is in accord with this that these, who have been accredited on account of holding firm to the hope of their faith, are in Heb. 12:1 called a "cloud of witnesses" for the church of the present time. *L. Coenen*

7. It is fitting to ask what is the value of the witness-theme for the church in the last third of the twentieth century. First, the frequent use of the witness-theme in the NT stresses the importance of the historical foundations of the Christian religion. The principal events of the public ministry of Jesus were wrought in the presence of his chosen companions and apostles. They had been present in Jerusalem during the final week, and were in a position to attest the facts of his trial, crucifixion and burial. Above all, they were competent witnesses to vouch for the fact of his resurrection.

For both Luke and John the Jerusalem apostles occupy a special place in holy history, because they have been with Jesus from the commencement of his public ministry. In the Apocalypse the stress seems to fall on Christ, "the faithful and true witness", who serves as the archetype for the faithful band of believers who must maintain the same testimony even at the sacrifice of life itself. A similar note is struck in the Pastorals, where Timothy is reminded of the "good confession" of his Lord before Pontius Pilate and exhorted to offer the same type of witness in his own day (1 Tim. 6:12 f.). In the Book of Acts the factual content of the apostolic testimony receives particular attention, especially in the speeches (→ Proclamation). The testimony rests upon the great acts of God in Jesus Christ, and the resurrection forms the very core of this.

In other words, for all the major NT writers the historical facts of Christian origins are of paramount importance. This is patently true of the four Evangelists, who felt it necessary to set out the life of Christ in the form of Gospels (cf. A. Barr, "The Factor of Testimony in the Gospels", *ExpT* 49, 1937–38, 401–8). It is certainly true of Paul, who declared the basic facts of the gospel to be "of first importance", and appended a list of witnesses to the risen Christ (1 Cor. 15:1–8). In fine, it was of supreme significance to the New Testament writers that the apostolic teaching was not based on a collection of → myths, but on the experience of eyewitnesses.

In the light of the NT's repeated insistence on the rôle of eyewitnesses and the subsequent stress on the historical nature of the events which the witnesses report, one

must raise the question: Has historical scholarship taken this factor sufficiently seriously? Certainly current preoccupation with form criticism, redaction criticism, audience criticism and the like must not blind our eyes to the NT's unmistakable stress on those who were the actual witnesses of the primary events. Unless the testimony of these eyewitnesses can be impugned as spurious, misrepresented or erroneous, their evidence of Christian origins must be taken seriously. It may be questioned, for instance, whether Bultmann's demythologizing programme has taken sufficient account of the presence of eyewitnesses in the earliest strata of gospel tradition (for recent critiques of Bultmann's demythologizing see, *inter alia*, C. H. Pinnock, "Theology and Myth", *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 128, 1971, 215–26, and C. Brown, "Bultmann Revisited", *The Churchman* 88, 1974, 167–87). In fact, the importance attached to eyewitnesses in the NT strengthens the case for the life, death and resurrection of Jesus, and hence buttresses the historical foundations of the Christian faith. In a day of widespread scepticism about Christian origins this contribution is both timely and significant (cf. P. Carnley, "The Poverty of Historical Scepticism", in S. Sykes and J. P. Clayton, eds., *Christ, Faith and History*, 1972, 165–89).

In the second place, the witness-theme is particularly pertinent to a bewildered, questioning age. Ours is unquestionably a time of religious as well as cultural pluralism; to be convinced of this one has only to read the works of Francis Schaeffer, John Macquarrie and H. R. Rookmaaker (F. A. Schaeffer, *Escape from Reason*, 1968, and *The God Who Is There*, 1968; J. Macquarrie, *Twentieth Century Religious Thought*, 1966; H. R. Rookmaaker, *Modern Art and the Death of a Culture*, 1970). Theological ideas from a wide range of sources have been thrown into the contemporary melting pot and are being vigorously debated. This is precisely the type of situation in which the NT writers make abundant use of witness imagery and terminology. The claims of Christ were being hotly contested, then as now, and in such a milieu the language and thought forms of the Old Testament controversy sprang naturally to mind.

The Fourth Gospel provides the setting for the most sustained controversy in the NT. Here Jesus has a lawsuit with the world. His witnesses include John the Baptist, the Scriptures, the words and works of Christ, and later the witness of the apostles and the Holy Spirit. They are opposed by the world, represented by the unbelieving Jews. John has a case to present, and for this reason he advances arguments, asks juridical questions and presents witnesses after the fashion of the OT legal assembly. The same observation is true of the Book of Acts, though Luke develops his case somewhat differently from John.

All of this material is suggestive for twentieth-century apologists. The person and place of Jesus in the present pluralistic theological climate is still very much a contentious issue. The claims of Christ as the Son of God are currently widely disputed. In such an environment a brief must be presented, arguments advanced and defending witnesses brought forward, if the Christian case is to be given a proper hearing. To fail to present the evidence for the Christian position would be tantamount to conceding defeat to its opponents. That is to say, the controversy theme, so evident in the NT, appears to be highly pertinent to the missionary task of the church today.

In the third place, it is noteworthy that faithful witness often entails suffering and persecution. In the Book of Revelation, for instance, Christians are about to enter a time of severe persecution, and some of them will be brought before the courts and

sentenced to death. For this reason the seer of Patmos encourages them to "hold" to the "testimony of Jesus". Under such circumstances words with forensic overtones are naturally given their full weight in John's message of encouragement. Metaphors drawn from the lawcourt are never far from the author's mind, as a study of chs. 11, 12, 18 and 19 confirms (cf. A. A. Trites, *The New Testament Conception of Witness*, *Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series* 31, 1977, 154–74).

Thus it is not surprising that wherever Christians have faced opposition and hostile lawcourts for the sake of their testimony, the Book of Revelation has been a source of inspiration. As Christ had conquered suffering and death, so they too would conquer and share his victory over the forces of evil. As their Lord had witnessed faithfully even unto death, they also must bear unflinching testimony.

The Synoptic accounts of anticipated persecution are also instructive. Here the idea of witness is certainly very much a live metaphor (A. A. Trites, "The Idea of Witness in the Synoptic Gospels – Some Juridical Considerations", *Themelios* 5, 1968–9, 18–26). Hauled into courts by their opponents, Christians will be told what to say in the hour of crisis by the Holy Spirit. The very fact of standing before kings, councils and governors would offer unprecendented opportunities for witnessing. Though believers would often be condemned in earthly lawcourts, in heaven the Son of man would acknowledge them and reverse the unjust judgements pronounced against them.

Similarly in the Fourth Gospel and Acts when the apostles are witnessing for Christ in the face of antagonism and hostility, they do not witness in their own strength but rather in the convincing power of the Spirit. They are reassured that the Spirit is active in challenging the world with the truth of what they say. John underscores the inner witness of the Spirit (cf. I. de la Potterie, "La Notion de Témoignage dans Saint Jean", in J. Coppens *et al.*, eds., *Sacra Pagina*, 1959, II, 194–96; J. C. Hindley, "Witness in the Fourth Gospel", *SJT* 18, 1965, 321–23; and T. Preiss, "The Inner Witness of the Holy Spirit", *Interpretation* 7, 1953, 268), while Luke in Acts focuses on the outward manifestation of the Spirit's work in signs and wonders which confirm the apostolic testimony (cf. L. Cerfaux, "Témoins du Christ d'après le Livre des Actes", *Recueil Lucien Cerfaux, 1954–62*, II, 157–61; W. C. van Unnik, "The 'Book of Acts' – the Confirmation of the Gospel", *NovT* 4, 1960, 26–59; A. Rétif, "Témoignage et Prédication Missionaire dans les Actes des Apôtres", *Nouvelle Révue Théologique* 73, 1953, 152–65).

All this witness material provides a challenge to faithfulness and a note of encouragement, both of which are as relevant to hard-pressed twentieth-century Christians as to their first-century counterparts.

Finally, something must be said about the importance of the witness motif for contemporary preachers and communicators of the Christian message. In this connection three features may be mentioned.

First, witnesses are passionately involved in the case they seek to present. They have been apprehended by it, and so they have an inner compulsion to plead its merits with others. Like their first-century predecessors, they cannot but speak of what they have seen and heard.

Secondly, witnesses are held accountable for the truthfulness of their testimony. Perjury was, and still is, a serious offence punishable by heavy penalties. This solemn sense of being responsible under God for speaking truthfully appears in Paul, who

four times declares, "God is my witness". Applied to preachers, this means that they are driven back to the Scriptures as the standard whereby their witness is to be judged.

Thirdly, witnesses must be faithful not only to the bare facts of the Christ-event, but also to their meaning. This entails presenting Christ and his message in the significance which genuinely belongs to them. "What that character is lies to our hand in the NT Scriptures. . . . To be faithful witnesses we must ever keep before us and (in the course of our regular congregational preaching) before our hearers, the fully rounded, finely balanced, many-sided yet unitary, significance of Christ" (N. Alexander, "The United Character of the New Testament Witness of the Christ-Event", in H. Anderson and W. Barclay, eds., *The New Testament in Historical and Contemporary Perspective*, 1965, 32 f.; cf. A. M. Hunter, *The Unity of the New Testament*, 1943). *A. A. Trites*

→ Advocate, → Confess, → Deny, → Judgment, → Law, → Proclamation, → Righteousness, → Truth

(a). E. L. Allen, "Controversy in the New Testament", *NTS* 1, 1954–55, 143–49; F. I. Anderson, "The Socio-Juridical Background of the Naboth Incident", *JBL* 85, 1966, 46–57; A. Barr, "The Factor of Testimony in the Gospels", *ExpT* 49, 1937–38, 401–8; J. M. Boice, *Witness and Revelation in the Gospel of John*, 1970; H. J. Cadbury, "Roman Law and the Trial of Paul", in F. J. Foakes Jackson, K. Lake and H. J. Cadbury, *The Beginnings of Christianity*, V, 1933, 297–355; G. B. Caird, *A Commentary on the Revelation of St. John the Divine*, 1966; R. P. Casey, "Appended Note on *martys*", in F. J. Foakes Jackson, K. Lake and H. J. Cadbury, op. cit., V 30–37; D. R. Catchpole, "You Have Heard his Blasphemy", *TB* 16, 1965, 10–18; and *The Trial of Jesus: A Study of the Gospels and Jewish Historiography from 1770 to the Present Day*, 1970; J. Chapman, "We Know that his Testimony is True", *JTS* 31, 1930, 379–87; H. Danby, "The Bearing of the Rabbinical Code on the Jewish Trial Narratives in the Gospels", *JTS* 21, 1920, 51–76; S. de Dietrich, " 'You are My Witnesses' – A Study of the Church's Witness", *Interpretation* 8, 1954, 273–79; J. Downing, "Jesus and Martyrdom", *JTS* New Series 14, 1963, 279–93; J. H. Eaton, "The King as God's Witness", *ASTI* 7, 1968–69, 24–40; W. H. C. Frend, *Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church from the Maccabees to Donatus*, 1965; E. M. Gershfield, "Questio Quid Iuris – Some Thoughts on Jewish Law", *Harvard Theological Review* 61, 1968, 60–67; J. M. Gilchrist, "On What Charge was St. Paul Brought to Rome?" *ExpT* 78, 1966–7, 264 ff.; J. C. Hindley, "Witness in the Fourth Gospel", *SJT* 18, 1965, 319–37; W. L. Holladay, "Jeremiah's Lawsuit with God", *Interpretation* 17, 1963, 280–87; A. J. Hultgren, *Jesus and His Adversaries: A Study of the Form and Function of the Conflict Stories in the Synoptic Tradition*, (Dissertation, Union Theological Seminary, New York) 1971; G. Johnston, *The Spirit-Paraclete in the Gospel of John, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Studies* 12, 1970; L. E. Keck, *Mandate to Witness – Studies in the Book of Acts*, 1964; J. A. Kleist, "The Two False Witnesses (Mk. 14:55 ff.)", *CBQ* 9, 1947, 321 ff.; R. Koch, "Witness", *EBT* III 976–85; G. E. Ladd, *The Pattern of New Testament Truth*, 1968; T. A. Langford, "Giovanni Miegge on Jesus as a Martyr", *Interpretation* 18, 1964, 183–90; J. Limburg,"The Root *rîḇ* and the Prophetic Lawsuit Speeches", *JBL* 88, 1969, 291–304; J. Macleod, "The Witness of Moses to Christ", *EQ* 17, 1945, 5–12; D. A. McKenzie, "Judicial Procedure at the Town Gate", *VT* 14, 1964, 100–4; H. S. Maine, *Ancient Law*, 1907; J. W. Malcolm, "*Martyria* and Authority in the New Testament", (Dissertation, Edinburgh) 1963; T. W. Manson, "Martyrs and Martyrdom", *BJRL* 39, 1956–7, 463–84; I. H. Marshall, "Martyrdom and the Parousia in the Revelation of John", *StudEv* IV, 1968, 333–39; R. V. Moss, "The Witnessing Church in the New Testament", *Theology and Life* 3, 1960, 262–68; D. T. Niles, *Whereof We Are Witnesses*, 1965; D. E. Nineham, "Eye-witness Testimony and the Gospel Tradition", *JTS* New Series 9, 1958, 13–25; ibid. 10, 1959, 243–52; ibid. 11, 1960, 253–64; T. E. Pollard, "Martyrdom and Resurrection in the New Testament", *BJRL* 55, 1972, 240–51; E. Pond, "The Evidence of Testimony", *Bibliotheca Sacra* 102, 1945, 179–93; D. W. Riddle, "From Apocalypse to Martyrology", *Anglican Theological Review* 9, 1927, 260–80; H. Riesenfeld, "The Meaning of the Verb *arneisthai*", *Coniectanea Neotestamentica* 11, 1947, 207–19; A. N. Sherwin-White, *Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament*, 1963; H.

Strathmann, *martys* etc. *TDNT* IV 474–514; M. C. Tenney, "The Meaning of 'Witness' in John", *Bibliotheca Sacra* 132, 1975, 229–41; A. A. Trites, "The Importance of Legal Scenes and Language in the Book of Acts", *NovT* 16, 1974, 278–84; "The Idea of Witness in the Synoptic Gospels – Some Juridical Considerations", *Themelios* 5, 1968, 18–26; "*Martys* and Martyrdom in the Apocalypse: A Semantic Study", *NovT* 15, 1973, 72–80; "The Woman Taken in Adultery", *Bibliotheca Sacra* 131, 1974, 137–46; "Two Witness Motifs in Acts 1:8 and the Book of Acts", *Themelios* 7, 1970, 17–22; and *The New Testament Concept of Witness*, *Society for New Testament Study Monograph Series* 31, 1977; H. van Vliet, *No Single Testimony: A Study in the Adoption of the Law of Deut. 19:15 into the New Testament*, *Studia Theologica Rheno-Traiectina* 4, 1958; J. B. Ward-Perkins, "Memoria, Martyr's Tomb and Martyr's Church", *JTS* New Series 17, 1966, 20–37.

(b). R. Asting, *Die Verkündigung des Wortes im Urchristentum*, 1938, 458 ff.; K. Barth, *Der Christ als Zeuge*, 1934; M. Barth, *Der Augenzeuge*, 1946; H. J. Boecker, *Redeformen des Rechtslebens im Alten Testament*, 1964; N. Brox, *Zeuge und Märtyrer*, 1961; E. Burnier, *La Notion du Témoignage dans le Nouveau Testament*, 1939; H. von Campenhausen, *Die Idee des Martyriums in der alten Kirche*, 1936; E. Castelli *et al.*, *La Testimonianza*, 1972; L. Cerfaux, "Témoins du Christ d'après le Livre des Actes", *Recueil Lucien Cerfaux, Études d'Exégèse et d'Histoire Religieuse*, II, 1954, 157–74; J. P. Charlier, "L'Exégèse Johannique d'un Précepte Legal: Jean viii 17", *RB* 67, 1960, 503–15; H. Dörrie, F. Paschke, H. Hohlwein and A. Lehmann, "Märtyrer", *RGG*[3] IV 587 ff.; E. Esking, "Das Martyrium als theologisch-exegetisches Problem", in *In Memoriam Ernst Lohmeyer*, 1950, 224 ff.; E. Günther, "Zeuge und Märtyrer", *ZNW* 47, 1956, 145–61; J. Harvey, "Le 'Rîḇ-Pattern', Requisitoire Prophétique sur la Rupture de l'Alliance", *Biblica* 43, 1962, 172–96; E. Käsemann, "Ketzer und Zeuge", *ZTK* 48, 1951, 292 ff. (reprinted in *Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen*, I, 1968 [5], 168 ff.; F. Kattenbusch, "Die Märtyrtitel", *ZNW* 4, 1903, 111–27; R. Koch, "Témoignage d'après les Actes", *Masses Ouvrières* 129, 1957, 16–33; ibid. 131, 1957, 4–25; E. Leisi, *Der Zeuge im attischen Recht*, 1908; M. Lods, *Confesseurs et Martyrs*, 1948; E. Lohse, *Märtyrer und Gottesknecht*, *FRLANT* 46, (1955) 1963[2]; P. Marcel, "Le Témoignage en Parole et en Actes", *Revue Réformée* 9, 1958, 36–47; C. Masson, "Le Témoignage de Jean", *Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie* 38, 1950, 120–27; P. H. Menoud, "Jésus et ses Témoins", *Église et Théologie* 23, 1960, 7–20; O. Michel, "Biblisches Bekennen und Bezeugen", *EvTh* 2, 1935, 231–45; and *Prophet und Märtyrer*, *BFChTh* 37/2, 1932; R. Morgenthaler, *Die Lukanische Geschichtsschreibung als Zeugnis: Gestalt und Gehalt der Kunst des Lukas*, I–II, 1949; W. Nauck, "Die Tradition und der Charakter des ersten Johannesbriefes", in *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament*, ed. J. Jeremias and O. Michel, 1957; E. Peterson, *Zeuge der Wahrheit*, 1937; I. de la Potterie, "La Notion de Témoignage dans S. Jean", *Sacra Pagina* 2, 1959, 193–208; A. Rétif, "Témoignage et Prédication Missionaire dans les Actes des Apôtres", *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* 73, 1951, 152–65; and *Foi au Christ et Mission*, 1953; R. Schippers, *Getuigen van Jezus Christus*, 1938; J. Smend, "Der Zeugnischarakter der christlichen Verkündigung", *ZST* 13, 1936, 489–517; H.-W. Surkau, *Martyrien in jüdischer und frühchristlicher Zeit*, 1938; B. Trepanier, "Contribution à une Recherche sur l'Idée de Témoin dans les Écrits Johanniques", *Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa* 15, 1945, 5–63; A. Vanhoye, "Témoignage et Vie de Dieu selon le Quatrième Évangile", *Christus* 16, 1955, 155–71.

Woe

οὐαί	οὐαί (*ouai*), woe, alas.

CL & OT *ouai* (Lat. *vae*) is an onomatopoeic exclamation of pain or anger (Arrianus).

In the LXX *ouai*, which occurs 69 times, usually represents the Heb. *hôy*, occasionally *'ôy*, and rarely *'î*, *hô*, *hî*, and *hôwâh*, all deriving from roots meaning to howl; e.g., *'î* otherwise means a jackal, from its nocturnal cry like the scream of an infant. *hôy*, like the other Heb. terms, is used to express grief (Prov. 23:29), despair (1 Sam. 4:7), lamentation (1 Ki. 13:30), dissatisfaction (Isa. 1:4), pain (Jer. 10:19), a threat (Ezek. 16:23), or simply to attract attention (Isa. 55:1).

NT In the NT *ouai*, more often than not, expresses sympathetic sorrow rather than condemnation. But the latter is more evident in Matt. 11:21 (= Lk. 10:13), where Jesus reproached the cities of Chorazim (mentioned only here), Bethsaida (Jn. 1:44), and even Capernaum, his headquarters (Matt. 4:13), for their utter lack of response when he was active in their midst for so long. The strength of Jesus' condemnation of self-sufficiency and pride can be gauged from his comparison of the probable public reaction in ancient Tyre and Sidon had the citizens of those notoriously wicked cities (Isa. 23) been given similar opportunities of witnessing his mighty signs of the presence of the kingdom of God. Indifference is spiritually more deadly than violence and sensuality. In Matt. 18:7 (absent from the parallel passage in Mk. 9:42–48), "Woe to the world!" is not so much denunciation as warning and lamentation: "Alas for the world!" – i.e., for men in general (Lk. 17:1). Jesus foresees the inevitability of temptations to sin (*skandala*, causes of stumbling). True, they are a means of testing true believers (1 Cor. 11:19), but the responsibility of the individual remains. He must neither succumb himself nor be the cause of stumbling in others. The context of this saying (Matt. 18:1–6, 10) indicates that Jesus had selfish ambition specifically in mind, a motive which leads to trampling on one's fellows, hurt feelings, depression, and misery. The weak, in particular, are liable to suffer. To be the cause of injuring the spirit of another is very easy, and it is very culpable.

The seven woes upon the scribes and Pharisees in Matt. 23:13 ff. (four recur in Lk. 11:42–52) are denunciatory. Scribal teaching and exposition of Scripture were obscuring the real issues of belief and conduct. Casuistry was making it virtually impossible for men to fulfil the law of God and to devote themselves to that fidelity which leads to the kingdom of heaven (D. Hill, *The Gospel of Matthew*, 1972, 311). Yet the undertone of sorrow is not absent: it is made explicit in Jesus' closing lament over Jerusalem (Matt. 23:37–39). He was well aware of the large number of ordinary people the Pharisees were misleading. The first woe (23:13) is directed against the lawyers who blocked men's way to the kingdom of heaven. By their misinterpretations, the scribes had hidden and lost the key to the true meaning of Scripture, and so to the knowledge of the way of salvation (Lk. 11:52; Hos. 4:6). The second woe (Matt. 23:15) condemns the lengths to which these men went in order to secure converts from among Gentiles, but converts not so much to Judaism as to their own sectarian brand of Pharisaism (Josephus, *Ant.* 20, 40). Wherever they succeeded, the fanaticism which is not unusual in converts produced a proselyte twice as formal and hypocritical as those who turned him into a Pharisee in the first place. Jesus' reference to the effort needed to make a single convert implies that the Pharisees' missionary exertions met with limited response. Hellenistic Judaism, more liberal in outlook, had much greater success.

The third woe (Matt. 23:16–22), again directed against Pharisaic teaching, exposes the casuistry which subverted morality: there are not two kinds of truth, one important and the other not. Bad enough that men should be led to think that unless they swear an oath, they may make use of half-truths and misleading statements without censure. Yet more destructive of morality is the teaching that even after an oath men need not tell the truth if the oath has not been taken in a particular way. Pharisaic distinctions about oaths were not only wrong in themselves, but perverse in principle. Even if a distinction were allowed, an oath by the temple, the house of God, ought to be regarded as more binding, not less, than an oath by something

which happened to be in that building. To swear by heaven was to employ a euphemism for the name of God himself. Every oath was made before God.

The fourth woe (23:23 f.) referred to Pharisaic scrupulosity in the application of the law of tithing (Lev. 27:30–33; Deut. 14:22–29) down to the minutest details. The context in the Mosaic law was concerned with the three main crops of grain, wine, and oil, not with small aromatic herbs used in flavouring food. Of itself, such scrupulosity was, at best, an unnecessary burden. But it drew condemnation from Jesus because it ill contrasted with the Pharisees' total lack of concern over far weightier principles of morality – justice, mercy, and faith.

The fifth woe (23:25 f.) condemned the punctilious observance of ritual purifications in the kitchen (matters of scribal tradition, and not of Mosaic law) to the neglect of plain moral obligations (Lk. 11:39). A vessel externally clean may contain what has been grasped by robbery and greed. Conversely, when applied to man's life, if the inside were clean, i.e. that man is right with God, then what is outside, his outward actions and behaviour, will also be pure before God. The thought of the sixth woe (23:27 f.) is applied differently in Lk. 11:44. In Matthew's version the whitened tombs appear clean and attractive on the outside, but their interiors are full of foulness; such were the Pharisees. Luke refers to the whitewashing of graves on the 15th Adar before Passover, so that no one might unwittingly get too close to them and so become ceremonially unclean and disqualified from taking part in the festival. People were contaminated by the Pharisees through not being aware of their true character. The seventh woe (Matt. 23:29–33 = Lk. 11:47 f.) condemns the Pharisees' hypocrisy in building fine tombs and monuments, as works of supererogation and by way of reparation, to honour prophets murdered by their forefathers, while at the same time plotting to do away with the living prophet in their midst. Judgment would not be delayed much longer, for the Pharisees of the day would soon complete the works of sin begun by those before them (Matt. 23:32), for sons inherit the character of their fathers. The destruction of Jerusalem and the dispersal of the nation would be the inevitable consequences (A. Plummer, *An Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*, 1909, 316–21).

In Matt. 24:19 (= Mk. 13:17; Lk. 21:23) *ouai* expresses pity and compassion for those who on account of family responsibilities would be hindered in their escape from the doomed city of Jerusalem. The woe concerning the fate of Judas (Matt. 26::24, Mk. 14:21, Lk. 22:22) has acute sorrow uppermost: "Alas for that man!" But the divine wrath is also an element, for the expression "that man", applied to one still in the supper-room, suggests that severance from Christ had, in effect, already taken place: Judas was putting himself outside God's mercy. Jesus utters four woes, found only in Luke (6:24–26), to warn those who do not follow him. The repeated *ouai* expresses his sadness at what he knows is the inevitable end of any who continue to carry on blindly in self-sufficiency. Such men may be rich in worldly terms – wealth in itself is no necessary bar to discipleship (Matt. 27:57; Lk. 8:3) – but in what really matters, the things of the spirit, Jesus is aware that the self-centred are bereft of true assets (Isa. 65:13). The fourth of these woes is a reminder that worldly wealth attracts flattery from those who curry favour, but is no indicator of merit.

In 1 Cor. 9 Paul speaks of his personal liberty in the gospel, including (v. 15) the liberty *not* to make use of his undoubted right (v. 14) to receive support from the Corinthian church while he ministered among its members. But in one respect he had

no liberty. Preach he must. The compulsion he felt to proclaim the gospel of Christ was such that he could in one phrase describe it in terms of both an inward divine constraint (→ Necessity, art. *anankē*) and an outward burden pressing upon him (cf. Isa. 8:11; Jer. 20:9). To preach the gospel was part and parcel of the very fibre of his life and nature. *ouai* for him if he did not do so. The meaning is not that God would punish him, but that for Paul to be false to the trust given to him, and to carry the memory of that faithlessness for ever, would be the greatest misery imaginable.

In Jude 11 the writer utters a prophetic woe upon heretical teachers, whom he describes in terms of the sins and consequent fates of Cain, Balaam, and Korah – the classic examples of the disastrous effects of jealousy, greed, and pride. In contemporary Judaism Cain, beyond being the first murderer, personified a wide spectrum of evil, including selfishness, self-sufficiency, and a powerful influence over the lives of other men in godlessness and sensuality (Philo), and violence, lust, greed, and blasphemy (Josephus). The Jerusalem Tg. on Gen. 4:7 represents Cain as the first sceptic: "There is neither judgment nor Judge, nor is there any other world than this. The good receive no reward, nor will vengeance be inflicted on the evil. The world was not created in mercy, nor is it governed in mercy." A 2nd-cent. gnostic sect called themselves Cainites because they regarded the God of the OT as responsible for the world's evil, and so exalted Cain and others who resisted such a deity. The inclusion of Balaam reflects not the apparently favourable light of Num. 22–24, where he declines to prophesy except as the Lord directs, but as the unprincipled character known to later Judaism (Philo, Josephus; SB III 771) as the prototype of mercenaries who shrink from nothing for financial gain. Such are doomed to hell (Pirke Aboth 5:29). The choice of Korah, a flagrant example of blasphemous insubordination and its fate (Num. 16), may have been prompted by information reaching Jude that the false teachers were defying church overseers and spreading unrest among the Christian community. See J. N. D. Kelly, *The Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, 1969.

As befits the culminating book of the Bible in which ultimate issues are starkly portrayed, Revelation includes *ouai* several times. In Rev. 8:13 the threefold warning of *ouai* from an eagle corresponds to three trumpet-blasts about to be sounded in succession by three angels which announce further drastic judgments to fall upon an unbelieving world. The symbol of an eagle (*aetos*) warning the world is not found in Jewish apocalyptic writings, but if *aetos* means, as it may, vulture, Hos. 8:1 is a near parallel: "Set the trumpet to your lips, for a vulture is over the house of the LORD" (cf. Lk. 17:37). After the devil is expelled by Michael and his angels, the inhabitants of heaven can well rejoice. But a loud cry of *ouai* gives sympathetic warning that heaven's deliverance means a redoubling of the devil's wrath against the earth (Rev. 12:12). In Rev. 18 *ouai*, alas, occurs in a threefold chorus of self-pity wailed by national leaders (18:9), traders (18:11), and merchant sailors (18:17; cf. Ezek. 27:29 ff.) on the spectacular collapse of the mighty commercial city of Babylon. The *ouai* is not an expression of concern for the suffering of the inhabitants, but of utterly self-centred grief because the source and means of financial profit have been swept away. The sin of Babylon was not in trading as such, but in the misuse of commerce to seduce mankind to adopt gross materialism and mammon-worship. See G. R. Beasley-Murray, *The Book of Revelation*, 1974. *N. Hillyer*

Woman, Mother, Virgin, Widow

In biblical times, depending on the station in life a woman occupied, whether she was single or married, childless or widowed, her social significance varied considerably; and this is reflected in the use of the words dealt with here. *gynē*, which can stand for mistress, maid, fiancée, wife or widow, is a general designation for every female in contrast to the male. If a woman is called *mētēr*, mother, she has a certain social position of honour; the word is also often used metaphorically. The widow (*chēra*) is thus the embodiment of peculiar poverty and indigence; in the NT the word may also denote a certain standing in the community. The young, still unmarried woman is called *parthenos*. In this the emphasis may lie, on the one hand, on her fully-matured youth and, on the other hand, on her innocence and purity.

γυνή

γυνή (*gynē*), woman; γυναικάριον (*gynaikarion*), a little woman, contemptuously a silly woman; γυναικεῖος (*gynaikeios*), female.

CL 1. *gynē*, woman, female being, occurs in Mycenean Gk., and especially from the time of Homer, with numerous derivations and composites. Its provenance is disputed. In profane Gk. *gynē* denotes woman (a) in contrast with man (→ Man, art. *anēr*); (b) in contrast with goddesses; (c) wife, fiancée, widow, also concubine; (d) mistress; (e) maid; (f) the female among animals. *gynē* in the voc. is used as an address with no irreverent secondary meaning (Homer, Sophocles and others).

2. In the Gk. world the attitude to women extended from the striking disrespect for the Athenian woman (education befits only the courtesan) through the freer and more highly esteemed status of the Dorian woman to the pronounced high estimate of women in Sparta. "The general rule in this matter is that the further we go west the greater is the freedom of woman" (A. Oepke, *gynē*, *TDNT* I 777). In regard to the status of women, the Graeco-Hellenistic environment of the NT shows in its great diversity strong parallels in detail to the general oriental picture, in which, as compared with the OT, the cultic significance of women is often in evidence (e.g. the offering of chastity by priestesses, whether as unblemished virginity or as sacral prostitution).

OT 1. In the OT *gynē*, woman, stands for the Heb. *'iššâh* in the vast majority of instances, though some 14 other translations are found in isolated passages. The woman is subject to the authority of man (father, brother, husband, → Marriage). Her worth, as also her honour, lies in bearing children (cf. Deut. 25:5–10, levirate marriage, → Marriage, art. *gameō* OT 5; Gen. 24:60; Lev. 19:3; 1 Sam. 1:6; Ps. 113[112]:9). Childlessness is a curse (Gen. 29:21–30:24). Polygamy is an encumbrance, though it is evidenced, e.g. in the patriarchs (→ Abraham), → David and → Solomon. Excluded from all official cultic business (1 Sam. 1:3 ff.; cf. Exod. 23:17), woman bows readily to idolatry. On the other hand, she may move freely (cf. 1 Sam. 1:9 ff.; 2:1 ff.). In contrast with the rest of the oriental (religious) world, she is recognized as a person and as a man's partner. The former point finds its highest expression in the story of Ruth, the Moabitess, which has apologetic intentions. The latter point is given its foundation in the account of the creation of man as male and

female (Gen. 1:27 f.; cf. 2:18–25). Wisdom is personified as a woman (e.g. Prov. 1:20 f.; 8:1–3; Wis. 7:12–22; Eccl. 1:6–20). *H. Vorländer*

2. In later Judaism man was understood to have been originally androgynous. Support for this view might be claimed from the story of woman being made out of one of man's ribs (Gen. 2:21 ff.). Commenting on Gen. 5:2, Rabbi Simeon taught that "God does not make his abode in any place where male and female are not found together; nor are blessings found save in such a place, as it is written: 'And he blessed them and called their name Man on the day that they were created.' Note that it says *them* and *their* name, not *him* and *his* name. The male is not even called man until he is united with the female" (Zohar, quoted by D. S. Bailey, *Sexual Relation in Christian Thought*, 1959, 272). Karl Barth has argued that the image of God in which man was created is man as male and female (*CD* III, 1, 183–206; cf. J. J. Stamm, "Die Imago-Lehre von Karl Barth und die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft", in *Antwort. Karl Barth zum siebzigsten Geburtstag*, 1956, 84–98; and P. K. Jewett, *Man as Male and Female: A Study in Sexual Relationships from a Theological Point of View*, 1975). The exegetical basis for this interpretation is to be found in Gen. 1:26 f.: "Then God said, 'Let us make man in our image, after our likeness; and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the birds of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creeps upon the earth.' So God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them." The plurality expressed in v. 26a is not a plural of majesty but an expression of the divine plurality which is reflected in the mutual relationships of human existence as male and female. In v. 27b the image is defined in terms of God creating *them*. The idea of a helper "meet for" man (Gen. 2:18) means a "partner". "What is sought is a being resembling man but different from him. If it were only like him, a repetition, a numerical multiplication, his solitariness would not be eliminated, for it would not confront him as another but he would merely recognise himself in it. Again, if it were only different from him, a being of a wholly different order, his solitariness would not be eliminated, for it would confront him as another, yet not as another which actually belongs to him, but in the way in which the earth or tree or river confronts him as an element in his sphere, not as a fellow-occupant of this sphere fulfilling the duty allotted within it. To be created good, man needs a being like him and yet different from him, so that in it he will recognise himself but not only himself, since it is to him a Thou as truly as he is an I, and he is to it a Thou as truly as it is an I" (*CD* III, 1, 290). In the light of this concept of the image of God and the story of Adam's rib (Gen. 2:21–24), Dwight Hervey Small speaks of God creating "a 'woman-sized void' in man, a void which none of the animals nor even another man could fill" (*Christian: Celebrate Your Sexuality*, 1974, 143).

Barth himself is aware of the limitations of this concept of the image of God and the need for clarification (cf. *CD* III, 1, 196). He points out that the fact that the image of God in man corresponds to the bisexuality of animals belongs to the creatureliness of man rather than to the divine likeness. In man the image is found in two different individuals, whereas in God it is found in the one divine being. Moreover, there is a threeness in the divine Trinity, whereas there is a duality in the image in man and a threeness in the recurring cycle of parent, children and grandchildren. P. K. Jewett, who welcomes Barth's insight in seeing the image of God in

terms of man as male and female, thinks that Barth's discussion not only suffers from occasional overstatement but that Barth tends to slide into identifying this relationship exclusively with that between husband and wife (op. cit., 46; cf. *CD* III, 1, 312 f., 317 f.).

On the various questions connected with marriage → Marriage; → Divorce; → Separate. It is frequently stated that under the OT law the wife was no more than a possession. The neighbour's wife could be coveted, like his ox, ass or any other possession (Exod. 20:17; Deut. 5:21). Even Ruth, whose character stands out in the story, was finally *bought* along with the field that Boaz redeemed (Ruth 4:5, 10). Although women were members of the → covenant people of Israel, they could not receive the covenant sign of → circumcision. A father or husband could nullify a woman's vows (Num. 30). Although the husband had the right to divorce (Deut. 24:1–4), the wife had no similar reciprocal rights. On the other hand, Deut. 24:5 prescribes that a man should not be eligible for military service for a period of one year after taking a wife. But even here the emphasis falls on the man's happiness. In the OT the price of the bride became a dowry (Gen. 34:12; Exod. 22:15 f.). The structure of patriarchal society is reflected in Exod. 20:12; cf. Lev. 19:3; Deut. 5:16. Num. 27:6 shows awareness of a daughter's right of inheritance. A wife differed from material possessions in that she could not be sold.

From time to time in Israelite history women played a significant part, and could even be prophetesses. Miriam, the sister of Moses and Aaron, is so described (Exod. 15:20). Deborah was a prophetess who evidently also judged the people (Jdg. 4:4). She gave a prophetic commission to Barak to defeat the army of Sisera (Jdg. 4:6), and celebrated the triumph with the song of Deborah (Jdg. 5:1–31). Huldah, the prophetess, was consulted by king Josiah in time of crisis (2 Ki. 22:14–20). The contexts make it clear that both Deborah and Huldah were married. The accounts of the deliverances of such prophetesses indicate that "prophetess" was more than an honorary title, given to the wives of prophets (cf. Isa. 8:3). Other women who played a prominent part in history for good or ill were Esther, the Hebrew wife of the Persian king Ahasuerus whose actions saved her people, and Jezebel, the wife of king Ahab who led Israel into Baal worship (1 Ki. 18–22).

Jewett points out that especially in early times women associated freely with men (op. cit., 87; cf. Rebekah, Gen. 24:10 f.). A daughter could inherit the possession of her father, if he died without a male heir (Num. 27:1 f.), though she had to marry within her own tribe to retain the inheritance (Num. 36). In cases of marriage the father's consent was essential, although Rebekah was consulted (Gen. 24:58). The account of Saul giving his daughter, Michal, to David points up Saul's dubious motives and the unhappy consequences (1 Sam. 18:17 ff.; 25:44; 2 Sam. 3:13; 6:16 f.). Failure to produce an heir was a mark of reproach (cf. Pss. 127[126]:7 ff.; 128[127]:3 ff.; Isa. 54:1 ff.) which finds classic expression in the stories of Sarah and Hannah. In both cases the sons that were subsequently born according to the promise of Yahweh, Isaac and Samuel, became his instruments of salvation for his people. But in both cases the wives had suffered much. Sarah had resorted to offering Abraham her maid, Hagar (Gen. 16:1–6; → Abraham; cf. also Rachel and Bilhah, Gen. 30:1–13). Hannah's life had been made wretched by Elkanah's other wife, Peninnah (1 Sam. 1:3–8). Polygamy, which was not forbidden by the law, was practised in NT times (→ Marriage, art. *gameō* OT 7).

Hannah had free access to the house of the Lord (1 Sam. 1:3 f.; cf., however, 2 Chr. 8:11), but in Herod's temple women were allowed only as far as the Court of Women (see the description of the temple under → Temple, art. *to hieron* OT). Josephus designates the area by the same word used elsewhere by the Greeks for a harem (*gynaikōnitis*; Josephus, *War* 5, 199; cf. Plut., *Cato Minor* 30, 2, 819d). The woman required monthly purification (Lev. 15:19–31), and twice as long after the birth of a daughter as after the birth of a son (Lev. 12:2–5; cf. Lk. 2:22). In the synagogues women began to be segregated from men from the 3rd cent. B.C. onwards. This process was intensified after the destruction of the temple in A.D. 70 (cf. Jewett, op. cit., 90 f.; Jeremias, op. cit., 374). Any male member of the synagogue might be asked by the ruler to read from the law or the prophets, but the woman was to preserve strict silence, "The woman does not read out of the Torah for the sake of the honor of the congregation" (Megillah 23a [Baraitha]; quoted from Jewett, op. cit., 91). Women were commonly bracketed with slaves and children by the rabbis (J. Leipoldt, *Die Frau in der antiken Welt und im Urchristentum*, 1962, 56). Women, slaves and children were not invited to pronounce the benediction at meals (Berakoth 3:3; 7:2). Rabbi Eliezer ben Hyrkanos could even say that he who teaches his daughter the law teaches her foolishness (Sotah 3:4). Conversation with women was discouraged (Erub. 53b; Aboth 1:5; cf. Jn. 4:9, 27). "May the words of the Torah be burned, they should not be handed over to women" (T. J. Sotah 10a, 8; cf. *TDNT* I 781). Jewett sees perhaps the most striking rabbinic depreciation of women in the saying of Rabbi Judah ben Elai (c. A.D. 150): "One must utter three doxologies every day: Praise God that he did not create me a heathen! Praise God that he did not create me a woman! Praise God that he did not create me an illiterate person!" (Tosefta Ber. 7, 18; cf. T. J. Ber:13b; cf. op. cit., 92; J. Leipoldt, op. cit., 58).

C. Brown

NT In the NT *gynē* means (a) a woman, female being (Matt. 9:20; Lk. 13:11, in contrast with → man Acts 5:14); (b) wife (Matt. 5:28, 31 f.; 1 Cor. 7:2 ff.); also someone betrothed (Matt. 1:20, 24; cf. Deut. 22:23 f.). *gynē* in the voc. is common as an address (e.g. Matt. 15:28; Jn. 2:4; 19:26; see above, CL 1). Besides *gynē* there are *thēlys*, female (also as a noun) in Mk. 10:6, and with a special meaning of maiden (cf. Mary in Matt. 1:23; but cf. Gal. 4:4), *parthenos*, virgin and → *chēra*, widow. The hapax legomena *gynaikarion*, which is a diminutive of *gynē*, little woman, but used contemptuously for a silly woman, and *gynaikeion*, female, occur in 2 Tim. 3:6 and 1 Pet. 3:7 respectively.

H. Vorländer

1. *Women in the Gospels.* (a) The Parables. The parables of Jesus often deal with the life and conduct of women (Matt. 13:33 par. Lk. 13:20 f., the woman and the → leaven; Lk. 15:8 ff., the lost coin; Matt. 24:40 f. par. Lk. 17:35, the women grinding at a mill). In the first two of these parables the part of the woman in the parable represents the action of God the Father. In the latter it counterbalances the illustration of the men in the field or in a bed, indicating that men and women have the same status in relation to salvation. Lot's wife serves to illustrate the dire need for wholehearted commitment, not turning back for material things in the hour of judgment (Lk. 17:32; cf. Gen. 19:26). It is not without significance that the allusion draws on the action of a woman to illustrate a danger that can happen to men. This

teaching is immediately followed in Lk. 18:1–8 by the parable of the importunate widow who, by her persistence in petitioning the unjust judge, gains vindication. The parable of the wise and foolish virgins, drawn from Jewish marriage customs, illustrates the need to be ready for the coming of the Son on the part of both men and women (Matt. 25:1–3). Jesus himself spoke to women in public; unconcerned about Jewish rules, he even taught them (Lk. 10:38–42, the visit to the house of Mary and Martha; Jn. 4:7–27, the woman of Samaria; note the astonishment of the disciples that Jesus was talking with a woman in v. 27).

(b) Healing. Jesus gave proof of his compassion and power in his healing of women no less than of men: Peter's wife's mother (Matt. 8:14 f. par. Mk. 1:29 ff., Lk. 4:35 f.); Jairus's daughter and the woman with the issue of blood who, because of her plight not only suffered much but would have been ritually unclean and cut off from the community (Matt. 9:18–26 par. Mk. 5:21–43; Lk. 8:40–56); and the Syro-Phoenician woman and her daughter (Matt. 15:21–28 par. Mk. 7:24–30). In Lk.the widow of Nain's son was raised to life out of pity for his mother (Lk. 7:11–17; cf. 1 Ki. 17:17–24; 2 Ki. 4:32–37); in Jn. Lazarus was raised in response to his sisters, Mary and Martha (Jn. 11:1–44).

(c) Followers of Jesus. Jesus' gift and call to divine sonship were intended for the poor and the lost and in a special way for women upon whom he conferred a new dignity. Even in his infancy the faith of Anna is placed by Luke alongside that of Simeon (Lk. 2:25–38). We do not find women disciples in the circle of the Twelve (→ Apostle). But this may well be due to the Twelve being chosen as the counterpart to the twelve sons of Jacob as heads of the twelve → tribes. However, women were to be found among the followers of Jesus; they were more prominent than the men in their love, care and courage after the crucifixion (Matt. 27:55 f. par. Mk. 15:40 f., Lk. 23:49; Matt. 28:1 ff. par. Mk. 16:1 ff., Lk. 24:1 ff.). Lk. describes the preaching ministry of Jesus in the following terms: "Soon afterward he went on through the cities and villages, preaching and bringing the good news of the kingdom of God. And the twelve were with him, and also some of the women who had been healed of evil spirits and infirmities: Mary, called Magdalene, from whom seven demons had gone out, and Joanna, the wife of Chuza, Herod's steward, and Susanna, and many others, who provided for them of their means" (Lk. 8:1–3). This latter point suggests that the traditional rôle of the man as the provider was here reversed.

Mary Magdalene or Mary of Magdala is one of the most prominent women who followed Jesus. Magdala was an important fishing, shipbuilding, agricultural and trading centre. Situated at the south end of the Plain of Gennesaret, it had a large Gentile population. Later rabbis ascribed its fall to its licentiousness (Midrash on Lam. 2:2). It is mentioned in Matt. 14:34; Mk. 6:53. Some scholars are reluctant to identify Mary with the prostitute who anointed Jesus' feet and found forgiveness from Jesus in the house of Simon the Pharisee (Lk. 7:36–50). It is conceded that Jesus had cast out "seven demons" from Mary (Lk. 8:2; cf. Mk. 16:9). But it is pointed out that there is no necessary connexion between the moral state of Magdala and that of Mary, and that Mary is introduced in Lk. 8:2 in a formal way with no apparent allusion to what has just been described. The "seven demons" could express the serious and prolonged nature of her plight (cf. Lk. 11:26). On the other hand, the way in which Mary is introduced in Lk. 8:2 might well be Lk.'s modest and cryptic

way of identifying Mary and of expressing the new beginning that she had found in Jesus. Her past was now a nameless past; she had found a new identity.

Mk. 15:40 f. mentions the ministry of the women followers of Jesus in the Marcan account of the crucifixion: "There were also women looking on from afar, among whom were Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James the younger and of Joses, and Salome, who, when he was in Galilee, followed him, and ministered to him; and also many other women who came up with him to Jerusalem" (cf. Jn. 19:25). Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James, and Salome are mentioned by Mk. as those who came to anoint the body of Jesus (Mk. 16:1; cf. Lk. 23:55–24:11). They were the first to be told of the resurrection. Lk. 24:10 omits Salome, but mentions Joanna "and the other women" who told the apostles, "but their words seemed to them as idle tales, and they did not believe them" (Lk. 24:11). In Matt. 28:1 Mary Magdalene "and the other Mary" are the first witnesses. The account in Jn. 20:1–18 mentions Mary Magdalene alone, who then told Peter and the disciple whom Jesus loved. In the Synoptic accounts, the women do not actually see the risen Christ but the empty tomb and the angelic messenger. But in Jn., Mary meets the risen Christ, supposing him to be the gardener, though she is forbidden to attempt physical contact with him. "Jesus said to her, 'Do not hold me, for I have not yet ascended to the Father; but go to my brethren and say to them, I am ascending to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God' " (Jn. 20:18).

Mary of Bethany, the sister of Martha, figures in two sets of stories. Lk. 10:38–42 describes how Jesus entered an unnamed village, where he was received by Martha. Her sister "sat at the Lord's feet and listened to his teaching". Martha, distracted "with much serving", rebuked Mary but was in turn rebuked by Jesus: "Martha, Martha, you are anxious and troubled about many things; one thing is needful. Mary has chosen the good portion, which shall not be taken away from her." Jn. 11:1–12:8 describes the raising of Lazarus, the brother of Martha and Mary, at Bethany, a village to the east of Jerusalem. Here too Martha appears as the more active and voluble sister (cf. Jn. 11:20 ff., 39; 12:2; with 11:31 ff.; 12:3). In Lk. Mary sat at the feet of Jesus; in Jn. she anointed his feet and wiped them with her hair (Jn. 11:2; 12:3).

Mk. 14:3–9 also describes an anointing at Bethany in the house of Simon the leper during the last week of Jesus' life. Whereas Jn. 12:4 ff. specifically mentions Judas' complaint that the ointment could have been sold for three hundred denarii and the money given to the poor, Mk. 14:4 does not identify the source of the complaint. Both evangelists record Jesus' interpretation that the poor will always be with the disciples, but that the act of anointing had been done beforehand for Jesus' burying (Mk. 14:6–9, which concludes "And truly, I say to you, wherever the gospel is preached in the whole world, what she has done will be told in memory of her"; cf. Jn. 12:7 f.). There are differences of detail (in Mk. she anoints Jesus' head; in Jn. the feet), but there can be no doubt that it is the same incident that is described. The account in Matt. 26:6–13 is substantially the same as in Mk. except that an exact price is not put upon the value of the ointment. The anointing which in the first instance was an act of love is construed by Jesus as symbolic of a wider meaning. It anticipates his death, and it also has a messianic character. The title Christ means the anointed one (→ Jesus Christ, art. *Christos*); and kings and priests were anointed by having oil poured over their heads (→ Anoint, arts. *aleiphō* and *chriō*). Elsewhere

Jesus emphasized the intrinsic connexion between his messiahship and his death (cf. Matt. 16:13–23 par. Mk. 8:27–33, Lk. 9:18–22). He had been anointed at the beginning of his ministry by the → Spirit at his → baptism (Lk. 4:18; cf. Isa. 61:1; Acts 4:27; 10:38; Heb. 1:9; cf. Ps. 45:7). He now received this unprecedented anointing in the house of a leper at the hands of a woman at the beginning of his passion. By linking the act with his death, Jesus was further underlining the character of his messiahship.

The accounts give rise to a number of historical and critical questions. The identification of Mary Magdalene, Mary of Bethany and the unnamed woman of Lk. 7:36–50 was widely accepted in the western church from the sixth century. The woman in the Matthean and Marcan stories is also unnamed. But if Jn. is correct in naming her as Mary, one of the daughters of the house, Matt. and Mk. may have suppressed her name out of a Jewish reticence. It is not beyond the bounds of possibility that Simon and Lazarus were one and the same person (the former name meaning "Asked of God", and the latter "God has helped"). But J. N. Sanders is more likely to be right in taking Simon the leper to be the father of Martha and Mary (" 'Those whom Jesus Loved' (John xi. 5)", *NTS* 1, 1954–55, 29–41). It may be that the disease of which Lazarus died was leprosy, perhaps contracted from Simon the leper, which might supply a reason for Lazarus' premature death and give added point to the remark of Jn. 12:39. Further, Lazarus might have served as a model for the parable in Lk. 16:19–31, which, if Lazarus was suffering from a skin disease coming under the general description of leprosy, might explain his sitting at the gate of the rich man full of sores (v. 20) and the allusion to someone rising from the dead (v. 31). If the two Marys are the same, the name Mary Magdalene might be an allusion to her former way of life as a kind of prodigal daughter (cf. Lk. 15:11–32, with Martha as the one who stayed at home). It may be noted in passing that the house referred to in Lk. 10:38 was Martha's. Lk. himself gives no indication of where the house was. It may have been in Galilee, or it may have been the one at Bethany mentioned in Matt. 26:6, Mk. 14:3 and Jn. 12:1. Although Simon was a common name, the circumstances may suggest that Simon the leper (Matt. 26:6 par. Mk. 14:3) was the same as Simon the Pharisee (Lk. 7:36, 40, 43 f.). If Lk. 7:36–50 is the same story as in the other Gospels, only set in a thematic rather than a chronological context, it is not beyond the bounds of possibility that the woman concerned was none other than Mary Magdalene "from whom seven demons had gone out" and who is later mentioned in her sister's house but who here is actually coming home but is not acknowledged by her own father. Henceforth, she found healing, forgiveness and new life in Jesus. On the other hand, there may have been two anointings, the first by the woman (probably Mary) in Lk. 7 and the second in the last week of Jesus' life. If it was Mary in both instances, the first was an act of love at a time which was a crisis for her, and the second was an act of love expressing her devotion to Jesus at a time which was a crisis for him.

For → Mary, the mother of Jesus, and the mothers of the disciples → *mētēr*. Also mentioned among the followers of Jesus is Mary the wife or daughter of Clopas (Jn. 19:25; cf. Mk. 2:14; 3:18; Lk. 24:18).

(d) The Sayings of Jesus. If Jesus' parables and actions lifted women to a status equal to that of men, and if in the gospel narratives certain women stand out, the sayings of Jesus make it clear that it is not because of their sex that women or men are

important. It is their relationship to Jesus that matters. When told of the presence of his mother and brothers, Jesus replied, "Here are my mother and brothers! Whoever does the will of God is my brother, and sister and mother" (Mk. 3:34 f.; cf. Matt. 12:46–50; Lk. 8:19 ff.; Jn. 15:14). In reply to the woman in the crowd who said, "Blessed is the womb that bore you, and the breasts that you sucked!" Jesus answered, "Blessed rather are those who hear the word of God and keep it!" (Lk. 11:27 f.). The particularity of divine grace is illustrated by the fact that "there were many widows in Israel in the days of Elijah, when the heaven was shut up three years and six months, when there came a great famine over all the land; and Elijah was sent to none of them but only to Zarephath, in the land of Sidon, to a woman who was a widow" (Lk. 4:25 f.; cf. 1 Ki. 17:18–16). In response to the weeping of the women of Jerusalem as Jesus went to the cross, he turned to them and said, "Daughters of Jerusalem, do not weep for me, but weep for yourselves and for your children. For behold, the days are coming when they will say, 'Blessed are the barren, and the wombs that never bore, and the breasts that never gave suck!' " (Lk. 23:28 f.; cf. 21:23 f.). The story of the widow's mite (Mk. 12:41–44 par. Lk. 21:1–4) illustrates the devotion of the most depressed class of the community compared with that of the rich. It is not the relative amount that counts but the whole-hearted commitment. The story of the woman taken in adultery is not in the best manuscripts, but is regarded by many as an authentic tradition which found its way into the Gospel (cf. R. E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John, Anchor Bible*, I, 1966, 335–38 and the literature referred to there). The story may well illustrate the tendency to judge without a fair and proper hearing, just as the Jewish leaders had been barely restrained from judging Jesus in this manner (cf. Jn. 7:51; Deut. 17:6; Exod. 23:1). Sin is not condoned (Jn. 8:11). But none of the men was able to condemn, when confronted with the challenge, "Let him who is without sin among you be the first to throw a stone at her" (Jn. 8:7).

In Matt. 21:31 f. Jesus asserts that prostitutes and tax collectors will enter the kingdom of heaven before the religious leaders, for they repented at the preaching of John the Baptist. The bracketing of these two classes together implies the lowest depths of degradation to which male and female could sink. But whilst sin is never condoned, the saying illustrates how the social outcasts find not only acceptance, but places of honour in the kingdom. A tacit witness to this is the genealogy of Matt. Although it is based on male descent, it contains the names of four women all of whom were involved in sexual irregularity: Tamar who had intercourse with her father-in-law (Matt. 1:3; cf. Gen. 38); Rahab the harlot (Matt. 1:5; cf. Jos. 2:1); Ruth the Moabitess who was thus not a true Jewess and who obtained her husband by lying with him on the threshing floor (Matt. 1:5; cf. Ruth 3:6–18); Bathsheba, the wife of Uriah, with whom David committed adultery (Matt. 1:6; cf. 2 Sam. 2:2–5). In addition Mary herself was suspected by Joseph of having committed intercourse with another man (Matt. 1:18 ff.).

2. *Paul and Acts.* (a) The Status of Women. Gal. 3:28 asserts that, "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus." Some scholars take this to be an allusion to an early baptismal formula (cf. parallels in 1 Cor. 12:12 f. and Col. 3:9 ff.; R. Scroggs, *IDB Supplementary Volume*, 1976, 966). Scroggs comments: "To enter the Christian community thus meant to join a society in which male-female roles and

valuations based on such roles had been discarded. The community was powerless to alter role valuations in the outside culture, but within the church, behavior patterns and interrelationships were to be based on this affirmation of equality." Similarly, P. K. Jewett regards the text as "the Magna Carta of humanity" (op. cit., 142). "Salvation does not alter the ordinance of creation; rather it redeems it. . . . In Christ the man and the woman are redeemed from false stereotypes, stereotypes which inhibit their true relationship. Thus redeemed, they are enabled to become what God intended them to be when he created Man in his image – a fellowship of male and female. The restoration of this true fellowship of the sexes is one of the ways we 'put off the old man and put on the new man who is being renewed unto knowledge after the image of Christ' (Col. 3:10)" (op. cit., 142 ff.).

In the light of Eph. 5:25, Jewett asks how many rabbis had ever said that a man should love his wife as Yahweh loved Israel (op. cit., 145). For a former rabbi, Paul acted in a revolutionary way. He could greet by name women in the Roman congregation (Rom. 16:6, 12, 15), naming Priscilla even before her husband (Rom. 16:3). In Rom. 16 he mentions by name no less than seven Christian women, and the letter may well have been carried by Phoebe, a deacon of the church of Cenchreae (Rom. 16:1 f.). As a rabbi, Paul should hardly have deigned to address women, where no men were present, but he did so unhesitatingly at Philippi (Acts 16:13). The church there evidently began in the house of Lydia (Acts 16:15, 40), and women evidently played a dominant, though not always salutary, part in its life (Phil. 4:2). At Thessalonica and Beroea women were among the prominent members of the church (Acts 17:4, 12).

The question arises whether there is not a tension between this strand of Paul's teaching and the hierarchical view of woman's subordination to man in the light of 1 Cor. 11:2–16; 14:34 f.; 1 Tim. 2:11–15 and Tit. 2:4 f. (cf. Jewett, op. cit., 111–49). In the first of these passages, Paul develops a hierarchical doctrine of headship. Scroggs sees an irreconcilable contradiction if *kephalē*, head, is taken to mean "ruler" or "superior authority". But *kephalē* may also mean "source", e.g. the source of a river. "Since a remark in 1 Cor. 11:12 suggests that Paul is thinking of Gen. 2, where man is said to be the source of woman, that may also be the point in 1 Cor. 11:3. Belief in Christ as the agent of creation (e.g. 1 Cor. 8:6) would explain the associated statement that Christ is man's head (i.e. source). Such an interpretation would make 1 Cor. 11:3 consistent with all Paul's other statements and actions" (op. cit., 967; for fuller discussion of this passage → Head, art. *kephalē* NT 3). Similarly, in 1 Tim. 2:11–15 Paul's premise is the ontological priority of the male (→ Adam, art. *Heua*). On the basis of this priority Paul adopts what for him is a personal rule: "I permit no woman to teach or to have authority over men; she is to keep silent" (2 Tim. 2:11). The precise wording should be noted. Paul is here stating his own position and practice which corresponds to his inherited Jewish position and for which he finds grounds in the order of creation and the fall. The question to be asked is whether the inferences that Paul draws here are to be regarded as universally normative in the light of cultural and educational changes, even by those who regard the premises of the argument as an expression of the ontological structure of human relationships. 1 Cor. 14:34 f. likewise expresses the practice which Paul personally follows and wishes to see followed in the churches.

With regard to the rôle of women in public worship and teaching, Paul followed

Jewish practice, seeing a reason for it in the structure of creation. The question may be asked how he envisaged the outworking of his understanding of man and woman in Christ in relation to → marriage. (On the question of divorce and separation → Divorce, art. *apostasion*, and → Separate, art. *chōrizō*.) At first sight, he might appear to teach an uncompromising subordinationism, if certain passages are taken out of context, e.g. "Wives, be subject to your husbands, as in the Lord" (Eph. 5:22; cf. Col. 3:18). But in the light of Paul's teaching as a whole there is a dialectical tension and paradox in his instructions. For in Eph. the teaching is prefaced by the general instruction: "Be subject to one another out of reverence for Christ" (Eph. 5:21). Moreover, it works out the way in which husbands are to love their wives in terms of two analogies: loving the wife as oneself (v. 28), reflecting the second great commandment (Matt. 22:39 par. Mk. 12:31; cf. Lk. 10:27; Lev. 19:18) and the one-flesh doctrine of marriage (v. 31; cf. Gen. 2:24); and the pattern of Christ (vv. 25, 32). "Husbands, love your wives, as Christ loved the church and gave himself up for her" (Eph. 5:25; cf. Col. 3:19). In other words, the headship and lordship of Christ does not consist in authoritarianism. Rather, it is expressed precisely in self-giving. For Paul, Christ's lordship was exercised precisely in taking the form of a servant (cf. Phil. 2:7; Mk. 10:45). Likewise, the husband's headship is to be exercised in the same self-giving in which he lives out his new nature in Christ. The headship consists in a renunciation of all authoritarianism; the only subjection that it is to demand is self-subjection for love of the wife. Entirely in line with this position is the statement in 1 Cor. (the same epistle which speaks of the headship of the man) that "the wife does not rule over her own body, but the husband does; likewise the husband does not rule over his own body, but the wife does" (1 Cor. 7:4). The idea of the wife actually ruling over the husband appears to be unparalleled in previous Jewish thinking, and contradicts Paul's alleged misogyny. The thrust of Paul's teaching is therefore caught in the dynamic paradoxes of mutual subjection and the thought that the headship of the husband is to be realized in utter self-sacrifice for the loved one, in a way that applies to marriage the self-sacrifice of Christ.

Relevant to the discussion of marriage relationships is the paraenetical passage in 1 Thess. 4:3–8 which treats sexual ethics in the wider context of sanctification (on this whole passage see E. Best, *The First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians*, *BNTC*, 1972, 158–70; H. Baltensweiler, "Erwägungen zu 1. Thess. 4;3–8", *ThZ* 19, 1963, 1–13; W. Vogel, "*Eidenai to heautou skeuos ktasthai.* Zur Deutung von 1. Thess. 4.3 ff in Zusammenhang der paulinischen Eheauffassung", *ThBl* 13, 1934, 83 ff.; C. Maurer, *skeuos*, *TDNT* VII 365 ff.). The RSV translates *skeuos* in v. 4 as "wife": "that each one of you know how to take a wife for himself in holiness and honour." *skeuos* normally means "vessel" and *ktasthai* may mean to "possess", hence the passage has been understood to mean that Paul is urging the men among the Thessalonian believers that sanctification also involves knowing how to possess their sexual organs or their bodies. They are not to be dominated by lust and sexual licence like the heathen (v. 5). Rather, they are to practise monogamy and refrain from adultery (v. 6) and immorality in general (v. 3; for the meaning of *porneia* → Discipline; and → Separate, art. *chōrizō* NT). Tertullian and Chrysostom took *skeuos* to mean body, but Theodore of Mopsuestia and Augustine took it to mean wife (*TDNT* VII 365), and Best favours this interpretation in view of the fact that *ktasthai* in the present tense normally means to gain or acquire, and no one could be

said to gain his body (op. cit., 161). *skeuos* is used of the women in 1 Pet. 3:7 and of men (2 Tim. 2:21; Acts 9:15; cf. Rom. 9:21 ff.). Maurer adduces rabbinic evidence for "vessel" (Heb. *kᵉlî*) being used of women in sexual contexts, and suggests that *ktasthai* here corresponds to the Heb. *ba'al 'iššâh*, to become lord or master of a wife (cf. Deut. 21:13; 22:22; 24:1; Isa. 54:1 which have specific reference to sexual intercourse; cf. also Isa. 62:5; Gen. 20:3; Prov. 30:23). The thought, therefore, would be parallel to 1 Cor. 7:2 ff., where Paul urges marriage as the divinely appointed provision for man's sexual needs. If it be pointed out that Paul seems to be concerned here with male sexual needs rather than the concerns of the woman, the reason for this appears to be that it was precisely the male sexual needs and lack of sanctification that constituted the problem at Thessalonica. But if 1 Thess. was among the first, if not the first of Paul's letters, and Eph. among the last, it could be that we can trace a development in Paul's teaching culminating in his vision of the marriage relationship as a mirror of the relationship of Christ and the church.

(b) The Ministry of Women. Some of the passages already alluded to have touched on the ministry of women in the early church. Even before Pentecost women were among those who "devoted themselves to prayer" with the disciples (Acts 1:14; cf. 12:12). The first convert at Philippi was Lydia who was baptized with her household (Acts 16:14 f.). At Thessalonica and Beroea women of high standing were among the first converts (Acts 17:4, 12). As a believer the woman is an *adelphē*, sister (→ Brother, art. *adelphos*). Among the women who were fellow-workers with the apostles were Priscilla, the wife of Aquila (Acts 18:2, 26; Rom. 16:3 f.), and Phoebe, "a deaconess of the church of Cenchreae" (Rom. 16:1), Cenchreae being the port of Corinth. 1 Cor. 16:19 refers to the church in the house of Aquila and Priscilla, and they are included in the greetings of 2 Tim. 4:19. The house of Mary, the mother of John Mark, served as a place of meeting for the church (Acts 12:12). Alongside the male diaconate there was also a female one; or perhaps more accurately the early church saw the emergence of both men and women as deacons. At first this ministry was evidently of a free character with no titles attached. Acts 9:36 mentions Tabitha at Joppa, whose name meant Dorcas or Gazelle; "She was full of good works and acts of charity." Part of her work consisted in making coats and garments (v. 39). Lydia's hospitality was part of her service (Acts 16:15). Paul's use of the masc. term *diakonos* not only suggests the existence of an order of women deacons but also that the women were included in the same order as male deacons. This explanation would make the best sense of the injunction to women in 1 Tim. 3:11 which occurs in a discussion of the qualities required in deacons: "The women likewise must be serious, no slanderers, but temperate, faithful in all things." Although some scholars think that this refers to the wives of deacons and others think that the question cannot be decided with certainty (cf. M. Dibelius and H. Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles*, *Hermeneia*, 1972, 58), the use of *diakonos* for Phoebe and the fact that Paul is talking about *diakonoi* both before and after v. 11 suggests that he is also talking here about women deacons, and that men and women alike could be deacons. A separate order of widows (1 Tim. 5:39; cf. Tit. 2:3 ff.; → *chēra*) seems also to be indicated. The nature of the work of the deacon is not clearly defined. It would seem that teaching and oversight fell to the *episkopoi*, "bishops", and *presbyteroi*, "elders" (→ Bishop). The etymological link between *diakonos* and the vb. *diakoneō*, to serve, implies some form of service, which judging from the ac-

tivity of the Seven in Acts 6 and that of Tabitha and Lydia may have had a strongly practical character (→ Serve, art. *diakoneō*).

The rôle of women in worship at Corinth was evidently a source of much dispute. On the question of the veiling of women in worship → Head, art. *kephalē* NT 3. The question of the propriety of women praying or prophesying with their heads uncovered (1 Cor. 11:5, 13) implies that women took part in the charismatic worship at Corinth. However, Paul's attitude here is in keeping with his Jewish and OT background. In ch. 11 he urges the veiling of women, stating that this is the practice which "we recognize" (v. 15). In ch. 14 he gives his ruling: "As in all the churches of the saints, the women should keep silence in the churches. For they are not permitted to speak, but should be subordinate, as even the law says. If there is anything they desire to know, let them ask their husbands at home. For it is a shameful thing to speak in church. What! Did the word of God originate with you, or are you the only ones it has reached?" (1 Cor. 14:33b–36). H. Conzelmann sees this passage as an interpolation which interrupts the flow of the argument (*1 Corinthians*, *Hermeneia*, 1975, 246). He regards it as "a reflection of the bourgeois consolidation of the church, roughly on the level of the Pastoral Epistles: it binds itself to the general custom" (cf. 2 Tim. 2:11; see above (a)). (That the passage is an interpolation is argued on purely textual grounds by G. Zuntz, *The Text of the Epistles*, 1953, 17.) Others see in Paul's attitude the residue of a rabbinic, Jewish outlook which falls short of Paul's insights into the status of women in Christ (for further discussion see G. Fitzer, *Das Weib schweige in der Gemeinde*, *ThEH* New Series 110, 1963; S. Aalen, "A Rabbinic Formula in 1 Cor. 14, 34", *StudEv*, II, 1, *TU* 87, 1964, 513–25). In this case Paul's attitude might be comparable with that of Peter on the question of circumcision, where Peter had not fully worked out the implications of the gospel for his stance (cf. Gal. 2:11 ff.). On the other hand, Paul's pronouncement may be seen as a ruling which was valid in the social, cultural, educational and church setting of his time but which no longer obtains today. In this case his recommendations might be comparable with his views which elsewhere he regards as his opinion (1 Cor. 7:25). An alternative view interprets this passage as a ruling about the maintenance of order, which has nothing to do with directions about teaching. The operative words are: "if they wish to learn anything" (1 Cor. 14:35). Paul is aiming at "the prevention of self-willed speaking" which is quite different from the praying and prophesying by women which Paul allows (1 Cor. 11:5; cf. G. Delling, *TDNT* IX 43). Similarly, 1 Tim. 2:12 might be interpreted not as an absolute prohibition of women teaching but as a repudiation of allowing them to domineer and lay down the law. The hapax legomenon *authentein* can mean both to have authority over and to domineer (cf. Arndt, 120).

What light does the NT shed on the question of the ministry of women today? The type of answers that are given often depend upon the type of questions asked. If we ask what are the formal precedents or the explicit statements of the NT we have already shaped the answer: the formal precedents are limited to the rôle of a number of women among whom Phoebe is classed as a deacon, and Paul's express pronouncements seem to exclude not only the ordination of women but the possibility of women leading public worship. Similarly, a blank answer is obtained if we ask what the NT says about the ordination of women. In point of fact, the NT says nothing about the ordination of men in terms of investing them with a lifelong status and

authority. In speaking of ministry, the NT lays its emphasis on gifts and functions which are not necessarily exercised in every given church situation (cf. 1 Cor. 12:4–31; Rom. 12:4–8; Eph. 4:11 ff.). Deacons existed at Philippi (Phil. 1:1) and in the churches served by Timothy (1 Tim. 3:8–13), but there is no evidence of them in the other Pauline Epistles. The Seven were called into being for a particular ministry in the Jerusalem church (Acts 6), but when the particular need passed, the ministry was evidently not perpetuated. Subsequently Philip became an evangelist (Acts 21:8; cf. 8:4 ff. and Stephen's preaching in 6:8 and 7:1–60). The variety and flexibility of ministry in the NT in the light of the needs of the situation and the gifts exercised in any given church would suggest that this is the pattern and precedent to be followed in thinking about ministry today. We should not ask whether there is a formal precedent but whether there is a gift of the Spirit and a need. With regard to the ministry of women we should not try to reproduce their rôle in the first-century milieu. We should rather ask what is their status in Christ, and what gifts and opportunities has the Spirit given to women in the church today.

3. *Peter.* The injunctions to wives and husbands in 1 Pet. 3:1–7 are comparable with those in Col. 3:18 f. and Eph. 5:21–33. Wives are to be submissive to their husbands. Character rather than outward adornment should be their true beauty. The thoroughly Jewish and OT character of the teaching is epitomized by the example of Sarah's obedience (v. 6; cf. Gen. 18:12). But this is counterbalanced by v. 7: "Likewise you husbands, live considerately with your wives, bestowing honour on the woman as the weaker sex [*skeuei*, lit. vessel; cf. 1 Thess. 4:4], since you are joint heirs of the grace of life, in order that your prayers may not be hindered." There are further affinities with Paul in the use of *skeuos*, vessel, for the wife. The relationship of married life to prayer echoes 1 Cor. 7:5. The reference to giving honour may be compared with Paul's statement that the wife rules over the husband's body (1 Cor. 7:4), and the picture of man and woman as "joint heirs of the grace of life" recalls the assertion of Gal. 3:28 that in Christ "there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus."

4. *Hebrews.* In the great chapter on faith, women are singled out as examples among the great heroes of the OT. They include Sarah who received power to conceive (Heb. 11:11 [on which see further F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Hebrews, NLC*, 1964, 299–302]; cf. Gen. 17:19; 18:11–14; 21:2; cf. also Rom. 4:19; 9:9; 1 Pet. 3:6), Rahab the harlot who "did not perish with those who were disobedient, because she had given friendly welcome to the spies" (Heb. 11:31; cf. Jos. 2:1–21; 6:22–25), and the women who "received their dead by resurrection" (Heb. 11:35; cf. 1 Ki. 17:17–24; 2 Ki. 4:25–37).

5. *Revelation.* In the Letters to the Seven Churches the church at Thyatira is accused of tolerating "the woman Jezebel, who calls herself a prophetess and is teaching and beguiling my servants to practise immorality and to eat food sacrificed to idols" (Rev. 2:20). The OT allusions recall 1 Ki. 16:31; 2 Ki. 9:22, 30; Num. 25:1. Jezebel's name does not apparently occur in later Jewish writings. J. M. Ford sees it as a nickname for some person who supported false prophets, as did Queen Jezebel in the time of → Elijah (*Revelation, Anchor Bible*, 1975, 403).

Elsewhere woman or women constitute an important symbol in Rev. (cf. 9:8; 12:1, 4, 6, 14–17; 14:4; 17:3, 4, 6 f., 9 f., 18; 19:7; 21:8). In ch. 12 the vision of the woman clothed with the sun, with the moon under her feet, wearing a crown of

twelve stars, and giving birth to a son, recalls the story of Mary giving birth to Jesus, escaping from Herod with the infant Jesus into Egypt (cf. Matt. 2:1–23). Having failed to destroy the child, "the dragon was angry with the woman, and went off to make war on the rest of her offspring, on those who keep the commandments of God and bear testimony to Jesus" (Rev. 12:17). (Similar imagery, in reference to the birth of a "wonder of a counsellor" (cf. Isa. 9:6) in the Qumran community, is used in 1QH 3:7–10.) But the image of the woman also represents the community of the people of God (cf. Isa. 54:5; Jer. 3:6–10; Ezek. 16:8; Hos. 2:19 f.; 2 Esd. 9:38–10:59). Isa. 66:7 uses the picture of Zion in birth-pangs. Yahweh is pictured as the husband of Zion, Jerusalem or Israel (Isa. 54:1, 5 f.; Jer. 3:20; Ezek. 16:8–14; Hos. 2:19 f.) who is a mother (Isa. 49:21; 50:1; 66:7–11; Hos. 4:5; Bar. 4:8–23), and who is in the throes of birth (Mic. 4:9 f.; Isa. 26:16 ff.; Jer. 4:31; 13:21; Sir. 48:19). The celestial imagery may recall Jdg. 5:31; Pss. 89(88):36; 104(103):2; Isa. 60:1; Jer. 15:9; Sir. 26:16 (cf. J. M. Ford, op. cit., 195 f.). By contrast the harlot, → Babylon, is in a situation comparable with that described by Jeremiah in depicting the fall of Jerusalem (Jer. 15:5–9). In the picture of the new Jerusalem God takes the place of the sun (Rev. 21:22). The vision in Rev. 12 depicts the conflict of the people of God, modelled on OT imagery of Zion and Israel as the people of God and also on the history of Jesus himself. Although the adversary is mighty and capable of causing great devastation, he will ultimately fail.

In Rev. 21:2 f. the church is pictured as the new Jerusalem after the first earth and heaven have passed away, coming like a bride from heaven for her husband. (The bride is the wife of the → Lamb (Rev. 21:9; cf. Eph. 5:32). The thought resumes the picture of the marriage supper of the Lamb (Rev. 19:7 ff.; cf. Ps. 118[117]:24; and the Targum to Ps. 48 which pictures Jerusalem as a bride and the Targum on Cant. which sees the assembly of Israel as a bride; J. M. Ford, op. cit., 361). By contrast Babylon, the symbol of godless civilization, is a harlot who has by now been judged (Rev. 17:1–18). *C. Brown*

μήτηρ

μήτηρ (*mētēr*), mother.

CL 1. A high estimation of motherhood and parenthood can be traced everywhere in antiquity. Already in pre-historic times (this is shown by numerous finds of small images of expectant mothers with pronounced sexual characteristics), man was aware of the close relationship between human life and that of the earth itself. The earth became the great mother who gives everything and then in death takes everything back into herself. Thus in many regions the oldest figures of the gods are earth mothers (cf. mother earth, *mater terra*, *magna mater*). Such mother-deities, which are represented anthropomorphically, play a great part in the popular religions of the East. Veneration of them often led to cultic prostitution, in order to gain an immediate share in their life-controlling powers, as in the Canaanite cult of Astarte (see OT below). Yet the picture of the mother deity can also be spiritualized and civilized and be detached from the highly erotic domain of the figure of Venus, as in the case of the Egyptian goddess, Isis, the embodiment of the true wife and mother. On the other hand it can assume the cruel and bloody traits of an Artemis or a Kali. We find

in the mother-deities the whole gamut of female possibilities (cf. G. van der Leeuw, *Religion in its Essence and Manifestation*, 1963, I, 91–100).

2. In Gk. philosophy the mother-concept is used in a metaphorical sense, when e.g. Plato speaks of matter as the "mother of all" (*Tim.* 50d; 51a; or the "nurse", *Tim.* 49a; 52d). In his speculations about → wisdom, Philo designates wisdom the "mother of the world and of the logos" (*Ebr.* 32). In general he often uses the expression in a metaphorical sense.

OT In the LXX *'ēm* is translated over 300 times by *mētēr*.

(a) In the OT we find again and again traces of the mother-deities of the heathen world. The prophets fought a ceaseless battle against the Canaanite Astarte cult. The worship of the goddess of fertility was bound up for the most part with cultic prostitution (cf. among other passages 1 Sam. 31:10; 2 Ki. 23:13; also Jdg. 2:3; 10:6). Cultic "unchastity" became a symbol of apostasy from Yahweh (Hos. 4:13 ff.; cf. Rev. 17:5).

(b) A maternal judicial praxis possibly still operated in special formulations, e.g. "the son of thy mother" in place of brother (Jdg. 8:19; 9:1–3; Pss. 50[49]:20; 69[68]:8), the "mother's house" (e.g. Gen. 24:28), or when the mother sought a wife for her son (Gen. 21:21). Nevertheless, the world of the OT still bears the stamp of the patriarchate, and the judicial regard for the female line of descent as that of hereditary succession is not stressed. Thus, for instance, a mother who has borne sons enjoys in the world of the patriarchate, a world dominated by men, a special position of honour among mothers and women.

(c) Motherhood is also guarded in the Fifth Commandment (Exod. 20:12). The death penalty rests upon any who strike or curse father or mother (Exod. 21:15, 17). Nevertheless, despite firm parental ties, it is still stressed that a man should leave father and mother and cleave to his wife (Gen. 2:24).

(d) The OT repeatedly gives prominence to women who played a special part in politics (e.g. 1 Ki. 15:13; 2 Ki. 3:13; Jdg. 5:7) or in the history of God's people (so Sarah, Rebekah, Ruth, Hannah, Bathsheba, → *gynē* OT).

(e) The concept was also carried over into the preaching of the prophets: the people of God is called the mother of Israel, and is entrusted to God (as to a husband) (Jer. 50:12). In Hosea she becomes an adulteress (Hos. 2:4, 7), in Ezek. 16:15 a harlot. Isa. 50:1 takes up the figure: Israel is the mother whom God divorces for the sins of her children (cf. Jer. 50:12). Finally, the picture of a mother is carried over to the capital city → Jerusalem, to Mount Zion, about which the people cluster as children about their mother (2 Sam. 20:19; cf. Gal. 4:26); for mother the LXX has here *mētropolis*. 2 Esd. (A.D. 100) calls the earthly Jerusalem "the mother of us all" (10:7).

Only in two places (Isa. 49:15, *gynē*, and 66:13) does the OT liken God's conduct to the action of a woman. In the OT creaturely distance from Yahweh forbade any deifying of what is motherly, and any sexually orientated presentation of God's likeness. On the other hand, → wisdom is personified as a woman (Prov. 1:20 f.; 8:1–3; cf. Wis. 7:12–22; Sir. 1:6–20).

NT In the NT *mētēr* occurs 84 times (72 in the Gospels alone). The concept of the mother or of motherhood is never exalted to a religious symbol or used in mythological presentations.

1. In the Gospels, besides explicit and particular mention of many mothers, we find the whole gamut of the natural relationship between mother and child.

(a) According to the Synoptic tradition, Jesus accepted the Fifth Commandment (Exod. 20:12; cf. Deut. 5:16; Exod. 21:16; Lev. 20:9) in all its absoluteness, even in respect of the consequences of its violation (Matt. 15:4 par Mk. 7:10). Pharisaic softening of the commandment is firmly rejected (Matt. 15:5 f. par. Mk. 7:11 f.; → Gift, art. *korban*). Nevertheless, as in the OT, the relationship of a man to his wife and that of a wife to her husband is given precedence over that to a mother, and thereby the natural detachment from the parental home is confirmed (Gen. 2:24; Matt. 19:5 par. Mk. 10:7 f.; cf. Eph. 5:31; → Separate, art. *chōrizō* NT).

(b) Jesus clearly delineates the limits of parental power which denies the claims of God. For the sake of the → kingdom of God adherence to the parental home has to be put aside (Matt. 10:34; more strictly in Lk. 12:53).

2. In Paul, as in the whole of the NT, respect for motherhood is an obvious manifestation of divinely-given life (cf. Rom. 16:13; 1 Thess. 2:7). That Paul nowhere mentions his own mother is not remarkable. He is able to compare his pastoral endeavours for the new Christians with those of a mother, just as he can also call himself a father who has begotten faith in them (Gal. 4:19; Phlm. 10). He praises Timothy's mother Eunice and grandmother Lois (2 Tim. 1:5), and urges him to treat the older women like mothers and the younger ones like sisters (1 Tim. 5:2). The → Jerusalem that is above is our mother in contrast to the present Jerusalem that is in bondage, like Hagar and Mount Sinai (Gal. 4:26 f.; cf. Isa. 54:1; → Parable, art. *parabolē* NT 9). By contrast Rev. 17:9 describes → Babylon as "mother of harlots and of earth's abominations".

3. The status of the mother of Jesus. (a) For all his respect for his mother (at the age of twelve he was subject to her after his visit to the temple, Lk. 2:51) and all his care for her (i.e. during the crucifixion, Jn. 19:26 f.; cf. Matt. 27:55 f.; Mk. 15:40 f.; Lk. 23:49), there remains a clear distinction between Jesus and his mother (cf. Lk. 2:49). He prevented her, when she would have hampered him in his messianic office (Matt. 12:46 ff. par. Mk. 3:31 ff., Lk. 8:19 ff.), and also at the time of the wedding at Cana (Jn. 2:4). Lk. 11:27 f. is also significant. Jesus turned the *personal* adulation for his mother into a *general* injunction: "Yes, blessed are they that hear the word of God and keep it" (cf. W. Michaelis, *mētēr TDNT* IV 643).

(b) The status of Mary in early Christendom is in accord with Jesus' attitude. After the resurrection she retires completely and in the rest of the NT is named only once (Acts 2:14).

(c) "In primitive Christianity the mother of Jesus was far less important than the mother of the founder in other religions" (W. Michaelis, ibid.). The Roman Catholic madonna-cult is supported by statements about the virgin birth made at a time subsequent to the NT, and imposes further layers on the various ideas already present in the NT regarding the mechanics of the incarnation (divine begetting at the baptism in Matt. 3:17, Mk. 1:10, Jn. 1:33, but also in Lk. 3:22 – fatherlessness and motherlessness; a begetting by Joseph – brought forward by opponents). The Catholic notions of the "mother of God" and of the "queen of heaven", though later

than the NT, point to much earlier religio-historical roots in the East (cf. CL above).

(d) Mary's psalm, the *Magnificat*, is given in Lk. 1:46–55. Lk. also relates the story of the → angel Gabriel's visit (Lk. 1:26 ff.) and the family relationship between Mary and Elizabeth, the mother of John the Baptist (Lk. 1:5–25). Matt. records Joseph's reaction to Mary's pregnancy (Matt. 18:1–25), the visit of the magi to → Bethlehem and the flight into Egypt (Matt. 2:1–23). Lk. records the birth in Bethlehem, the visit of the shepherds, the circumcision and presentation in the temple, and the visit of the twelve-year-old Jesus to the temple (Lk. 2:1–52).

4. Other mothers mentioned are: the mother of the sons of Zebedee (Matt. 20:20; 27:56); Mary (Matt. 27:56 par. Mk. 15:40); Mary, the mother of John (Acts 12:12); the mother at the death-bed (Mk. 5:40 par. Lk. 8:51); the widow of Nain (Lk. 7:12, 15); Herodias (Matt. 14:8, 11 par. Mk. 6:24, 28). The expression "from his mother's womb" occurs in Matt. 19:12; Lk. 1:15; Acts 3:2; 14:18; Gal. 1:15 (cf. Pss. 22[21]:10; 71[70]:6; Jn. 3:4). *E. Beyreuther*

παρθένος — *παρθένος* (*parthenos*), maiden, virgin.

CL The provenance of the word *parthenos*, maiden, is uncertain. The evolution of its meaning seems to resemble that of *Jungfrau* in German, where the primary meaning is simply a girl who is attaining or has attained the age of a woman. Later *Jungfrau* narrows in sense and means one who has as yet not been touched by a man. As in many centres of culture, virginity was esteemed highly among the Gks. In religion it is a characteristic of many goddesses; its origin has often to be sought in the mother-deities of pre-historic Mediterranean cultures. The chief figures are Artemis (Lat. Diana), a daughter of Leto, and Athene (Lat. Minerva), a daughter of Zeus, who alone was not born of a woman, a fact that may also have determined her other name Parthenos – her temple in Athens is called the Parthenon. In apparent variance with virginity, these goddesses, especially Artemis, were often the guardians of birth, motherhood, and the fertility of the land and of animals. Here the emphasis lies less upon chastity than upon youthful vitality with its magical power, and so the original character of a mother-deity again makes its appearance. In the later veneration of Mary there are many traces of the heathen cult of the divine mother and maiden.

OT 1. Heb. has two words for maiden: *'almâh* and *bᵃṯûlâh* and also *naʿᵃrâh*, a young girl. The occurrence of *parthenos* in the LXX is restricted in the Heb. canon to the translation of these three words. In 44 out of 50 passages in the NT *bᵉṯûlâh* is rendered by *parthenos*; in 3 passages a translation is lacking. Joel 1:8 has *nymphē*, bride. Est. 2:2 has *korasia aphthora*, innocent girls, and v. 19 *korasia parthenika*, virgin-like girls. *bᵉṯûlâh* always means an untouched maiden; like a young man, she is the embodiment of hope (cf. Amos 8:13; Isa. 24:4; Lam. 1:18), and so the word can serve as a designation of → Israel (cf. Amos 5:2; Jer. 18:13; 31:4, 21) and → Jerusalem, the daughter of Judah (Lam. 1:15) and of Zion (e.g. Lam. 2:13).

On the other hand, *'almâh* is used for a young girl or a woman at the age of puberty (cf. Prov. 30:19) until she gives birth to her first child. *'almâh* is translated by *neanis*, girl, maiden, young married woman in Exod. 2:8; Ps. 68(67):25; Cant. 1:3;

6:8(7). Only twice is *'almâh* translated by *parthenos* (Gen. 24:13; Isa. 7:14). In Gen. 24:13 *'almâh* denotes a virgin, for virginity is mentioned expressly in v. 16. In Isa. 7:14 it may be questioned whether a virgin as such is implied, otherwise *bᵉṯûlâh* would have stood there (cf. O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 1–12*, 1977, 100 ff.; G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Jesaja*, I, 1966 ², 113 ff.). Even so, it has been debated on linguistic grounds whether *bᵉṯûlâh* must mean a virgin in the strictest technical sense (cf. G. J. Wenham, "*Bᵉtûlâh* 'A Girl of Marriageable Age' ", *VT* 22, 1972, 326–48; J. M. Ford, "The Meaning of Virgin", *NTS* 12, 1965–66, 293–99). On the quotation of this Isa. passage in Matt. 1:22 f. → God, art. *Emmanouēl*. In contrast with the LXX interpretation, other Gk. translations have *neanis* instead of *parthenos*, which like the Heb. does not necessarily imply virginity. In Gen. 24:14, 16, 43, 55; 34:3 (twice) *naʿᵃrâh* is translated by *parthenos*.

2. In the OT accounts of long-barren women (Sarah, → Abraham, art. *Sarra*; and Hannah, 1 Sam. 1 and 2) becoming pregnant through divine intervention, there is never any thought of excluding male, human agency. The same holds good for the birth of John the Baptist in Lk. 1. Rabbinic Judaism also is unacquainted with any other notion, and the messiah is always viewed as one to be begotten of a human father like all men (SB I 49). Only in Hellenistic Judaism, where extra-Judaic influences were stronger, do other ideas appear to have come in; yet here also we find no trace of the idea that the messiah was to be born of a virgin.

NT 1. *parthenos* occurs 3 times in Matt. 25:1–12, once in Acts, 5 times in 1 Cor. 7, once in 2 Cor. 11, and once in Rev. General usage becomes apparent in the parable of the Ten Virgins (Matt. 25:1, 5, 11). In Acts 21:9 unmarried daughters are meant. Mary is called a *parthenos* indirectly only in Matt. 1:23 and directly only in Lk. 1:27. Virgins are discussed in Paul's teaching on marriage in 1 Cor. 7:25, 28, 36 ff. (→ Marriage, arts. *gameō* and *hyperakmos*; → Separate, art. *chōrizō*). That hardly holds good for Rev. 14:4, which probably, as with 2 Cor. 11:2, bears a metaphorical meaning, i.e. chaste. Lk. 2:36 speaks of Anna living with her husband seven years from her *parthenia*, virginity.

2. (a) By *parthenos* Rev. 14:4 probably means those who, in contrast with the promiscuous and idolaters ("not to defile oneself with women" has then a metaphorical sense), are able to devote themselves entirely to the → Lamb. In 2 Cor. 11:2 Paul hopes that, as a *paranymphios* (cf. Gen. 24), he may be able to present to the coming Lord a bride who meanwhile has not cast about for another Jesus.

(b) The precise meaning of *parthenos* in 1 Cor. 7 is debated (cf. H. Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, *Hermeneia*, 1975, 131 f.). Some scholars think that the term refers to women who are married but whose spiritual ideals caused them to live as virgins. Paul describes this situation in 1 Cor. 7:1–7. That he is thinking of such women in vv. 25 ff. is doubtful, on the grounds that he does not call the women in vv. 1–7 *parthenoi*, and the fact that his advice in the two cases is different. In vv. 1–7, when the couples are actually married, he recommends normal married sexual relations; in vv. 25–38, where the couples are evidently not married, he commends the unmarried state to those who have the gift for it. W. G. Kümmel, on the other hand, following G. Schrenk, *TDNT* III 60 f., thinks that Paul has in mind the relation of a man to his betrothed who is a virgin in the ordinary sense (H. Lietzmann, *An die Korinther I–II*, enlarged by W. G. Kümmel, *HNT* 9, 1969 ⁵, 33 f.). The exegesis depends in

part upon one's opinion of the gnosis in Corinth (cf. W. Schmithals, *Gnosticism in Corinth*, 1971).

(c) Where the NT speaks of Mary as a virgin, it has in mind the period up to the birth of Jesus. The statements regarding Jesus' supernatural conception (his *birth* is not supernatural: Lk. 2) are limited to the nativity narratives in Matt. and Lk. Mk., which is the earliest Gospel, and Jn. do not refer to it. Matt. and Lk. have different aims. Lk. 1:35 clearly bases Jesus' divine sonship on a miracle that went beyond the experience of Elizabeth (v. 36; cf. above OT 2). On the other hand, Matt. wishes to parry Jewish attacks upon the tradition regarding Jesus' origin that were already being made. There is added the quotation from Isa. 7:14 (cf. above OT 2) and with it, in a way that is typical of him, Matt. indicates the fulfilment of OT prophecy (→ Jesus Christ; → Fullness, art., *plēroō* NT 1; → God, art. *Emmanouēl*).

3. It is remarkable how in Matt., apart from the Isa. quotation, Mary is called *gynē* (Matt. 1:20 and 24, where *tēn gynaika sou/autou* "your/his woman" has the connotation of "wife"; cf. the different readings of Lk. 2:5). The genealogy of Matt. denotes not Mary's natural but her legal relation to Joseph, since for the sake of his Davidic sonship Jesus must pass legally for a son of Joseph (v. 16; cf. Lk. 3:23). But earlier witnesses to the Christian tradition such as Paul and Mk. make no explicit reference to the virgin birth. Gal. 4:4 speaks of God sending forth his Son, "born of woman, born under the law." According to Rom. 1:3, Jesus was *genomenou ek spermatos Dauid kata sarka*, lit. "made of the seed of David according to the flesh." That Mary is here regarded as of the house of David does not necessarily contradict Matt. 1:16 and Lk. 3:23, if we remember that by marriage Mary was brought into the house of David. For further discussion → Son, arts. on the Virgin Birth and the Genealogies of Jesus. According to Rom. 1:4, one of the proofs of Jesus' divine sonship is the → resurrection (→ Determine, art. *horizō*).

O. Becker, C. Brown

χήρα

χήρα (*chēra*), widow.

CL *chēra*, which occurs frequently after Homer, is fem. of the adj. *chēros*, deprived, and means a woman deprived (of her husband), i.e., a widow.

OT 1. The Heb. *'almānâh*, translated in the LXX by *chēra*, connotes not only the death of the husband but also the ideas of loneliness, abandonment and helplessness. The meaning of the word thus shows clearly that widows are regarded in a special way as in need of protection. In conformity with this, they are often mentioned in the OT in association with → orphans and strangers (e.g. Exod. 22:21, 24; Deut. 10:18; 24:17, 19 ff.; 26:12 f.; 27:19; Jer. 22:3). Their generally straitened condition had its basis in the social and legal status of women (→ art. *gynē*, OT) at that time, especially in certain regulations of the law of → inheritance.

2. Yahweh receives widows to himself. They should put their trust in him (Jer. 49:11), for he executes judgment for them (Deut. 10:18; Ps. 68[67]:5; Prov. 15:25; Mal. 3:5) and upholds them (Ps. 146[145]:9). Therefore, his people also are called to maintain the widows' rights and to have compassion on them. Otherwise, they will bring down his wrath upon themselves. Thus in the solemnity of worship the people

are bound in duty to fulfil Yahweh's righteous will: "Cursed be he that perverts the justice due to the sojourner, the fatherless, and the widow" (Deut. 27:19; cf. also Exod. 22:22 f.; Deut. 10:18; Isa. 1:17–23; 10:2; Jer. 7:6; 22:3; Zech. 7:20).

3. Accordingly, in the OT various laws are given which ease the condition of the widow: her clothes should not be taken in pledge (Deut. 24:17); in the third year the → tithe should be for her benefit (Deut. 14:29; 26:12 f.). The gleanings of the field etc. should be left for widows (Deut. 24:19 ff.; cf. Ruth 2:2). It is explicitly stated that widows are to be invited to the sacrificial meals and to the feasts (Deut. 16:11, 14) and thus have their place in the congregation. According to Lev. 22:22 f., the widowed daughters of priests have a share of the offering if they return childless to their fathers. For the Maccabean period cf. 2 Macc. 3:10; 8:28, 30, and in rabbinic Judaism further allowances for widows were made (cf. Ben-Zion Schereschewsky, "Widow", *Encyclopaedia Judaica* XVI 491–95).

Nevertheless, complaint about the unjust and merciless treatment of widows pervades the OT (see *inter alia* Isa. 1:23; Ezek. 22:7; Mal. 3:5; Job 22:9; 24:21; Ps. 94:6; Wis. 2:10).

4. A plethora of legal questions, above all about the right of inheritance, arises when the remarriage of widows is considered. The OT assumes its possibility and in rabbinic Judaism it is even encouraged; but not before three months after the death of the husband (SB I 47). There are two restrictions. (a) A high priest may not marry a widow (Lev. 21:14), or (in rabbinic Judaism) anyone "who becomes a widow in the time of her betrothal" (SB I 3; cf. II 393 ff.). (b) From the earliest times there are indications that a widow could be made an heiress to properties (1 Chr. 2:24 LXX; cf. Ezek. 22:10; also Gen. 35:22; 2 Sam. 16:20 ff.; 1 Ki. 2:13 ff.). A vestige of this right of inheritance of the sons or agnates is the levirate marriage (Deut. 25:5 ff., → Marriage), which remained until the NT period. According to it, a man was in duty bound to marry the widow of his deceased brother if the marriage had been without sons (in rabbinic Judaism, without children; cf. Matt. 22:24 and SB I 886 f.). The first son of this marriage then counted as a son of the deceased brother.

5. Isa. uses *chēra* in a metaphorical sense for → Babylon: "Now therefore hear this, you lover of pleasures, who sit securely, who say in your heart, 'I am, and there is no one besides me; I shall not sit as a widow or know the loss of children': These two things shall come to you in a moment, in one day; the loss of children and widowhood shall come upon you in full measure, in spite of your many sorceries and the great power of your enchantments" (Isa. 47:8 f.; cf. Rev. 18:7). But for Israel there stands, as the new divine covenant, the promise that the reproach of her widowhood (*chēreia*, – the exile is meant) will no more be remembered (Isa. 54:4).

NT 1. The NT speaks of the straitened circumstances of the widow: cf. her importunate legal action (Lk. 18:1 ff.), the abuse of her trust (Mk. 12:40 par. Lk. 20:47), her poverty (Mk. 12:41–44 par. Lk. 21:1–4).

2. The NT churches recognized their responsibility for the widow. The strongest expression occurs in Jas., where all outward veneration of God in worship is contrasted with it: "Religion [*thrēskeia*] that is pure and undefiled before God and the Father is this: to visit orphans and widows in their affliction" (Jas. 1:27). In the church at Jerusalem there was at an early date an organized provision for widows (→ Mercy; → Poor; → Possessions). The murmuring of the Hellenistic group because

their widows, as compared with those of the Hebrews, were being put at a disadvantage, led to the choice of seven men from the Hellenistic section who were charged with the care of these widows (Acts 6:1 ff.).

3. In the later NT period, the regulation regarding widows in 1 Tim. 5:4–16 is instructive. Here a distinction is drawn between widows and "real widows [*ontōs chērai*]" (vv. 3, 5, 9, 16). The "real widow" is left alone (v. 5), the church provides for her (v. 16); on the other hand, if the widow has relations, they are in duty bound to care for her (vv. 4, 16). The real widows were included in a roll of widows (v. 9). From the conditions of admission it appears certain that the widows who were enrolled received at the same time an office in the church. They had to be over sixty years old (v. 9), to have been the wife of only one man (v. 9; this may refer to polygamy or the second marriage of a divorcée, rather than to a widow; → Man, art. *anēr* NT 3). She must be "well attested for her good deeds" (v. 10), i.e. the bringing up of orphans, hospitality, readiness for humble service and helpfulness when face to face with those in straitened circumstances. Presumably these good works were the responsibility of a community of widows. Young widows were refused for they would be ensnared too easily by laziness etc. (v. 13). Those enrolled also seem to have taken a decision not to marry again; in the case of younger widows this had to be taken into consideration, and this may have been the reason for excluding them. "When sensuality leads them away from Christ, they then wish to marry. And then they are condemned, because they have broken their first pledge [i.e. the decision made in faith to remain a widow]" (J. Jeremias in *Die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus usw.*, *NTD* III 1937 [3], 28). This does not involve rejection in principle of another marriage, as is explained in v. 14: "So I would have younger widows marry. . . ." Here we have the attitude of the second Christian generation. It is different from that in 1 Cor. 7:8, where Paul says to the unmarried and to widows that "it is well for them to remain single as I do." Such statements may have been determined by the expectation that the parousia was near (→ Present). In the meantime an order of widows had emerged.

S. Solle

→ Adam, → Discipline, → Divorce, → Father, → Image, → Marriage, → Separate, → Son, → Virtue, art. *Haustafeln*

(a). J. J. von Allmen, "Women and the Threefold Ministry", *The Churchman* 86, 1972, 89–99; O. J. Baab, "Woman", *IDB* IV 864–67; D. S. Bailey, *Sexual Relation in Christian Thought*, 1959; K. Barth, *CD* III, 1, 183–206; R. T. Beckwith, "The Office of Women in the Church of the Present Day", *The Churchman* 83, 1969, 170–83; E. Best, *The First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians*, *BNTC*, 1972, 158–70; E. P. Blair, "Martha", *IDB* III 287 f.; "Mary", *IDB* III 288 ff.; and "Mary Mother of Jesus", *IDB* III 290–93; K. Bliss, *The Service and Status of Women in the Churches*, 1952; G. G. Blum, "The Office of a Woman in the New Testament", *The Churchman* 85, 1971, 165–74; P. A. H. De Boer, *Fatherhood and Motherhood in Israelite and Judean Piety*, 1974; M. Boucher, "Some Unexplored Parallels to 1 Cor 11, 11–12 and Gal 3, 28: The New Testament and the Role of Women", *CBQ* 31, 1969, 50–58; N. P. Bratsiotis, *'îš, 'iššâh*, *TDOT* I 222–35; C. M. Breufolge, "The Religious Status of Women in the Old Testament", *Biblical World* 35, 1910, 405–19; R. E. Brown, *The Virginal Conception & Bodily Resurrection of Jesus*, 1973; W. Brueggemann, "Of the Same Flesh and Bone (Gn 2, 23a)", *CBQ* 32, 1970, 532–42; P. Brunner, "The Ministry and the Ministry of Women", *Lutheran World* 6, 1959, 247–74 (cf. also the reply by A. Paulsen, ibid. 7, 1960, 231 f.); G. B. Caird, "Paul and Women's Liberty", *BJRL* 54, 268–81; J. B. Carol, ed., *Mariology*, I–II, 1955–57; *Concerning the Ordination of Women*, published by the World Council of Churches, Department of Faith and Order and Department on Cooperation of Men and Women in Church, Family and Society, 1964; J. Daniélou, *The Ministry of Women in the Early Church*, 1961; E. Deen, *All of the Women of the Bible*, 1955; G.

Delling, *parthenos*, *TDNT* V 826–37; K. P. Donfried, "The Allegory of the Ten Virgins (Matt 25: 1–13) as a Summary of Matthean Theology", *JBL* 94, 1975, 415–28; G. E. Duffield, ed., *Why Not?*, 1972; D. Edwards, *The Virgin Birth in History and Faith*, 1943; M. S. Enslin, "The Christian Stories of the Nativity", *JBL* 59, 1940, 317–38; M. S. Ermath, *Adam's Fractured Rib: Observations on Women in the Church*, 1970; F. C. Fensham, "Widow, Orphan and the Poor", *JNES* 21, 1962, 129–39; J. M. Ford, "The Meaning of Virgin", *NTS* 12, 1965–66, 293–99; G. von le Fort, *The Eternal Woman*, 1962; M. D. Gibson, "Phoebe", *ExpT* 23, 1911–12, 281; *Gender and Ministry*, Church of England, Central Advisory Council for the Ministry. A Report Prepared for the Church Assembly, 1962; H. Graef, *Mary: A History of Doctrine and Devotion*, I–II, 1963–66; R. W. Graham, "Women in the Pauline Churches: A Review Article", *Lexington Theological Quarterly* 11, 1976, 25–34; H. A. Hoffner, *'almānâh*, *TDOT* I 287–91; W. L. Holladay, "Jeremiah and Women's Liberation", *Andover Newton Theological Quarterly* 12, 1972, 213–23; P. K. Jewett, *Man as Male and Female: A Study of Sexual Relationships from a Theological Point of View*, 1975; E. Koffmahn, "Woman", *EBT* III 985–91; D. M. Lake, "Woman", *ZPEB* V 950–55; G. W. H. Lampe, "Church Tradition and the Ordination of Women", *ExpT* 76, 1964–65, 123 ff. (cf. the replies by J. Pretlove, ibid., 294, and L. Hodgson, "Theological Objections to the Ordination of Women", ibid., 77, 1965–66, 210–13); G. van der Leeuw, *Religion in its Essence and Manifestation*, I–II, 1963; L. Legrand, *The Biblical Doctrine of Virginity*, 1963; J. J. Lilly, "Jesus and his Mother During the Public Life", *CBQ* 8, 1946, 52–57, 197–200, 315–19; H. Lockyer, *All the Women of the Bible*, 1967; R. Loewe, *The Position of Women in Judaism*, 1966; J. G. Machen, *The Virgin Birth of Christ*, 1932[2]; E. M. MacDonald, *The Position of Women as Reflected in the Semitic Codes of Law*, 1931; J. McHugh, *The Mother of Jesus in the New Testament*, 1975; T. Maertens, *The Advancing Dignity of Women in the Bible*, 1969; G. J. C. Marchant, "Evangelicals and the Ordination of Women", *The Churchman* 87, 1973, 289 ff.; W. Meeks, "The Image of the Androgyne: Some Uses of a Symbol in Earliest Christianity", *History of Religions* 13, 1974, 165–208; C. Maurer, *skeuos*, *TDNT* VII 365 ff.; W. Michaelis, *mētēr*, *TDNT* IV 642 ff.; T. O'Meara, *Mary in Protestant and Catholic Theology*, 1966; P. S. Minear, *The Interpreter and the Birth Narratives*, 1950; W. Moll, *The Christian Image of Women*, 1967; H. Oberman, *The Virgin Mary in Evangelical Perspective, Facet Books Historical Series* 20, 1971; A. Oepke, *gynē*, *TDNT* I 776–89; J. Orr, *The Virgin Birth of Christ*, 1908; J. Pedersen, *Israel*, I–II, 1926, 46–96; J. O'Rourke, "Women and the Reception of Orders", *Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa* 38, 1968, 290–98; I. J. Peritz, "Woman in the Ancient Hebrew Cult", *JBL* 17, 1898, 111–48; W. E. Phipps, *Was Jesus Married?*, 1970; R. C. Prohl, *Woman in the Church: A Restudy of Woman's Place in Building the Kingdom*, 1957; R. Reuther, ed., *Religion and Sexism*, 1974; H. Riesenfeld, "The Ministry in the New Testament", in A. Fridrichsen, ed., *The Root of the Vine: Essays in Biblical Theology*, 1953, 123–27; C. C. Ryrie, *The Place of Women in the Church*, 1958; and *The Role of Women in the Church*, 1968; J. N. Sanders, "Those Whom Jesus Loved", *NTS* 1, 1954–55, 29–41; D. H. Small, *Christian: Celebrate Your Sexuality*, 1974; M. Schmaus, "Mariology", *Sacramentum Mundi* III 376–90; G. Schrenk, *skeuos*, *TDNT* V 365 ff.; and *thelō*, *TDNT* III 60 f.; R. Scroggs, "Paul and the Eschatological Woman", *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 40, 1972, 283–303; and "Woman in the NT", *IDB Supplementary Volume*, 1976, 966 ff.; G. Stählin, *chēra*, *TDNT* IX 440–65; R. T. Stamm, "The Status of Women Workers in the Church", *The Lutheran Quarterly* 10, 1958, 139–60; K. Stendahl, *The Bible and the Role of Women: A Case Study in Hermeneutics*, *Facet Books Biblical Series* 15, 1966; V. Taylor, *The Historical Evidence for the Virgin Birth*, 1920; S. Terrien, "The Omphalos Myth and Hebrew Religion", *VT* 20, 1970, 315–38; and "Toward a Biblical Theology of Womanhood", *Religion in Life* 42, 1973, 322–33; M. Thurian, *Marriage and Celibacy*, *Studies in Ministry and Worship* 10, *1959; and Mary, Mother of All Christians*, 1963; W. D. Thomas, "The Place of Women in the Church at Philippi", *ExpT* 83, 1971–72, 117–20; M. E. Thrall, "The Ordination of Women to the Priesthood", *Theology* 57, 1954, 330–35; and *The Ordination of Women to the Priesthood: A Study of the Biblical Evidence*, *Studies in Ministry and Worship* 7, 1958; R. Tiemeyer, *The Ordination of Women: A Report Distributed by Authorization of the Church Body Presidents, as a Contribution to Further Study, Based on Materials Produced through the Division of Theological Studies of the Lutheran Council in the U.S.A.*, 1970; P. Trible, "Depatriarchalizing in Biblical Interpretation", *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 41, 1973, 30–48; and "Woman in the OT", *IDB Supplementary Volume*, 1976, 963–66; C. H. Turner, *The Ministry of Women*, 1919; R. de Vaux, *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions*, 1961, 19–40; C. J. Vos, *Woman in Old Testament Worship*, 1968; W. O. Walker, "1 Corinthians 11:2–16 and Paul's Views Regarding Women", *JBL* 94, 1975, 94–110; L. M. Weber, *On Marriage, Sex and Virginity*, *Quaestiones Disputatae* 16, 1964; G. J. Wenham, "*B[e]tûlāh*, 'A Girl of

Marriageable Age' ", *VT* 22, 1972, 326–48; J. W. Wenham, "The Blessed Virgin Mary – An Evangelical Point of View", *The Churchman* 86, 1972, 27–38; C. Wessels, *The Mother of God, Her Physical Maternity: A Reappraisal*, 1964; H. W. Wolff, *Old Testament Anthropology*, 1974; *Women and Holy Orders, Report of a Commission Appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York*, 1966; F. Zerbst, *The Office of Woman in the Church: A Study in Practical Theology*, 1955.

(b). A. Adam, *Christus und die Frau*, 1951; H. Baltensweiler, *Die Ehe im Neuen Testament. Exegetische Untersuchungen über Ehe, Ehelosigkeit und Ehescheidung*, *AThANT* 32, 1967; and "Erwägungen zu 1. Thess. 4.3–8", *ThZ* 19, 1963, 1–13; G. Beer, *Die soziale und religiöse Stellung der Frau im israelitischen Altertum*, 1919; G. G. Blum, "Das Amt der Frau im Neuen Testament", *NovT* 7, 1964, 142–61; K. Bornhäuser, "Die Geburts- und Kindheitsgeschichte Jesu", *Beiträge zur Förderung der christlicher Theologie*, 2. Reihe, 23, 1930, 38–45, 82–87; J. Bottéro, "La Femme dans l'Ancien Israel", in *Histoire Mondiale de la Femme*, I, 1965, 224–47; J. Coppens, "La Soumission de la Femme à l'Homme d'après Gen. 3, 16b", *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 14, 1937, 632 ff.; P. Cruvellier, "La Droit de la Femme dans la Genèse et dans le Recueil de Lois Assyriennes", *RB* 36, 1927, 350–76; G. Delling, *Paulus' Stellung zu Frau und Ehe*, *BWANT* 4, 5, 1931; M. Dibelius, *Jungfrauensohn und Krippenkind, Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften* 4, 1931–32 (reprinted in *Botschaft und Geschichte*, I, 1953, 1 ff.); A. Dietrich, *Mutter Erde*, 1925 [3] (new impression 1938); J. Doller, *Das Weib im Alten Testament*, 1920; H. Donner, *Die soziale Botschaft der Propheten*, 1963; G. Erdmann, *Die Vorgeschichten des Lukas- und Matthäus-Evangeliums*, 1932; A. Feuillet, "La Dignité et le Rôle de la Femme d'après quelques Textes Pauliniens", *NTS* 21, 1974–75, 157–91; G. Fitzer, *Das Weib schweige in der Gemeinde. Über den unpaulinischen Charakter der mulier-taceat-Verse in 1. Korinther 14*, *ThEH* 110, 1963; B. Gärtner, "Das Amt, der Mann und die Frau", *In Signo Crucis*, 1963; E. von der Goltz, *Der Dienst der Frau in der christlichen Kirche*, 1914[2]; E. Gössmann, *Die Frau und ihr Auftrag*, 1961; and *Mann und Frau in Familie und Öffentlichkeit*, 1964; F. C. Grant and W. von Soden, "Muttergottheiten", *RGG* [3] IV 1227 ff.; H. Greeven, "Das Hauptproblem der Sozialethik in der neueren Stoa und im Urchristentum", *Neutestamentliche Forschungen*, 3. Reihe, 4, 1935, 113 ff.; S. Gutknecht, *Das Motiv der Jungfrauengeburt in religionsgeschichtlicher Beleuchtung*, (Dissertation, Greifswald) 1952; S. Hanson, "Mutter", *BHHW* II 1262 f.; M. Hengel, "Maria Magdalena und die Frauen als Zeugen", in *Abraham unser Vater. Festschrift für Otto Michel, Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Spätjudentums und Urchristentums* 5, 1963, 243–56; L. Hick, *Die Stellung des heiligen Paulus zur Frau im Rahmen unserer Zeit*, 1957; H. Holzinger, "Frau und Ehe im vordeuteronomischen Israel", *Wellhausen-Festschrift*, 1914, 227 ff.; N. J. Hommes, "Taceat Mulier in Ecclesia", *Arcana Revelata*, Festschrift Grosheide, 1951, 33–43; F. Horst, H. Greeven et al., "Frau", *RGG* [3] II 1067 ff.; H. Jordan, *Das Frauenideal des Neuen Testaments und der ältesten Christenheit*, 1909; E. Kähler, "Zur 'Unterordnung' der Frau im Neuen Testament. Der neutestamentliche Begriff der Unterordnung und seine Bedeutung für die Begegnung von Mann und Frau", *ZEE*, 1959, 1–13; *Die Frau in den paulinischen Briefen unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Begriffes der Unterordnung*, 1960; and *Das Amt der Frau in der Kirche. Colloquium. Theologische Blätter des theologischen Konvents der Bekenntnisgemeinschaft der Evangelisch-Lutherischen Landeskirche Hannover* 1, 1962; A. Kalsbach, *Die altkirchliche Einrichtung der Diakonissen bis zum ihrem Erlöschen*, 1926; F. Kattenbusch, "Die Geburtsgeschichte Jesu als Haggada der Urchristologie", *ThStKr* 102, 1930, 454–74; P. Ketter, *Christus und die Frauen*, I–II, 1944–49; C. von Kirschbaum, *Die wirkliche Frau*, 1949; L. Kösters, "Maria, die Mutter Jesu", *LTK* VI 886 ff.; J. Kühlwein, *'iššâh*, *THAT* I 247–51; *'almānâh*, *THAT* I 169–73; and *'ēm*, *THAT* I 173–77; M. J. Lagrange, "La Conception surnaturelle du Christ d'après Saint Luc", *RB* 23, 1914, 60–71, 188–208; E. Laland, "Die Martha-Maria-Perikope Lukas 10, 38–42", *StTh* 13, 1959, 70–85; R. Laurentin, *Structure et Théologie de Luc I–II*, 1964; F. J. Leenhardt, *La Place de la Femme dans l'Église d'après le Nouveau Testament*, 1948; F. J. Leenhardt and F. Blanke, *Die Stellung der Frau im Neuen Testament und in der alten Kirche*, *Kirchliche Zeitfragen* 24, 1949; J. Leipoldt, *Die Frau in der antiken Welt und im Urchristentum*, 1962; M. Löhr, *Die Stellung des Weibes zu Yahve-Religion und Kult*, 1908; J. Michl, K. Rahner, A. Müller and H. Schauerte, "Maria", *LTK* VII 25 ff.; K. Neulinger, *Frauengestalten des Neuen Testaments*, (Dissertation, Vienna) 1950; H. Norden, *Die eheliche Ethik der Juden zur Zeit Jesu*, 1911; A. Paulsen, *Mutter und Magd*, 1938[2]; W. Philipp, "Muttergottheit", *EKL* II 1469 ff.; H. Preisker, *Christentum und Ehe in der ersten drei Jahrhunderten*, 1927; H. Räisänen, *Die Mutter Jesu im Neuen Testament*, 1969; G. Reidick, *Die hierarchische Struktur der Ehe*, 1953; K. H. Rengstorf, *Mann und Frau im Urchristentum*, 1954; A. Rosenberg, *Die Erhebung des Weiblichen. Ordnung und Ausstand der Frau in unserer Zeit*, 1959; M. Rosseels, *Der Frau aber geziemt es zu schweigen*, 1964; and *Die Frau im Aufbruch der Kirche*, 1964;

K. Rückert, "Die Begriffe *parthenos* und *aparchē* in Apk. 14,4,5", *ThQ* 68, 1886, 391–448; ibid. 69, 1887, 105–32; H. Rusch, *Töchter des Glaubens*, 1960; O. Schilling and J. Weilner, "Mutter", *LTK* VII 707 ff.; A. Schlatter, *Marienreden*, (1927) 1951[3]; K. L. Schmidt, "Die jungfräuliche Geburt Jesu Christi", *ThBl* 14, 1935, 289–97; A. Schulz, "Alma", *BZ* 23, 1935–36, 229–41; C. Seltmann, *La Femme dans l'Antiquité*, 1956; J. J. Stamm, "La Prophétie d'Emmanuel", *Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie*, New Series 32, 1944, 97–123; A. Steinmann, *Die jungfräuliche Geburt des Herrn*, 1926 [3]; L. Stöcker, *Die Frau in der alten Kirche, Sammlung gemeinverständlicher Vorträge* 47, 1907; W. Türck, "Die Stellung der Frau in Elephantine", *ZAW* 41, 1928, 166 ff.; P. Tischleder, *Wesen und Stellung der Frau nach der Lehre des heiligen Paulus, NTAbh* 10, 3-4, 1923; W. Vogel, "*Eidenai to heautou skeuos ktasthai.* Zur Deutung von 1. Thess. 4.33 ff. in Zusammenhang der paulinischen Eheauffassung", *ThBl* 13, 1934, 83 ff.; J. Weerda, "Mariologie", *RGG*[3] IV 767 ff.; W. Wiesner, "Jungfraugeburt", *EKL* II 496 ff.; L. Zscharnack, *Der Dienst der Frau in der ersten Jahrhunderten der christlichen Kirche*, 1902; H. Zschokke, *Die biblischen Frauen des Alten Testaments*, 1882.

Word, Tongue, Utterance

Word and language are the means by which man enters into an intellectual relationship with his environment, especially with his fellow men. More than a mere cipher, a word or a concept is, for the ancients, a means of ordering phenomena and ideas, and at the same time a bridge for communication, and a way of gaining mastery or influence, as is expressed particularly in the forms of → curse and → blessing. Formally and structurally a word appears as language (*glōssa*, strictly speaking, a tongue), while acoustically it is perceived as a sound or voice (*phōnē*; → Quiet). That a word does not merely denote a thing, but stands for it, and can be virtually identical with it, is shown perhaps most powerfully in the noun *rhēma*, whereas the aspect of order, and the fixing and systematization brought about by words, can be most clearly observed in the most comprehensive group associated with *logos*. Because words, as the shape and form in which one expresses one's thinking, count as one of the highest distinguishing characteristics of human beings, the Bible also speaks of the self-communication of God in the category of the word, right up to the Johannine identification of God with the *logos*, in such an all-embracing way that any tension with the activity of God is excluded. Appended to this survey of NT terminology is a study of language in the light of contemporary philosophy and linguistics, entitled *Language and Meaning in Religion.*

γλῶσσα

γλῶσσα (*glōssa*), tongue, language, speech; ἑτερόγλωσσος (*heteroglōssos*), speaking a foreign language, of alien speech.

CL The noun *glōssa*, tongue, language, speech, may be cognate with *glōchin*, a point. Originally it meant the tongue of humans and animals in the physiological sense (Homer, *Od.* 3, 332), the organ of taste and speech. Figuratively *glōssa* stands for the faculty of speech, utterance, and also language, dialect (Homer, *Od.* 19, 175; Hdt., 1, 57). It can also denote an obscure linguistic expression which requires explanation (Aristotle, *Poet.* 21p 1457b 1 ff.).

OT In the LXX *glōssa* also appears in the form *glōtta*. In about 100 of the some 160 instances it stands for the Heb. *lāšôn* or the Aram. *lišān*, tongue, language. It

means the tongue as the physical organ in humans and animals (Exod. 4:10; Jdg. 7:5); figuratively it denotes the faculty of speech, language (Gen. 11:7). In the poetic and prophetic books of the OT and in Sir., the tongue is in particular the organ of sinful man – the tool of falsehood and evil, of arrogance and godlessness (Job 15:5; Ps. 140[139]:4; Prov. 6:17; Isa. 3:8; Jer. 9:2, 7). Sins of the tongue are like a lash (Job 15:5), like a sword and bow and arrows (Ps. 57[56]:5), or like a poisonous snake (Ps. 140[139]:4), causing disaster and destruction, and undermining a man's relationship with God and his neighbour. It is because "death and life are in the power of the tongue" (Prov. 18:21) that the admonitions to keep one's tongue from evil (Ps. 34[33]:14), and with one's tongue to intercede for justice and truth (Pss. 35[34]:28; 37[36]:30; Prov. 15:4) and to praise God (Pss. 51[50]:16; 126[125]:2; Sir. 31:30) are so urgent.

NT In the NT use of the word (attested 52 times) the chief theological emphasis lies in Acts (6 times) and 1 Cor. 12 and 14 (3 and 14 times respectively), where the tongues of fire which rested on the disciples (Acts 2 and 3) are a picture of the baptism with fire of the Holy → Spirit, and the speaking "in other tongues" is an accompanying sign of the working of the Spirit (→ Pentecost). By contrast the rich man in torment wanted Lazarus to cool his tongue (Lk. 16:24).

For the rest, the NT use of the word links on to that of the LXX (often in quotations: Acts 2:26 = Ps. 16:9; Rom. 3:13 = Pss. 5:9; 140:3; 14:11 = Isa. 45:23; Phil. 2:11 = Isa. 45:23; 1 Pet. 3:10 = Ps. 34:13), whereby *glōssa* characterizes the tongue as a part of the body (Lk. 16:24; Rev. 16:10), as the organ of speech (e.g. Lk. 1:64; Mk. 7:35; 1 Jn. 3:18; Jas. 1:26), and, along with *dialektos*, idiom, dialect, as language, turn of speech, dialect (Acts 2:11). In Rev. *glōssa* is used 7 times in the summary phrase "tribes, languages, peoples and nations" (Rev. 5:9; 7:9; 10:11; 11:9; 13:7; 14:6; 17:15; cf. also 16:10) to denote the totality of → peoples and nations in God's eyes (→ Tribe).

1. The tongue, the organ of speech, reveals man's inmost self. It can be subject to demonic binding (Mk. 7:33, 35; but cf. also Lk. 1:64). Under the power of the → Evil One the out-working of sin is revealed in many various ways through the tongue (cf. Jas. 1:26; 3:5 f., 8; 1 Pet. 3:10 = Ps. 34:13; 1 Jn. 3:18). But even here Jesus proves his saving power. With the individual, as with the redeemed community, the renewing power of the Holy Spirit is made known with the tongue, and by it God's praise is spread abroad. The universal confession of Christ as Lord by every tongue (Phil. 2:11) "is no utterance of personal piety but the sign of a new aeon already begun in the Church and the world" (R. P. Martin, *Philippians*, *New Century Bible*, 1976, 102).

2. The phenomenon at Pentecost of speaking in tongues or glossolalia (a word of Gk. origin but not found in the NT), is regarded in the NT as a fulfilment of OT prophecies (Acts 2:16–21 = Joel 2:28–32; 1 Cor. 14:21 = Isa. 28:11 f., though the latter has a negative implication) and as a mark of the dawning of the age of salvation. There is no reflection on OT parallels or similar religio-historical manifestations, although Paul, for example, is obviously aware of the existence of mystic and ecstatic manifestations in Hellenism (1 Cor. 12:2).

(a) The quotation in 1 Cor. 14:21 from Isa. 28:11 f. (*en heteroglōssois*, by people of foreign tongues), which originally referred to a foreign human language, is applied

by Paul to the glossolalia, which the unbelievers do not understand. In Corinth members of the congregation were impelled by the Holy Spirit to give voice to inarticulate and enthusiastic prayer, praise and thanksgiving in the Spirit (1 Cor. 14:14 ff.). This speaking in tongues was the outflow of an elemental possession of the individual and a distinct form of personal worship (1 Cor. 14:2, 28b). Since this praising and praying in tongues was not understood by others, speaking in tongues did not contribute to the edification and strengthening of the congregation (1 Cor. 14:5). ([Ed.] Paul can even say that tongues are a sign for unbelievers [1 Cor. 14:22]. The quotation from Isa. 28:11 f. regards the presence of speakers of foreign tongues as a sign of judgment. This could imply judgment on the church, if all spoke in tongues with no one to interpret. At any rate the outsiders would conclude that they were mad [v. 23]. But prophecy is able to work graciously by convicting of sin and leading to repentance and true worship [vv. 24 f.].)

Paul did not forbid the speaking in tongues (1 Cor. 14:39b); indeed he himself practised it freely (1 Cor. 14:18). But he urgently exhorted examination, discipline and restraint (1 Cor. 14:14 ff.). In the congregational gatherings, speaking in tongues is only to be given scope when, by means of additional interpretation inspired by the Spirit, it contributes to their edification (1 Cor. 14:26 ff.). Prophecy, i.e. proclamation of the gospel inspired and filled by the Spirit, is to have unconditional priority over glossolalia (1 Cor. 14:19), which Paul cites last of all in the list of gifts (1 Cor. 12:10). Paul nowhere intimates that glossolalia is an indispensable proof of the reception of the Spirit, or that the gift of glossolalia raises those members who have received it to a higher level of Christian living. Speaking in tongues must never contribute to the exaltation or self-assertion of pious people, but only to the glory of God. ([Ed.] On the need for interpretation → further Prayer, art. *entynchanō* NT. In the case of the interpretation of tongues, it would seem that Paul is not thinking of interpretation in the sense of translating one language into another, which would presume that "tongues" had a coherent scheme of grammar, syntax and vocabulary. Rather, interpretation here seems to be more akin to discerning what the Spirit is saying through the one who is speaking in tongues.)

(b) According to Luke's account in Acts 2, the bestowal of the Spirit in Jerusalem was linked with "speaking in other tongues"; together the disciples proclaimed the great deeds of God (Acts 2:4, 11), and at the same time the Holy Spirit caused many to understand this proclamation in their own language. Even if the tradition does not give us any absolutely clear picture of the events at Pentecost, at least it makes plain that God's Spirit effected an exceptional speaking and hearing of the gospel, which led to the formation of the original community. When later in Caesarea the first pagans received the Holy Spirit and became members of the church, they also shared in the gift of grace of worshipping and praising God "in other tongues", as again later the disciples of John the Baptist who became believers in Ephesus (Acts 10:46; 19:6). (→ further Pentecost; → Other, art. *allos, heteros* NT 2.)

(c) These manifestations were undoubtedly of different kinds, since for Jerusalem, Luke describes the speaking in tongues as a preaching of the gospel (*apophthengesthai*, to declare openly, to address someone enthusiastically, Acts 2:4, 14) directed to men in foreign languages or at least dialects; in Caesarea, Ephesus and Corinth, however, it was probably a case of praise and worship addressed to God in inarticulate tones. What is common is the conviction that these phenomena

are rooted, not in the excitability of human piety, but in the work of the Holy Spirit, and that it is to the glorification and worship of God that they contribute.

H. Haarbeck

λόγος

λόγος (*logos*), word, utterance, meaning; λέγω (*legō*), collect, count, say; λογικός (*logikos*), intellectual, rational, reasonable, spiritual; λόγιον (*logion*), saying; λόγιος (*logios*), eloquent, cultured; ἄλογος (*alogos*), irrational, without speech; λαλέω (*laleō*), to talk, chat, speak.

CL In the secular Gk. world, the word *logos* had already assumed a central significance for speculative thought long before its own terminology was more precisely defined. This became even more important at the time when the word was being adopted – precisely on account of the breadth of its basic meaning – as a technical term by the various developing sciences in Greece of the 5th cent. B.C. Grammar, logic, rhetoric, psychology and metaphysics, theology and mathematics gave it a different sense, even within the same branch of science.

1. *Early Usage.* The word *logos*, from the root *leg-*, to collect, to pick up, to recount, to speak, means word, discourse, language, account. In Homer, who uses it only in *Il.* 15, 393 and *Od.* 1, 56 in the plur., its meaning is not distinguished from *mythos* (→ myth) and *epos*, which dominate the same lexical field. But the post-Homeric usage differentiates the meanings. It reserves *epos* for epic literature based on the Homeric metre, and *mythos* to characterize fictitious stories, and then fictitious tales of the gods, which though poetically shaped, have an inner content of truth (first in Hdt., 2, 45). The area thus, so to speak, left free to denote that which is meant by "speech", "word", is occupied by a new post-Homeric word constructed on a Homeric root, *rhēma*, whereas *logos*, only weakly attested, stays restricted to the meaning of discourse (Xen. in Diels-Kranz I, 127, 9) or the theme of a discourse (Theognis, 1055).

2. *Philosophical Usage.* (a) The decisive change in the use of the word *logos* begins with Heraclitus (*c.* 500 B.C.). For him *logos* can mean discourse, didactic discourse, i.e. teaching (*Frag.* 1), word (*Frag.* 87), and even reputation (*Frag.* 39). But at the same time, it can also mean relation, proportion (*Frag.* 31), meaning (*Frag.* 50), common universal law (*Frag.* 2), truth (*Frag.* 1). It is worth noting with this breadth of meaning that Heraclitus has the whole field of meaning in mind in each individual use of the word: the words which contrast the objects with one another, the relationships which exist simultaneously between the objects, the law which underlies these relationships – a common law, in fact, including human beings as well – and the demand which grows out of this law, common to all men, for appropriate behaviour. It becomes clear from this that Heraclitus was not concerned with a philosophical system, but with getting hold of the unity of the One and the All (*Frag.* 50) through the existence of the universal law of proportion which underlies continuous change. *logos* for him is thus the instrument of thought, expressing both the thought-process and its conclusion, and also its consequences for the thinker (*Frag.* 2).

Since the *logos*, "unlike myth, which the god places in the soul of the poet as an inner truth ... is directed to that which is existent and material", it embraces "the

whole empirical breadth of everything which one has ascertained by the use of eyes and ears" (Schadewald, *Antike*, 155). These conclusions are founded on the meaning of the verb *legō*, which underlies *logos*, and which denotes the activity of collecting, carefully selecting, cataloguing in succession, and arranging together in an orderly sequence. Thus originally it had nothing to do with talking or speaking. Everything that man sees he explores with his mind and relates together; this relationship, according to Heraclitus, is the *logos* of individual objects, contained in the objects themselves, and exhibiting a law common to all existents (*Frag.* 2). He is therefore able to say "the One is All" (*Frag.* 50). The world represents for him a reciprocal relationship between the objects and with the whole, into which man himself is drawn, on account of which he is also capable of reason. Hence he recognizes universal laws within himself (psychology) and the laws of his own being in the world-whole (metaphysics). This "world-whole", however, still remains "world". It must not be interpreted transcendentally; in fact, the thought of transcendence does not yet exist.

The precision with which Heraclitus expounded his teaching inevitably provoked opposition. If he himself had also required people to listen to nature (*Frag.* 112), his contemporary Parmenides combined with the word *logos* (with which he soon equated the term *noēma*, thought, Parmenides, *Frag.* 8, 50) the idea of pure thought undisturbed by the senses (*Frag.* 7, 4 f.). Parmenides thus transplanted the realm of the *logos* to the other side of the deceptive world of appearances, in the world of pure Being. In the world of appearances itself there is only the insoluble struggle of opposites with one another (→ Truth).

Three things become evident for the first time in the *logos*-concept: (i) antithetical argument (Parmenides regards himself as consciously opposed to Heraclitus in his thought: cf. *Frag.* 6, 4 f.); (ii) dualism (Parmenides divides Heraclitus' "Whole" [*Frag.* 50] into two equal and clearly divorced spheres); (iii) the narrowing down of the concept of *logos* to the subjective sphere of the activity of thinking and the thought itself (Parmenides, *Frag.* 8, 50, where he even gives preference to the word *noēma*).

(b) At the same period (the middle of the 5th cent.), the teaching of the Sophists spread throughout Greece. This was an intellectual movement which stirred Greek society at all levels, and can be characterized by the following view-points: (i) reflection is directed towards man and towards the relationship between the individual and society; (ii) knowledge of the necessity, but also the possibility, of educating people to play a sensible part in political life; (iii) the conviction that the *logos*, discourse – accomplished by elucidation and criticism of poets (especially Homer) – made this possible.

In the confrontation over these three themes, the word *logos* took on the meaning of the individual method of argument, which was able to deal with the most varied problems in a totally disinterested manner, the only important thing being to defend one's own proposition. The reason why this appeared possible was the conviction that every *logos* already contained the counter-*logos* (Protagoras in Diels-Kranz II, 266, 15 f.). Antithetical argumentation is thus recognized as the basic principle of debate. As compared with Parmenides, it was the world of here-and-now reality, which he had so devalued, which gained exclusive interest. This is reflected in the in-

ductive method, which had likewise become the victim of severe condemnation by Parmenides.

It was now possible for debates on a particular theme to take place (*dissoi logoi*), through two-sided, mutually contrasted discourses concerning Good and Bad, Beautiful and Ugly, Truth and Falsehood (Diels-Kranz II, 405 ff.; even personified on stage by Aristophanes, *Nubes* 889–1104).

Dexterous manipulation of arguments made it possible to turn a "lesser", i.e. a disreputable, unjust matter into the "better" (*ton hēttō logon kreittō poiein*), as, by a sophistic twist, Socrates in his trial was charged with having done (Plato, *Apol.* 18b).

However, it was not only the totally value-free meaning of *logos*, adapted to purely individual aims, which characterized the time of the Sophists. At the same period people saw a great force in the *logos*, a potentiality for everything great and significant. Gorgias (Diels-Kranz II, 290, 17 ff.) names it a great ruler, who can effect "most divine" (*theiotata*) works in the smallest body. Isocrates (3, 7) ascribes to it a pedagogic power by which the bad are reproved and the good are praised; he almost goes as far as to assign a civilizing power to the *logos* (cf. *TDNT* IV 82), since nearly everything that man has created has been created by the *logos* (15, 254). Here is the expression both of an enthusiasm that is typical of this period of enlightenment; but also of a recognition of value-conceptions that has an almost missionary trait. It is, however, significant that, according to the self-same Gorgias (Diels-Kranz II, 277, 39), the Sophistic art of oratory did not operate with empirical knowledge, by contrast with other skills (the word "knowledge" is expressly rejected in the sentence), but only with words (*dia logōn*), whereby the real truth of the matter was left out of account by the speaker. The activity of discussing (*dialegesthai*), in the Sophistic understanding, accordingly brings to light no more than thesis and antithesis. It is in the implementing of the discussion itself that there lies the value for which one is striving. It was possible for a Sophist to break off with a remark such as "Now it is time to turn to something else" (Plato, *Prt.* 361e), without any loss of face.

(c) Socrates turned against this Sophistic separation of word and content, with two basic considerations in mind: (i) since the world itself is ordered, the material objects of the world can only be expressed univocally; (ii) the activity of conversation (*dialegesthai*) takes place in the true sense of the word only when the intention is to reach agreement, the *koinos logos*, the common foundation of human community. He viewed discussion as a community-producing activity, so long as in the struggle for truth "all knowledge drives irrestibly towards realization" (R. Stenzel, "Socrates", Pauly-Wissowa, III, 831). Socrates himself behaved in just such a way in prison (Plato, *Crito* 46b and c). The purpose of discussion for him is not talking for talking's sake (*logoi heneka logou*, Plato, *Crito* 46d; cf. above 3 (a)), but the process of reflection through dialogue, which discovers the *logos* of things.

(d) Plato, whose thought was more concerned with the concept of Ideas or → Forms, added nothing decisively new to the philosophical understanding of *logos*. Even with Aristotle no new ground is broken in the use of the *logos*-concept in the problem of the interpretation of the world and man's relation to and in it. Rather, the Socratic-Platonic concept is systematized, and understood in a specialized and limited way. Man alone of living beings has *logos*, because his actions are determined by the word, and he himself is capable of speech and understanding (*Pol.* 1, 2p, 1253a, 9 f.; and *Eth. Nic.* 1, 6p, 1098a, 4 f.).

(e) Reviewing the development of the concept of *logos* so far, it is clear that no further development can take place along the lines of understanding that have been marked out. Heraclitus' general universal law and the Sophists' individual oratorical ability are the extremes beyond which one cannot go within the frame of reference provided by the existing understanding of *logos*. A fundamentally new orientation of thought, namely, the thesis that ethics is the basic problem for man, was provided by the Stoics, who confronted the Gk. starting-point of knowledge with the formulation of their question: How must I live in order to be able to be happy? Nevertheless, here too the complex of ideas from which the answer is worked out is denoted as the *logos*. It is instructive that in a philosophy which was no longer orientated along either national Gk. or political, or ontological lines, the *logos*-concept yet retained the power to serve as a designation for the "Most General". This "Most General" is, however, now no longer won by perception but set by conviction. The *logos* in this thinking is the expression for the ordered and harmonious purposiveness of the world (*TDNT* IV 84). It is equated with → God, or (as in Chrysippus, the second head of the Stoa, *c.* 250 B.C.) combined with God; it is the constitutive principle of the cosmos, which extends right through matter. In that the world is viewed as a unity and allowed to become an unfolding of the *logos*, a high degree of spiritualization is conceded to it. There is no room here for the Socratic conception of the active search for truth, which is necessarily followed by its re-enactment in society, although there is for the Heraclitean sense of the world-whole. For the Stoics the latter is not, of course, to be found in the world independent of thought, but derives from a specific point of origin in the Logos-God. Attempts are certainly made to bridge the gap between both realms by the idea of development; but a dichotomy or dualism is still presupposed, which – despite Parmenides – cannot be derived solely from Gk. thought.

A thorough intellectual organization of the world and the definition of man's location in it – a fundamental pre-condition for ethics – is undertaken on the basis of Aristotelian schematization. There are, on the other hand, the seminal, the seed-bestowing Logoi (*spermatikoi logoi*) which permeate the whole world and bring about the continuity of all growth and occurrence and thus its meaningful course. Furthermore, there is a right Logos (*orthos logos*) or universal law which bestows on man the power of knowledge and thence of moral behaviour. Corresponding with the dual conceptuality of the word *logos* (thinking and saying) a distinction is made between the inner Logos (thinking), given by the God-Logos, and the Logos ordained for articulation (speaking) – a regression vis-à-vis Plato's formulation that thinking is a dialogue with oneself (Plato, *Soph.* 263e).

(f) The secular Gk. intellectual beginnings brought late fruits to maturity in Neo-Platonism, a philosophical system of the 3rd cent. A.D. As in the Stoa, the Logos is here conceived as a force which invests material objects with shape, form and life (*TDNT* IV 85 f.), and is even bracketed together with → life (*zōē*; Plotinus, *Enneads* 6, 7, 11). Plotinus (A.D. 205–*c.* 269) asks: what is the Logos? His answer runs: It is as it were an emanation from spirit and soul (the components of the intelligible world) into the material world, and by means of this emanation the whole world, right to the last – even an already dead – little piece of matter is permeated by the Logos (cf. *Enneads* 3, 8, 2; *TDNT* IV 85). This process is thought of as a continuing, that is to say, not as a once-for-all, historical event. It represents in its combined association of intelligible and real world an overcoming of Stoic dualism. It is true

that the Logos-component, which produces all the many and varied phenomena, is also here called *logos spermatikos*. But this is now no longer understood (as with the Stoics) in a biological and scientific sense as the "moisture in the seed", but as a spiritual quality, Number, Measure or Logos.

Finally, as in Stoic doctrine, man is able to raise himself out of the delusion of reality by means of his own *logos*. But this process no longer leads in a Gk. sense to knowledge, with ethical behaviour as a consequence. Rather, it leads from the *logoi* (i.e. above and beyond the intelligible world) and sight (*epi tēn thean*), to the vision which is no longer Logos, but which creates a relationship with that which was earlier and is more than the *logos* (*Enneads*, 9, 4 and 10). However, with this conception of the goal of vision as the disclosure of a trans-logical reality, the realm of secular Gk. thought (for which the whole world is divine, but not yet divided into real and intelligible) is evidently left behind.

(g) Among the systems offering an explanation of the world in terms of the Logos there are, finally, the mystery religions. These cultic communities did not see their task as lying in the communication of knowledge of a scientific nature, but of mysteries to their initiates who strove for purification in the recurrent enactment of sacred actions (cf. G. Wagner, *Pauline Baptism and the Pagan Mysteries*, 1967). The foundation for the cultic actions was sacred texts (*hieroi logoi*, already thus in Hdt., 2, 51), revealed by the founder of the cult or by men inspired by the divinity on the basis of a → revelation. Among them were the cult of Dionysus, the Pythagoreans and the Orphic mysteries. By means of these cults, non-Gk. (primarily Egyptian) theological speculations influenced Gk. thought, such as in the Isis-Osiris mysteries, in which Osiris, the *logos* created by Isis, is the spiritual → image of the world (Plutarch, *De Iside et Osiride* 54). Similarly in the cult of Hermes, the latter informed his son Tat (an Egyptian name) in the "sacred text" belonging to the cult how by God's mercy he became *logos* and thus a son of God (*hyios theou*). As such, he brought regulations and form into the world, but himself remained a mediating being between God and matter on the one side, and God and man on the other. The *logos* can also however appear as the son of Hermes, resulting in a triple gradation: God (Zeus), Son (Hermes), *logos*.

3. *Usage in Grammar, Logic and Rhetoric.* (a) Apart from its use in formulations of general interpretations of the world, the word *logos* is used with striking precision in the field of grammar. One of the examples of definition transmitted under Plato's name (Plato, *Definitiones* 414d) is the following: "*logos* is a sound representable in written characters, which is able to express everything that exists, a discourse composed of substantives and verbs in the field of prose" (translation by H. Leisegang, "Logos", Pauly-Wissowa, III 1037). *logos* is thus here set over against the Homeric concept, in line with the basic general Gk. meaning and set in the realm of (in particular, non-poetic) discourse. The word denotes a higher totality composed of levels made up of parts varying in size (letters, i.e. the basic elements, and words, the latter chosen qualitatively as being the words which constitute a sentence). Its possibilities for use are limitless. The formulation of this element-doctrine of the Logos is ascribed to the Atomists. Plato worked with it, and the doctrine initiates the development first to grammatical science, the teaching of sentence-analysis, and secondly to metaphysics, the teaching of the "logical" shape of the cosmos. (The word "logical"

first appears in the Stoa.) By contrast with *epos* and *lexis*, *logos* is meaningful discourse.

(b) When the defence of mutually contradictory theses became the chief occupation of Sophistic philosophers, it became clear that anyone who wished to argue well and unassailably could not forgo a knowledge of grammar. Plato had realized that it was possible to form such opinions only when the existence of the object of the discussion could be asserted. For this, however, one needed a sentence, i.e. a combination of noun and verb; and such a sentence, i.e. a meaningful association of words, is in Plato called *logos* (cf. *Soph.* 262a).

Aristotle systematized this use of *logos* in making judgments in that he first of all investigated the words in themselves, before placing them in a meaningful context: there are the "categories". In themselves they have no meaning, i.e. for Aristotle, in the realm of logic, there is no such thing as the *logos* of a word. But since it is the sentence which gives the individual word its sense and defines its limits of meaning, *logos* comes to mean the definition (*Met.* 7p, 1012a, 23; prepared for in Plato, *Rep.* 343a). Thirdly, alongside judgment and definition, *logos* for him means the conclusion, i.e. the final proposition of a line of argumentation (syllogism) which concludes the proof. A *logos* is a conclusion when, if something is posited, various other things of necessity follow from what is posited by virtue of the fact that it is the case (*Analytica* 1, 1p, 24b, 18, translation by Leisegang, op. cit., 1042). Finally, *logos* means the proof itself, so that the main points of a logical argument – judgment, definition, conclusion, proof – can be expressed both in Aristotle and subsequently in later logicians by the word *logos*. After Aristotle, Gk. philosophy did not again take great interest in the strictly logical shape of the word *logos*.

(c) If grammar is the science of the analysis of sentences (*logoi*, because meaningful), and if knowledge of it is necessary in order to argue logically, then it is inevitable that the art of rhetoric, in which this takes place, will also have to work with the idea of *logos*. For Gorgias, poetry, speeches in court and philosophical disputations are all equally *logoi*, now in verse, now under the imposed conditions of competition, now as controversies. The conflict arose over the different areas of competence of orators and philosophers: *logos* for the orator meant continuous discourse, for the philosopher dialogue. So, slowly, the dialogue took over as the stylistic form of the philosophers, the *logos* as the stylistic form of the orators. Plato is acquainted with both, but introduces also the entirely new so-called maieutic dialogue, or the Socratic dialogue, as it is now chiefly called (the term comes from Aristotle, *Poet.* 1447b, 11). This *logos*, the name of which is borrowed from midwifery, is characterized by the way that the one who engages in maieutic discussion does not wish to procure a victory for his own thesis (he does not even need to have one), but desires by his questioning to unearth the knowledge which may well be present in his partner, although he himself may not yet be conscious of it. From this form of dialogue the philosophical dialogue evolved, appearing among the Stoics as a sub-group of logic, and generally designated as dialectic.

4. The apparently bewildering overall picture of the use of *logos* fits together intelligibly, if we note that the word was used as human discourse with an eye to content – implying, however, objectivity and thereby conformity – in order to establish one's mastery of the presumed regularity of the world. This is of course only true of those philosophers who were ready to argue from man to the world; but because of

the strength of these systems the effect of these thinkers far exceeded that of the remaining representatives of Gk. philosophy. To the same extent that the conviction of the order of the world (*logos*) was to be conveyed in a lecture (*logos*) to a sceptical audience, a speaker sharpened his appreciation of the particular choice and combination of various words (*logos*), their logical validity, and their power to convince (*logos*). Thus the speaker, who was able to convince his hearers with a carefully-constructed discourse (*logos*), was able to reap success.

One can also understand how the individual sciences (grammar, logic, rhetoric), the necessary means to this end, had already reached perfection in the 4th cent. B.C., because they were accessible to observation and systematic control, while the struggle for knowledge of the totality of the world was in flux far longer. It is worthy of note that, thanks not least to new basic assumptions from non-Gk. traditions of thought apparent from the time of the Stoics onwards, it was still possible to summon up the energy for a closed system in the 3rd cent. A.D. *G. Fries*

OT 1. *Heb. Terms for Word.* The Heb. equivalent for *logos* is predominantly *dāḇār*, word, but not infrequently *'ēmer*, word (cf. *'āmar*, to say), *'imrâh*, word, saying, and *millâh*, word. Since *dāḇār* is also rendered by → *rhēma* in the LXX, it is important to make the statistical observation that in the OT historical books *logos* is the predominant rendering, while in the prophets *rhēma* predominates by as much as eight-fold. The vb. *legō* stands chiefly for *'āmar*, to speak, to say, *dāḇār* means word, report, command, but also thing, matter, affair and (linked with adjs.) something (*dāḇār ra'*, something evil, Deut. 17:1; *dāḇār gāḏôl*, something great, 1 Sam. 20:2). It follows from the double structure of *dāḇār* – the meanings "word" and "thing" – that in the word there is always contained something of the thing itself, that the thing itself is only ever accessible in the word, and that the word cannot be separated from its content nor the content from the word.

The term "word of Yahweh" (*dᵉḇar YHWH*) is found 241 times in the OT. The way in which these passages are distributed among the individual books (e.g. Jer. 52, Ezek. 60 times), the observation that the expression "word of Yahweh" is used substantially more often in the prophetic epoch than in any previous or later time, and the fact that 221 of all the OT occurrences (i.e. 93%) denote a prophetic word of God, permit the conclusion that this phrase virtually represents a technical term for the prophetic revelation of the word (O. Grether, *Name und Wort Gottes im Alten Testament*, *BZAW* 64, 1934, 77, cf. 63 ff.). In addition, *dāḇār* already served early on to designate the divine → commandment and will for justice (Exod. 34:28, the Ten Commandments) granted to Israel along with their → election and the → covenant, and, particularly in exilic and post-exilic times, to act as a periphrasis for the creatively efficacious activity of God in → creation (Gen. 1) and nature (Pss. 29 and 33). The prophetic word of promise which shapes history, the directive word of the covenant which takes possession of men and the creative word of God which determines nature and its order combine to describe the → revelation of God in the OT.

2. *Ancient Oriental Notion of the Word of God.* In the ancient Orient a word was widely regarded not as an indicative designation, i.e. as a bearer and mediator of meaningful content (the noetic aspect of the word), but as a power which was efficacious in incantations and magical spells, in blessings and curses, even in the spatial and material world. A → curse, as a baneful word, could penetrate the affec-

ted person like some disintegrating substance and bring destruction by spreading outwards from within (the dynamic aspect of the word).

The divine word, in particular, was believed to possess dynamic power and creative potency in Egypt, Assyria and Babylonia. In Egypt the power of creation and the preservation of the world is traced back to the divine word. According to an inscription from Memphis, Ptah, the creator god, exercised his creative activity with the help of "heart and tongue", i.e. with his word (L. Dürr, *Die Wertung des göttlichen Wortes im Alten Testament und im antiken Orient, Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch – (Ägyptisch)en Gesellschaft*, 42, 1, 1938, 25). The dynamic power of the creative word is also conveyed from Ptah to other gods. Thus it is said of Thoth: "What rises up out of his mouth takes place, and what he says happens" (ibid., 27 f.). In Mesopotamia, too, the creative power of the divine word is praised. The following predications may be quoted from the Marduk-Ellil hymns: "His word, which passes by like a storm.... The word which rends the heavens above; the word which shakes the earth below.... His word is a storm which annihilates everything.... When his word proceeds gently along, it destroys the land" (8 ff.). As far as the difference between the biblical and the ancient oriental understanding of the word of God is concerned, one can assert, despite many analogies, that in the latter the divinity "is set in a partly magical and partly natural relation to the world" and that in consequence "the word is also viewed as a magical or natural quantity or as an emanation of the divinity, so that the divinity is linked to or identified with nature" (O. Grether, op. cit., 144). In Israel, by contrast, the creative word of God was purified of any magical or emanative understanding, and demythologized to become the word of the God who by exhortation, claim and promise gives shape to history. The OT knows only the particular and at any given time underived creative word of God spoken to the world.

3. *The Forms of the Prophetic Proclamation of the Word of God.* The subject-matter of prophetic → proclamation is the word of God. However, in so far as the words of the OT prophets display certain basic common forms, despite their individual differences, one must ask what understanding of the word of God the various forms and literary categories of prophetic proclamation express, since it is not the prophet who avails himself of the word, but Yahweh's word which takes the prophet into its service. Here the question of form-criticism passes immediately into that of content: "What determined the choice of the form was primarily the subject-matter of the message" (G. von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, II, 1965, 39).

(a) The word of God as a word of vocation (the literary category of the account of a call). The special nature of prophetic proclamation finds expression in accounts of calls where the authority of the prophetic word is grounded solely in the word of God which gives the commission, i.e. in the call. Two forms of the accounts of calls can be distinguished: the first form (Jer. 1:4–10) is characterized by a divine discourse (a word of election and appointment), by the prophetic contradiction and the confirmation of the sending by a concluding sign (here the touching of the mouth, "Behold, I have put my words in your mouth", Jer. 1:9). This form of call-account, characterized by the word of God addressed and transmitted to the prophet, is distinguished particularly by the "very personal individual encounter between Yahweh and the one called" and "the strict subordination of every other consideration to the word of Yahweh" (W. Zimmerli, *Ezechiel*, *BKAT* XIII/1, 1969, 17 f.). The second

form begins with a vision, where the word issued to the prophet does not go forth in the context of a personal dialogue with the prophet, but is pictured as the result of a consultation of Yahweh with his council which the prophet sees in a vision (Isa. 6; Ezek. 1). But in that the word of vocation comes from the sphere of the divine council, i.e. in that the prophetic word of commission is crystallized out of the vision of the throne-scene, the second form of call-account also clearly exhibits the subordination of the visionary element to the word of vocation: the vision reaches its climax in the audition, in the promulgation of the word of God (W. Zimmerli, op. cit., 19 f.). The concentration on the word of Yahweh which calls the prophet, the account of the call as the prophet's own "press report", to which there are no adequate parallels in the ancient Orient, the fact that the prophetic subject "is knowingly, consciously and willingly addressed, and won over to obedience" (H. W. Wolff, *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament*, *ThB* 22, 1964, 215), the observation that "the waking consciousness was greatly intensified but in no way switched off" (ibid.), that the prophet thus knew "that he had been really called and not intoxicated" (op. cit., 216), and, finally, the surprising fact that the prophets from Amos onwards do not understand themselves as bearers of the Spirit, but as proclaimers of the word of Yahweh – all this shows the difference between the prophetic reception of the word and an ecstatic experience, which by-passes the consciousness. In other words, the various forms of call-accounts make it clear that "the supremacy of the word is the essential distinguishing feature of the Old Testament prophet" (ibid.; cf. Grether, op. cit., 84 ff.).

(b) The word of God as the word of a messenger (the messenger formula). One of the most striking marks of the prophetic proclamation of the word is the introductory formula, "Thus says Yahweh", which represents something of a constant within the literary categories utilized by the prophets, from Elisha to Malachi. This formula originates in the formal language of the secular sending of messengers. It presupposes the situation of a messenger who comes with a message he has received previously, and who, in delivering his message, refers back to this occasion (cf. Gen. 32:4–6; 2 Ki. 18:19, 29, 31). Since, at the point of time of delivering the message, the messenger refers back to the occasion, now in the past, when the employer entrusted him with the message, one should translate "thus has Yahweh spoken". ([Ed.] But because this word has a continuing validity representing the mind and will of the master the emphatic present, "Thus says Yahweh", is equally correct. The Hebrew mind probably did not draw a sharp distinction between past and present in this respect.) The adoption of the messenger formula to introduce the prophetic word indicates that this is strictly understood as a passing on of the entrusted word of God. The messenger formula turns up as early as the Mari letters of the 18th cent. B.C., which report of prophets who have to deliver a message to the king on behalf of God. But the unqualified announcement of judgment by the prophets from Amos onwards is a contrast to such qualified prophecies of well-being delivered to the king to which one can also add rebuke and intervention against the king (cf. Nathan in 2 Sam. 12:1 ff.; Gad in 2 Sam. 24:11 ff.). The Mari texts have no parallels to these unqualified words of judgment (cf. C. Westermann, *Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech*, 1967).

(c) The word of God as a word of disaster (the structure of the prophetic word of judgment). The word of disaster in the prophets before Amos, almost always directed immediately to an individual (usually the king), presents a two-membered statement:

the prophet names the crime and announces Yahweh's judgment. Between the accusation and the announcement of judgment stands the messenger formula ("therefore thus has Yahweh spoken", 1 Ki. 21:17 ff.; 2 Ki. 1:3 f.). In other words, the prophets made a clear distinction between the initial accusation (the motivation) and the announcement of the judgment (the direct word of God). Strictly speaking, the word of God is only the announcement of judgment. It is characterized as such by the introductory messenger formula: the accusation stands *before* the actual word of the messenger (cf. C. Westermann, ibid.). The prophetic words of disaster from Amos onwards, directed against Israel or Judah as a whole, frequently display the same two-membered nature – motivation, messenger formula and announcement of judgment (Amos 4:1–3; Isa. 8:5–8). The word of God issued direct to the prophet and characterized as such by him by means of the messenger formula (mainly containing subject-matter of a general sort, e.g. "the end has come", Amos 8:2) is given added precision by the prophet by means of an introductory, explanatory and accusatory word of motivation addressed to the listeners. The accusation which provides the motive for and preface to the word of disaster is thus a piece of prophetic reflection on the basis of the reception of the direct word of God. The prophet is no mere mouthpiece of God, but a responsible translator of the received word of God into the situation of the addressee: "It is hardly possible to overrate the importance of the prophet's share, for without it the word the prophet receives does not reach its goal" (G. von Rad, op. cit., II, 73).

(d) The word of God and the word of man (quotations in prophetic oracles). Those to whom the word is addressed are also drawn into the word of God, in that the prophet reproduces moods, sentiments and attitudes of the hearers in quotations of words they have spoken (H. W. Wolff, "Das Zitat im Prophetenspruch", op. cit. 38 ff.). Yahweh's word is then understood as his reply to a statement by the people reproduced in quotation form. Characteristically, however, this is not placed in the messenger's word itself, but in the prophet's grounding of the accusation which precedes the word of God. For the prophetic messenger of the word, God's word and man's word are not interchangeable. Conversely, of course, a messenger word which merely extends the word of God "but fails to produce a confrontation with the hearers is essentially unprophetic" (Wolff, op. cit., 110). It is thus precisely the quotation in the prophetic word which shows that Yahweh's word, promulgated by him directly to the prophet, sets out to engage in complete dialogue with the addressees and can assimilate the word of man. But in that the word of man can thus be taken up into the movement of the word of God, it becomes true that "even the quotation is proclamation" (Wolff, op. cit., 84).

(e) The character of the word of God as event (the word-event formula). The characteristic formula for the prophetic reception of the word runs: *wayᵉhî dᵉbar YHWH 'el...*, lit. "and the word of Yahweh was to...." 113 OT passages contain this formula, which turns up in the prophetic histories of the early monarchy (e.g. Samuel, 1 Sam. 15:10; Nathan, 2 Sam. 7:4; Elijah, 1 Ki. 17:2, 8; 18:1), appears in the redactional headings of the prophetic books (Hos. 1:1; Zeph. 1:1), but in Jer. (30 times, in part secondary) and especially in Ezek. (50 times) invades the prophet's own words, and also has a firm place in Hag. (2:10, 20) and Zech. (9 times) (cf. W. Zimmerli, *BKAT* XIII/1, 89).

This word-event formula is characteristic for the OT conception of the word of

God in several respects. (i) Since the basic meaning of the verb *hāyâh*, "it was", denotes that something becomes effective, the formula could almost be translated "the word of God became active reality with. . ." (S. Mowinckel, *Die Erkenntnis Gottes bei den alttestamentlichen Propheten*, 1942, 19, quoted in G. von Rad, op. cit., II, 87, n. 15), or "the word assumed effective shape in" (C. A. Keller, *BHHW* III 2183). The dynamic, urgently pressing force of the word of God clearly emerges here. (ii) The word-event formula stresses "the eminently historical character of the word of God in partaking of the nature of an event" (W. Zimmerli, *BKAT* XIII/1, 89). The revelation of the word to the prophet is not a process of one-sided spiritual perception of timeless truth but an event which assails the prophet, even, at times, physically (Isa. 21:1–10; Jer. 4:19–21); here the word of God appears as a virtually objective force with a dynamic impact (O. Grether, op. cit., 150 ff.). (iii) The word-event formula does not speak indeterminately of "a word", but of "*the* word of God" becoming an effective event (L. Koehler, *Old Testament Theology*, 1957, 106). The word which goes forth at any particular time demands to be accepted as the complete word of God. There is no superior concept with which to organize and domesticate the word of God. (iv) The frequent utilization by Jer. and especially Ezek. of the word-event formula is the mark of an "already highly developed knowledge of the 'word of Yahweh', almost indeed, of the development in Prophetic circles of a 'prophetic theology of the word' " (W. Zimmerli, op. cit., 89).

4. *The Word of God in Prophetic Proclamation.* (a) Prophecy before the writing prophets (Samuel, Elijah, Elisha). As Samuel, to whom "the word of Yahweh" was revealed (1 Sam. 3:7) at a time when "Yahweh's word had become rare in the land" (1 Sam. 3:1), announced judgment on Saul on account of his "rejection of the word of God" (1 Sam. 15:23, 26), so → Elijah invoked the validity of the word of Yahweh with absolute authority against King Ahab, basing himself on the covenant-traditions of the "God of Israel" (1 Ki. 17:1) and the "God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob" (1 Ki. 18:36). He announced to Ahab that neither dew nor rain would fall "except by my word" (1 Ki. 17:1). In consequence of the efficacious power of his mighty word, Elijah was for Ahab the "destroyer of Israel", because he had not only prophesied the drought, but also caused it by his word (1 Ki. 18:17). In view of the threat of confusion between Yahweh and Baal as a result of Ahab's syncretistic religious policies, Elijah, as God's spokesman in Israel on Mount Carmel, brought about a fundamental divorce between Yahweh and Baal on the basis of divine judgment, in order to prove that Yahweh was God and that Elijah had "done all these things at thy word" (1 Ki. 18:36). Thus, thanks to the preaching of Elijah all areas of life, whether in respect of property (the story of Naboth, 1 Ki. 21) or health (Ahaziah's search for healing, 2 Ki. 1) were subordinated to Yahweh's lordship, and transgression of the divine law was requited with a word of judgment to the individual (1 Ki. 21:17–19; 2 Ki. 1:3 f.; cf. C. Westermann, op. cit.). Elijah's journey to Horeb, which links up with Israel's → wilderness tradition, showed with regard to → revelation, that Yahweh does not reveal himself in storm, earthquake and fire, but in quietly whispered words (1 Ki. 19:12). As with Elijah, so with Elisha, prophetic word and action are closely interwoven. Nowhere in the OT are so many miracles crowded into so small a space and recounted as proof of the prophet's *charisma* as here (G. von Rad. op. cit., II, 27). By contrast with the prophets from Amos to Jeremiah, Elijah and Elisha are bearers of the Spirit at the same time as they are proclaimers of the word of God –

Yahweh's word and Yahweh's spirit are here closely interconnected. The power of the prophetic word in the political sphere is shown not least by Elisha's designation of Jehu (2 Ki. 9).

(b) The conception of the word of God in the writing prophets. (i) Amos. "The words of Amos of Tekoa" (Amos 1:1): so runs the heading to an older selection of Amos' words from chs. 3–5, which has not yet been given the heading "word of Yahweh", as those who later pass on the words of the prophets like to do (cf. Hos. 1:1; Jer. 1:1). The connexion of the heading "the words of Amos" with the form of the collection of the wise men (cf. the "words of the wise" in Prov. 22:17) indicates, conversely, that at the time of the recording of the sayings of Amos there is still no tradition of literary collections of words of the prophets (H. W. Wolff, *Dodekapropheton*, *BKAT* XIV/1, 1965 ², 153).

The rhetorical question, "If the lion has roared, who is not afraid? If Yahweh has spoken, who can but proclaim it?" (Amos 3:8) presents a word in the form of a discussion, giving a reply to the question of the legitimacy of speaking in the name of Yahweh: Yahweh's word has startled and caught the prophet by surprise. Anyone who attributes his appearance to brazen caprice must ask himself whether terror at the sudden roaring of a lion is capricious. The inseparable connexion between cause and effect makes it clear: Yahweh's word has irresistibly compelled the prophet to engage in proclamation. His proclamation is a reflex action in response to the word of Yahweh, as is terror to a lion's roar.

In the cycle of visions (Amos 7:1–8; 8:1–2; 9:1–4; cf. 8:2 "the end has come upon my people"), Amos explains how Yahweh forced on him the word concerning the imminent end. Amos distinguishes himself from all previous prophets by preaching total destruction, not just for a single individual (e.g. the king by Nathan in 2 Sam. 7 and 12 and Gad in 2 Sam. 24 and 1 Chr. 21) but for the whole of Israel. Since in Amos' time under Jeroboam II (787–747 B.C.) Israel was enjoying a period of booming economic prosperity, the proclamation of disaster cannot be viewed as the consequence of rational calculation and political far-sightedness. Its sole source is the event of Yahweh's word itself, Yahweh's firm grip, which took Amos from herding the flocks and compelled him to speak (Amos 7:15).

From this one can understand the frequent appearance of the messenger-formula ("Thus says Yahweh", 11 times; Amos 1:3, 6, 9, 11, 13; 2:1, 4, 6; 3:12; 5:3 f.) and the concluding formula ("Yahweh says", Amos 1:5, 8, 14; 2:3, 11, 16; 3:15; 4:3, 5 f., 8–11; 5:17; 7:3; 9:15). The advice of the high priest Amaziah to his king – "the land is no longer able to bear all his words" (Amos 7:10) – is also explicable from Amos' announcement of total judgment. The word of Yahweh, proclaimed by Amos, has reached dangerous proportions for Israel's religious, political and economic life. Amos is banished from the land: "You must not preach any longer" (Amos 7:13). A thoughtless people, especially its upper classes, self-confident in their own prosperity, have not listened to his word.

Amos therefore preached that a hunger for the word of God would so overwhelm them that they would stagger around exhausted in the search for the word of Yahweh (Amos 8:11 f.). Yahweh can hold back his word; he retains the right of disposal over his word. The longing to hear Yahweh's words is not here a sign of religious life but a hunger which results in death. If Yahweh has withdrawn his word, on which Israel's whole existence is based, that is the ultimate catastrophe (cf. G. von Rad, op. cit., II,

92; for a different view see Wolff, *BKAT*, XIV, 379 f., who holds that the saying belongs to a later time reflecting Deuteronomic preaching).

(ii) Hosea. The heading "the word of Yahweh that came to Hosea" (Hos. 1:1; cf. Joel 1:1; Mic. 1:1; Zeph. 1:1; Jer. 1:1 LXX) comes from a collector of prophetic tradition from Deuteronomistic circles in Judea.

Since Hosea's commissioning as messenger includes not only his word, but also his marriage and family life, this title makes it clear that "Yahweh's word" does not exclusively denote the word of God to be proclaimed by the prophet (Hos. 2:18, 23 f.; 4:1 etc.), but also the life of the prophet expropriated by the word of Yahweh. "Thus the book of Hosea does not even present the narratives of the prophet (1:2–9; 3:1–5) out of biographical interest, but only because they preserve the word of Yahweh" (H. W. Wolff, *BKAT* XIV, 3). Yahweh's command to Hosea to marry a girl (a "whore") who had fallen prey to Canaanite cultic immoralities, and in this marriage to exemplify the guilt of the Israel of that time, which had itself lapsed into Canaanite fertility rites, is a symbolic action (Hos. 1:2 ff.) with which the prophet is commissioned at the beginning of his prophetic ministry, "for the land commits great harlotry by forsaking Yahweh" (Hos. 1:2b). This symbolic disclosure of the word of God introduces the first period of Yahweh's speaking through Hosea by stating, according to Hos. 1:2a, how Yahweh began to speak *through* (not *to*) Hosea, and is to be understood as a kind of foreword. This first period of the promulgation of Yahweh's word is directed towards a second; Hos. 3 reports another symbolic action, whereby Hosea rescues his wife from slavery and takes firm protective measures to prevent her giving way to her inclinations (Hos. 3:1–5). That is to say, although Israel has turned away from Yahweh and been justly repudiated by him, she will be accepted back again, because Yahweh loves her. The two symbolic actions together thus sound out the centre of Hosea's proclamation. In that the prophet himself presents the word of Yahweh in his own life, and not merely proclaims the word of God by mouth but by his whole family life, Hosea himself comes entirely under the word of God. "This vivid symbolic demonstration of the word of God in the prophet's family ... announces the message of the incarnation of the word" (H. W. Wolff, op. cit., 24).

In the second part (chs. 4–14), introduced by the attention-catching formula, "Hear the word of the LORD, O people of Israel" (4:1; "word of God" only occurs in Hosea at 1:4 and 4:1) "the whole path of Hosea's proclamation from the threats of judgment to announcement of salvation is ... now trodden a second time" (Wolff, op. cit., 83).

This ultimate correlation of word of judgment and word of salvation in Hosea is confirmed finally by Hos. 6:5: "Therefore I have hewn them by the prophets, I have slain them by the words of my mouth, and my judgment goes forth as the light." "Prophets" and "words of my mouth" here stand in parallel, i.e. the prophets are messengers of Yahweh, in so far as they proclaim the words of the mouth of Yahweh. The goal of Yahweh's word of judgment is the restoration of a new order of life (Hos. 6:5b); the word that slays is in the service of the word which saves. The teleological correlation of God's word of judgment with his word of salvation is particularly clear in Hosea.

(iii) Isaiah. If the heading of Isa. 1:1 describes the content of the whole book of Isaiah as a "vision" (*ḥāzôn*) of the prophet, the content of the selection which

originally began at Isa. 2:1 is characterized as "the word" which the prophet "saw". The visionary experience of the reception of the word is expressed here, just as is the central position of the word as being the content of the prophetic vision.

The corresponding absolute use of "word" is found in Isa. 9:7 (EVV 9:8): "The LORD has sent a word against Jacob, and it will light upon Israel." This verse not only speaks of the "word" in the absolute as of an almost independent entity, but it also gives us no information as to the content to which people should listen. What is under discussion here is not a word as the *bearer of a message*, but the word as a *bearer of divine and powerful consequences*, which creates history. According to Grether, the word is here "rather like an accumulation of latent energies which cannot wait to be released very much longer.... The *dāḇār* is like a missile with a time-fuse which has just hit the enemy lines and must explode in the next few seconds" (op. cit., 104). This word of Yahweh bound to the prophet (the word is "sent") is the power which sets history in motion and causes all kinds of destruction, which judges the disobedient nation in a cumulative series of acts of divine punishment (Isa. 9:7–20; 5:25–30). Isaiah looks back to an epoch when Yahweh intervened in Israel's history with ever new blows, and understands these judgments as the ever new discharges of the word of God sent, proclaimed and dismissed.

This is how the word concerning hardening of the heart in Isa. 6:9 f. should be understood. Isaiah is commissioned to make the nation obdurate and to harden its heart by means of this very word of God, "until cities lie waste without inhabitant, and houses without men, and the land is utterly desolate" (Isa. 6:9–11). In the word concerning hardening of the heart, the conception of the creative word of God at work in history is given its sharpest definition, namely that "this word effects judgment not only in the external world of history, but in human beings, in the most hidden recesses of their own hearts, namely, their refusal of the appeal by which Yahweh would save them" (G. von Rad, op. cit., II, 154; cf. Isa. 9:7). The hardening of Israel's heart to Yahweh's solicitous offer and the word about obduracy which forms the subject-matter of the prophetic commission – these are the things which constitute the puzzle of Isaiah's proclamation.

The word of God to be proclaimed by Isaiah is thereby independent of its rejection by men. "The fact that a prophet's word is not heard is far from meaning that this is the end of it" (G. von Rad, op. cit., 155). The repudiation of the word by Isaiah's generation means that it must be recorded for a future one: "And now go, write it before them on a tablet, and inscribe it in a book, that it may be for the time to come as a witness for ever.... Because you despise this word" (Isa. 30:8, 12; cf. 8:16 ff.). This process of the documentary recording of the message rejected by those who heard it shows not only that, despite its lack of success, the word of God is far from finished. It also, and for the first time, shows the character of the written word, where the prophet extends the area of reference of the word of God beyond the first circle of recipients to hearers further off. The word of God still has a future beyond its rejection, for "he does not call back his words" (Isa. 31:2; 55:11).

This future is depicted in Isa. 2:2–5 (cf. Mic. 4:1–3). Here is the account of a pilgrimage of the nations to the mountain of God, one nation urging another: "Come, let us go up to the mountain of the LORD.... For out of Zion shall go forth the law and the word of the LORD from Jerusalem" (→ Wilderness, Mountain, art. *oros*). The hope is directed to the new order of life established by Yahweh, in the cen-

tre of which stands the word of God, signifying righteousness and life and embracing directions for living. The close relationship of the word of God to instruction and law (see below, 5) is shown not only in the designation of the word of God as Torah (Isa. 2:3) but also in the prophet's words which are spoken in the style of priestly Torah.

(iv) Jeremiah. The heading of the book as a whole "words of Jeremiah" (not as W. Rudolf would have it: "the story of Jeremiah", *Jeremia*, HAT 12, 1968 ^{3}, 1), and the statistical observation that the term "word of Yahweh" appears 52 times in Jer. out of a total of 241 occurrences in the OT, and that the word-event formula appears 30 times out of a total of a 113 occurrences in the OT (Grether, op. cit., 65 ff.) makes it quite obvious that we are already here in a world of reflective knowledge of the "word of Yahweh", which entitles us to speak in Jer. of a "theology of the word". This view still stands, even discounting the suggested Deuteronomic revisions and additions (e.g. Jer. 11:1 ff.; 46:1; 47:1; 49:34).

The word of God came to Jeremiah as a powerful word of vocation (627 B.C.). The calling of Jeremiah (Jer. 1:4–10) is characterized by the introductory word-event formula as being entirely word-event. Yahweh's word of election and commission (Jer. 1:5) dominates the whole process; the touching of his lips by Yahweh's hand seems to be the sole visionary trait (Jer. 1:9a). The word of appointment to be "a prophet to the nations" is followed by the prophet's interruption (Jer. 1:6). The exhortation to be fearless (Jer. 1:8) makes it clear that the real cause of the prophet's interruption is not his youthful age but his fear of the office of messenger of the word; Jeremiah is well aware of their sufferings from the past history of prophecy. By contrast with the voluntary application of Isa. 6:8b we see here already a knowledge of the burden of proclaiming the word of Yahweh. The process of sending consists, in the case of Jeremiah, in the transference of the word of God: "Behold, I have put my words in your mouth" (Jer. 1:9). The transmission of the word of God to the prophet does not signify for Jeremiah that he has any rights over the word, but it includes the knowledge of Yahweh's freedom to keep him waiting for the event of the word of God. It is through the transmission of the word of God to Jeremiah that he becomes an agent of the word who has been set "over nations and over kingdoms"; as an individual he has been given the power to intervene in the fortunes of nations and kings. These are not the reflections of a megalomaniac which "would make the weal and woe of whole nations dependent on the word of a young man from a petty state" (expressly rejected by W. Rudolf, *Jeremia*, 6). Here, rather, is revealed the mightiness of the word of God, which is not thrown into history without effect (cf. Isa. 9:7). The prophet's mandate of the word is negative and positive: "to pluck up and break down, to destroy and to overthrow, to build and to plant" (Jer. 1:10). Already there begins to emerge here in the call the clear knowledge of the two-sided nature of the word of God as word of judgment (chs. 1–25) and word of salvation (chs. 30–32).

The word of God features prominently in Jeremiah's early preaching (627–622 B.C., the time of Josiah). The theme of the first phase of Jeremiah's preaching is Yahweh's complaint against Israel's faithless back-sliding into the Baal cult (Jer. 2:4:5, cf. Hosea), and the announcement of the dawning of Yahweh's wrath in the shape of the advancing sinister foe from the north (Jer. 4:5–6:30). In response to Jeremiah's proclamation of judgment, by which he placed himself in the succession of his predecessors, his hearers replied in effect: "What the prophets say turns out to be nothing but wind, and the word [of the LORD] is not in them" (5:13). But because

the prophet's word is denied as God's word, God turns it to its destructive fulfilment: "behold, I am making my words in your mouth a fire" (5:14). That is the reply of the word of God (*dāḇār*) to the practical atheism of men's words of mockery (*dāḇār*; 5:14). The prophet's temptation to doubt, which arises in view of the people's ridicule of the message of judgment, issued and issuing, and his question: will the word that I have proclaimed as Yahweh's word also definitely come true? is similarly reflected in the vision of the almond-bough, which follows immediately after the account of the call. This indicates clearly the beginning of the prophet's reflections and doubts concerning the effective fulfilment of Yahweh's word. Yahweh's interpretation of the vision of the almond (Heb. *šāqēḏ*) is: "I am watching [*šōqēḏ*] over my word to perform it" (Jer. 1:12; note the play on words in which the point of the vision turns on a pun).

The word of God also features in the misunderstanding of the Deuteronomic reform (609–598 B.C., the time of Jehoiakim). Jeremiah was silent in the period following the Josianic reform (622–609 B.C.). He was waiting to see whether the nation was really turning to Yahweh. Jeremiah was neither a critic nor a propagandist of the reform; no word from God reached him during this time. After the death of Josiah, however, and with Jehoiakim's accession to the throne, when it became clear that the Deuteronomic reform had produced no return to Yahweh, but only a false religious confidence, the word of God reached the prophet anew (Jer. 7:1; 26:1). In the famous temple sermon Jeremiah inveighed against the religious confidence of the nation which appeals to the → temple and the divine presence (Jer. 7:4) but has no use for the covenant commandment (Jer. 7:5 ff.). This excessive emphasis on the temple and on confidence in their deliverance is nothing but an impenitent trust in "delusive words" (Jer. 7:4, 8 JB) and will bring in its train the destruction of the temple (Jer. 7:14). In the great liturgy of the day of repentance, which Jeremiah depicts (Jer. 14:1–15:4), and in which there are echoes of conventional songs of repentance sung by the people (Jer. 14:7, 9, 19–22), the reply of Yahweh (Jer. 14:10; 15:1–4) is the announcement of judgment and catastrophe. In Yahweh's word through the prophet, the people's pious impenitence comes to light. A further consequence of the misunderstanding of the Deuteronomic reform was the bragging of the scribes about the word of the covenant commandment, which thus became a dead law: "How can you now say, 'We are wise, and the law of the LORD is with us'? But, behold, the false pen of the scribes has made it a lie. The wise men shall be put to shame, they shall be dismayed and taken; lo, they have rejected the word of the LORD, and what wisdom is in them?" (Jer. 8:8 f.). The invectives against the temple and scribes earned Jeremiah a death-sentence (ch. 26). But he stood by his message and was ready to answer for it with his own life. The word of Yahweh and the messenger of the word cannot be separated. In ch. 26 it is accordingly not the suffering of the prophet, but the passion-story of the word of God that stands at the centre.

The word of God plays an important part in the confessions of Jeremiah. Jeremiah's ministry as a messenger was not exhausted by his preaching of the word of God. Jeremiah's suffering was the suffering of the man who has, in his own person, been hurt himself by Yahweh's word of judgment. We see the prophet sharing suffering under the word of God, shaken to the very depths of his physical being by that judgment which he himself announced (Jer. 4:19–21). In Jeremiah's lament over the sick and dying land (Jer. 8:18–23), we see man under the judgment and onslaught of the word of God. As often as Yahweh's word came to him, he accepted it

greedily as if it were his favourite dish: "Thy words were found, and I ate them, and thy words became to me a joy and the delight of my heart" (Jer. 15:16). But this pleasure and happiness at receiving the word was broken by the knowledge of the judgment he must proclaim, which drove him into isolation from human beings (Jer. 15:17; cf. 16:1–9). Jeremiah, the proclaimer of God's word of judgment, who himself suffered as he announced this judgment against his own inward feelings (Jer. 4:19), and who staked everything on restraining the judgment by means of his intercession (Jer. 14:11; 15:1), suffered at the same time under the taunt that the judgment he announced apparently never seemed to come: "Behold, they say to me, 'Where is the word of the LORD? Let it come true!' " (Jer. 17:15). Jer. 19:1–20:6 reports how, after the symbolic action of the smashing of an earthenware flask, Jeremiah was beaten and put in the stocks by Pashhur, the priest and chief officer of the temple, on account of this proclamation of judgment. The confession of Jer. 20:7–9 follows immediately after the passion: "the word of the LORD has meant for me insult" (20:8 JB). The prophet's resolve to proclaim the word of Yahweh no longer (20:9a) came up against the irresistible weight of the word which presses in on him, like some objective force, from within and without. The suppressed word of God burnt like a fire inside him, threatening disintegration, so that it seemed preferable to endure ridicule and maltreatment rather than be consumed by the burning of the word. Because Jeremiah stood on the side of those who have experienced the assault of the word of God, and because, as a messenger of the word of judgment, he was simultaneously drawn into the → suffering of God over his people, it belongs to the event of the word of God that the witness himself is broken. With no other prophet is the extent of the word of judgment entrusted to him, the suffering which he shares under the assault of the word of God, the suffering he feels at the taunt that the word of God has been proclaimed, but apparently not fulfilled, and the knowledge of the impossibility of escape from the commission to preach the word of God so clearly perceptible as in the case of Jeremiah. The story of the scroll in ch. 36, as also the suffering of Jeremiah himself, is intended to be understood as a kind of passion story of the word of God: man wants to burn the word (Jer. 36:23), but Yahweh's word remains in force even more fully than beforehand (Jer. 36:32). The fact that suffering with Jeremiah was an integral component part of the prophetic ministry is expressed at least (in formal respects) in the fact that, by contrast with the prophets before him, one can no longer clearly notice any formal demarcation between accusatory prophetic discourse and God's actual word of judgment (G. von Rad, op. cit., II, 69, 193).

The word of God is the criterion of false prophecy at the time of Zedekiah (598–587 B.C.). As the collection of sayings "concerning the prophets" (Jer. 23:9–40) shows, Jeremiah clashed with prophetic circles in Jerusalem which proclaimed after the first deportation of 598 B.C. that the disaster would be averted, and that the deportees would soon return (Jer. 23:16 ff.; 28:2 ff.). In the face of the sanguine words of these dreamers – what has the word of God to do with dreams? (Jer. 23:28) – Jeremiah proclaimed the abiding validity of God's powerful word of judgment: "Is not my word like fire, says the LORD, and like a hammer which breaks the rocks in pieces?" (Jer. 23:29). In his confrontation with the prophets of optimism and Hananiah, who proclaimed deliverance for Jerusalem, Jeremiah sought for the criteria of the true word of God in false prophecy. Anyone who has been present in Yahweh's council will not be able to tell his hearers what they desire (Jer. 23:18, 22).

When the word comes true it will be known whether the prophet has spoken Yahweh's word (Jer. 28:9). How little the prophet himself has these criteria at his disposal is shown in Jer. 28:11. Jeremiah is not able to counter Hananiah's proclamation of deliverance with any word of Yahweh and goes his way in order to wait for the renewed event of the word of God (Jer. 28:12). Yahweh's even more severe word of judgment (Jer. 28:12 ff.) thus links up with the breaking of the yoke and Hananiah's message of optimism. God's word of power does not leave man's negative reply out of account. However much the word of God may be accompanied by such signs, serving as criteria, these are not open to human manipulation, either objective or neutral. "The right to articulate the predicate 'false prophet' with authority is reserved alone for the prophet" who waits in obedience and readiness for the new event of the word of God (cf. G. Quell, *Wahre und falsche Propheten*, *BFChTh* 46, 1, 1952, 194).

(v) Ezekiel. The frequent appearance of the messenger formula, the appearance 60 times out of 241 OT occurrences of the phrase "word of Yahweh", the appearance 50 times out of a total of 113 occurrences of the word-event formula, which respectively mark the beginning of new units of speech, and finally the "oracle of God" formula – *n^e'um YHWH* "Oracle of Yahweh" or "utterance of Yahweh"– occurring 83 times in Ezek., and the concluding formula of the word of God – "I, Yahweh, have spoken it" – appearing 11 times, all make it obvious that, as with Jeremiah, we are dealing with an "already highly developed knowledge of the 'word of Yahweh' " (W. Zimmerli, *Ezechiel*, *BKAT* XIII III, 1969, 89).

Ezekiel was commanded at the outset to eat the scroll of the word of God (Ezek. 2:9–3:3). Ezekiel is called by the God who appears to him in a scene of the heavenly throne, making it clear that the decisive element in the depiction of the throne-vision is the commissioning of the word. The one sent by Yahweh is entrusted with a word, of which the strongly formal character is quite striking: "Thus has the Lord Yahweh spoken" (Ezek. 2:4). The formal wording of the commission (the messenger formula) is intended to make clear that the prophet's charge to proclaim the word does not rest primarily in a message with firmly fixed outlines and content, but in personal adherence to the Sender, who remains Lord of his word. Ezekiel's proclamation of the word of God is to be before everything else the reflex of his reception of that message (W. Zimmerli, op. cit., 73). Ezek. 2:10 pictures the hand of Yahweh stretched out towards the prophet and holding an open scroll, with writing on both sides, intended to display the oppressive surfeit of the word of God. In that the contents of what is written are named as "lamentation and mourning and woe", "the contents of the book are described from the perspective of the effects which the word written in the book and to be proclaimed by the prophet will bring to maturity" (W. Zimmerli, op. cit., 77). The effect of the word of God is powerful and direct. The roll is offered for the prophet to eat, and thus Jeremiah's picture of his ardent devouring of Yahweh's word as it comes to him (Jer. 15:16) is turned into dramatic reality in the experience of the prophet Ezekiel. The eating of the scroll (Jer. 3:2), the absorption of what is eaten into the inner self (Jer. 3:3), makes clear that the prophet becomes totally one with the word of God. This consent to the word of God excludes outbursts such as Jeremiah's, in the same way that Jeremiah's irresistible longing for the word of God (Jer. 15:16) has become "that which Yahweh has strictly ordered and commanded at the hour of his call" (Ezek. 3:1; cf. Zimmerli, op. cit., 78).

Ezekiel's speaking takes place in the knowledge of the absolute transcendence of the divine word. As already in the passion-story of the word of God in book form in Jer. 36, so now in the mention of the scroll in Ezek. the written form of the prophetic word of God is presupposed. In Ezek. 3:4, by way of conclusion, the command is given to "speak with my words to them". This describes Ezekiel's commission as the prophetic proclamation of the word of God, in correspondence with the word-event of Yahweh.

In Ezek. prophetic symbolic actions anticipate in event-form the history announced by the word of God. Symbolic actions are a vital element of the proclamation of the word of God in Ezekiel. In the brick which he besieges, the scanty fare which he eats, the cutting and destruction of his hair (Ezek. 4:1–5:4), but also in his carrying out an exile's baggage (Ezek. 12:1 ff.) and in marking out the two roads (Ezek. 21:23 ff.), Ezekiel is to give an active symbolic representation of the advance of the enemy, announced by the word of God, the beleaguering and reduction of the city, and the deportation of the population. By contrast with the accounts of prophetic actions in earlier prophecy, which follow an exposition and the account of the action with the interpretation (1 Ki. 22:10 f.; 2 Ki. 13:14–19; Jer. 13:1–11; 19; 28 f.), the introduction in Ezekiel is replaced by the divine word of command, and (with the exception of Ezek. 12:1–16 and 24:15–24) the actual performance of the action by the prophet is no longer reported, but simply the word of God which commands the action (cf. Ezek. 3:25–5:4; 12:17–20). This assimilation of the accounts of symbolic actions into the divine word of command in Ezekiel makes it clear, however, that the symbolic actions are absolutely and entirely the word of Yahweh embodied and becoming event, an anticipation in event-form of the history announced by the word of God (cf. W. Zimmerli, op. cit., 104). It is not, however, simply actively but also passively that the prophet, in his own person and fortunes (lying bound, Ezek. 4:4–8; trembling, Ezek. 12:17–20; numb in the face of his wife's death, Ezek. 24:15–24), is a prediction in word-form of coming events. Whereas in Jer. 4:19–21 the prophet's individual suffering and outcry are expressed unmodified, in Ezekiel all suffering is swallowed up into the word of Yahweh and put at the service of the proclamation of the word of God. It is because the word of God proclaimed by the prophet is not powerless, but itself occasions future history, that the prophet is a symbolic proclamation of the word of God, not only with his mouth, but also with his actions and his suffering, for in them the history which has been introduced by the word of God is already taking shape.

A feature of Ezek. is the debates. The fact that in the proclamation of the word of God it is not only a matter of a "majestic monologue by God, but a process of real encounter with the people of the nation of Israel" (W. Zimmerli, op. cit., 55) is shown in Ezek. by the form of discourse in which an answer is given in debate-form to a quotation of the people (Ezek. 12:21 ff.; 26:28). In answer to what the people are saying, that the prophetic word is not fulfilled and that the natural erosive process of time is taking effect on the word of God (Ezek. 12:21 f.), or that the word of God will only affect reality in the far-off future (Ezek. 12:27), Yahweh replies: "But I the LORD will speak the word which I will speak, and it will be performed. It will no longer be delayed, but in your days, O rebellious house, I will speak the word and perform it, says the Lord GOD" (Ezek. 12:25). Yahweh's word is a word which produces history; it is not eroded by time, and there is no possibility of banishing it to

the far future. The peculiarity of this form of debate in Ezek. consists in the fact that the quotations of the nation against which the word of Yahweh is directed are also entirely assimilated into the word of God. That is, in the quotations the actual hearer of the word of God has his say, but in the way that the word of God sees him.

The word of God comes as the word to the individual (the prophet as watchman). Ezek. 33:1–9 introduces the third section of the book, in which the word of Yahweh concerning the coming salvation is the central point. The great judgment on the nation has already overtaken them in the final fall of → Jerusalem and the final dissolution of the state of Judah. By contrast with the introductory account of his call in Ezek. 1:1–3:15 and his mission there to the whole nation "whether they listen or not" (Ezek. 2:5), Ezek. 33:1–9 has the force of a second calling of the prophet. The messenger of the word, who had Yahweh's burning word of judgment to proclaim, becomes after the fall of Jerusalem a watchman and a warner, delivering the word of Yahweh entirely to the individual. If the prophet hears a word from Yahweh's mouth, he is to warn the individual sinner (Ezek. 33:7). If he neglects to do so, Yahweh will require his blood at the hand of the prophet (Ezek. 33:8). The word of God thus refers the prophet to the individual recipient of the word with a directness unknown in previous prophecy, and assigns the responsibility for each individual life to the prophet – whereby the messenger of the word of God is himself at stake. The directedness of the word of God to an individual man has not been articulated in this way before Ezek.

The word of God is also creative in Ezek. In Ezek. 37:1–14 the vision of the raising of the bones of the dead is recounted. Taken to a field of completely dried-out bones, the prophet is given the charge of speaking Yahweh's word of promise over this field of the dead (Ezek. 37:4–6). At the spoken word of Yahweh the bones come together, and ligaments, flesh and skin grow over them. At a new word of Yahweh the breath of life comes into that which is still lying dead on the ground, so that the dead rise and stand up alive (Ezek. 37:9–10). This vision is God's reply to the resigned declaration of the nation (Ezek. 37:11, "our bones are dried up"), in which, for its confession of its lostness, Israel is promised new life, resurrection from the graves of the exile and safe conduct home to their own land (Ezek. 37:11–14). The following points should be remembered, with respect to Yahweh's word. (1) What is here depicted comes astonishingly close to the original creation of man by Yahweh (Gen. 1), but is heightened by the fact that this creation is a new creation out of the bones of the dead, i.e. of men whose history has reached a point of breakdown. Yahweh's word effects new creation from the dead. (2) If Yahweh, according to Gen. 1, creates by means of the creative word which he himself speaks, so in Ezek. 37:1–14 it is the "word of Yahweh" (37:4) proclaimed by the prophet which becomes the power which creates life from the dead. (3) This creative word of the prophet, however, does not represent a spell or any magical power. It is related to Yahweh's word of promise, which provides both the basis, the content and the interpretation of the prophetic discourse (Ezek. 37:4–6, 9, 11–14). (4) This creative word of Yahweh, proclaimed by the prophet, is not a magical potency ruling over nature. It is the resurrection of the scattered nation, its being led out of exile and home to its land, and the bestowal of the → Spirit. Yahweh's creative word is the opening of a new history which does not come about from the nation's own natural resources: it can only be expressed in the category of new creation from the dead by Yahweh's

creative word of promise (W. Zimmerli, op. cit., 885 ff.; K. Balzer, *Ezechiel und Deuterojesaja*, *BZAW* 121, 1971, 101 ff.).

(vi) Deutero-Isaiah. Many modern scholars regard Isa. 40–55 as the work of a prophet writing towards the end of the exile of the Jews in Babylon between approximately 550 and 538 B.C. His prophecy came to be included with that of Isaiah of Jerusalem. The following reconstruction takes account of this historical perspective. At the beginning of the exile there stands Ezekiel's unrelenting word of judgment; at the end we have Deutero-Isaiah's proclamation of the powerfully effective word of God, whose theme is Israel's salvation.

The word of God is the sole abiding reality (Isa. 40:8; 55:11). Isa. 40:1–8 relates the prophet's call. Vv. 1–5 speak of comforting the nation and building a road through the desert. The prophet counters the summons to "proclaim" with the resigned question, "What shall I cry? All flesh is grass . . ." (v. 6). It is the complaint of those who are left in exile, those who have felt the breath of Yahweh's judgment (vv. 6 f.). By contrast with the despair and scepticism of the prophet who stands in solidarity with his people comes the message: "the word of our God remains for ever" (40:8 JB). This word of God is the foundation of all the prophet's proclamation; his whole proclamation is summed up in Isa. 40:8 and 56:6–11 (C. Westermann, *Isaiah 40–66*, 1969, 8). The subject-matter of this word is that the nation will be forgiven, comforted and led back home along the desert-road. This word of God is not the word which stands dualistically opposed to a world of transience and death, but the word which is spoken into history, bringing about a new history and a new future: as the rain waters the earth and causes the crops to spring up, "so shall my word be that goes forth from my mouth; it shall not return to me empty, but it shall accomplish that which I purpose, and prosper in the thing for which I sent it" (Isa. 55:11). It is this creative power of the word of God in history, which will be realized in the return of the nation from exile, which Deutero-Isaiah proclaims.

The word of God is expressed by the word of the prophet. Isa. 40:8, in connexion with the call of the prophet, spoke of the permanence of the word of God, and Isa. 55:11 spoke equally of the word which changes the world, which effects that "for which I sent it" (O. Grether, op. cit., 134). The word of God powerful in history is the word of God proclaimed by the prophet he has sent. By contrast with the soothsayers and oracle-mongers of Babylon (Isa. 44:25), Yahweh has honoured the word of judgment of Israel's prophets (Isa. 44:26). But if Yahweh has made their word of judgment come true, then he will also make the saving action proclaimed by his prophets come true (Isa. 44:27). The movement in history announced by Deutero-Isaiah is the out-working of a word, which does not return empty (cf. Isa. 45:23).

The word of God is vindicated by world-history. In the face of the world of the Babylonian gods the question must be asked: What is the power which alone is at work in history? Deutero-Isaiah's answer runs: Yahweh alone is the God, whose word of promise creates history. He is the One who surpasses the idols of Babylon in that the events of Israel's history have all been announced and correspondingly taken place. "The reliable connexion between God's speaking and his acting is the decisive argument in the judicial proceedings between Yahweh and the gods" (C. Westermann, op. cit., 16; cf. Isa. 41:26 f.; 43:9 f.; 44:7; 45:21; 48:14). God's power and

right of disposal in his word over future history is the real proof that he is God, as against the impotence of the idols (Isa. 44:1).

The word of God is the ground of the creation of the world. Deutero-Isaiah extends the compass of the word of God to a dimension which it had never reached in any prophet before him, namely, to the creation of the world by the word of Yahweh (Isa. 40:26; 58:13; 50:3). The stars, which were regarded in Babylon as the supreme gods, are creations of Yahweh's word. By his word Yahweh has created the world and called the whole host of the stars of heaven into existence (Isa. 40:26). By contrast with the creative power of the word of Marduk, the creative word of Yahweh is here proclaimed as not only causing history, but calling the whole of creation into existence. The proclamation of the creation of the world by the word signifies the extension of the historical efficacy of the word of God into the world of creation, whereby the creation of the world itself becomes an element in Yahweh's saving activity in history.

The word of God is a word of deliverance and salvation. In view of the exile and the persisting Babylonian domination, was it possible to believe the prophet with his proclamation of the word of Yahweh as creating history in its dimensions of creation and in its dimensions of past and future? It is from this angle that one should understand the literary category of the priestly word of deliverance, which the prophet adopts in his proclamation to "those of little faith and those who had grown very weary, for whom reality wore a very different appearance, because they felt themselves forsaken by God and were unable to believe that Jahweh cared about their 'way' " (G. von Rad, op. cit., II, 249; cf. Isa. 41:8 ff.; 45:9 ff.; 49:14 ff.; 54:4 ff.). This word of deliverance is for Deutero-Isaiah the most characteristic form of a promise of salvation, utilizing, as it does, the form of favourable hearing by a priest in answer to an individual's complaint (1 Sam. 1; cf. J. Begrich, *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament*, *ThB* 21, 1964, 217 ff.). The word of God which he has to proclaim is directed to every member of this nation as a whole in his most individual and personal self (cf. C. Westermann, op. cit., 12 ff.). The word which embraces the world and history, which Yahweh has put in the prophet's mouth (Isa. 51:16), and which makes his mouth a sharp sword (Isa. 49:2), is at the same time there, "so that I [the prophet] may know how to sustain with a word him that is weary" (Isa. 50:4). The mighty word which calls the world and history into existence is also the word of deliverance and salvation with which God lovingly condescends to his people and woos their heart, so hardened by suffering. "Never before had he [Jahweh] come so close to his people when he addressed them, laying aside anything which might alarm them in case he should terrify one of those who had lost heart" (G. von Rad, op. cit., II, 250).

5. *The Word of God as Covenant Commandment.* (a) "The words" constitute the proclamation of God's will for justice. The commandments, the proclamation of God's will for justice, are called "the ten words" in Exod. 34:28 (cf. Gk. "decalogue"), and described more precisely as "the words of the covenant". It is not they which are the basis of the covenant (cf. O. Procksch *TDNT* IV 99); it is the → covenant grounded in Yahweh's election which includes the covenant ordinances. The proclamation of God's will for justice is introduced in Exod. 20:1 by "Yahweh spoke all these words". Thus the communication of these commands is founded by the introductory preamble in Exod. 20:2 on the self-disclosure of Yahweh and the

leading out of the nation from → Egypt. This is also expressed in the account of the ratification of the covenant attached to the so-called Book of the Covenant (Exod. 20:22–23:19). In Exod. 24:3–8 Moses recounted to the people "all the words of Yahweh and all the ordinances", and the people answered with one voice, "All the words which Yahweh has spoken we will do." Then Moses wrote down "all the words of Yahweh" (Exod. 24:3 f.).

(b) The Covenant Commandments and the Prophets' Message of Judgment. The way in which the prophets viewed their commission of validating the authority of the covenant commandment against judicial malpractice and law-breaking in Israel is shown in Amos, who measures Israel by the old covenant regulations. Among the reasons for the word of judgment which he announced, Amos names the oppression of the → poor (Amos 2:7 f.; 3:9 f.) and the perversion of justice as transgression of the covenant order (cf. Exod. 22:30 ff.; 23:1 ff.). In Hosea the consequence of transgressing the covenant law (Hos. 4:2) is that Yahweh gives notice of the abrogation of the covenant: You are "Not-my-people" (Hos. 1:9). And in Jeremiah's temple speech the people have their sin uncovered in a decalogue-like array of justice (cf. the enumeration of stealing, murdering, committing adultery and perjury, Jer. 7:9), and words of judgment (Jer. 7:1 ff.). Equally, the threat to the nation in the covenant law, if they transgress the commandment, provides the background to the description of → Jerusalem as "the city of blood" (Ezek. 22) and Ezekiel's announcement of judgment. Thus one sees already quite clearly in the prophetic proclamation the close association of God's powerful word of judgment, which announces and forms the prelude to coming history, and the judicial proclamation of covenant law which provides the foundation for the word of judgment (R. Bach, *Gottesrecht*, 23 ff.; W. Zimmerli, *The Law and the Prophets: A Study of the Meaning of the Old Testament*, 1965).

(c) "The Word" as a Designation of the Whole Commandment. In Deuteronomy not only is the covenant commandment designated as "the ten words" (Deut. 4:13; 10:4), but the multiplicity of commandments are designated as "words" (cf. Deut. 1:1, 18; 4:10, 36; 5:5; 28:14), and an individual commandment as a "word" (Deut. 12:28; 15:15; 24:18, 22). However, in so far as in Deut. "the words of this Torah" (Deut. 17:19; 27:3; 28:58; 29:28), despite the great variety of individual commandments, are understood for the first time as the simple uniform revelation of the will of Yahweh to Israel, "word" also appears in the sing. to denote the whole commandment (Deut. 4:2; cf. Jos. 1:13), and in consequence to express total human dependence on "this word" (cf. this word "is your life", Deut. 32:47). Every seven years, in the context of the festival of the renewal of the covenant, the divine covenant-law with its promises and threats (cf. the curses in Deut. 27) was read out at the great national assembly, "that they may hear and learn to fear the LORD your God, and be careful to do all the words of this law" (Deut. 31:12). The concentration on the one God (Deut. 6:4), the one sanctuary (Deut. 12) and the one "word" (Deut. 4:2) reveals Deut.'s theological concern. "The whole revelation of the divine will for justice imparted to Israel in the covenant, brought near to it by Yahweh and laid in its heart and mouth (30:14) is thus simply *dāḇār* [word]" (W. Zimmerli, *RGG* ³ VI 1810).

6. *The Word of God and History in the Deuteronomistic History.* Deuteronomistic history, beginning in Deut. 1–3 with a glance backwards to the time of →

Moses, and then presenting the history of the conquest of the land, the judges and the kings, i.e. comprising the books from Deut. to 2 Ki., is thought by many to-day to have been written in its final form after the catastrophe of 587 B.C. from the theological standpoint of the book of Deut.

(a) The curse of the covenant commandment. Deuteronomistic history presents the history of Israel in both northern and southern kingdoms as a story of progressive apostasy from Yahweh's commandment, especially from the summons of Deut. to worship Yahweh at only one place (Deut. 12). Judgment on Israel and Judah (2 Ki. 17:7 ff., 19 f.) is the consequence of the powerful effect of God's word of justice and of law in Israel's history, and therefore the honouring of the possibility of the curse announced in Deut. (Deut. 27:15 ff.; 28:15). The curse in Deut. was thus no empty word (Deut. 32:47), but became reality in the history of Israel's downfall.

(b) The threat of the prophets. Not only was the curse of the covenant commandment realized in the history of Israel and Judah, but so also was the threat of the prophets. Deuteronomistic history portrayed the course of history it presented, a period of almost 700 years of Israelite history from the time of Moses to the Babylonian exile, in terms of the interconnexion between the promulgation of prophetic threats, and their corresponding historical fulfilment, making use of a fixed terminology. The prophetic word "is confirmed" (Deut. 9:5), "does not fail" (Jos. 21:45; 23:14; 1 Ki. 8:56; 2 Ki. 10:10), "it is established" (1 Sam. 1:23; 15:11, 13; 2 Sam. 7:25; 1 Ki. 2:4; 6:12; 8:20; 12:15), "it comes to pass" (Jos. 23:15), "it is fulfilled" (1 Ki. 2:27; 8:15, 24). "To show how this word functioned in history" (G. von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, II, 94 n. 23) and "the correspondence between promulgated word and historical fulfilment" (op. cit., I, 340) are that which undergirds the concern of Deuteronomistic history (cf. Deut. 18:21 f.).

(c) The summons to return. In teaching, however, that the history of total annihilation should be understood as the fulfilment of Moses' curse and the honouring of the prophetic threat, Deuteronomistic history understood itself at the same time as a call to return (1 Ki. 8:46–53). As again and again after times of apostasy and judgment new deeds of deliverance followed a return to Yahweh (Jdg. 2:11–22; 1 Sam. 12:6–25), so, in view of the totality of the judgment, it remains an open question as to whether "it might not yet come to an entirely new phase with entirely new provisions of salvation for the people who are Yahweh's possession" (H. W. Wolff, op. cit., *ThB* 22, 314). "The work therefore contributes to an urgent invitation to return to the God who brings salvation in history" (op. cit., 322). But this means, with respect to the word of God proclaimed by the prophet, that the goal of the proclamation of God's word of judgment is not that (as with fortune-telling) it should become history, but that people should return to Yahweh. Hence, the announcement of judgment might not come true (Jer. 25:3 ff.; 26:2 ff.; 36:2 f.; Ezek. 18:1 ff.; 32:1 ff.; Jon. 3:8 ff.), or that, once executed, the judgment might itself become the message as in Deuteronomistic history.

(d) The promise to David. Alongside the fulfilment of the curse and the message of judgment in Israel's history, and this history as itself a summons to return, there is the word of promise. But the significance it deserves is disputed. If we follow G. von Rad, the promise given to → David in 2 Sam. 7 stands as a heading to Israel's history of judgment. The final notice in the Deuteronomistic history of the liberation of king Jehoiachin and his elevation to the table of the king of Babylon (2 Ki. 25:7–30) is

also intended to turn people's expectation to the God who has made his promise to David concerning the future of the Son of David, and who keeps faith even in face of judgment (G. von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, I, 343 f.). However, Deuteronomistic history teaches that the history of Israel should be understood as the fulfilment of the covenant commandment proclaimed by Moses with its possibilities of blessing and curse. It honours the threats announced by the prophets and is thus a summons to return to Yahweh. At the same time it brings a reminder of the promise even in face of Israel's history of judgment. Thus both elements of the word of God are bound together here, as indeed they already had been in the pre-exilic prophets (cf. above 5 (b)). "The word of God is here both the permanently present demand of the commandment in the nation and also the continually new proclamation in the prophetic word which affects and shapes history" (Zimmerli, *RGG*^{3} VI 1810). What Zimmerli says here of the prophetic word is true of the word of promise, the summons to return and the message of judgment.

7. *The Word of God as the Word of the Creator.* The fact that the OT conception of the creative power of the word of God is influenced by ancient oriental hymns (L. Dürr, op. cit., 8 ff.; cf. above, 2), which praise the thunder and violence of Marduk's voice in the storm, is shown by Ps. 29, which portrays the appearance of Yahweh in the storm (v. 3 ff.) and hears God's booming word of power in the thunder-clap. There is a two-fold distinction between the OT conception and that of the ancient orient, which saw the mighty word of the divinity as a dynamic potency which emanated from the divinity and held sway over nature.

(a) In the OT there is a correlation of the word of the Creator with God's word of salvation (Pss. 33:6, 9; 148:5, 8). Yahweh's word in creation, by which he called heaven into existence (Ps. 33:6, "by the word of Yahweh the heavens were made") is an element of Yahweh's historical lordship in word and deed (Ps. 33:4) and of his covenant-based condescension to the poor (Ps. 33:13 ff.). The protological word of the Creator (Ps. 33:6) has the function of serving the soteriological word of salvation (Ps. 33:4). The determination of this relationship is confirmed by the first creation narrative (ascribed to the priestly tradition) which not only speaks of the word of command of Yahweh the Creator, by whose power all things come into existence (Gen. 1), but also intends creation by the word to be understood as the opening chapter of the history of the covenant. C. Westermann represents a critical approach to Pentateuchal study when he writes: "In the great context of the Priestly Code God's working by the word is in no way limited to the creation; his activity in history is similarly determined", and this (following the Priestly representation) reaches its climax in the establishment of the cult (Exod. 25:1; C. Westermann, *Genesis*, *BKAT*, I, 153). In this association of the word of the Creator with the covenant- and salvation-history of Yahweh in his dealings with Israel Gen. 1 corresponds with the proclamation of Isa. 40–55.

(b) There is also a correlation of the word of the Creator with God's word of law (Ps. 147:15 ff.). In Ps. 147:15 ff. the creative word of God is specifically linked with meteorological phenomena; Yahweh's word, sent out like a messenger (Ps. 147:15, "He sends forth his command to the earth, his word runs swiftly"), brings snow (v. 16) and hail (v. 17). Yahweh's word also causes the ice to melt again (v. 18). But this creative word which holds sway over nature is none other than the word of the covenant commandment, by which Yahweh lays claim to Israel: "He declares his word to

Jacob, his statutes and ordinances to Israel" (v. 19). Israel consequently does not understand the creative word mythically or naturalistically but in accord "with the word of law and lordship which was imparted to the chosen people. . . . Having had the word of law and lordship imparted to them, the chosen people came to know and understand the God who rules nature by his word, and who bears and sustains all creation" (H.-J. Kraus, *Psalmen* XV/I, 1972 [4], 958 f.).

Thus in the OT Yahweh's creative word is to be understood only in close connexion with the word of God as the word of salvation (the word of promise) and as the word of law (the covenant commandment). It is this which constitutes the specifically Israelite understanding of the word of God.

8. For the understanding of the word of God in Judaism → *rhēma* OT 2; for the religious historical background to John's Gospel see also under NT 4 (b).

NT 1. *The Occurrence and significance of logos and legō in the NT.* (a) *logos* is attested 331 times in the NT (appearing in all writings except Phlm. and Jude), with both secular and theological meanings. *logos* means *inter alia* statement (Matt. 5:37), utterance (Matt. 12:32; 15:12; Lk. 20:20), question (Matt. 21:24), command (Lk. 4:36), report, information and rumour (Acts 11:22; Matt. 28:15; Mk. 1:45; Lk. 5:15), discourse (Matt. 15:12), wording (1 Cor. 15:2), word of mouth (Acts 15:27; 2 Cor. 10:10) as opposed to the written (Acts 1:1) word, mere words by contrast with power and action (1 Thess. 1:5; 1 Cor. 4:19), object, matter (Mk. 9:10; Acts 8:21), words of Scripture (1 Cor. 15:54), words of warning (Heb. 5:11), account (Rom. 14:12), settlement (of an account) (Phil. 4:15), motive (Acts 10:29), proclamation, teaching, instruction (Lk. 4:32; 10:39; Jn. 4:41; 17:20), the word of God, the word of the Lord, the word of promise, of truth, of life, the word of Jesus, the word concerning Jesus Christ (Acts passim), Jesus as the Word (Jn. 1:1, 14).

(b) *legō*, to speak, appears 1320 times in the NT, mostly unstressed, but sometimes used with the theological, qualified significance discussed below (cf. the → Amen-words under 2 (a) (iii), and Jesus' words of healing 2 (a) (iv)). The vb. *laleō*, to speak, which belongs to another stem and is less important, however (298 instances), is used primarily by Luke (Gospel and Acts 91 times), John and Paul (60 times each, including 34 times in 2 Cor.). *logikos*, reasonable, is found only in Rom. 12:1 and 1 Pet. 2:2; *logios*, scholarly, educated, only in Acts 18:24. The diminutive *logion* (formed from *logos*), saying (originally a short word, oracle), is attested only 4 times in the NT (Acts 7:38; Rom. 3:2; Heb. 5:12; 1 Pet. 4:11), always of some form of divine inspiration.

2. *The Word of Jesus Christ*: Jesus' own words. (a) The proclamation of Jesus. At the centre of Jesus' words stands the → proclamation of God's pressing nearness and the announcement of the inauguration of God's world-wide dominion (→ Kingdom), already present in Jesus' person and words. Jesus' words therefore announce neither simply the presence, nor exclusively the future of the kingdom of God. Rather, Jesus spoke of a present coming of the future kingdom of God which was already taking place in his words. But in Jesus' proclamation one finds no absolute use of "the word of God". Mk. 4:13–20, the sole place where this term is encountered in the mouth of Jesus, is regarded by J. Jeremias and others as belonging to the early church's interpretation of the parables (Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, 1963 [2], 77 (but → Parable, art. *parabolē* NT 3).

(i) The lack of messenger and word-event formulae. Nowhere did Jesus follow the OT prophets in prefacing his words with the messenger formula "thus says the Lord"; and, in the context of his proclamation, the word-event formula "the word of God came to me" is similarly lacking. This OT formula occurs once only in Lk. 3:2 (*rhēma theou egeneto*, "the word of God came to John") in the case of John the Baptist, who is however placed in the time of the OT prophets (Lk. 16:16). It is lacking similarly in apostolic times. The lack of messenger and word-event formulae in the case of Jesus is an indication that Jesus' proclamation cannot be understood simply in prophetic categories.

"There can be only one reason why the idea of a detailed Word of God imparted to Jesus Himself has not found its way into the [Synoptic] record. This is that such an idea was felt to be inappropriate and inadequate to describe the relationship of Jesus with God" (G. Kittel, *TDNT* IV 114). The saying of Jesus that the Father had delivered everything to him (Matt. 11:27) "set the unity of Jesus with the Father and also with the Word of God, on a completely different basis far beyond isolated impartation" (ibid.).

(ii) The antitheses and the Amen-formulae. There is a positive correspondence with this lack of messenger and word-event formulae in the proclamation of Jesus in the presence of introductory formulae, which show that the claim of Jesus breaks the bounds of that of an OT prophet of the word. In the antitheses of the Sermon on the Mount with the schematized, "You have heard that it was said to the men of old . . . but I say to you" (Matt. 5:21 ff.), Jesus annuls the statements of the past which were regarded as having divine authority, setting his own "I" in the place where, in the prophets, we find Yahweh's.

In this, Jesus is not claiming, as the OT prophets and the rabbis did, to be the legitimate interpreter of the → law of God. He is instead setting himself up over against the Torah. While in the Qumran community "the radicalized demand of the divine commandment is nowhere set over against the Torah of Moses" (E. Lohse, "*Ich aber sage euch*", in E. Lohse, ed., *Der Ruf Jesu und die Antwort der Gemeinde. Exegetische Untersuchungen Joachim Jeremias zum 70. Geburtstag*, 1970, 189–203, see p. 197), Jesus is speaking in the antitheses as once the God of Moses did, and thus setting himself and his words up directly alongside God and the word of God. The same is true of the formula, "Amen, I say to you" (cf. Mk. 3:28; 8:12; 9:1, 41; 10:15, 29; 11:23; 12:43; 13:30; 14:18–25, 30 and par.), which has no analogy in the whole of the Jewish literature (→ Amen). The Amen-formula normally served to strengthen someone else's words, and was used in OT times to adopt words of blessing or cursing (G. Dalman, *The Words of Jesus*, 1902, 226–29), but Jesus used it without exception in order to preface and strengthen his own words. As such, however, it is not to be compared with the messenger-formula used by prophets (J. Jeremias, *New Testament Theology*, I, 35 f.). Rather, the placing of the Amen in front of Jesus' own words characterizes them as something sure and trustworthy. "Thus in the *amēn* preceding the *legō hymin* of Jesus we have the whole of Christology *in nuce*" (H. Schlier, *amēn TDNT* I 338). The Amen-formula which prefaces Jesus' words is an expression of Jesus' divine certainty of himself and the divine self-authentication of his own words.

(iii) The authority of Jesus' words. His use of the Amen-formula and "I" shows that Jesus intended his word to take the place of the Torah. It was stated in contem-

porary Judaism that the man who hears the words of the Torah and does good works is building on firm ground. We find Jesus saying "he who hears these words of mine and does them will be like a wise man who built his house upon the rock" (Matt. 7:24; cf. Deut. 28:15, 30). The "I" of Jesus which speaks here is claiming divine authority. "What distinguishes his word even from the highest claims of the prophets of old is the fact that Jesus makes people's decision dependent on the hearing and doing of his own words. The OT prophets know that they are the bearers of the word of God – nothing less. But none of them says that 'his words' do not pass away or that it is by his words that the fate of his hearers will be decided. But, according to all the traditions, this is precisely what Jesus says" (J. Schniewind, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*, *NTD* 2, 1968[12], 105; cf. Mk. 8:38; 13:31).

The authority of Jesus' word is seen in his call to → discipleship: "and he said to him, 'Follow me' " (Mk. 2:14; cf. 1:14 ff.). This call of Jesus, which confronts men in the midst of their everyday work, is not bound to any pre-conditions. It comes about through the efficacious word of Jesus, which makes men's response appear as something quite self-evident. The power of this word is further reflected in the response of the hearers. They either took offence at Jesus' words (Mk. 10:22; Matt. 15:12) or were amazed at his words, "for he taught as one who had authority, and not as their scribes" (Matt. 7:29). Alternatively, they attempted "to entrap him in his talk [*logō*]" (Mk. 12:13 par. Matt. 22:15, Lk. 20:20), because it is in his words that his claim and the centre of his mission can be seen.

(iv) The unity of Jesus' words and deeds. The power of Jesus' word is also shown not least in the stories of → healing, where the healings ensue (Mk. 1:25 f.; Lk. 7:14 f.) through the word of Jesus (Mk. 2:11, "I say to you, rise . . ."), and through his word of command (Mk. 9:25). The connexion between Jesus' word of forgiveness (Mk. 2:5) and his word of healing (Mk. 2:11) is to be noted: the word of healing is the physical expression of Jesus' word of forgiveness. The word of the Judge of the world, who has the power to forgive sins, is proved in the healing to be an effective and a creative word.

The healings are part of Jesus' word and are not to be detached from his proclamation. According to Lk. 4:18, Jesus related the prophetic word of Isa. 61:1 f. to his own mission. God had sent him to bring good news to the poor and sight to the blind. This denotes the unity of word and deed in Jesus' proclamation. But it is not only the unity of word and deed, but the superiority of word over deed which is characteristic for Jesus' proclamation. Mk. 1:21–38 recounts the various healings performed by Jesus and finally his "flight" (Mk. 1:35 ff.) where he gives the disciples who are looking for him the reply: "Let us go elsewhere . . . so that I can preach there, too, because that is why I came" (Mk. 1:38 JB). It becomes obvious that Jesus' deeds (→ Miracle, art. *sēmeion*) are subordinated to his word in those accounts of healings where the healing takes place by means of Jesus' word – "But only say the word, and my servant will be healed" (Matt. 8:8) – something without parallel in Jesus' world, and thus striking for the eye-witnesses (cf. also Matt. 8:16: "he cast out the spirits with a word"). The proclamation of the kingdom of God takes place by means of Jesus' word, and Jesus' healings are the physical expression of his word.

(b) Jesus' Unconcealed Word of Suffering and of the Cross: Mark's Gospel. Mk. 1:45 ("he [the healed man] went about and began to talk about it and to spread the news [*ton logon*] . . .") and the phrase "he [Jesus] spoke the word to them", which

appears in Mk. 4:33, cf. 2:2 and 8:32, belong entirely to the Marcan redaction (E. Schweizer, *Neotestamentica. Deutsche und englische Aufsätze, 1951–1963*, 1963, 100; J. Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, 1963 [2], 77). They are therefore to be interpreted in the context of Mk.'s theology. According to Mk., Jesus forbade those who had been healed to say anything further about the miracle of their healing (Mk. 1:44; 5:43; 7:36); people must not get to know that Jesus is the messiah by hearing tales of miracles (→ Secret). But it is stressed at the same time that Jesus' commands to keep silence were broken again and again (Mk. 1:45; 7:36). Mk. recounts this breaking of the command to keep silence because Jesus' divine authority cannot remain hidden, but he stresses the secrecy because it is not yet time for the proclamation of Jesus: his mystery is not yet revealed in his → miracles; it is first truly revealed at the → cross (cf. E. Schweizer, *The Good News According to Mark*, 1970, 30 f.). The real centre of the story of Jesus is not to be found in the miracles, but in his suffering and death.

In the first part of Mk.'s Gospel, the collection of conflict-debates (Mk. 2:1–3:6), which recount Jesus' victory over sin and law, the hardening of the → Pharisees' hearts and their decision to put Jesus to death, is introduced with the sentence "and he [Jesus] was preaching the word to them" (Mk. 2:2). The Pharisees' response to the "speaking of the word [*elalei ton logon*]", which proves the power of Jesus over sin and the law, was blindness to God's revelation in his word. In the second part (Mk. 3:7–6:6) Jesus replied to the hardness of heart of his relations ("he is beside himself [*exestē*]", Mk. 3:21) and to his rejection by the → scribes from Jerusalem ("he is possessed by Beelzebul", v. 22) by speaking in → parables (v. 23). Mk. 4:33 f. establishes the necessity of parabolic language in retrospect: "With many such parables he spoke the word to them, as they were able to hear it; he did not speak to them without a parable, but privately to his own disciples he explained everything". God's revelation in Jesus' word is so foreign to men that all Jesus' speaking can be done only in pictorial language. Only God himself can open up such pictorial language for men.

By contrast with Jesus' concealing teaching in parables, Mk. 8:32 speaks of the direct unconcealed speaking of Jesus: "and he said this plainly." The content of this direct word of Jesus is the suffering and death of the Son of man (8:31). The word of the → cross is the dissolution of all pictorial speech: "The mystery which has previously been hidden and is now unconcealed is the suffering of the Son of Man" (E. Schweizer, op. cit., 100). For Jesus' word of power over demons, sin and the law remains a concealed word so long as it is not understood in the light of Jesus' unconcealed word concerning his suffering and death. In understanding the word of God, there is thus mirrored the thought that Mk. wished his gospel to be understood as a passion story with extended introduction (M. Kähler). In that Jesus' words and deeds, together with his death and resurrection, are thus proclaimed by Mk. as the word of God, the transition to the "word of the cross and resurrection" as the decisive subject-matter of NT proclamation becomes readily intelligible.

(c) The Messiah of the Word and the Messiah of Deed: Matthew's Gospel. Matthew not only presents the words of Jesus in large blocks of discourses (the Sermon on the Mount in chs. 5–7, the sending out of the Twelve in ch. 10, discourses against the Pharisees in chs. 12 and 23, parables in ch. 13, behaviour in the Christian community in ch. 18, and the apocalyptic discourse in ch. 24), but also gives expres-

sion to his understanding of the word of Jesus by the way, in particular, in which he has related the Sermon on the Mount (chs. 5–7) to the collection of ten narratives of miracles of Jesus (chs. 8 f.): the Sermon on the Mount (the *word* of the messiah) is followed by the deeds of Jesus (the → work of the messiah). Matt. has expressed this basic thought not only by his compositorial placing of the Sermon on the Mount before the miracle narratives, but also by the redactional sentences Matt. 4:23 and 9:35 which act as a surrounding frame for chs. 5–9: Jesus "proclaimed the gospel of the kingdom and healed every kind of sickness ... among the people" (Matt. 4:23; 9:25). "The basic aspects of Jesus' working are here described: He is a preacher, the messiah of the word ... and, in healing, the messiah of the act" (J. Schniewind, op. cit., 8). Finally, chs. 5–9 are summarized and pointed in the words of Jesus, quoted deliberately at the end by Matt: the blind see, the lame walk, lepers are cleansed and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up and the poor have the good news proclaimed to them (Matt. 11:5).

In this Jesus-logion, the word concerning the good news preached to the poor, which stands at the end as a climax to the list of miracles enumerated, is transparently the central point; from this it is evident "that the good news is to be more than all miracles" (Schniewind, op. cit., 140). The importance of the placing of this word of Jesus at the end and as a climax to the enumeration is characteristic of Matt., although it seemed odd even to the earliest exegetes. Some MSS have moved the word about the resurrection of the dead to the end of Jesus' words or left the word about the good news out entirely, because the resurrection of the dead seemed to them to be something far greater than the word of Jesus. For Matt. (and for Jesus) the case is exactly the reverse: the word of Jesus is the centre, the healings performed by Jesus' word (Matt. 8:8, 16) are an accompaniment in the form of signs to the word of Jesus. They are a physical expression of his mightily creative word (G. Eichholz, *Tradition und Interpretation*, *ThB* 29, 1965, 39–43).

3. *The Word Concerning Jesus Christ*: the Cross and Resurrection as the Content of the word of God. (a) The understanding of the word of God in Paul. Paul calls the message proclaimed by him to his congregation "the word of God" (1 Cor. 14:36; 2 Cor. 2:17; 4:2; Phil. 1:14), "the word" (1 Thess. 1:6; Gal. 6:6), "the word of the Lord" (1 Thess. 1:8), or "the word of God which you heard from us" (1 Thess. 2:13).

(i) The word of tradition. However much Paul was aware that the word of God which he had to proclaim was founded directly on the revelation of the Son of God outside Damascus (Gal. 1:1, 15 f.), and distinguished him from other proclaimers of the word whose legitimation was mediated through men, he stressed just as much, on the other side, that the message proclaimed by himself and the Jerusalem apostles is the same (→ Proclamation). Closely following an old Jerusalem confession, Paul preached the message of the Son of God, who, on the basis of the resurrection, was designated Son of God in all his power (Rom. 1:3 f.).

Paul reminds the spiritual party in Corinth of the message of salvation in accordance with the word (*logō*, i.e. wording) in which he proclaimed it to them, which he passed on to them in the same terms in which he himself received it (1 Cor. 15:1–3), the content of these traditions from Jerusalem quoted by Paul in the text being the resurrection of the messiah who had died for sins (1 Cor. 15:3–5). The word of God proclaimed by Paul is constitutively related to the cross and resurrection of Jesus as

the object of the proclamation; here the remembrance of that which took place then is not simply an appeal to faith in the word of God (as with R. Bultmann, "The Concept of the Word of God in the New Testament", in *Faith and Understanding*, 1969, 286–312, see especially 300 ff.). The word of God for Paul is the message of a unique event at that time, and as such speaks to people: this is the message "by which you are saved, if you hold it fast – unless you believed in vain" (1 Cor. 15:1 f.).

(ii) The word of the cross. Paul describes the centre of his proclamation as "the word of the cross". He has publicly proclaimed the crucified Christ in the Galatian congregations (Gal. 3:1), and made it the sole content of his preaching (1 Cor. 2:2). In the word of the → cross, Paul puts into words "what took place on the cross. Here a decision about mankind has been given by God. The message depends on what has happened. It proclaims the decision which has already been given" (G. Eichholz, op. cit., 105). This word of the cross stands in absolute opposition to the "wisdom of this world" (1 Cor. 1:18–3:20), in that it makes nonsense of the → wisdom of this world and the boasting of those who claimed superior knowledge (1 Cor. 4:8), and it thereby stands in opposition to a theology of glory consonant with such a wisdom, where the cross and the Crucified One no longer have any place (cf. 1 Cor. 2:8).

The message of the decision given about the world on the cross is in its critical function as the "word of the cross" related to the typical Jew, who asks for proof of God's power, and to the typical Greek, who asks for divine wisdom (1 Cor. 1:22 ff.). The word of the cross, with its reference to the varying Jewish and Gk. preconceptions, does not merely signify here the correcting but the exploding of the prior understanding, since man "just does not comprehend the message along the lines of his prior understanding. For God does not confront him along the lines of such a prior understanding" (G. Eichholz, op. cit., 111; against R. Bultmann, op. cit.). However much the word of the cross, as the message of God's once-and-for-all decision in favour of the world given on the cross, is concretely related to its Jewish and Gk. hearers, it nevertheless destroys all their previously held misconceptions. The word of the cross is the central conception and criterion of the Pauline proclamation. But in that the word of the cross is at the same time "the word of life" (Phil. 2:16) – as the Crucified One is at the same time the Risen One – this word signifies the power of God and the wisdom of God (1 Cor. 1:24 ff.) for those Jews and Greeks who are called. For "Christ's death is not annulled by the resurrection and exaltation: rather it is held on to, made operative as a saving event in both judgment and deliverance, and so becomes the subject matter of preaching" (G. Bornkamm, *Paul*, 1971, 160).

(iii) The word of → reconciliation. The word of the cross is called "the word of reconciliation" by Paul in 2 Cor. 5:19. This word, which is passed on by the apostolic "ministry of reconciliation", is founded on the event of reconciliation in the death of Jesus "while we were yet sinners" (Rom. 5:8–10). The reconciliation, which is related to and embraces all men, is the Pauline development of the universal representative statements of the early church (cf. 2 Cor. 5:14, "one has died for all"), and is developed later on in Col. 1:19–22. This universal reconciliation of the world with God in the death of Christ establishes and grounds "the word of reconciliation" (2 Cor. 5:19; cf. Col. 1:25), according to Paul, as the message of this event once and for all.

The word of reconciliation is to be distinguished from the reconciliation itself, as grounded in it; it is not that the event of the reconciliation of the world with God

comes about further in the word of reconciliation, as though the word of Christian proclamation and the history which it communicates coincide, are indeed one (cf. R. Bultmann, op. cit., 305 ff.). By contrast with claims of a coincidence between NT kerygma (→ Proclamation, art. *kērysso*) and the event proclaimed (Bultmann), Paul distinguishes between the *historical event* of the reconciliation of the world and *the speaking event of the word* of proclamation concerning this event. The word of reconciliation "looks back at a conclusive event that has already happened, and forward from this to the revelation of the conclusion which has already taken place in this event" (K. Barth, *CD* IV, 2, 204). On the other hand, commenting on the phrase "ministry of reconciliation" (2 Cor. 5:19), F. Büchsel writes, "Since the *diakonia tēs katallagēs* [ministry of reconciliation] has not yet come to an end, and the world has not yet heard the *logos tēs katallagēs* [word of reconciliation] in all its members, reconciliation itself must not be thought of as concluded" (*TDNT* I 257). The event of reconciliation in the death of Christ is neither to be separated from the event of proclaiming the word of reconciliation nor to be mediated along with this in the sense of a kerygmatic process; the "once-for-all" nature of the reconciliation is proclaimed as such in the word of reconciliation: it does not only become "once-for-all" in the word of reconciliation.

(iv) The word of promise. As Paul in Rom. 9:9 designates the word of election to Isaac as the word of God, so Christ, the Yes and the Amen of God's promises (2 Cor. 1:19 f.), makes the word of proclamation an unambiguous word of salvation (2 Cor. 1:18). The representative death of Jesus Christ and the curse laid on him is the fulfilment and universalization of the word of promise given to → Abraham (Gal. 3:6–14; cf. Gen. 12:3; 15:6; 18:18), which retains its validity even for the Israel which rejected the messiah, so that the question as to the validity of the word of God in view of the rejection of the messiah by Israel becomes the keynote of Rom. 9–11: "But it is not as though the word of God had failed" (Rom. 9:6). As the word of → election stood over the history of Israel, so the word of → promise about the destruction of death stands over the world, and "then shall come to pass the saying that is written: 'Death is swallowed up in victory' " (1 Cor. 15:54; cf. Isa. 25:8). For Paul, the question of the fulfilment, the honouring and the abiding validity of the OT word of promise means nothing less than that the whole perspicuity, trustworthiness and validity of the word of reconciliation and justification is itself at stake.

(v) Word of God and word of man. The word of God, which according to Paul is promulgated in the shape of the word of man, is thereby at the mercy of the possibility of being confused with other human words. This is why Paul thanks God that in the church at Thessalonica "when you received the word of God which you heard from us, you accepted it not as the word of men but as what it really is, the word of God, which is at work in you believers" (1 Thess. 2:13).

After Paul had been driven out of Philippi and come as an alien to Thessalonica, working hard of necessity to earn his living, he proclaimed the word of God to them without any attempt to impress by appearances (1 Thess. 1:9 f.). Paul consciously avoided proclaiming the word of God like the wandering apostles of the day with enthusiastic speech and in the presentation of their own spiritual power, by drawing on impressive words of wisdom or preaching with mixed motives, modifying or falsifying the word of God (1 Thess. 2:5; 1 Cor. 2:1, 4, 13; 2 Cor. 2:17; 4:2). Instead, and in order to legitimate the word of God, he pointed to his human →

weakness (2 Cor. 2:9; cf. 10:10), and again in order to legitimate the word of the cross, he pointed to his persecution as a disciple of the cross (Gal. 6:17). Knowing the humanity of the word of God, Paul also instructed the church (1 Cor. 14:9, 19) to give precedence in worship to intelligible language rather than unintelligible indulgence of one's own possession of the Spirit (speaking in tongues). "But the primary and intrinsic secret to which the New Testament message directs us is that God's word has become *one* with man's word, that it has come to us and become understandable in a human word" (G. Bornkamm, "God's Word and Man's Word in the New Testament", *Early Christian Experience*, 1969, 4 f.).

(b) The Word of God as a Guaranteed Word of Promise: Hebrews. Having spoken repeatedly and in various ways through the prophets, God has in these last days spoken through his Son (Heb. 1:1–4). When God speaks thus in the Son as the final word of God which ushers in the turning-point of the ages, it is at the same time a summons not to miss the promised → rest (Heb. 4:1, 11). As a word of promise directed towards a coming fulfilment it is active and effective, like the "word of God" valid and promulgated by angels on Sinai (Heb. 2:2); where disdained it can bring death and judgment in so far as it is "sharper than any two-edged sword" (Heb. 4:12). This word of God, which had its beginning in the words of Jesus (Heb. 2:3) is decisively grounded in the exaltation of Jesus to the right hand of God (Heb. 1:5 ff.) and in his installation as eschatological high priest (Heb. 7:1 ff.).

This installation into the authority of the high priest, grounded in the divine "word of the oath" (Heb. 7:28; → Swear), is "the bringing in of a better hope" (Heb. 7:19 AV), and thus God's decisive word of promise, guaranteed by oath. But in that Heb. teaches that the Christ-event in cross and exaltation is to be understood as a guaranteed word of promise, open for coming fulfilment, it is also the effective summons to the church to hold fast to their confession of hope. As this "word of exhortation" (Heb. 13:22), the letter itself is directed to the church community, now grown weary in the face of the persecutions and sufferings which were to be expected. The authority of the High Priest crucified for the many is the eschatological word of God, which, as a grounded word of promise, is directed to its coming fulfilment and must be grasped for that reason (B. Klappert, *Die Eschatologie des Hebräerbriefs*, *ThEH* Neue Folge 156, 1969, 11, 22, 28 f., 31 f., 46, 61).

(c) The Word of God as the Apostolic Message of Christ: Acts. In Acts the absolute use of the "word of God" is already a regular periphrasis for the apostolic preaching (Acts 4:29; 6:2, 7; 8:4; 11:19; 13:5, 7, 44, 46; 16:32; 17:13; 18:11). This word of God proclaimed by the apostles, which can also be called "the word of the Lord" (Acts 8:25; 12:24; 13:49; 15:35 f.; 19:10, 20) and is "the word" which God sent to the children of Israel (Acts 10:36), has for its content the word-event of Jesus Christ, i.e. the history of the word (Acts 10:37, *to genomenon rhēma*) from its beginnings in Judea to the appearance of the Risen Christ and the sending out of the disciples. The apostolic word-event of proclamation is grounded in the word-event of the history of Jesus Christ (Acts 10:36 f.), and this is its normative subject-matter.

The apostolic message of Christ is therefore "the word of this salvation" (Acts 13:26), which is for both Jews and Greeks. This word of God, which God himself (Acts 17:30), or Jesus Christ, the Exalted One (Acts 13:38 f.; 26:23), proclaims is the word of the apostles Peter and John (Acts 8:25) and of Paul and Barnabas (Acts 13:5, 46; 14:25; 15:36; 17:13; 18:11). The word of God, to which Paul commends

his congregation (Acts 20:32) is proved to be powerful (Acts 19:20), it grows and multiplies (Acts 6:7; 12:24), spreads throughout the whole land, and, according to the "words" of the Risen Christ (Acts 1:9), is to be proclaimed "in Jerusalem [cf. chs. 1–7], in all Judea and Samaria [cf. chs. 8–12] and to the end of the earth [cf. chs. 13–28]" (Acts 1:8). Acts closes (28:30 f.) with the reference to Paul proclaiming the kingdom of God and the gospel of Jesus Christ in Rome; it is thus the document of the powerful advance in history of the word of God, both in the foundational and illustrative nature of the apostolic preaching in Jerusalem and Judea, on the one hand (chs. 1–12), and in the world-wide mission of Paul, on the other (chs. 13–28). This word of God or word of the Lord in the apostolic preaching is spoken (cf. Acts 4:29, 31; 11:19, 13:46) and proclaimed (Acts 13:5; 15:36; 17:13), it is to be received (Acts 8:14; 17:11), i.e. heard as the word of God (Acts 4:4; 13:7; 44; 19:10), and to be accepted in faith and praised (Acts 4:4; 15:7; 13:48). If the content of the apostolic preaching is the message of the saving-event in Jesus Christ, it can be said of Acts that "The Word of God is the Word about Jesus" (G. Kittel, *TDNT* IV 116).

4. *Jesus Christ as the Word.* (a) The Understanding of the Word of God in the Johannine Literature. John's Gospel, like the Synoptics (cf., e.g. Mk. 4:14 ff.; Lk. 5:1), denotes Jesus' preaching as the proclamation "of the word [of God]": Jesus' words are those of the Father, in which the work of the Father is performed (Jn. 14:24; cf. 3:34; 14:10; 17:8). Anyone, therefore, who hears Jesus' words and accepts them in faith hears God's word (Jn. 5:24; 8:51; 12:48; 14:24; 15:3; 17:14, 17). Because Jesus' word is at the same time the word of the Father, it is therefore the word of salvation (Jn. 14:24) and of → truth (Jn. 17:17), and that is why Jesus' words effect → life in believers (Jn. 5:24) and → judgment in non-believers (Jn. 12:47 f.). The "words of God" which Jesus speaks, are in their totality God's self-revelation to men – "God's word", "thy word" (Jn. 14:6, 14, 17). But this is not to have mentioned the specifically Johannine understanding of the word of God in his Gospel; for "the words of the Revealer (sometimes called *ta rhēmata*, 3:34; 6:63, 68; 8:47; 12:47 f.; 14:10; 15:7; 17:8) are not identical with the revealer as 'the Word' " (R. Schnackenburg, *The Gospel according to St John*, I, 1968, 483). Over and above the statement that Jesus' word is the word of God, Jesus himself is called "the Word" (Jn. 1:1, 14). That is, Jesus' words (of proclamation) as the words of God are grounded in Jesus' being as the Word. "He is not called the Logos absolutely because he utters the word or words of God; on the contrary, his words rather have the force of God's words because he is the Logos, that is, the divine revealer and redeemer" (ibid.). This absolute and personal use of the Logos-concept in its identification with Jesus is found in addition to Jn. 1:1, 14 only in 1 Jn. 1:1 (Jesus as "the Word of life") and Rev. 19:13, where the name "the Word of God" is used for Christ as he returns in victory (combining Wis. 18:5 and Dan. 7).

(b) The understanding of the Word of God in the Johannine Prologue. (i) The original form of the Logos-hymn. In understanding the Johannine Logos-prologue (Jn. 1:1–18), it is important to see that this represents a commentary-like adaptation of an earlier Logos-hymn, which originally comprised vv. 1–4(5), 9–11, 14, 16 (R. Schnackenburg, op. cit., 224 ff.; E. Schweizer, *Neotestamentica*, 113 f.). It spoke of the incarnation of the Word in v. 14 only, and not in v. 5 (contra E. Käsemann, "The Structure and Purpose of the Prologue to John's Gospel", in *New Testament Questions of Today*, 1969, 138–67, see especially 150 ff.). Since v. 14 is a part of the

original poem, representing in the incarnation of the Logos a genuinely Christian statement, it cannot stem from gnostic-Baptist circles, since it is utterly improbable that a pre-Christian hymn would have spoken of the incarnation of the Baptist (against R. Bultmann, *The Gospel of John*, 1971, 18). The original Christian hymn consists of four strophes and describes: (1) the divine Being of the Word and his function in creation (v. 1–3); (2) the function of this Word as light and life for the world of men (v. 4 f., 9); (3) the rejection of the Word and his work in the human world even *before* the incarnation (Jn. 10 f.); and (4) the complete surprise of the event of the Incarnation of the Word and its believing acceptance in the Christian community (vv. 14, 16).

As → wisdom vainly sought for a dwelling amongst men and returned to her heavenly place (Eth. Enoch 42:1 f.), so the original Christian hymn recounted the fate of the Word: the Logos, the true light which illuminates every man, by whom the world came to be, came to his own property but was not accepted by his own people (Jn. 1:5, 9–11). "As one shuts the door in the face of some unwelcome travelling stranger, so it turned out ... with the divine Logos: people did not open up to him. They knew nothing of the fact that he had given the world its being; he was like a stranger, with whom one has nothing to do" (E. Haenchen, "Probleme des johanneischen Prologs", in *Gott und Mensch. Gesammelte Aufsätze*, 1965, 131). Only in Jn. 1:14 does the hymn come to the actual statement of the incarnation of the Word, leaving the Wisdom-narrative far behind; "but now the Logos did the most that could be done, the final thing still possible; in order to gain acceptance among men, He became man himself" (v. 14, ibid.). The Incarnation of the Word is "the unprecedented thing to which the Wisdom-myth could offer no parallels" (ibid.).

(ii) The Prologue of John's Gospel. In consequences of the incorporation of the commentary, and in particular of vv. 6–8 and 15 (12 f., 17 f.) with the Evangelist's allusion to the appearance of John the Baptist, whereby vv. 5, 9–11 are no longer to be referred to the work of the Logos *before* his incarnation, but anticipate the Incarnate Logos, the Prologue of Jn. 1:1–18 is to be divided into three sections: (1) *The pre-existent being of the Word* (Jn. 1:1–4). "In the beginning" – not "at the beginning" of Creation (Gen. 1:1), but in the "time before time" of divine eternity – was the Word (pre-existence of the Word, Jn. 1:1), the Word was with God (personal reference, Jn. 1:2), indeed, "the Word was God" (essential divinity of the Word, Jn. 1:1). By this Word, whereby the universe was created, men have their life and the benefit of light (Jn. 1:3 f.). (2) *The coming of the Word to the world of men and his incomprehensible rejection* (Jn. 1:5–13). The Logos who came into the world, to whom John the Baptist bore witness (Jn. 1:6–8; in the Evangelist's mind vv. 5 ff. thus already hint at the incarnation), was rejected by men in an incomprehensible way (Jn. 1:9–11), with the exception of those who came to faith and thus became children of God (Jn. 1:12 f.). (3) *The event of the incarnation of the Word and its redeeming significance* (Jn. 1:14–18). Without surrendering – indeed, rather, in the application of – his essential divinity, the Word became a mortal man (*sarx*), took up residence amongst men, and, as the presence of God's glory with men, signified the gift of God's grace and covenant faithfulness to them (Jn. 1:14, 16), surpassing the OT revelation of the word in the commandment and becoming event in Jesus Christ (Jn. 1:17 f.).

(iii) The religio-historical derivation of the Logos concept. The question as to the

sphere from which Jn. adopted the term Logos, "the word", can even now not be answered with certainty.

(1) In Greek philosophy (cf. *TDNT* IV 79–91), in which "the word" plays a large part (according to Heraclitus: men do not comprehend this Logos, which always is, *TDNT* IV 81), and amongst the Stoics (cf. *TDNT* IV 84 f.; M. Pohlenz, *Die Stoa*, 1959², 32 ff.), where the Logos is the "world-reason" which sustains and permeates the cosmos like a fine spiritual substance, the personal character of the Logos (Jn. 1:1 f.) and the thought of the world resisting the Logos (Jn. 1:10 f.) are both absent. (2) The attempt to derive the Logos-concept from the OT pure and simple, founders on the facts that, although the LXX can occasionally speak of the word of God as of an active force (cf. Ps. 147:15–18; Wis. 9:1), it does not speak of the word of Yahweh as a person; and that, although the proclamation of "the word of God" by Jesus is spoken of in the absolute in the NT outside the Johannine literature, Jesus himself is never spoken of as the Word of God (not even in 2 Cor. 1:19 f.; cf. T. Zahn, *Introduction to the New Testament*, III, 1909, 327 f., 330). Thus, the Johannine concept transcends the OT concept of the word. (3) In Jewish Wisdom-speculations, where → Wisdom participates in the creation of the world, she is sent into the world by God and rejected by men (Prov. 8:22–36; Sir. 24:3–12; Eth. Enoch 42:1 ff.). If Wisdom too has many conceptions and material statements parallel to Jn. 1:1 ff., yet not only the statement concerning the creation of Wisdom (otherwise in Jn. 1:1 f.), but also the fact that Jewish Wisdom literature cannot account for the choice of the term "Logos" (= "the Word") in Jn. 1:1 ff. speaks against a direct derivation of the Johannine Logos-concept from Jewish Wisdom-speculations. (4) The designation *mêmrā'* (word) in the Targums appears as the Memra of Yahweh or Adonai, and always as an executive agent for God's activity, which preserves his transcendence; but it cannot be considered as a parallel, since there was never any hypostasis of "Memra" (SB II 302 ff.; V. Hamp, *Der Begriff "Wort" in den aramäischen Bibelübersetzungen*, 1938). It is equally improbable either that the statements concerning the Torah made by the rabbis (which are quite similar to those made concerning the Logos (SB II 353, ff.) are in fact parallels, or that Jn. 1:1 ff. is intended to be an antithesis directed against Torah-speculation (cf. G. Kittel *TDNT* IV 134 ff.), since the Logos-concept is lacking precisely in the antithetical vv. 1 and 17, and since it is not certain whether Jn. 1:17 ever belonged to the original hymn at all. (5) A gnostic derivation of the Logos-concept is doubtful not only because the myth of the descent of the Redeemer does not allow of certain proof of its pre-Christian origins (C. Colpe, *Die religionsgeschichtliche Schule*, *FRLANT* Neue Folge 60, 1961), but also because the Logos concept by and large remained foreign to the gnostic systems (W. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, [1913] 1970, 387 f.; J. Jeremias, "Zum Logos-Problem", *ZNW* 59, 1968, 83 ff.; R. Schnackenburg, op. cit., I, 229 ff., 238 ff., 543–57). (6) Hellenistic Judaism. Not only the rendering of Hab. 3:5 "plague goes in front of him" (JB; *deḇer*, plague) in the Gk. translation of the LXX by "before him [God] will go the Logos [*dāḇār*]"; and not only Wis. 18:14 ff. (God's all-powerful Logos comes down from heaven to bring punishment and judgment on the Egyptians; J. Jeremias *ZNW* 59, 1968, 83 f.), but also Philo's Logos-doctrine provide the strongest contacts with the Johannine Logos-concept. In Philo not only is the Jewish Wisdom identified with the Logos, the Logos understood as a mediating power between God and the Creation and ascribed divine predicates,

but Philo (e.g. *De Cherubin* 125 ff.; *Spec. Leg.* 1, 81; *Leg. All.* 3, 96) also simultaneously combines OT statements of creation by the word, Stoic statements of the Logos as the world-soul and Platonic elements (the Logos as the archetype of the created world) with one another (cf. R. Schnackenburg, op. cit., I, 235 ff.; *TDNT* IV 88 ff.). In the question of the origin of the Logos-concept, pre-eminent significance is therefore to be attributed to Hellenistic Judaism.

(iv) The Incarnation of the Word. What does the Johannine message of the incarnation of the Word (Jn. 1:1 ff.) signify within the compass of, and in antithesis to, this Hellenistic Judaic milieu? By contrast with its outlook (cf. Philo), according to which the divine Logos binds together the heavenly and earthly world and rules over and through both macrocosm and microcosm, the Good News of the Johannine Prologue consists in the fact that the Logos no longer works "spiritually" but is found embodied in a mortal man. It no longer embraces the whole world in a simultaneous transcendence and immanence in order to mediate salvation to it through inspiration, but the Logos "becomes one man among others, takes their sin to Himself" (C. Colpe, *TDNT* VIII 470; cf. Colpe, "New Testament and Gnostic Christology", in *Religions in Antiquity. Essays in Memory of E. R. Goodenough*, 1968, 227 ff., especially 235 f.). Thus the incarnation of the Word does not mean that Jesus in his pure humanity proclaims the eschatological word of God (R. Bultmann, *The Gospel of John*, 1971, 35 f.; and *Theology of the New Testament*, II, 1955, 40–49, 59–69). Over against what is in point of fact a kenotic interpretation – i.e. one which eliminates the divinity of Jesus (H. J. Iwand, "Vom Primat der Christologie", in *Antwort. Karl Barth zum siebzigsten Geburtstag*, 1956, 181), and a replacement of the Word becoming flesh by a notion of the flesh becoming word (i.e. the earthly Jesus), one must formulate in the sense of the Johannine Prologue – not a genuine man, commissioned with God's eschatological call to decision, dwelt amongst us – but the Word, God himself (Jn. 1:1 f.) in his divine glory (Jn. 1:14 f.) who assumes the full reality of historical objectivity, human transience (*sarx*) and human death (Jn. 1:14a; cf. 6:61, 63; 1:29; 1 Jn. 3:5; Rom. 8:3). Or, with Schniewind's pertinent phraseology, "Even the prologue speaks of the Cross" (in H.-J. Kraus, *Julius Schniewind. Charisma der Theologie*, 1965, 202). The incarnation of the Word thus does not mean Jesus as the eschatological ambassador, in whom God is present and acting (*pace* Bultmann); it signifies the presence of God himself in the flesh. A religious historical parallel to this statement will for this reason never be found (cf. C. Colpe, *TDNT* IV 470). The message of the incarnation of the Word (Jn. 1:14) "is more and other than the historicising of a mythological event" (ibid.). In other words, the incarnation of the Word means the presence of God in the person of Jesus, not just the present activity of God in the words of Jesus.

B. Klappert

5. *Cognates.* Of the various cognates found in the NT, the most important is the group connected with *eklektos*, chosen, elect (→ Elect). Otherwise, the terms are comparatively rare. Apollos is described in Acts 18:24 as an *anēr logios* which may mean "an eloquent man" (RSV) or "a learned man" (*TDNT* IV 137). The former is supported by v. 25 and possibly by the picture of Apollos in 1 Cor. 1:12; 3:5. But too much cannot be read into these latter passages, as the Apollos faction might

equally have been attracted by his learning, and in any case Apollos may not have been responsible for the formation of the faction.

logion in the LXX is used for an oracular saying (Num. 24:4, 16), individual sayings (Isa. 28:13), and the commandments (Deut. 33:9), but frequently as a general statement about the word of God (e.g. Isa. 5:24; Pss. 19[18]:4; 107[106]:11; 119[118]:154–69 [22 times in all]; 148[147]:15). In Acts 7:38 Moses is said to have received "living oracles [*logia zōnta*]", i.e. the Torah or perhaps more especially the Decalogue (cf. Deut. 32:46 f.). In Rom. 3:2 Paul lists among the advantages of the Jews the fact that they were entrusted with the "oracles of God [*logia tou theou*]" (cf. Rom. 15:8). But in neither case did these advantages turn out to be an abiding benefit, for the Jews did not use them for salvation. The readers of Heb. 5:12 are rebuked for needing instruction in "the first principles of God's word [*stoicheia tēs archēs tōn logiōn tou theou*]", which evidently implies a failure to grasp not only the OT revelation but the Word of God in Jesus Christ, for "in these last days" God "has spoken to us by a Son" (Heb. 1:2). In the context of an exhortation to employ gifts for one another "as good stewards of God's varied grace" (1 Pet. 4:10), Peter urges: "whoever speaks, as one who utters oracles of God" (v. 11). Here *logia theou*, which is used elsewhere to describe the oracles of God in the OT and in Heb. 5:12 of Jesus Christ, is used of charismatic utterance. The phrase contains the implication that some charismatic utterances were less than edifying. It would appear to rule out not only speaking in tongues but any kind of unedifying pronouncement. E. Best sees the phrase "whoever speaks" as including "whether as prophet, preacher or teacher in the worship, instruction or mission of the community, or as an individual privately encouraging, evangelizing or rebuking another Christian, or even a pagan" (*1 Peter*, *New Century Bible*, 1971, 160). Hence, the speaker is urged not to give his own opinions or be motivated by self-esteem but to speak what is given to him as God's word to the glory of God (v. 11c).

alogos is found in cl. Gk. meaning both dumb and without reason (*TDNT* IV 141). In Acts 25:27 it has the latter sense, but in 2 Pet. 2:12 and Jude 10 either or both senses are possible.

logikos is found in secular Gk. meaning "belonging to speech" and "belonging to reason", "rational". In this lattter sense it is found in Gk. philosophy, especially the Stoics (*TDNT* IV 142). Man is a *zōon logikon*, "a rational being" (Epictetus, *Dissertationes* 2, 9, 2; M. Ant., 2, 16, 6; cf. 55, 4; Philo, *Abr.* 32, where there may be overtones of "spiritual"). In 1 Pet. 2:2 the RSV translates *logikos* "spiritual": "Like newborn babes, long for the pure spiritual milk [*logikon adolon gala*], that by it you may grow up to salvation." E. Best prefers this sense to either "of the word" (AV), though he admits that this is the natural meaning of the context (cf. 1 Pet. 1:23 ff.; cf. also Jas. 1:21), or "reasonable" (RVmg), "rational" which is the normal meaning among Gk. philosophers (op. cit., 98). Best thinks that the latter meaning would suit Rom. 12:1, but finds it difficult to see how it would fit 1 Pet. 2:2. However, it may be suggested that there may be an intended paradox or contrast between milk as the food of babes and the rational word which, when fed upon, leads to maturity (cf. v. 2b). Best, like G. Kittel (*TDNT* IV 142), prefers "spiritual" as the meaning both here and in Rom. 12:1, seeing parallels in the later gnostic writings which allude to spiritual, i.e. non-material, sacrifices (*Corp. Herm.* 1, 31; 13, 18 and 21). The RSV uses "spiritual" in its rendering of Rom. 12:1: "I appeal to you therefore brethren, by

the mercies of God, to present your bodies as a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God, which is your spiritual worship [*tēn logikēn latreian hymōn*]." This meaning would fit the context, where Christian worship is set over against Jewish conceptions of religion. But the word may have been chosen both here and in 1 Pet. because of its ambiguity and overtones of both "spiritual" and "rational". For in Rom. Paul may well be emphasizing the need for charismatic worship to express itself in forms which were at once spiritual and rational. In the context of ch. 12 Paul returns to the subject of gifts (vv. 6 ff., cf. vv. 3 ff.), and the need for worship to be given a rational and practical expression may well be a counterpart to his treatment of charismatic worship in ch. 8 (→ Prayer, art. *entynchanō*).

The vb. *logomacheō* and the noun *logomachia* each occur in the Pastoral Epistles. 1 Tim. closes with a warning about contentious teachers: "If any one teaches otherwise and does not agree with the sound words of our Lord Jesus Christ and the teaching which accords with godliness, he is puffed up with conceit, he knows nothing; he has a morbid craving for controversy and for disputes about words [*alla nosōn peri zētēseis kai logomachias*], which produce envy, dissension, slander, base suspicions, and wrangling among men who are depraved in mind and bereft of the truth, imagining that godliness is a means of gain" (1 Tim. 6:3 ff.). Similarly, 2 Tim. 2:14 urges Timothy to "Remind them of this, and charge them before the Lord to avoid disputing about words [*mē logomachein*], which does no good, but only ruins the hearers." These passages evidently refer to those who in 1 Tim. 1:4 occupied themselves with → myths and endless → genealogies (cf. also 1 Tim. 4:3; 6:20; 2 Tim. 2:14–18; Tit. 1:14 ff.; 3:9). The precise nature of the teaching is obscure, though it would seem to be some form of gnosticizing Judaism. Myths and genealogies were already linked in Plato (*Tim.* 22a; cf. Polybius 9, 2, 1). In the early church Irenaeus notes a link between them among the heretics (*Haer.* 1, 30, 9; cf. also Preface; Tertullian, *De Praesc.* 33; see further M. Dibelius and H. Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles*, *Hermeneia*, 1972, 16 ff., 83 ff., 110 ff.). *C. Brown*

ῥῆμα

ῥῆμα (*rhēma*), word, utterance, thing, matter, event, case.

CL The noun *rhēma* (root *wer-* or *rhē*; cf. *erō*, I will say; *rhēsis*, statement, discourse, explanation; *rhētōr*, orator; cognates Lat. *verbum*, Ger. *Wort* and Eng. *word*) means that which is stated intentionally: a word, an utterance. It was used in poetry from Pindar onwards (*Pyth.* 4, 277 f.) and in prose from Hdt. onwards (7, 162). In the famous epigram of Simonides (*Frag.* 92; E. Diehl, *Anthologia Lyrica Graeca*, 1925, II, 94) for the battle of Thermopylae it is said that the Spartans fell in obedience to commands (*rhēmata*). In Plato *rhēma* denotes an individual word (*Tim.* 49c) but also a sentence (*Leg.* 840c). In grammar *rhēma* means a verb as distinct from an *onoma*, a noun (Aristotle, *Poet.* 20p, 1457a, 11).

OT 1. In the LXX *rhēma* occurs predominantly for Heb. *dāḇār*, word, thing, which is of course chiefly rendered by → *logos*, above all in the prophetic books. However, *rhēma* is found 147 times in the Pentateuch and frequently in Deut. and the Deuteronomistic historical works. The double meaning of *dāḇār*, as word and thing, has thus coloured the use of *rhēma*, which can therefore mean both (a) word,

utterance as well as (b) matter, event, case. *rhēma* appears as the result of things said and of things done. Indeed, the latter meaning turns the scale (cf. 1 Sam. 18:8).

(a) *rhēma*, word, utterance, is often synonymous with → *logos* (cf. e.g. the alternation of both terms in Exod. 34:27 f.; 2 Sam. 14:20 f.; 1 Ki. 12:24; 11:41 *v.l.*). As determined by the context, it means, e.g., the word of prayer (Pss. 5:2; 17[16]:6) and in the plur. the message of the spheres (Ps. 19[18]:5). Frequently it is the word of God: a single utterance (Exod. 19:6), a command (Deut. 13:1), the creative word (Deut. 8:3), or a directive oracle (1 Sam. 3:1). Formulaic are the phrases which indicate obedience "according to the word of the LORD" (e.g. 1 Ki. 12:24; 15:29) and "doing this word" (Deut. 24:18, 20, 22). The plur. occasionally denotes the commandments in general (Deut. 28:58), then the Ten Commandments (Exod. 34:1, 27 f.; otherwise in Deut. 10:4), the content of the Shema "Hear, O Israel" (Deut. 6:6), the revelation of the word at Sinai (Deut. 4:36) and the admonitions of Wisdom (Sir. 39:6; Wis. 6:25). *rhēma*, word, can also be used for the process of inspiration (Num. 23:5, 16, God puts the word into the mouth of the pagan Balaam) and in the phrase "the word of the LORD came to . . ." (Israel's prophets: Samuel, 1 Sam. 15:10; Elijah, 1 Ki. 17:2, 8; 18:1; Jeremiah, Jer. 1:1); but → *logos* is mainly used for this.

(b) *rhēma*, thing, matter (likewise *logos*, 2 Sam. 1:4; 17:4) is more specifically defined by the context as an action (Gen. 22:16; Deut. 15:10; 23:10), a legal case (Exod. 18:26; Deut. 1:17), an event (Deut. 4:32) or thought (Deut. 15:9). The double meaning of *rhēma* as event and account is shown where the chronicle of the acts of → Solomon is called *biblion rhēmatōn Salōmōn*, 1 Ki. 11:41; but *logoi* stands more commonly for such chronicles (e.g. 2 Ki. 14:15 f.; 15:11–36). In the narrative portions of the Pentateuch there appears the copulative construction "after these things", "after this" (*meta ta rhēmata tauta* e.g. Gen. 15:1; 22:1).

2. In post-biblical Judaism at the time of Jesus the Heb. term *dāḇār* corresponding with the Gk. *rhēma* is used much as in the OT.

(a) In the Dead Sea Scrolls *dāḇār* can be found with much the same frequency, meaning (i) word and (ii) thing, matter, the former esp. in hymnic and exegetical fragments, the latter in legal stipulations.

(i) The human word and the faculty of speech are held to be particular miracles of the divine creation (1QH 1:28 f.). But *dāḇār* also means the word of God, his commandment (1QS 5:14, 19, 1QH 4:35) and his promise (1QS 2:13). The word of the prophets (CD 7:10; 8:20) is the object of the actualizing interpretation by the Teacher of Righteousness (1Qp Hab 2:5–9; 7:4–8).

(ii) *dāḇār*, meaning affair, concern, is the object of consultations in the community (1QS 6:1, 4, 16), and then also a matter which is elicited by exegesis (1QS 8:11 f.).

(b) In Philo *rhēma* is completely overshadowed by → *logos*, and – in a genuinely Gk. way – simply means "word", and in grammar "verb" (*Agric.* 136). Otherwise, it is used in distinction from a thought or deed. Following Exod. 20:18, Philo says that what God speaks are not words but works (*Decal.* 47).

(c) In rabbinic literature *dāḇār*, like the Aram. terms *millâh* or *millᵉtā'*, derived from other roots, has the same meanings of word and matter; in the Targums *mêmrā'*, word, appears as a periphrasis for the God who reveals himself.

(i) *dāḇār* means an individual word, an utterance. As well as the spirit, the soul and the senses, man has received the word of the mouth as something which con-

stitutes his nature as a man (B. Nidd. 31a). Warnings are however given against loquaciousness: this leads to sin (Aboth 1, 17). In the practice of teaching, the *dāḇār* is associated with the all-dominant Torah. The "words of the Torah" are distinguished from the "words of the tradition" (*qabbālâh*), i.e. the biblical books apart from the Pentateuch (B. Nidd. 23a), and from the "words of the scribes", i.e. the decisions of the rabbis (Yeb. 9, 3). The latter, however, can also be called the "words of the living God" (B. Erub. 13b), i.e. they receive the exposition intended by God. The frequent exegetical phrase "another word [or matter]" introduces a further, divergent interpretation.

The word of divine revelation is readily designated by the *nomen actionis dibbūr* or *dibbᵉrâh*, derived from the vb. *dibbēr*; this is the case for the Ten Commandments (Mekilta on Exod. 20:2). There was much speculation amongst the rabbis as to the universal effect of the giving of the law on Sinai; every single word (*dibbūr*) which came from the mouth of God divided into seventy languages, each single word filled the universe, put the souls of the hearers to flight and drove the Israelites back twelve miles (B. Shab 88b). With the election of Israel, all other lands were excluded as places of revelation (*dibbᵉrôṯ*) (Mek. on Exod. 12:1). Study discloses the riches of the revelation: as there are many smaller waves in between the wave crests in the sea, so there are many finer points in between the individual words of the Torah (Yalkuṭ 971). The word of revelation can be conceived in terms of personification (J. Shab. 7, 10c; cf. beginning of Lev.R. 1).

(ii) Meaning "matter" or "thing", *dāḇār* appears in the common introductory question: "A parable. What is the thing like?" *dāḇār* is used many times as a general designation for legal cases, and occasionally also for human beings (B. Sotah 28b). The formula "another matter" is used to indicate things which one would not like to mention by name, such as idolatry (B. Shab. 17b), pigs (B. Shab. 129a), or sexual intercourse (B. Ber. 8b).

NT In the NT the term *rhēma* occurs 67 times, especially in the Lucan writings (32 times) and in Jn.'s Gospel (12 times). The meaning "word" predominates, which is grounded not least in the non-legal and kerygmatic character of the NT. The meaning "matter" is rare (see below, 5).

Whereas → *logos* can often designate the Christian → proclamation as a whole in the NT, *rhēma* usually relates to individual words and utterances: man has to render account for every unjust word (Matt. 12:36); Jesus answered Pilate without a single word (Matt. 27:14); the heavenly ones speak unutterable words (2 Cor. 12:4).

For *rhēma* as the word of God's prophecy, it is characteristic that it is attended by its fulfilment (→ Fullness, art. *plēroō*) and becomes fact, in the double sense of *dāḇār*, which gains significance particularly in the messianic age.

1. For Luke the basic principle is: "With God nothing is impossible" (Lk. 1:37; cf. Gen. 18:14, Matt. 19:26); he may also have understood *rhēma* as the word of → promise, which does not remain unfulfilled (cf. Lk. 2:29). The Christmas message (Lk. 1:38; 2:17), proclaimed by an angel, is thus God's word, to which one bows in trust and obedience and of which one lives to see the realization (Lk. 2:15, 17, 19). The preaching of John the Baptist makes this clear. Whereas for the rabbis prophecy was extinct, Luke applies the legitimating formula for a prophetic word – "the word of the Lord came . . ." – to the Baptist (Lk. 3:2), who, as the messenger of the

messiah, was more than a prophet (Lk. 7:26 f.), and even before his death saw his prediction become reality (Lk. 7:22 f.; cf. Simeon in 2:29). In this sense even the words of Jesus are designated by the noun *rhēma* in Lk. Anyone who believes and obeys him and, like Peter, throws out the net in response to his word, sees its fulfilment (Lk. 5:5–8). Certainly, Jesus' word is not always immediately understood (Lk. 2:50; cf. 20:26), and this is particularly true of the predictions of suffering (Lk. 18:34; cf. Mk. 9:32 par. Matt. 17:23, Lk. 9:45; cf. Jn. 12:16); but the later realization awakes the memory and discloses the connexion between word and event (Lk. 24:8; Acts 11:16; cf. Mk. 14:72 par. Matt. 26:75, Lk. 22:62; cf. Jn. 18:16 ff., 25 ff.; Mk. 14:30).

2. In Acts the plur. *rhēmata* relates to Stephen's critique of → law and → temple, condemned as blasphemous (Acts 6:11, 13), and positively to the apostolic witness of the Christ-event proclaimed in the speeches (Acts 2:14; 5:20; 10:22, 44; cf. 26:25). Here, too, there emerges the unity of word and object in the term *rhēma*. For even the individual events of the Christ-event are denoted as *rhēmata* (Acts 5:32; 13:42), and the double aspect of the *rhēma*-concept is matched by the double testimony of the apostles who are eye-witnesses of the facts to which they bear witness by the word (Acts 5:32).

3. In St. John's Gospel the unity of Jesus' word and God's word is expressly established; Jesus speaks "the words of God" (Jn. 3:34; cf. 8:47; 14:10; 17:8). What the pious Jew expects from the Torah (→ Law) can be applied to the words of Jesus: they are → spirit and → life (Jn. 6:63), i.e. they are inspired and not (for instance) the words of a madman (Jn. 10:21), they give eternal life (Jn. 6:68) to those who accept them (Jn. 17:8) and who keep them in themselves (Jn. 15:7). The divine authority of these words rests on the sending of Jesus (Jn. 3:34) and especially on his sonship (Jn. 3:35; 17:8). This means, in practice, that Jesus' words are accompanied by his work, for the Father who abides in Jesus performs his works (Jn. 14:10).

4. In Paul and the post-Pauline literature, this equation of Jesus' words and God's word is matched by the correlation between → gospel and OT prophecy (Rom. 1:2–4).

What was said in Deut. 30:12–14 concerning the word of the Torah is, according to Paul, to be understood as a pointer to the message of justification through Christ: it is, for the believer, the word which is near, which is given to him and which saves him (Rom. 10:8), but which, like the song of praise of the spheres, is carried by its messengers into the furthest corners of the earth (Rom. 10:18 = Ps. 19:5). Paul can designate the glad tidings of the gospel as the "word of Christ" (Rom. 10:17), for which "word of God" is found in some MSS.

In 1 Pet. 1:24 f., the identification of both dimensions is achieved by relating Isa. 40:8 ("the word of the Lord endures for ever") to the gospel. In 2 Pet. 3:2 a reminder is given of the words of the prophets and of the instructions of the Lord proclaimed by the apostles; in the parallel passage Jude 17, however, it is simply the words of the → apostles of Jesus Christ which are mentioned.

5. *rhēma*, meaning thing, matter, appears in Lk. 2:15, 19 and there refers to the Christmas events. Many times in the NT, reference is made to the legal provision of Deut. 19:15, whereby a legal matter (*rhēma*) is to be binding on the basis of the evidence of two or three witnesses. Whereas in Matt. 18:16 this provision is impressed upon the community as a community rule (cf. 1QS 6:1), and is applied by

Paul in a quite wilful manner to his judicial decisions in community affairs (2 Cor. 13:1), John has related it to → proclamation (Jn. 8:17): the truth which comes from God, to which Christ bears witness, is presented as the single evidence of two witnesses being heard in the forum of the world. *O. Betz*

Language and Meaning in Religion

Biblical scholars have always regarded the study of language as a necessary part of the task of arriving at the meaning of the biblical text. However, today it is more widely recognized that it is of value to the student of the Bible and Christian theology to study not only traditional grammar and lexicography but also the phenomenon of language as such, seen as a particular form of human behaviour. Three distinct areas of research contribute to an understanding of language. (i) Modern general linguistics begins, in effect, with the work of Ferdinand de Saussure. Saussure views language as a structural system in the social life of the community, which operates on the basis of convention (or more strictly, an "arbitrary" relation to the world → 1 (b)). The value of linguistics for biblical studies has recently been demonstrated by James Barr, R. Kieffer, Erhardt Güttgemanns, and others (→ 5 (c) below). (ii) Linguistic philosophy in Britain and America has also contributed to our understanding of language. Here the insights and methods of the philosopher Ludwig Wittgenstein have special importance. Like Saussure, in his later writings he approached language as a social phenomenon belonging to human life, but he also paid special attention to the varied functions which language could perform in relation to different settings and forms of life. Several philosophers of religion have explored the possible implications of this perspective for the language of Christian faith (→ below 4). (iii) A third distinctive approach to language has connexions with the work of Herder and Wilhelm von Humboldt, but finds particular expression in the philosophy of Martin Heidegger and Hans-Georg Gadamer. Many British and American linguistic philosophers dismiss Heidegger's approach out of hand. But even apart from its considerable influence on German theology, there is also an increasingly strong protest that more serious attempts must be made at constructive dialogue between the perspectives of Wittgenstein and Heidegger. In the present discussion we shall take account of all three areas of thought.

1. *The Nature of Language and its Power.* (a) Language does not merely articulate and express thoughts which are already present, fully formed, to the mind. (i) Words stimulate thought, and influence both how and what men think. At the same time they do not operate at an intellectual level only. They do not merely convey information from one mind to another. They may also serve to arouse passions, or, equally, to channel or to subdue them. Poetic language may open up a vision in which imagination and emotions have full play. Still further, language moulds character and directs men's actions. Words may provoke a whole nation to determined action, or else persuade men towards an attitude of passive acceptance. (ii) In the context of certain accepted conventions and social institutions, the speaking of words may effectively perform certain specific actions. To say "I do" (in the appropriate situation) may be to marry a wife. To say "I hereby appoint . . ." may be to put someone in charge of a national budget or an army. There can be no question that words not only say; they also do (→ below (c)). (iii) More even than this, they also bring the individual into relation with the community. Historically, they provide

him with access to the accumulated wisdom of past generations. Through language he can draw on the intellectual and spiritual resources of many centuries of human experience. Geographically, through writing or the broadcast word, the individual may gain access to the wisdom and culture of communities otherwise widely separated. Personally, through everyday talk, the individual develops his own character and outlook in inter-relation with the community within which he lives.

(b) But on what basis does language have the power to effect all this? From at least the time of Plato, Gk. philosophers debated whether language operates on the basis of "nature" or "convention". Plato reports that Cratylus argued that all words were naturally appropriate to the things they signified. Onomatapoeia might seem to confirm such a view: cymbals crash, and bees buzz. But a moment's reflection will serve to remind us that very few of our words are onomatapoeic. Furthermore, a number of considerations point firmly to the conclusion that the relationship between the forms of words and what they mean is quite simply (to use Saussure's word) "arbitrary". (i) Different forms occur in different languages. If "sister" has a natural relation to sisters, how could the same thing be claimed for "Schwester" or for "soeur"? Sometimes one language uses two words (French "à bon marché") where another uses one word (English "cheap"). (ii) In any case words change their meanings as the years pass. If the meaning of a word is a "natural" one at one particular stage of its history, it will not be so at another. (iii) Grammatical structure, at least in the traditional sense of "grammar", also varies from language to language. The arbitrariness of "surface" grammar is notorious in linguistic philosophy. For example, the sentence "a round square does not exist" does not predicate a given quality (non-existence) of some entity described as a "round square". Its logical structure is, rather: "it is false to assert that an entity exists of which 'round' and 'square' can be predicated simultaneously." The fallacy of a supposed parallelism between logic and "surface grammar" has been attacked by many writers, from Bertrand Russell to Noam Chomsky. (iv) Many single linguistic forms have multiple meanings (polysemy, e.g. floor *board*, and *board* and lodging); whilst two words of different meaning may both have the same linguistic form (homonymy). Thus Saussure rightly insists that the arbitrary character of the linguistic sign is the very first principle of all language-study. This principle "dominates all the linguistics of language; its consequences are numberless" (F. de Saussure, *Course in General Linguistics*, 1960, 68; cf. A. C. Thiselton, "Semantics and New Testament Interpretation", in I. H. Marshall, ed., *New Testament Interpretation*, 1977, 87–8). By claiming that language functions on the basis of convention, however, it is not suggested that a language-community consciously decides to adopt certain linguistic conventions by formal agreement. It is merely to assert that *accepted social habit* in the use of language is ultimately the only basis on which any relation between given linguistic forms and given linguistic meanings may be said to rest. Such habit may certainly also admit of change; but only if this change becomes effectively accepted by a language-using community.

(c) If language rests on social habit, does this mean that the biblical writers imply a mistaken view of human language, especially when they speak of its power? O. Procksch holds that according to Heb. thought "the word appears as a material force which is always present and at work" (*TDNT* IV 93). Gerhard von Rad argues that word in the OT is "an objective reality endowed with mysterious power" (*Old Testa-*

ment Theology, II, 1965, 85). More seriously, he claims that Heb. man was "unable properly to differentiate between word and object, idea and actuality" (op. cit., 81). It is perhaps less surprising to find such a verdict in J. Pedersen: "No distinction is made between word and the matter described" (*Israel: its Life and Culture*, I–II, 1926, 167 f.). L. Dürr insists that the OT writers see words as power-laden (*kraftgeladen*) forces (*Die Wertung des göttlichen Wortes im Alten Testament und im antiken Orient*, 1938, 52, 61, 71). Finally, following Dürr and Grether, H. Ringgren also argues that the word is "a concrete substance . . . acting so to speak mechanically" (H. Ringgren, *Word and Wisdom*, 1947, 158).

From the point of view of modern linguistics, this is not, as G. von Rad claims, a "richer" view of language. It is simply a mistaken one. The central point of the so-called "general semantics" of the Alfred Korzybski school is that "the word is not the thing"; and modern linguistics as well as modern philosophy convincingly demonstrates both the correctness and the importance of this principle. If the OT writers did indeed hold this view of language, it would be due only to the primitiveness and cultural relativity of their outlook. Their view would be akin to that of the phenomenon of word-magic, as described by E. Cassirer and by B. Malinowski. Cassirer asserts that in primitive word-magic men believe in "the essential identity between the word and what it denotes" (*Language and Myth*, 1946, 49 f. and 58). J. Piaget, Karl Bühler, and E. Durkheim discuss this phenomenon with reference to primitive cultures and young children.

Elsewhere, in another article, I have examined and attacked in detail the claim that this view of language is in fact found in the OT (A. C. Thiselton, "The Supposed Power of Words in the Biblical Writings", *JTS* New Series 25, 1974, 283–99). The main part of my case turns on four arguments. (i) This view cannot draw support from the fact that the Heb. word *dāḇār* can mean both word and thing. Such an argument rests on a misunderstanding of the significance of polysemy, or multiple meaning, in language. (ii) More important, arguments have been put forward about a Heb. view of the nature of language *as such* on the basis of passages from the OT which speak about the power of words *spoken by God.* Words spoken by the God of Israel (or in the ancient Near East, by Marduk or Atum) have power precisely because of the identity of the speaker, who will perform what he has spoken. (iii) Special examples of such "power-laden" formulae as blessing and cursing are better understood on the basis of analogies with performative utterances in modern language-study than as examples of primitive word-magic. J. L. Austin showed that performative language indeed *does* things (e.g. "I do" in marriage; "I baptize . . ." in baptism; "I give and bequeath . . ." in making a will); but that the effectiveness of the utterance rests on the existence of certain accepted procedures, not on natural causal force. (iv) OT scholars were encouraged to find this so-called "dynamic" view of language in the Bible not least because they regarded an ideational and intellectualist view as the *only* possible alternative. In point of fact, neither of these two views gives an adequate or even correct account of language at all. To these four main arguments we may add a fifth consideration. Counter-examples can be found in both the OT and NT which stress the weakness of words as well as their power. It is recognized (especially in Prov.) that words are no substitute for deeds, and that they cannot alter facts. In the NT the gospel comes not in word only but in power (1 Cor. 2:4; 4:19, 20).

We may conclude with confidence that the view of the nature and power of language found in modern linguistics and philosophy is correct, and that this in no way conflicts with the view of language presupposed by the OT and NT. Indeed the modern stress on the variety of different functions which language performs is well demonstrated by its range of functions and effects within the biblical writings.

2. *Language and Thought.* The modern debate about the relation between language and thought often gives rise to misunderstanding. At one extreme there stands the theory of Benjamin Lee Whorf that language decisively influences not only human thought in general, but most specifically man's view of the world. At the other extreme, some exponents of the emphasis on convention in linguistics argue that linguistic forms are merely a matter of accident, and have little or no bearing on thought. The position taken in the present discussion is that both sides are (to some extent) correct in what they are trying to assert, but that the debate is artificially polarized by a failure to make it clear whether what is under discussion is linguistic *form* or linguistic *content.*

(a) There is no doubt that Saussure and his successors in general linguistics are correct when they urge that many features of language are arbitrary and accidental, and that often these features have little or nothing to do with theories about the world-view of particular language-communities. This principle is extremely relevant to biblical studies. T. Boman, for example, has strongly urged that on the basis of certain peculiarities of grammar and vocabulary, Israelite thinking is "dynamic, vigorous, passionate", whilst Gk. thinking is "static, peaceful, moderate, harmonious" (*Hebrew Thought Compared with Greek*, 1960, 27). To illustrate he argues that even the Heb. concept of number is more dynamic than the Gk., because, for instance the Heb. word for "two" comes from the verbal form *šānâh*, meaning "to repeat" (165). James Barr has rightly attacked Boman's arguments, drawing on principles which are accepted axioms in linguistics (*The Semantics of Biblical Language*, 1961). By way of illustration we may cite two characteristic statements made by writers on general linguistics which relate, respectively, to questions about grammar and vocabulary-stock.

(i) On the question of grammatical form, E. A. Nida observes; "The idea that the Heb. people had a completely different view of time because they had a different verbal system does not stand up under investigation. It would be just as unfounded to claim that people of the English-speaking world have lost interest in sex because the gender distinctions in nouns and adjectives have been largely eliminated, or that Indo-Europeans are very time conscious because in many languages there are time-distinctions in the verbs. But no people seems more time-orientated than the Japanese, and their verbal system is not too different from the aspectual structure of Hebrew. Furthermore, few peoples are so little interested in time as some of the tribes of Africa, many of whose languages have far more time distinctions than any Indo-European language has" ("The Implications of Contemporary Linguistics for Biblical Scholarship" *JBL* 91, 1972, 83). Nida stresses the arbitrariness of such grammatical features.

(ii) On the questions of vocabulary-stock, reference may be made in the first place to L. Hjelmslev's table of kinship terms. Hungarian has separate words for "elder brother" and "younger brother", whilst Malay has only one word for both "brother" and "sister". But this certainly does not mean that those who speak only Malay can

have no "concept" of an elder brother. It simply means that in that language the idea is expressed by a phrase rather than a word. Thus the linguistician David Crystal rightly warns us that it is false to argue: "Language X has a word for it, but Y has not; therefore X can say something Y cannot". He comments, "This fallacy stems from the misconception ... that the unit of translation-equivalence between languages is the word.... The fact that Y has no word for an object does not mean that it cannot talk about that object. It cannot use the same mechanical means to do so, but it can utilize alternative forms of expression in its own structure for the same end" (D. Crystal, *Language, Linguistics, and Religion*, 1965, 144).

(b) Does this mean that Whorf's theory is wholly wrong? Whorf does not deny the conventionality of language. The heart of his claim is that "language is not merely a reproducing instrument for voicing ideas, but rather is itself the shaper of ideas.... We dissect nature along lines laid down by our native languages". We "organize it into concepts" precisely on the basis of the conventions presupposed by our particular language (*Language, Thought, and Reality: Selected Writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf*, 1956, 212 and 214). Thus it is sometimes said, for example, that Eskimo peoples see the world in a distinctive way because of their range of words for degrees or kinds of whiteness. Whorf's view of language stems originally from Wilhelm von Humboldt, but it also has affinities with that of Sapir, Lichtenberg, and even Heidegger and Gadamer. The truth which this outlook expresses is that language hands on a particular tradition, or *habits* of thought, in which it is *easier* or *more difficult* to acquire certain perspectives. But this does not mean that each national language has its own logic, or that inter-translation is impossible. Indeed it in no way undermines the wholly valid claims of Nida, Crystal, and Barr, about the arbitrary nature of surface-grammar and vocabulary-stock.

(c) The two approaches must be held together, with the added proviso that extreme caution must be shown towards Whorf's specific theories about relations between particular language and particular world-views. Thus Max Black rightly warns us against an over-ready acceptance of his theories about the world-view of the Hopi Indians (*The Labyrinth of Language*, 1968, 63–90). The issue turns on whether what is in question is what Wittgenstein calls the "physical properties" of language, or language-*uses*. Gadamer makes a parallel distinction between "language in the way that philologists see it" and "what is said or handed down in this language" (*Truth and Method*, 1975, 400). Barr, Nida and Crystal are wholly correct if we are thinking about language in the sense of philology. But if what is at issue is deeper questions about language-habits that determine *logical* grammar or *deep* grammar, then Whorf and more especially Heidegger and Gadamer also express an important truth. Heidegger insists that the way we *use* language influences our view of what is true. Wittgenstein urges that certain "pictures" conveyed in language may hold us captive and paralyze our thinking. Thus when Heidegger and Wittgenstein insist (each in his own different way) that language influences thinking, this valid insight does not conflict with the claim of Barr and Nida that thinking is not decisively influenced by accidents of surface-grammar and vocabulary-stock. This point is often misunderstood. For example, on this basis D. O. Via attacks J. Barr for holding a view which he does not in fact hold (*The Parables*, 1967, 48).

3. *Language and Meaning: Word and Speech-act.* (a) One of the oldest and most persistent theories is the referential theory of meaning. Often two principles are held

together: (1) that the meaning of a word is the object to which the word refers; and (2) that even within broader stretches of language the word itself still remains the basic unit of meaning. Sometimes the term "semantics" is misleadingly tied to a referential theory of meaning. This stems largely from the practice of Charles W. Morris, according to which "semiotics", or the science of meaning, is divided into the three areas of: syntax (the inter-relationship between linguistic signs); semantics (according to Morris, the relationship between words and their referents); and pragmatics (the use of language in life). Alfred Tarski and Rudolf Carnap also tend to adopt this view of semantics, and it persists even in recent works (e.g. A. Grabner-Haider, *Semiotik und Theologie. Religiöse Rede zwischen analytischer und hermeneutischer Philosophie*, 1973). The plausibility of this theory of meaning lies partly in the fact that we assume all too readily that meanings are learned on the basis of ostensive definition (i.e. pointing to an object and stating its name).

(i) The theory of reference, as a matter of principle, however, has grave difficulties, at least if it is offered as a *comprehensive* theory of meaning (→ A. C. Thiselton, *Language, Liturgy, and Meaning*, 1975, 10–13). A child understands the procedure of ostensive definition only when he has received a certain measure of linguistic training. L. Wittgenstein demonstrates this decisively in his *Blue and Brown Books* and *Philosophical Investigations*. The key difficulty, he explains, is that ostensive definition can be interpreted in all sorts of ways, unless the one who is learning already understands the nature of the language in question. If I hold up a pencil and say "This is tove", it may mean *either* "this is pencil", *or* "this is wood", *or* "this is round", *or* "this is to-be-used", and so on. Wittgenstein writes, "Point to a piece of paper. – And now point to its shape – now to its colour – now to its number (that sounds queer). How did you do it?" (*Philosophical Investigations* 1958, *§* 33; cf. *Blue and Brown Books*, 1969², 2–4). Many years earlier Gottlob Frege underlined a further problem about the theory of reference. In practice, he argued, we sometimes use words which have different meanings to refer to the same object. Thus the meaning of "the morning star" is not the same as that of "the evening star", even though both terms may refer to the planet Venus. This led Frege to distinguish between sense (*Sinn*) and reference. Frege's objection is not fatal to referential theories, since they can be reformulated, as he saw, to take account of this difficulty. Nevertheless it does rob the theory of its common-sense appeal. Wittgenstein concluded that the referential theory of meaning can hold its spell over us only if we restrict our attention to certain kinds of words. He writes, "If you describe the learning of language in this way, you are, I believe, thinking primarily of nouns like 'table', 'chair', 'bread', and of people's names, and only secondarily of the names of certain actions and properties; and of the remaining kinds of words as something that will take care of itself. . . . Think of exclamations alone, with their completely different functions . . ." (*Philosophical Investigations §§* 1 and 27).

(ii) The second related principle which is often associated with the referential theory of meaning is also open to question, namely, that the word is the basic unit of meaning. In linguistics the chief criticism of this assumption comes from exponents of field semantics. Thus J. Trier insists that a word has meaning "only as part of a whole" and only "within a field" (*Der Deutsche Wortschatz im Sinnbezirk des Verstandes*, 1931, 6). The semantic scope of the word "red", for example, cannot be

assessed in merely abstract terms. Its scope will vary in accordance with whether it stands in contrast to "orange", or only to "yellow", within a field of colour-terms. Admittedly it is legitimate and indeed often necessary to study the meanings of words as such, provided that it is not forgotten that conclusions reached on this basis remain only generalizations arrived at on the assumption that the word in question occurs in a characteristic setting. Stephen Ullmann writes, "There is usually in each word a hard core of meaning which is relatively stable and can only be modified by the context within certain limits" (*Semantics. An Introduction to the Science of Meaning*, 1962, 49). A similar point is made by G. Stern (*Meaning and Change of Meaning*, 1931, 85). At the same time, however, it is very important to heed the warning of R. H. Robins, that this method of approaching meanings in terms of words is acceptable only "provided it is borne in mind that words have meanings by virtue of their employment in sentences ... and that the meaning of a sentence is not to be thought of as a sort of summation of the meanings of its component words taken individually" (*General Linguistics*, 1964, 22). In this sense, words are more than mere *names*.

From a philosophical point of view, too, the equation of the word with the name has caused persistent problems from Plato to Russell and the earlier work of L. Wittgenstein. In his earlier writings Wittgenstein stated, "One name stands for one thing, another for another thing, and they are combined with one another. In this way the whole group – like a *tableau vivant* – presents a state of affairs" (*Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*, 1961, 4, 0311). Wittgenstein came to see, however, that the notion of "simple" elements of language which correspond to "simple" objects is a mere abstraction demanded by the mind of the logician. He had earlier argued that simple objects stand in a determinate relation to one another, thereby constituting a state of affairs (*Sachverhalt*). Similarly, elements of language stand in a determinate relation to one another, in such a way that a statement constitutes a picture (*Bild*), or a model, of reality. On this view, every statement can in principle be wholly and completely analyzed with its smallest determinate elements, or "simples". In his later writings, however, Wittgenstein powerfully and convincingly demonstrates that *in practice* language does not operate in this way. If we actually *look* at language, rather than try to force some theory on to it, he urges, we see that even terms like "simple" and "exact" have no self-evident meaning which can be arrived at prior to their actual settings in human life. All language is relative to its "surroundings". The referential theory of meaning, therefore, of which Wittgenstein's early picture theory formed one example, fails to do justice to the ways in which language is actually used, at least if it is offered as a comprehensive theory of meaning.

(b) The so-called ideational theory of meaning suffers from all of the difficulties of the referential theory. In the Graeco-Roman era the Stoics drew a threefold distinction between (1) "that which signifies" (*to sēmainon*), namely, the linguistic sign; (2) "that which is signified" by the sign (*to sēmainomenon*); and (3) the actual object or event in the physical world to which these correspond (*to tynchanon*). This is the origin of the famous "semantic triangle" which C. K. Ogden and I. A. Richards still offer in the twentieth century as a basic model of the relation between language and meaning. According to these two writers, (1) there is a causal relation of reference between an object in the physical world and a concept, thought, or image in the mind (the first side of the triangle). (2) The concept or thought then stands in causal rela-

tion to its symbolic expression in language. Here the operative relation is that of symbolizing (the second side of the triangle). (3) Ogden and Richards claim that they have now explained the relation between the linguistic symbol and its object of reference. On the basis of the other two *causal* relations, we now have an *imputed* relation between the symbol and its referent (the third side of the triangle) (*The Meaning of Meaning*, 1923, 14). In effect, this is little more than an attempt to add a mentalist dimension to a theory of reference. In the seventeenth century John Locke argued that words are "external sensible signs . . . whereof invisible ideas might be made known to others. . . . The ideas they stand for are their proper and immediate signification" (*An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, 1798, III, § 21). In the twentieth century this emphasis has affinities not only with Ogden and Richards, but also with the work of Susanne K. Langer.

Rather than easing the difficulties of the referential theory, however, this approach makes matters even worse. As D. M. High urges, it is often associated with the idea that language is a rather shabby vehicle of expression for otherwise clear ideas. Linguistic expression derives its meaning from the image, idea, or mental picture, which the speaker is trying to communicate, "as if it were a kind of internal motion picture accompanying these performances" (*Language, Persons, and Belief*, 1967, 37). Once again, however, in his later writings L. Wittgenstein convincingly attacked the notion that language and thinking can be detached from each other in this way. Meaning is not a kind of mental process which somehow exists alongside actual speaking. In any case, in practice, we do not always experience a stream of images accompanying our speaking; nor is it easy to say in what a "thought" consists which we cannot express in language (cf. L. Wittgenstein, *Philosophical Investigations §§* 338–42). We have already suggested that to think of language as that which merely articulates thoughts already present to the mind is an inadequate and perhaps misleading view of language (cf. also F. Waismann, *Principles of Linguistic Philosophy*, 1965, 153–93). Whatever may be said about images or concepts, however, the problem still remains that the ideational theory of meaning escapes none of the difficulties of theories of reference. J. Pelc argues that all theories of meaning are severely limited which simply try to extend what remains basically a theory of words as names. This theory can never progress beyond the assumption "that the meaning of a sentence is a function of the meaning of its components" (*Studies in Functional Logical Semiotics of Natural Language*, 1971, 58).

(c) The problem of meaning is best approached when language is viewed as part of a human activity, or of a form of life (L. Wittgenstein, *Philosophical Investigations* § 23). We begin neither with words, nor with ideas, nor even with propositions, but with the human being speaking language in a particular situation. Looking back on his earlier writings, Wittgenstein spoke of "turning our whole examination round" (§ 108). "Only in the stream of thought and life (*Leben*) do words have meaning" (*Zettel*, 1967, § 173). Both Martin Heidegger in *Being and Time* (though less in his later writings) and Wittgenstein in his later period stress that language is a particular activity on the part of a human subject. For Heidegger, language and understanding constitute an *a priori* existentiale of *Dasein*, or human life. Meaning, Heidegger urges, is not something which we attach to some otherwise naked object which is present-at-hand (*vorhanden*). Meaning is bound up with the horizon of the human subject (*Dasein*) according to which he understands something *as* what it is to him

(*Being and Time*, 1962, § 32). In a parallel way Wittgenstein urges: "every sign *by itself* seems dead. . . . In use it is *alive*" (*Philosophical Investigations* § 432). We must now ask: if thinkers from two of the three areas of thought outlined above adopt this approach, can the same be said of the third area, namely, general linguistics? It must be admitted that in linguistics, language is more readily abstracted from the human subject, and regarded as an "objective" scientific phenomenon in itself. But this is not the whole story. We have said that F. de Saussure stressed the social character of language. Indeed, he distinguished carefully between *langue*, the linguistic reservoir of the community, and *parole*, the actual concrete speech-*acts*. Thus in Saussure, hardly less than in Wittgenstein, we have the seeds of the modern perspective according to which the basic elements of language are neither words nor sentences as such, but, rather, "speech-acts" (F. de Saussure, *Course in General Linguistics*, 9 and 13–14). Saussure's contrast between *langue* and *parole* has been taken up and developed in recent linguistics in terms of the distinction between linguistic competence and linguistic performance (Noam Chomsky, *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*, 1965, 5–15). Chomsky rejects the charge that his own "generative grammar" stresses competence at the expense of performance. Indeed he argues that in practice "the only studies of performance, outside of phonetics, are those carried out as a by-product of work in generative grammar" (15).

Wittgenstein's approach to the problem of meaning finds expression in his use of the term "language-game". He uses it in order to make two points. Firstly, language is grounded in human life. Wittgenstein writes, "The term 'language-*game*' is meant to bring into prominence the fact that the *speaking* of language is part of an activity, or of a form of life" (*Philosophical Investigations* § 23). Thus the term describes not only language itself but also "the actions into which it is woven" (§ 7). Secondly, language-uses are grounded in *particular* surroundings in human life. What language actually *is*, depends on the nature of the particular language-game under discussion. In a certain particular situation, language may indeed serve to "refer" to an object; and meaning may here be viewed in terms of reference. But language does not operate in a single uniform way. Certainly it does not always "describe". We must make "a radical break with the idea that language always functions in one way . . . to convey thoughts" (§ 304). In more positive terms, "For a *large* class of cases – though not for all . . . the meaning of a word is its use (*sein Gebrauch*) in the language" (§ 43). Wittgenstein describes such uses of words or sentences as "countless". This is because "this multiplicity is not something fixed, given once for all" (§ 23). In common with exponents of hermeneutical philosophy, he recognizes that language is open-ended towards future experience. New language-uses may emerge as human life develops. Wittgenstein writes, "Think of the tools in a tool-box: there is a hammer, pliers, a saw, a screw-driver. . . . The functions of words are as diverse as the functions of these objects. . . . What confuses us is the uniform appearance of words. . . . Their *application* (*Verwendung*) is not presented to us so clearly" (§ 11). It is, he suggests, like looking into the cabin of a locomotive. We see handles which look more or less alike (since they are all meant to be handled). But they all do different things, and may operate in different ways. To attempt to formulate some comprehensive theory of meaning is to imply that the relation between language and meaning is always the same. It is to be misled by the shape of the handles, or by the surface-grammar of language. By contrast, "we talk about it (language) as we do

about the pieces in chess when we are stating the rules of the game, not describing their physical properties" (*§* 108).

This approach does not lead to scepticism, however, concerning questions about meaning. On the contrary, it suggests only that such questions cannot be asked or answered in the abstract, independently of the task of looking at actual particular cases. We should even resist the temptation to ask: how does "religious language" acquire its meaning? We need to look at particular utterances in the actual life of the worshipping community, in order to determine what rôle these utterances play, and only then can we determine what may be said about their meaning. One of Wittgenstein's further insights was to see that concrete questions about meaning may also be answered with reference to observable life and conduct within the language-using community (→ 4 (c)). When we ask a question about meaning, "the kinds of use we feel to be 'the point' are connected with the rôle that such-and-such a use has in our whole life" (*Remarks on the Foundations of Mathematics*, 1956, I, *§* 16, 8). Wittgenstein himself offers many concrete illustrations of this principle, especially with reference to the meanings of such words or phrases as "think", "expect", "believe", "have pain", and "understand".

4. *Language and Religion.* (a) The language of religion is not necessarily a special kind of language, but is ordinary language put to a special kind of use. For example, when we talk about "hearing" the voice of God, we do not use a special word for "hearing"; but we do use the word "hearing" in a special way. Wittgenstein describes this kind of peculiarity as a difference of logical "grammar". He considers the statement: "You can't hear God speak to someone else; you can hear him only if you are being addressed"; and he observes: "That is a grammatical remark" (*Zettel*, *§* 717). In other words, this statement describes one of the logical peculiarities that marks the word "hear" when it applies, not to sound-waves striking the ear, but to hearing the voice of God. If someone finds it difficult to hear, he might be advised to buy a deaf-aid. But we should recommend a different course of action for someone who found it difficult to hear God. This indicates that "hear" has a peculiar grammar in this setting. Long before Wittgenstein, this feature of language was noted in the Fourth Gospel. Nicodemus is told, in effect, that "birth" into the kingdom of God has a different logical grammar from "birth" into the world (Jn. 3:3–7). The "living water" (i.e. running water) offered by Jesus to the woman of Samaria has a different grammatical status from that of "running water" as she imagines it (Jn. 4:10: "Sir, you have nothing to draw with . . ."). The disciples misunderstand the grammar of the "food" of which Jesus speaks (Jn. 4:31–34). The Jews misunderstand the peculiar meaning of "bread" (Jn. 6:31–35). In Wittgenstein's terms, Jn. shows that the problem of understanding the language of Jesus is bound up with the fact that its special "surroundings" have to do with faith and especially with christology. The claims which Jesus makes for himself give much of his otherwise ordinary language a distinctive meaning or grammar. Hence understanding his words and acknowledging his Person are bound up with each other.

(b) At the same time, the peculiarity of the logical grammar of Christian discourse should not be exaggerated. There are at least two bridges between "religious" language and that of the ordinary every-day world. The first of these is *analogy*. In analogy there is a parallelism, perhaps even an overlapping, between the ordinary

every-day grammar of a word and its distinctive logical grammar in the setting of religion. When we say that Jesus is the "son" of God the "Father", an unwanted area of the every-day grammar of "father" and "son" must be cancelled off. We do not wish to imply that the son was born to the father at a particular moment in time, or that his existence is more recent than that of his Father. In this sense, the Arians were misled by failing to notice a feature of the logical grammar of "son" in this setting. On the other hand, the words "father" and "son" are used precisely because the relationship between God and Christ remains analogous to that of a human father and son. From an ontological rather than a linguistic point of view, Paul states that the fatherhood of God is a prototype of all human fatherhood (Eph. 3:15). Although he is not making a linguistic point here, Paul's statement nevertheless presupposes some degree of continuity between "father" as applied to God, and "father" as applied to men. In the same way, to take another example, God's "coming" cannot simply be equated with the use of the same word in ordinary settings, since God is believed already to be, in another sense, omnipresent. Yet when the biblical writers speak of God's "coming" to the earth, there is at least some area of overlap with the usual meaning of the word. Similarly, if God is omnipresent, in one sense man cannot be distant from him; but probably all Christians would acknowledge some element of analogy between "coming" back to God, and the "coming" back of the absent prodigal son to his human father.

The philosophical theologian Ian T. Ramsey has attempted to articulate this double phenomenon of similarity and difference by using the terms "model" and "qualifier" (*Religious Language: An Empirical Placing of Theological Phrases*, 1957, 49–89). Ramsey uses the word "model", where many theologians from Thomas Aquinas onwards would have used the term "analogy". On the basis of linguistic models, God is said to be the "cause" of the universe; to be "wise" and "good"; and to have brought forth "creation" according to his "purpose". But Christians wish to stress not only the continuity of these terms with their everyday meanings, but also their differences from them. Hence qualifiers are added alongside the models. God is not only "cause"; he is "first" cause. He is "infinitely" wise and good. Creation is "creation *ex nihilo*"; and is in accordance with his "eternal" purpose (61–79). One reason why Ramsey prefers the phrase "models and qualifiers" to the traditional term "analogy" is that he also wishes to argue that when language functions in this way it provides the basis for what he calls a disclosure situation. The logical oddity that results from coupling together a model and a qualifier is not merely, negatively, a sign that language is being stretched beyond its usual limits. More positively, it also provokes a situation in which, as the hearer seeks to understand the language, "light dawns", or "the penny drops". A disclosure occurs which operates at a level which is not purely cognitive and informative.

There are understandable reasons why Ramsey should be reluctant to make great use of the term analogy. Many mediaeval theologians based their doctrine of analogy on the belief that God must contain in a supremely eminent way (*via eminentiae*) the qualities or degrees of being manifested in every finite being. This *via eminentiae* was thought to represent the only alternative to speaking about God in purely negative terms (e.g. as incorporeal, impassible, invisible). Ramsey's approach does not necessarily presuppose these metaphysical assumptions about God and being. At the same time, however, it would be a mistake to draw too sharp a contrast between the

traditional view of analogy and Ramsey's approach. Both approaches firmly assert two principles. Firstly, there is a necessary element of continuity or overlapping between religious uses of language and ordinary empirical applications of the same word or phrase. Secondly, there is also a necessary difference in the scope of their application, so that the precise scope of their meaning is different.

Two final points should be made about analogy. Firstly, analogy in this context is certainly not being used in a way which precludes metaphor. Metaphor is of the utmost importance in religious language. Indeed often to characterize certain *specific* language-uses in religion as metaphor is to lose sight of the fact that very much of our language is, in the widest sense, metaphorical. Not only the parables of the Synoptic Gospels and the imagery of Jn. and Rev., but also large stretches of theological argument in the Epistles necessarily use metaphor. But metaphor is not to be dismissed as somehow inferior to so-called literal discourse. To do this would be to yield to the spell of the referential and especially the ideational theories of meaning, and to assume that language must always be related to meaning in one uniform way. Secondly, when analogy is used, understanding is made more readily possible when a variety of models, images, or metaphors are used. This very variety helps the hearer to cancel off unwanted areas of the empirical, or every-day, meaning of the words of phrases in question. Thus in Jn., Jesus is indeed the shepherd; but he is also the light, the vine, the bread, the resurrection and so on. Unwanted areas of meaning are negated, whilst cross-bearings may be taken, as it were, which *together* point to the areas in which distinctive theological meanings converge.

(c) There is also a second major point of contact between the language of religion and the everyday empirical world. This comes to light in the modern philosophical debate about private language and *public criteria of meaning*. Wittgenstein, once again, is the thinker who has done most to set this debate in motion. Wittgenstein's starting-point is to consider the place of regularities, customs, and training, in the use of language. This aspect of language is also underlined in general linguistics, where Chomsky, Fodor, and Katz talk about mechanisms which are recursive (J. A. Fodor and J. J. Katz, *The Structure of Language*, 1964, 11; cf. 1–18 and 479–518). Wittgenstein is cautious about speaking of rules in any rigid or prescriptive sense. But he does speak of them in the sense of signposts or customs (*Philosophical Investigations*, *§§* 198–9). He writes, "Obeying a rule is a practice. And to *think* one is obeying a rule is not to obey a rule. Hence it is not possible to obey a rule 'privately' " (*§* 202). If the distinction between "correct" and "seems correct" disappears, then so has the concept "correct". It is easy to see what can count as a check or whether our use of the word "chair" or "table" is correct. If we were to use the word "chair" consistently in an incorrect way, someone else in the language-using community would soon tell us. But what kind of thing counts as a check on the correct use of words which relate to inner experiences or states of mind? Wittgenstein insists that if I know what it is to feel joy, grief, pain (and so on), *only from my own case*, I could not be aware of any regularity or custom about the application of these concepts in language. For what would it be to make a *mistake* in their application? In practice, however, such language *is* teachable, and not wholly "private" (in Wittgenstein's technical sense of the term). For we learn what joy, grief, pain, etc., *is*, because they play an observable part in life. Wittgenstein writes, "What would it be like if human beings showed no outward signs of pain (did not groan,

grimace, etc.)? Then it would be impossible to teach a child the use of the word 'toothache' " (*§* 257).

Although Wittgenstein's arguments about private language are made partly in the form of an attack on a Cartesian view of mind, we may apply this principle to the language of religion. If "being redeemed", "experiencing the Holy Spirit" (and so on), were *purely* (in Wittgenstein's sense of the term) "private" experiences, how could their meaning ever be conveyed to others? To be sure, there is a dimension to these experiences which is indeed inner and private. But it is also part of their very grammar that they should relate to human life in a public and observable way. In the same way we should say that pain is a genuinely "inner" sensation, but it is also necessarily compatible with some forms of overt behaviour and incompatible with others. What makes language teachable is its connexion with observable regularities in human behaviour. Hence what makes such a concept as "redemption" intelligible is not only (as we have seen) its analogy with parallel concepts in secular life, but also the cash-value of the concept in the observable life and ongoing tradition of the Hebrew – Christian community from the OT to the present day.

The OT in particular provides a publicly accessible tradition of patterns of events and behaviour which give currency to its language. The events of the Exodus, for example, provide a paradigm case, or a model language-game, of what "redemption" might mean. The notion of "salvation" begins to emerge as Israel passes through experiences of deliverance and prosperity in the period of the Judges. Piece by piece a tradition is built up, providing a continuity or regularity against which the application of certain concepts may be checked as correct or incorrect. These concepts do not of course remain static, but are purified and enriched as the biblical tradition grows. One reason why the biblical tradition is indispensable to Christian faith is that it provides paradigm cases of meaning, without which modern claims to "Christian" experience would face a problem of identity. The God who is worshipped in the Hebrew-Christian tradition is not merely the supreme being of speculative thought, but the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob; and the God and Father of the Christ of the NT.

This principle contributes decisively, alongside analogy, to the solution of the problem of meaning in religion. It does not merely result, however, in a backward-looking biblicism. In the modern era, the secular man may *begin* to grasp the meaning of religious language as he is in a position to see its cash-value in terms of observable acts and attitudes on the part of the Christian community, or the religious man. Wittgenstein writes, "One learns the game by watching how others play" (*Philosophical Investigations*, *§* 54). Correspondence between word and deed in the Christian community provides a more radical and effective solution to the problem of meaning in religion than attempts to re-label the Christian vocabulary.

(d) There are other approaches to the problem of religious language which are perhaps best viewed as part of the history of twentieth-century philosophy. This applies especially to A. J. Ayer's principle of verification, which is hardly still a live issue today, except in philosophical traditions which are unduly dominated by empiricism. It will be useful to distinguish between three phases in the development of thought.

(i) Shortly after the turn of the century, G. E. Moore and Bertrand Russell voiced a strong protest against much of the language and outlook of philosophical idealism,

as represented e.g. in the writings of F. H. Bradley. Moore claimed to write in the name of common-sense realism, and the mood of his thought was strongly empiricist. In addition to formulating his own approach, Russell claimed to find support for an empiricist orientation in the earlier work of Wittgenstein. We have already seen that, according to Wittgenstein's *Tractatus*, language serves to describe the facts of the physical world in a determinate way (or else express logical tautologies), but cannot be used for other purposes, including those of religion and ethics. That Wittgenstein himself did not wish his view to be understood as a defence of positivism can be seen from his correspondence with Paul Engelmann. (Recently this point has been brilliantly argued by A. Janik and S. Toulmin, *Wittgenstein's Vienna*, 1973.) Nevertheless, the *Tractatus* was interpreted by Russell and other in such a way that a thorough-going positivism was thought to be corroborated by Wittgenstein's early theory of language. Religious language, according to this approach, can result only in confusion, since it does not simply state facts about the world. This positivist outlook found particular expression in the Vienna Circle of the 1920s, of which one of the leaders was Rudolf Carnap.

(ii) A. J. Ayer's "Logical Positivism" represented the outlook of the Vienna Circle in Britain. Many believed that it took the discussion to a fresh stage. Ayer begins by attacking "the metaphysical thesis that philosophy affords us knowledge of a reality transcending the world of science and common sense" (*Language, Truth, and Logic*, 45). He then argued that any language which attempts to go beyond science or commerce is "devoid of literal significance". He asserts: "The criterion which we use to test the genuineness of apparent statements of fact is the criterion of verifiability" (48). We must ask, he urges, what observations must be made in order to check whether a statement is a factual one. Ayer's third step is to declare that if an utterance does not fall into this category, it is meaningless or "non-sense": "Until he (the speaker) makes us understand how the proposition that he wishes to express would be verified, he fails to communicate anything" (49). Ayer now adds two further points to his argument. Firstly, "analytic" statements (i.e. those which state what is true by definition) may be meaningful even though they remain unverifiable. Secondly, empirical statements need only be "verified in principle"; i.e. capable of verification, given the technical ability to make the observations required (whether or not these exist in practice).

In some quarters it was felt that Ayer had proved once and for all that religious utterances were without any genuine meaning. But other writers soon made the rejoinder that Ayer's approach remained fundamentally an *empiricist* viewpoint. H. J. Paton comments: "A purely linguistic approach may conceal from us what we are doing.... It is no new thing to find men who are prepared to believe only in what they can see and touch.... It is not easy to see why it becomes a more serious argument simply because it appears in a linguistic dress" (*The Modern Predicament*, 1955, 42). The decisive point that suggests special pleading on Ayer's part is that the verification principle itself is neither an analytical statement nor one that can be verified by observation. On the basis of Ayer's own work, it would be a meaningless criterion. Ayer slightly modified his original approach of 1936 in a second edition of *Language, Truth, and Logic*, in 1946, but the fundamental difficulties remain. In historical perspective we see how greatly Ayer was indebted to earlier empiricism and especially to the *Tractatus* as interpreted in the Russell tradition.

(iii) In the 1950s the debate about verification gave way to discussions about falsification. This principle can best be explained by an example. If the religious man asserts, "God is love", the philosopher may ask him what he would accept as evidence *against* the validity of this statement. If God allows millions to starve, or thousands to die of cancer, is this compatible with the statement that God is love? If the religious man answers that almost nothing would count against the validity of his assertion, the philosopher may reply that, in terms of *meaning*, it has died the death of a thousand qualifications. Very little, if any, of its actual *content* is left. One of the main exponents of this kind of approach is Antony Flew (*New Essays in Philosophical Theology*, 1955, 96–130). Philosophers of religion have reacted to it in two wholly different ways. Some argue that, like the principle of verification, this criterion of meaning applies only to empirical statements, and that it has nothing to do with religious language. They simply reject the challenge as irrelevant. Others accept the challenge, arguing that there must be and indeed are hypothetical situations which would falsify certain religious utterances. For example, if suffering never produced positive effects, or it could be shown that Jesus of Nazareth never lived, the status of certain religious utterances would be different. Those who accept the challenge of falsification see some value in this approach as helping to clarify the extent to which certain religious utterances *include* (though cannot be reduced to) cognitive or even empirical truth-claims. Nevertheless, the connexion between meaning and "making a difference" can perhaps be better explored in the broader context of questions about public criterion of meaning (→ above, (c)).

(e) Symbols, like metaphor, play an important rôle in religious language. Part of their power lies in the fact, that, according to Jung, symbols are vital for the necessary interplay between conscious and unconscious. Paul Tillich takes up Jung's approach, but in Tillich's theology the special place which he accords to symbol is bound up with a particular theological evaluation whereby the unconscious is thought to point to God. Tillich also tends towards a naturalistic view of language, arguing that, unlike the sign, the symbol itself "participates in that to which it points" (*Theology of Culture*, 1964, 54–5). These two assumptions may be questioned. But Tillich is correct in his emphasis on the *power* of symbols. He writes, "Every symbol is two-edged. It opens up reality, and it opens the soul" (op. cit. 57). "It opens up hidden depths of our own being" (*Dynamics of Faith*, 1957, 43). Symbols such as the sun, the closed door, inaccessible Eden, or the eschatological feast, reach right down into memories of childhood, or even perhaps through to racial memories. They call forth the response of the imagination and the heart. But pictures, as Wittgenstein reminds us, can be variously applied. This is the limitation of symbolic language. Whatever its relation to cognitive discourse in terms of its *chronological* use (cf. the parables of Jesus), from a *logical* point of view symbols can do no more than *supplement* cognitive discourse. To be sure, symbols (like parables and metaphor) are powerful in reaching through to the heart. But their application must be checked and tested against a broader linguistic content. For this reason, the Christian sacraments are always incomplete without the word. (I have discussed these points at greater length in *Language, Liturgy, and Meaning*, 1975, 22–32; and "The Theology of Paul Tillich", *The Churchman* 88, 1974, 86–107.)

5. *Language and the Biblical Text.* Certain theories of hermeneutics (→ Explain) and of translation-method are bound up with particular views about the nature of

language. (a) There are three distinct aspects to R. Bultmann's hermeneutical programme. Firstly, Bultmann adopts the perspective found in Schleiermacher and Dilthey, according to which the interpreter's understanding of the text is partly conditioned by his own pre-understanding. Bultmann writes, "The exegete is not a *tabula rasa*, but on the contrary approaches the text with specific questions, or with a specific way of raising questions" (*Existence and Faith*, 1964, 342). Pre-understanding is "not a prejudice, but a way of raising questions" (346). These questions should not be suppressed, but they should also be open to correction as understanding of the text begins to dawn. From the point of view of a theory of language, this hermeneutical approach is based on the valid recognition that, in Wittgenstein's terms, neither the language of the text nor the concepts of the reader can be viewed outside a particular language-game (→ above, 3 (c)). Language is not an abstraction the content of which can be viewed independently of the standpoint of the text and the reader. Secondly, Bultmann also employs existential interpretation in his handling of many parts of the NT. This procedure is in itself neutral from the point of view of a theory of language, and its value must be judged on other grounds. Thirdly, however, in his programme of demythologizing Bultmann works with three particular conceptions of → myth, each of which has close connexions with a theory of language.

(i) Bultmann tends to confuse analogy (or metaphor) and myth, as linguistic categories. He defines myth as "the use of imagery [*die Vorstellungsweise*] to express the other worldly in terms of this world" (H. W. Bartsch, ed., *Kerygma and Myth*, I, 1964, 10, n. 2). Thielicke and Schniewind insist that if this is the case, myth is no more dispensable than analogy or metaphor, and demythologizing becomes impossible. (We cannot accept Bultmann's reply that what is really at issue is the *uncritical* use of such language, since it is by no means clear that it is used uncritically in the NT.) Further, Bultmann makes much of the argument that so-called contradictions in the NT are symptomatic of myth (e.g. that the death of Christ is sometimes viewed as a sacrifice, sometimes as a victory over evil powers). But this argument rests on the same confusion. What we have here is simply a necessary diversity in the use of analogies, models, or metaphors. We have already seen why diversity of this kind is necessary (→ above, 4 (b)).

(ii) We must also ask whether Bultmann's view of language presupposes too sharp a contrast between outer form and inner content, or between language and thought. According to his second definition of myth, mythology expresses the world-view of a pre-scientific age. Thus heaven is "above", and supernatural forces intervene in the course of events in the world. This view of myth stems from the outlook of the Enlightenment, and can be seen in Heyne, Eichhorn, and D. F. Strauss. The implication is that some inner content or message lies beneath the primitive linguistic form which hides it. The task of interpretation is, as it were, to extract the kernel from the husk. But if this really is Bultmann's view, it lies open to the kind of criticisms which are often brought against the ideational theory of meaning (→ above, 3 (b)). Exponents of the new hermeneutic are quick to make such criticisms on linguistic grounds (see E. Jüngel, *Paulus und Jesus*, 1962, 135–9). There is perhaps some truth in this criticism, but we should be cautious about charging Bultmann with being concerned only about "inner" concepts. It could be argued that he is looking, in effect, for the "deep structure" which lies beneath the surface-grammar of the NT (→ (c) iii, iv).

Even so, there remains too disparaging an attitude towards the linguistic forms used by the NT. Bultmann's proposals may be compared to the interpretation of a code. Once it has been interpreted, the original code may be discarded as irrelevant. But the interpretation of the NT, as I. Henderson suggests, is more like the interpretation of a masterpiece. The interpreter returns to the original again and again. The original remains indispensable.

(iii) It is also arguable that Bultmann has misunderstood the logic of self-involving language, and failed to notice that language may perform different functions at the same time. In a third statement about myth he declares, "The real purpose of myth is not to present an objective picture of the world as it is [*ein objektives Weltbild*] but to express man's understanding of himself" (*Kerygma and Myth*, I 10; Ger. 23). Thus the statement that God will judge the world must be interpreted not as a statement about a future event at the end of history, but as a summons to live responsibly in the present. But Bultmann's valid recognition that this is not simply a flat descriptive statement about a future event does not carry with it the corollary that its statement-function should be ignored. Very often self-involving statements (as J. L. Austin showed) may depend on certain states of affairs being true. Because of his extreme, almost obsessive, antipathy towards "objectification" in religious language, Bultmann ignores the basic fact that a stretch of language may perform more than one function. Much more could be said about Bultmann's proposals, but our concern here is only with their relation to certain views of language.

(b) The outlook of the new hermeneutic has close affinities with the view of language found in Martin Heidegger's later writings. Heidegger believes that in modern Western society, with its orientation towards the technological and merely functional, language has ceased to be truly creative. Men have been beguiled into settling into a form of thinking that is mere calculation, and language has become trivialized. He traces the origin of the malaise of language to its roots in the dualism of Plato, when the unity of Being was fragmented into a division between the "lower" world of the physical senses and the "higher" realm of thought. This reduces both art and language into mere tools for the expression of concepts. But truly creative and eventful language, Heidegger urges, should communicate not "concepts" but reality. He writes, "Language is not a mere tool at his (man's) disposal. Rather it is that event which disposes of the supreme possibility of human existence" (*Existence and Being*, 1968[3], 300). In accordance with the climate of modern technology, merely functional language, or "idle talk", fragments reality into self-contained "fields". By contrast, language which is grounded in Being "gathers all things up" (*On the Way to Language*, 1971, 108). A "world" is opened up, conveying a vision of reality which can be revealed to man not in the haste of his technological frenzy, but in quiet submissive composure (*Gelassenheit*), in silent meditative listening. Negatively, "Words and language are not mere wrappings in which things are packed for the commerce of those who write and speak. It is in words and language that things first come into being and are. For this reason the misuse of language in idle talk, in slogans and phrases, destroys our authentic relation to things" (*An Introduction to Metaphysics*, 1959, 13–14). Positively, "To know how to question means to know how to wait . . ." (206). We must "let language, from within language, speak to us" (*On the Way to Language*, 85). "Speaking is of itself a listening" (123).

E. Fuchs and G. Ebeling draw on this perspective in their approach to the NT.

Firstly, language does not merely convey concepts. The NT does not merely inform us *about* the love of Jesus, or *about* salvation; it conveys the reality of his love and salvation. Secondly, the language of the NT, especially the parables of Jesus, draws the hearer into a "world" in which he does not merely consider "ideas" as a detached observer; but feels the impact of the message deep down in his own nature. He is drawn over, as it were, to see reality with the eyes of Jesus. Thirdly, the language of Jesus is creative. It enlarges the horizons of the hearer, so that he is never the same man again. When language operates in this creative way, there occurs a language-event (*Sprachereignis; Wortgeschehen*). Tracing how the horizons of the hearer become one with those of Jesus, Fuchs makes much of the hermeneutical category of "common understanding" (*Einverständnis*). This is something prior to, and deeper than, conscious thought, and has close affinities with Gadamer's notion of "a common world". Thus man is not simply active subject, forcing language to express the concepts which he has already. Rather, he listens to language, so that "the truth has us ourselves as its object". "The text is not just a servant that transmits kerygmatic formulations, but rather a master that directs us into the language-context of our existence in which we exist 'before God' " (E. Fuchs, *Studies of the Historical Jesus*, 1964, 211).

The theory of language represented in Fuchs and Ebeling avoids some of the difficulties which we find in Bultmann. Fruitful use is made of certain aspects of Heidegger's thought and much can be learned from this approach. Nevertheless there is more than a hint of the view described above as that of word-magic (→ above, 1 (b), (c)). Moreover Fuchs is more successful in handling some parts of the NT (e.g. the parables) than others. I have discussed the value and the limitations of the new hermeneutic more fully elsewhere (A. C. Thiselton, "The New Hermeneutic" in I. H. Marshall, ed., *New Testament Interpretation*, 1977, 308–333).

(c) General linguistics has stimulated developments in biblical studies in at least four areas. (i) In 1961 James Barr drew on the insights of F. de Saussure and his successors in order to establish certain principles in the area of biblical exegesis and lexicography. In so doing, he exposed the weakness of many (though by no means all) of the contributions to *TDNT*. The three main principles which he takes up (all of which can be found in Saussure) are the priority of synchronic linguistics over diachrony; the structural nature of language; and the connexion between the structural approach and linguistic convention. Synchronic linguistics designates the study of language at a particular point in time; diachronic linguistics relates to its history, change, and development. Barr rightly attacks the tendency in many theological writings to arrive at conclusions about meaning on the basis of observations about word-history. We do not assume, for example, that the Eng. word "nice" basically means "ignorant", merely because it may be derived from the Lat. *nescius*, ignorant. Yet many biblical scholars attempt to describe the meaning of a term at a given point in time on the basis of an etymology perhaps long forgotten even by the biblical writer's own generation. Barr asserts, "The main point is that the etymology of a word is not a statement about its meaning but about its history" (*The Semantics of Biblical Language*, 1961, 109).

Barr also draws on the axiom in general linguistics that the word alone, quite apart from its rôle within a field or a particular speech-act, carries with it a series of meanings which it draws from a variety of quite different contexts. For example, in certain

contexts the NT word *ekklēsia*, church, may be used to mean "the body of Christ", "the bride of Christ", and so on. But it does not collect together all these meanings independently of how a particular context conditions its meaning. Thus it cannot be said to mean "bride of Christ" in *Matthew's* chapters on the church. Barr describes this fallacious assumption as "the illegitimate totality transfer" and warns us that it "leads to the distortion of the semantic contribution made by words in contexts" (218 and 233). On the basis of the rôle of convention in language (→ above, 1 (b), (c)), Barr also attacks writers such as T. Boman for drawing conclusions about the nature of "Hebrew thought" from accidental linguistic morphology (→ above, 2). I have discussed the value of Barr's approach more fully elsewhere (A. C. Thiselton, "Semantics and New Testament Interpretation", in I. H. Marshall, ed., *New Testament Interpretation*, 1977, 75–104).

(ii) Some writers have explored the methods of field semantics for biblical interpretation. J. F. A. Sawyer, for example, takes as his point of his departure the linguistic axioms which we have noted in connexion with Saussure and Barr (*Semantics in Biblical Research. New Methods of Defining Hebrew Words for Salvation*, 1972). We noted earlier how the semantic scope of a colour-word may depend on the range of other colour-words within the "field" from which alternative colour-words might be selected. Sawyer examines the field of Heb. words which relate to salvation. This is necessarily an exercise in Hebrew lexicography, since the study shows how the scope of the Heb. terms reciprocally condition one another in a way which does not necessarily correspond with particular Eng. words. Whilst this remains, in one sense, a word-study, Sawyer does not assume that the word is an autonomous or independent bearer of meaning. He adopts the viewpoint of J. Trier that meaning is best explored in relation to the whole field (→ 3 (a)). (On the relation of Sawyer's work to hermeneutics, → A. C. Thiselton, "The Semantics of Biblical Language as an Aspect of Hermeneutics", in *Faith and Thought*, 103, 1976, 108–20.)

(iii) There is a growing body of literature on theories and methods of Bible translation. As representative of current trends, we cite the work of E. A. Nida and C. R. Taber (*The Theory and Practice of Translation*, 1969). The new focus of interest in Bible translation, they argue, is no longer that of reproducing the grammatical structure or style of the original language, but concerns the horizons and response of the receptor, or the modern native reader. "Correctness" is no longer regarded as an abstract absolute concept, but is always relative to the receptor's needs and response. This approach presupposes a certain way of looking at language, and of the many observations which might be made about it, we select two.

First, a key distinction is made between the deep structure which underlies the stretch of language to be translated and the surface-grammar of both the source language and the receptor language. We may illustrate the point with reference to 1 Jn. 2:26 where the Gk. has "I have written this to you" (*tauta egrapsa hymin*). Traditionally the sentence "I have written this to you" would be said to represent the "correct" Eng. translation. But the NEB translates it "So much for (those who would mislead you)". This is because it is recognized that the words in the Gk. constituted a signal that the writer was moving on to a fresh topic. Hence the "correct" translation would be that which conveyed the underlying function of the phrase to a modern English reader. One method often advocated in this connexion is the back-

transformation of the Heb. and Gk. text into "kernels" which are then transformed again into a more appropriate surface-structure in the receptor language (see I. H. Marshall, ed., op. cit., 78, for "kernel").

Secondly, if this approach is adopted, translation is (more than ever) inseparable from interpretation, or hermeneutics. It is a matter of building bridges between the source and receptor languages, in which the translator has to make theological and even cultural *judgments*, no less than the interpreter. No doubt this calls for added caution in assessing the extent to which such re-structuring is always legitimate. Nevertheless, as soon as we abandon a theory of meaning which is based on some artificially mechanical concept of word-meaning and reference, the problem is, as a matter of *principle*, inescapable. General rules will not take care of every case. Thus many translators would perhaps agree that in cultures where snow, for example, is unknown, "very white" might be a "correct" translation of "white as snow". But probably few would follow J. B. Phillips in regarding "ill from some psychological disease" as a correct *translation* of "possessed by an evil spirit" (Lk. 13:11). Problems such as this cannot be solved by purely mechanical means and the reason for this lies in the nature of language.

(iv) The most recent application of linguistics to biblical studies occurs in the work of Erhardt Güttgemanns and his school. Güttgemanns stands on the borders between linguistics, structuralism, and hermeneutics. As in the case of the translation theory discussed above (→ above, iii) the principle of "transformation" is crucial to his programme. He accepts the basic axioms of linguistics from Saussure to Chomsky concerning such issues as the priority of synchrony over diachrony (→ above, i); the contrast between linguistic competence (or virtuality, *Virtualität*) and performance (or actuality, *Positivität*); and the fact that meaning of a text is not the mere aggregation of its elements. But the binary or "game-tree" principle, according to which (in linguistics) meaning is seen in terms of a choice between alternatives, is also related to the binary or game-tree principle in anthropological structuralism. Narratives and parables, for example, are said to embody a deep structure which lies under the surface of the text. The task of "generative poetics" (as Güttgemanns calls his approach) is to arrive at a theory of actions or rôles within the "generative" matrix (competence) that finds expression on the surface of the narrative or parable (performance). Güttgemanns' approach is highly complex, and cannot be described clearly within a short space. He himself claims to offer a radical alternative to traditional exegesis which takes adequate account of the nature of language for the first time. As yet, it is too soon to tell whether he can fully justify his enormous claims.

6. *Responsibility in the Use of Language.* (a) The biblical writers speak equally of the power of language and of the need for caution, even reticence, in its use. (i) "Death and life are in the power of the tongue" (Prov. 18:21). "The tongue of the wise brings healing" (12:18), and a good word may bring gladness (v. 25). Words may be edifying (10:21) and may bring forth solid and productive results (12:14). "A gentle tongue is a tree of life" (15:4). In the NT the speaking of words is bound up with the experience of salvation. Salvation entails verbal confession (Rom. 10:9); and men cannot believe in him "of whom they have never heard" (10:14) (→ above, 1 (a)). (ii) At the same time, men will be called to account for their idle words (Matt. 12:36). Cruel or clumsy words can be like the piercing of a sword (Prov. 12:18).

Flattery may ruinously inflate a man's self-esteem (29:5); and the speech of a wicked man spreads strife (16:27, 28). Hasty and thoughtless words are counter-productive: "The mind of the righteous ponders how to answer; but the mouth of the wicked pours out evil things" (15:28). Christians are urged to be slow to speak (Jas. 1:19). For the tongue can be like a fire that sets a whole forest ablaze, and can spread deadly poison (Jas. 3:5, 6, 8).

(b) Martin Heidegger (→ above, 5 (b)) reminds us that we receive language as a trust, which is not to be taken for granted and treated lightly. In our own day, speech is often trivialized and relativized. In mass advertizing and in the realm of social engineering we can be seduced by words which masquerade as descriptions, but which in practice express only value-judgments. One man may speak of a "problem drinker", where others may use the term "drunkard". One political commentator calls a man "unco-operative", where another expresses admiration that he "stands by his principles". If language is manipulated irresponsibly for questionable purposes, its currency wears thin, and it ceases to be able to bear the freight which we put upon it.

(c) A still more fundamental issue, however, is raised by Wittgenstein's observations about public criteria of meaning (→ above, 4 (c)). We have seen that the publicly observable attitudes and conduct of the Christian community form the necessary backing that gives currency to its language. "One learns the game by watching how others play". "Only in the stream of thought and life do words have meaning". The warning against "idle words" (Matt. 12:36) refers not to the uttering of social pleasantries (which indeed have social value) but to words that are ineffective because they have no backing in practical conduct. Empty promises, vain intentions, or smooth blandishments fall into this category. Words that merely chase other words give rise to a circularity and a relativism that have no anchorage in reality. To cite one of Kierkegaard's similes, it is as if a shop sign which promises "Trousers Pressed Here" turns out, after all, to be displayed not by a cleaner's, but only by a shop which sells shop signs. Or to cite a simile from Wittgenstein, it is as if a man says, "I know how tall I am", and puts his hand on top of his head to prove it. Even the praises of the Christian community must be grounded in attitudes and acts which give them valid linguistic currency. By contrast with our frequent human failures, Jesus Christ fully embodied and lived out "the word made flesh". Jesus did not simply talk about humility; he took a towel and washed the disciples' feet. He did not only talk about sacrifice; he was actually crucified. He did not merely speak words about forgiveness and new life; he actually gave men forgiveness and new life. The language of Jesus is both intelligible and effective because it is grounded in life and in practical action. The Christian community is called to accept that same responsibility for the language which it speaks (→ Truth). *A. C. Thiselton*

→ Creation, → Explain, → Pentecost, → Revelation, → Scripture, → Spirit, → Truth

On *glōssa*, *logos* and *rhēma*:
(a). P. R. Ackroyd, "The Vitality of the Word of God in the Old Testament", *ASTI* 1, 1962, 7–23; A. B. D. Alexander, "The Johannine Doctrine of the Logos", *ExpT* 36, 1924–25, 394 ff., 467 ff.; B. W. Anderson, ed., *The Old Testament and the Christian Faith*, 1963; K. Barth, *The Word of God and the Word of Man*, 1928; "The Doctrine of the Word of God", *CD* I, 1 and 2; F. W. Beare, "Speaking with Tongues", *JBL* 83, 1964, 229 ff.; J. Behm, *glōssa*, *TDNT* I 719–27; E. Best, "The Interpretation of Tongues", *SJT* 28, 1975, 45–62; O. Betz, *phōnē* etc., *TDNT* IX 278–309; T. Boman, *Hebrew Thought*

Compared with Greek, 1960; G. Bornkamm, "God's Word and Man's Word in the New Testament", in *Early Christian Experience*, 1969, 1–13; and *Paul*, 1971; W. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos: A History of the Belief in Christ from the Beginnings of Christianity to Irenaeus*, 1970; R. E. Brown, "The Word", in *The Gospel according to John, Anchor Bible*, I, 1966, 519–24; R. Bultmann, "The Concept of the Word of God in the New Testament", in *Faith and Understanding*, I, 1969, 286–312; *Theology of the New Testament*, I–II, 1952–55; and *The Gospel of John*, 1971; C. Colpe, *ho hyios tou anthrōpou*, *TDNT* VIII 400–77; and "New Testament and Gnostic Christology", in *Religions in Antiquity. Essays in Memory of E. R. Goodenough*, 1968, 227 ff.; H. Conzelmann, *An Outline Theology of the New Testament*, 1969; M. Dahood, "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography I", *Biblica* 44, 1963, 289–303; G. Dalman, *The Words of Jesus Considered in the Light of Post-Biblical Jewish Writings and the Aramaic Language*, 1902; A. Debrunner, H. Kleinknecht, O. Procksch and G. Kittel, *legō, logos, rhēma*, etc., *TDNT* IV 69–143; C. H. Dodd, *The Bible and the Greeks*, 1935; and *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, 1953, 263–85, 292–96, 318–32; E. R. Dodds, "Supernormal Phenomena in Classical Antiquity", in *The Ancient Concept of Progress and Other Essays on Greek Literature and Belief*; G. Ebeling, *Word and Faith*, 1963; A. Ehrhardt, *The Beginning: A Study in the Greek Philosophical Approach to the Concept of Creation from Anaximander to St John*, 1968; A. Ehrmann, "A Note on the Verb *'āmar*", *JQR* 55, 1964–65, 166 ff.; W. Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament*, I–II, 1961–67; and *Ezekiel*, 1970; A. T. Hanson, *Studies in the Pastoral Epistles*, 1966; J. R. Harris, *The Origin of the Prologue to St. John's Gospel*, 1917; and "Athena, Sophia and the Logos", *BJRL* 7, 1922, 56–72; W. Jaeger, *Paideia: The Ideals of Greek Culture*, I–II, 1944–45; A. N. Jannaris, "St. John's Gospel and the Logos", *ZNW* 2, 1901, 13–25; J. Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, 1963 [2]; and *New Testament Theology*, I, 1971; E. Käsemann, "The Structure and Purpose of the Prologue to John's Gospel", in *New Testament Questions of Today*, 1969, 138–67; D. H. Kelsey, *The Uses of Scripture in Recent Theology*, 1975; L. Koehler, *Old Testament Theology*, 1957; I. M. Lewis, *Ecstatic Religion*, 1971; G. F. Moore, "Intermediaries in Jewish Theology: Memra, Shekinah, Metatron", *HTR* 15, 1922, 41–55; M. Noth, *The Laws in the Pentateuch and Other Studies*, 1966; G. von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, I–II, 1962–65; *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays*, 1966; and *Studies in Deuteronomy*, *SBT* 9, 1953; H. Ringgren, *Word and Wisdom*, 1947; W. J. Samarin, *The Tongues of Men and of Angels*, 1972; R. Schnackenburg, *The Gospel According to St John*, I, 1968; E. Schweizer, *The Good News According to Mark*, 1970; M. J. Suggs, "The Word is Near You: Romans 10:6–10 within the Purpose of the Letter", in W. R. Farmer, C. F. D. Moule and R. R. Niebuhr, eds., *Christian History and Interpretation. Studies Presented to John Knox*, 1967, 289–312; J. P. M. Sweet, "A Sign for Unbelievers: Paul's Attitude to Glossolalia", *NTS* 13, 1966–67, 240–57; M. F. Unger, *New Testament Teaching on Tongues*, 1971; G. Vos, "The Range of the Logos Title in the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel", *Princeton Theological Review* 11, 1913, 365 ff., 557 ff.; S. Wagner, *'āmar* etc., *TDOT* I 328–45; F. E. Walton, *The Development of the Logos Doctrine in Greek and Hebrew Thought*, 1911; A. J. M. Wedderburn, "Romans 8:26 – Towards a Theology of Glossolalia", *SJT* 28, 1975, 369–77; C. Westermann, *The Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech*, 1967; C. Westermann, ed., *Essays on Old Testament Hermeneutics*, 1963; H. W. Wolff, *Hosea, Hermeneia*, 1974; W. Zimmerli, *The Law and the Prophets: A Study of the Meaning of the Old Testament*, 1965.

(b). J. d'Alma, *Philon d'Alexandrie et le Quatrième Évangile*, 1910; C. Andresen, *Logos und Kosmos*, 1955; F. Ast, *Lexicon Platonicum*, 1835; R. Asting, *Die Verkündigung des Wortes Gottes im Urchristentum*, 1939; W. Bacher, *Die exegetische Terminologie der jüdischen Traditionsliteratur*, II, 1905, 206 f.; K. Balzer, *Ezechiel und Deuterojesaja*, *BZAW* 121, 1971; J. Begrich, "Das priesterliche Heilsorakel", *ZAW* 52, 1934, 81 ff. (reprinted in *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament*, *ThB* 21, 1964, 214 ff.); E. Ben Jehuda, *Millon Ha-Laschon Ha-'Ibrith*, 1959 [2]; E. Bréhier, *Les Idées philosophiques et religieuses de Philon d'Alexandrie*, 1925 [2], 83–111; R. Bultmann, "Die Bedeutung der neuerschlossenen mandäischen und manichäischen Quellen für das Verständnis des Johannes-Evangeliums", *ZNW* 24, 1925, 100 ff.; C. Colpe, "Worte Jesu", *BHHW* III 2184 ff.; R. Deichgräber, *Gotteshymnus und Christushymnus in der frühen Christenheit*, *StUNT* 5, 1967; G. Eichholz, *Tradition und Interpretation*, *ThB* 29, 1965; L. Dürr, *Die Wertung des göttlichen Wortes im Alten Testament und im antiken Orient*, *Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-(Ägyptisch)en Gesellschaft*, 42, 1, 1938; W. Eltester, "Der Logos und sein Prophet", in *Apophoreta*, Festschrift E. Haenchen, 1964, 109 ff.; G. Gerlemann, *dāḇar*, *THAT* I 433–44; H. Gese, "Psalm 22 und das Neue Testament", *ZTK* 65, 1968, 1 ff.; O. Grether, *Name und Wort Gottes im Alten Testament*, *BZAW* 64, 1934; M. D. Gross, *'Oṣar- Ha-'Aggadah*, 1961; R. H. Grützmacher, *Wort und Geist. Eine historische und dogmatische Untersuchung*, 1902; H. Guitert, *Von der Spache der Götter und Geister*, 1921; K. Haacker, "Das Pfingstwunder als

exegetisches Problem", in O. Böcher and K. Haacker, eds., *Verborum Veritas. Festschrift für Gustav Stählin*, 1970, 125–32; F. Häussermann, *Wortempfang und Symbol in der alttestamentlichen Prophetie*, *BZAW* 58, 1932; P. Heinisch, *Das "Wort" im Alten Testament und im Alten Orient*, 1922; V. Hamp, *Der Begriff "Wort" in den aramäischen Bibelübersetzungen. Ein exegetischer Beitrag zum Hypostasen-Problem und zur Geschichte der Logos-Spekulationen*, 1938; E. Haenchen, "Probleme des johanneischen 'Prologs' ", in *Gott und Mensch. Gesammelte Aufsätze*, 1965, 114–43; J. Jeremias, "Kennzeichen der Ipsissima Vox Jesu", in *Synoptische Studien. A. Wikenhauser Zum 70. Geburtstag*, 1954, 86 ff. (reprinted in *Abba*, 1966, 145 ff.); *Der Prolog des Johannes-Evangeliums*, *Calwer Hefte* 88, 1967; and "Zum Logos-Problem", *ZNW* 59, 1968, 82 ff.; E. Jüngel, "Jesu Wort und Jesus als Wort Gottes", in *Parrhesia. Karl Barth zum 80. Geburtstag*, 1966, 82 ff.; W. Kelber, *Der Logos-Lehre von Heraklit bis Origenes*, 1958; C. A. Keller, "Wort", *BHHW* III 2182 ff.; K. Koch, "Wort und Einheit des Schöpfergottes in Memphis und Jerusalem", *ZTK* 62, 1965, 251 ff.; E. König, *Der Offenbarungsbegriff des Alten Testaments*, 1882; E. Krebs, *Der Logos als Heiland*, 1910; M. J. Lagrange, "Vers le Logos de St. Jean", *RB* 32, 1923, 161 ff., 321 ff.; H. Leisegang, "Logos", Pauly-Wissowa, XIII 1035–81; J. Lindblom, "Die Vorstellung vom Sprechen Jahwes zu den Menschen im Alten Testament", *ZAW* 75, 1963, 263 ff.; E. Lohse, "Deus dixit", *EvTh* 25, 1965, 567 ff.; and "Ich aber sage euch", in E. Lohse, ed., *Der Ruf Jesu und die Antwort der Gemeinde. Exegetische Untersuchungen Joachim Jeremias zum 70. Geburtstag*, 1970, 189–203; E. Lombard, *De la Glossolalie chez les Premiers Chrétiens*, 1910; E. Mosiman, *Das Zungenreden geschichtlich und psychologisch untersucht*, 1910; G. Neumann, H.-G. Gadamer, J. Slok, T. Bonhoeffer, "Sprache", *RGG* [3] VI 263 ff.; G. Pfeiffer, *Ursprung und Wesen der Hypostasenvorstellung im Judentum*, 1967; G. Quell, *Wahre und falsche Propheten*, *BFChTh* 46, 1, 1952; E. Repo, *Der Begriff rhēma im Biblisch-Griechischen*, i–II, 1951–54; F. Rundgren, "Hebräisch *bāṣār* 'Golderz' und *'āmar* 'sagen'. Zwei Etymologien", *Orientalia* 32, 1963, 178–83; H. Rust, *Das Zungenreden*, 1924; E. Sachsse, "Die Logoslehre bei Philo und bei Johannes", *Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift* 15, 1904, 747–67; E. Schaeder, *Das Wort Gottes*, 1930; K. H. Schelkle, "Das Wort Gottes in der Kirche", *ThQ* 133, 1953, 278 ff.; H. Schlier, "Im Anfang war das Wort. Zum Problem des Johannes-Evangeliums", in *Die Zeit der Kirche*, I, 1956, 274 ff.; and *Wort Gottes*, 1962 [2]; H. H. Schmid, *'āmar*, *THAT* I 211–16; R. Schnackenburg, "Logos-Hymnus und johanneischer Prolog", *BZ* 1, 1957, 69 ff.; E. Schweizer, "Aufnahme und Korrektur jüdischer Sophiatheologie im Neuen Testament", in *Neotestamentica. Deutsche und englische Aufsätze*, 1963 [2], 110 ff.; I. P. Seierstad, *Die Offenbarungserlebnisse der Propheten Amos, Jesaja und Jeremia*, *Skrifter utgitt av Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo, Historisk-filosofisk klasse* 2, 1946; I. P. Seierstad, G. Harder and U. Mann, "Wort Gottes", *EKL* III 1846 ff.; J. Stenzel, "Sokrates", Pauly-Wissowa, II, 5, 811–90; and "Zur Theorie des Logos bei Aristoteles", *Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte der Mathematik*, I, 1931, 34 ff.; J. Szeruda, *Das Wort Jahwes*, (Dissertation, Basel) 1921; W. Vollrath, *Das Problem des Wortes*, 1925; H. W. Wolff, "Die Begründung der prophetischen Heils- und Unheilsprüche", *ZAW* 52, 1934, 1 ff. (reprinted in *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament*, *ThB* 22, 1964, 9–35); "Das Zitat im Prophetenspruch", *BEvTh* 4, 1937 (reprinted in op. cit., 36–129); "Hauptprobleme alttestamentlicher Prophetie", *EvTh* 15, 1955, 446 ff. (reprinted in op. cit., 206–31); "Das Geschichtsverständnis der alttestamentlichen Prophetie", *EvTh* 20, 1960, 218 ff. (reprinted in op. cit., 289–307); and *Dodekapropheton*, *BKAT* XIV/1–2, 1965–1969; W. Zimmerli, O. A. Piper, C. Andresen, W. Loew, and W. Jannasch, "Wort Gottes", *RGG* [3] VI 1809 ff.; W. Zimmerli, "Das Gotteswort des Ezechiel", *ZTK* 48, 1951, 249 ff. (reprinted in *Gottes Offenbarung*, *ThB* 19, 1963, 133 ff.); "Verheissung und Erfüllung", *EvTh* 12, 1952–53, 34 ff. (reprinted in *Probleme alttestamentlicher Hermeneutik*, *ThB* 11, 1960, 69 ff.); *Das Alte Testament als Anrede*, *BEvTh* 24, 1956; and *Ezechiel*, *BKAT* XIII, 1969.

On *Language, Meaning and Religion*:

(a). W. P. Alston, *Philosophy of Language*, 1964; Karl-Otto Apel, *Analytic Philosophy of Language and the Geisteswissenschaften*, 1967; A. J. Ayer, *Language, Truth and Logic*, 1946 [2]; J. L. Austin, *How to Do Things with Words*, 1971[2]; I. G. Barbour, *Myths, Models and Paradigms. The Nature of Scientific and Religious Language*, 1974; James Barr, *The Semantics of Biblical Language*, 1961; and "Common Sense and Biblical Language" in *Biblica*, 49, 1968, 377–87; H. W. Bartsch, ed., *Kerygma and Myth*, 1962 and 1964; Max Black, "Linguistic Relativity: The Views of Benjamin Lee Whorf", *Philosophical Review* 68, 1959, 228–38; *Models and Metaphors*, 1962; and *The Labyrinth of Language*, 1968; M. Black (ed.), *The Importance of Language*, 1962; R. B. Braithwaite, *An Empiricist's View of the Nature of Religious Belief*, 1955; R. L. Brown, *Wilhelm von Humboldt's Conception of Linguistic Relativity*, 1967; P. van Buren, *The Edges of Language*, 1972; E. Cassirer, *Language and Myth*, 1946; C. E. Caton, *Philosophy and Ordinary Language*, 1963; N. Chomsky, *Syntactic*

Structure, 1957; *Current Issues in Linguistic Theory*, 1964; and *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*, 1965; D. Crystal, *Linguistics, Language and Religion*, 1965; and *Linguistics* 1971; G. Ebeling, *Word and Faith*, 1963, and *Introduction to a Theological Theory of Language*, 1973; D. D. Evans, *The Logic of Self-Involvement*, 1963; A. Flew and A. MacIntyre, eds., *New Essays in Philosophical Theology*, 1955, 96–130; J. A. Fodor and J. J. Katz, eds., *The Structure of Language. Readings in the Philosophy of Language*, 1964; E. C. Fudge, "Language, Revelation and Illumination", *SJT* 26, 1973, 1–23; R. W. Funk, *Language, Hermeneutic and Word of God*, 1966; H.-G. Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, 1975; and "The Problem of Language in Schleiermacher's Hermeneutics", in *Journal for Theology and the Church* 7, 1970, 68–95; E. Gellner, *Words and Things*, 1968; E. Güttgemanns, "Generative Poetics", *Semeia* 6, 1976, 1–220; S. I. Hayakawa, *Language in Thought and Action*, 1965; M. Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 1962, 195–214; *An Introduction to Metaphysics*, 1959; *On the Way to Language*, 1971; and *Poetry, Language and Thought*, 1971; R. S. Heimbeck, *Theology and Meaning*, 1969; D. M. High, *Language, Persons and Belief*, 1967; W. Hordern, *Speaking of God: The Nature and Purpose of Theological Language*, 1965; A. Jeffner, *The Study of Religious Language*, 1972; O. R. Jones, ed., *The Private Language Argument*, 1971; M. Joos, "Semantic Axiom Number One", *Language*, 48, 1972, 258–65; R. H. King, *The Meaning of God*, 1973; J. Knox, *Myth and Truth. An Essay in the Language of Faith*, 1966; S. Laeuchli, *The Language of Faith. An Introduction to the Semantic Dilemma of the Early Church*, 1965; John Lyons, *Structural Semantics: An Analysis of Part of the Vocabulary of Plato*, 1963; *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*, 1968; and *Chomsky*, 1970; J. Macquarrie, *God-Talk. An Examination of the Language and Logic of Theology*, 1967; E. L. Mascall, *Words and Images*, 1957; C. W. K. Mundle, *A Critique of Linguistic Philosophy*, 1970; E. A. Nida, "The Implications of Contemporary Linguistics for Biblical Scholarship", *JBL* 91, 1972, 73–89; E. A. Nida and C. R. Taber, *The Theory and Practice of Translation*, 1969; C. K. Ogden and I. A. Richards, *The Meaning of Meaning*, 1930 [2]; N. Perrin, *Jesus and the Language of the Kingdom*, 1976; I. T. Ramsey, *Religious Language. An Empirical Placing of Theological Phrases*, 1957; *Models and Mystery*, 1964; and *Christian Discourse*, 1965; R. H. Robins, *General Linguistics*, 1964; R. Rorty, ed., *The Linguistic Turn: Recent Essays in Philosophical Method*, 1967; *Royal Institute of Philosophy Lectures – II, Talk of God*, 1969; F. de Saussure, *Course in General Linguistics*, 1960; J. F. A. Sawyer, *Semantics in Biblical Research: New Methods of Defining Hebrew Words for Salvation*, *SBT* 24, 1972; L. Alonso Schökel, *The Inspired Word: Scripture in the Light of Language and Literature*, 1967; J. R. Searle, *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*, 1969; A. C. Thiselton, "The Supposed Power of Words in the Biblical Writings", *JTS* New Series 25, 1974; 283–99, *Language, Liturgy and Meaning*, 1975; "Myth, Mythology", *ZPEB* IV 333–43; "The Semantics of Biblical Language as an Aspect of Hermeneutics", *Faith and Thought*, 103, 1976, 108–14; "Semantics and New Testament Interpretation" and "The New Hermeneutic" in I. H. Marshall, ed., *New Testament Interpretation*, 1977, 75–104 and 308–33; S. Ullmann, *The Principles of Semantics*, 1957 [2]; and *Semantics. An Introduction to the Science of Meaning*, 1962; W. M. Urban, *Language and Reality*, 1939; F. Waismann, *The Principles of Linguistic Philosophy*, 1965; P. Wheelwright, *Metaphor and Reality*, 1962; B. L. Whorf, *Language, Thought and Reality: Selected Writings*, 1956; A. N. Wilder, *Early Christian Rhetoric: The Language of the Gospel*, 1964; L. Wittgenstein, *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*, (1922) 1961; *Philosophical Grammar*, 1974; *The Blue and Brown Books* 1969 [2]; *Philosophical Investigations*, 1968[3]; *Zettel*, 1967; P. Ziff, *Semantic Analysis*, 1960.

(b). Karl-Otto Apel, "Wittgenstein und das Problem des hermeneutischen Vertehen", *ZTK* 63, 1966, 49–87; H. E. Berkle, *Semantik. Eine Einführung in die sprachwissenschaftliche Bedeutungslehre*, 1972; K. Bühler, *Sprachtheorie. Die Darstellungsfunktion der Sprache*, 1934; L. Dürr, *Die Wertung des göttlichen Wortes im Alten Testament und im antiken Orient*, 1938; E. Fuchs, *Hermeneutik*, 1970 [4]; and *Marburger Hermeneutik*, 1968; A. Grabner-Haider, *Semiotik und Theologie. Religiöse Rede zwischen analytischer und hermeneutischer Philosophie*, 1973; E. Güttgemanns, "Linguistische Probleme in der Theologie", *Linguistische Berichte* 8, 1970, 18–20; *Studia Linguistica Neotestamentica*, 1971; C. Hartlich and W. Sachs, *Der Ursprung des Mythosbegriffes in der modernen Bibelwissenschaft*, 1952; M. Heidegger, *Wegmarken*, 1967; H. Jaeger, *Heidegger und die Sprache*, 1971; E. Jüngel, *Paulus und Jesus*, (1962) 1967; R. Kieffer, *Essais de méthodologie néotestamentaire*, 1972; K. Otte, *Das Sprachverständnis bei Philo von Alexandrien, Sprache als Mittel der Hermeneutik*, 1968; F. de Saussure, *Cours de linguistique générale*, (Édition critique) 1967; F. D. E. Schleiermacher, *Hermeneutik*, (ed. H. Kimmerle) 1959; H. Steinthal, *Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft bei Griechen und Römern*, 1890 and 1961.

Work, Do, Accomplish

ἐργάζομαι

ἐργάζομαι (*ergazomai*), to labour, be active, work, bring about; ἔργον (*ergon*), deed, action, achievement, work, thing, matter; ἐργασία (*ergasia*), work, practice, business; ἐργάτης (*ergatēs*), someone who does something, workman; ἐνέργεια (*energeia*), working, operation, action; ἐνεργέω (*energeō*), to work, be at work, be active, effect something; ἐνεργής (*energēs*), active, effective, powerful; ἐνέργημα (*energēma*), activity, experience; εὐεργεσία (*euergesia*), kindness, a good deed, well-doing; εὐεργετέω (*euergeteō*), do work, benefit, show kindnesses; εὐεργέτης (*euergetēs*), benefactor; συνεργός (*synergos*), working together with, a colleague, fellow-worker, assistant; συνεργέω (*synergeō*), to work together, co-operate, aid, further.

CL 1. (a) The vb. *ergazomai*, which is a cognate of the noun *ergon*, has in the intrans. the basic meaning to work, to be engaged on something. Used trans. (linked, for instance, with *ergon*), it means to create, to produce, to perform and also to process (e.g. a raw material).

(b) *ergon* denotes from Mycenean Gk. onwards a deed, an action, by contrast either with inactivity or a mere word. It can refer to a specific occupational or official activity (e.g. agriculture or the military profession), and means in certain cases achievement, work; it is finally encountered with the weakened meaning of thing, matter. In the plur. *ergon* can also mean history.

(c) *ergasia* has a similar, if rather more limited, meaning; it can mean labour, occupation, arrangement, work (especially cultural) or business.

(d) The noun *ergatēs* generally indicates someone who does something, or else it means a worker as the member of a class (frequently a slave) or of a occupational group (in particular farm-labourers).

Whereas the vb. *ergazomai* and the noun *ergon* with the above basic meanings can be found from Mycenean times, Homer and Hesiod in cl. Gk., *ergasia* is first found in Pindar, and *ergatēs* only in the 5th cent. B.C. (the tragedians and Hdt.).

(e) *energeia* is found in the Pre-Socratics to denote activity. It is translated by activity, effectiveness, force. *energeō* accordingly means intrans. to be active, to be at work; trans. to effect or to do something. *energēs* is a later allied form (Aristotle onwards) of the adj. *energos*, active, effective. *energēma* is that which is effected, a deed.

While the word-group frequently serves in Hellenism and in Philo to describe cosmic and physical forces, *energeia* in the LXX (as in the NT) is used "almost exclusively for the work of divine or demonic powers" (G. Bertram, *TDNT* II 652). The word occurs only in 2 Macc. 3:29; 3 Macc. 4:21; 5:12, 28; Wis. 7:17, 26; 13:4; 18:22. *energeō* occurs only at Num. 8:24; 1 Esd. 2:20; Prov. 21:6; 31:12; Wis. 15:11; 16:17; Isa. 41:4.

(f) Also belonging to the main word-group under consideration are the words *euergesia*, good deed, well-doing, the vb. *euergeteō*, to do good, and the noun *euergetēs*. *euergesia* is already found in Homer; the vb. *euergeteō* is found in the tragedians, and *euergetēs* from Pindar onwards. *euergetēs* acquired in the world of Hellenism and Roman culture the significance of an honorary title which is given to deserving men, especially kings.

(g) *synergos* (Pindar onwards) denotes a colleague, a fellow-worker, an assistant.

From this the vb. *synergeō* is formed (Eur. onwards) meaning to work together, co-operate, aid, to further.

2. Already in Hesiod, work is described as having moral value; "through labour [*ex ergōn*] men become rich in herds and well-to-do. Those who work are much preferred by the immortal gods. Labour is by no means a disgrace, but laziness is a disgrace" (*Works* 307 ff.). Man shows himself fit by his *ergon*. One can understand from this how in Xenophon an expression speaks of *gignōskein*, recognizing a man *ek tōn ergōn*, by or in his works. In Plato (*Politicus* 352d–353e) *ergon* appears closely related to → virtue (*aretē*). This connexion is systematically unfolded in Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*: it is the task of *aretē* to bring to perfection the *ergon* (e.g.) of an organ (such as the seeing of an eye). The ethical value of particular deeds or accomplishments, *erga*, is frequently expressed by predicates such as *kala*, lovely, *agatha*, good, or negative ones like *kaka*, bad, *adika*, unjust, *ponēra*, evil.

OT In the LXX the word group is employed with the whole range of meaning of the cl. Gk. usages, serving with especial frequency to translate the Heb. words *'āśâh*, to do, to make, *pā'al*, to make, to do, and *'ābaḏ*, to work, to serve. Synonyms for *ergon* are provided by the word groups associated with → *poieō* and (more rarely) → *prassō*. What is new over against cl. Gk. is conditioned by Israel's particular faith in God.

1. *ergon* is thus used right at the beginning of the LXX to describe the work of the divine Creator (Gen. 2:2 f.). In the case of God's deed which takes place by means of a word (cf. 2 Esd. 4[6]:38, 43), the above-mentioned impression of an opposition between word and work can naturally not arise. In this connexion, although the phrase (*erga cheirōn sou*, "the works of thy hands") is frequently found to denote the work of the Creator, which embraces heaven, earth and men, the sing. *ergon* is found more often (e.g. Pss. 8:4, 7; 90[89]:16; 138[137]:8; Job 14:15; Isa. 29:23; cf. Heb. 1:10; 3:4). In the same way, *ergon* stands for God's works over and above the creation, and it then principally means the acts of Yahweh in history, through which he demonstrates to Israel his covenant-faithfulness (cf. e.g. the quotation from Ps. 95[94]:9 in Heb. 3:9). Hence, the term *ergon* now and then comes to mean miracle (e.g. Deut. 11:3; Sir. 48:14). God's deed, however, means not only preservation and salvation, but also judgment (e.g. Isa. 28:21; cf. Acts 13:41).

2. When *ergon* relates to the doings of human beings, it is able, within the compass of the LXX, to give expression especially to three major theological ideas.

(a) In most places where the word-group occurs, it has a positive meaning, namely, when it is used for the purpose of describing man's accomplishment of a task laid on him by God (cf. Gen. 2:15). Cultic actions, such as temple service and the offering of → sacrifices, appear as deeds of religious worth (cf. Num. 8:11). But also in everyday life that work is judged positively which demonstrates itself to be obedient fulfilment of the divine will, of the → law (cf. Exod. 20:9 f. and Deut. 5:13 f., where in the context of the Decalogue a significant alternation of work and rest is ordained). This applies as much to one's ordinary sphere of work (cf. Deut. 2:7; 14:29; Job 1:10; Ps. 90[89]:17) as to particular acts of obedience (e.g. Neh. 13:14, a work of love; Ps. 15:2, righteousness; Zeph. 2:3; cf. Pss. 7:4 f.; 18:21 ff.).

(b) In conjunction with the story of the Fall, *ergon* characterizes work as trouble, a burden and a curse (cf. Gen. 3:17 ff.; 4:12; 5:29; Deut. 26:6). This idea is par-

ticularly alive in Hellenistic Judaism where man's works are seen as essentially sinful (1 Esd. 4:37; 2 Esd. 7:119; Syr. Bar. 48:38; 54:2; *TDNT* II 644 f.).

(c) In other places in the LXX, the word *ergon* – perhaps influenced by Hellenistic Judaism – has the meaning of a bad, reprehensible deed which brings separation from God, i.e. of → sin (cf. e.g. Job 11:11; 21:16; 24:14). It is not so much here a matter of a particular wicked act but the sinful nature of actions which are alienated from God (cf. e.g. Prov. 11:18). God sees through the works of such people who, when it is dark (Isa. 29:15), are actively godless or lawless; "He shatters the mighty without investigation" (Job 34:25), for "their works are works of iniquity" (Isa. 59:6). The resultant negative assessment of human action "takes on a radically theological character in the NT" (*TDNT* II 645).

3. In Judaism, in particular, the view of works necessary for the fulfilment of the law and therefore for → righteousness (*dikaiosynē*) is developed and consolidated. The way to godliness is casuistically prescribed for the Jew by a multiplicity of regulations for the performance of the → law. There were, for example, the → Sabbath laws or the prescriptions for ritual cleansing with which Jesus and his disciples came into conflict. But since not everyone followed this path in all its details, a distinction was made between the righteous man and the average devout person (notably in Syr. Bar. and 2 Esd.). Eschatological intensification is given to this distinction (but cf. already Isa. 3:10 f.) by the notion of → reward and punishment related to the divine → judgment. One day God will recompense men according to their deeds. The godless will then receive their punishment, whereas the righteous can die without fear, for in God's sight they have "a store of works preserved in treasuries" (Syr. Bar. 14:12; cf. Matt. 6:20; Lk. 12:33; 1 Tim. 6:19). There are also isolated utterances, which anticipate the teaching of Lk. 17:10, such as Aboth 1:3: "Be not like slaves that minister to the master for the sake of receiving a bounty, but like slaves that minister to the master not for the sake of receiving a bounty; and let the fear of Heaven be upon you." But even these are not capable of erasing the impression of a firmly-stamped theology of works-righteousness.

At the same time, Judaism was also aware of God's acts. Praise of the works of the Creator had particular significance, but God's saving acts in history and in the last days were also praised (e.g. in the hymns of Qumran).

NT *ergazomai*, to labour, be active, bring about, work, occurs in the NT 41 times (18 in Paul), *ergon*, work, 169 times (Paul 68 times, including the Pastorals 20; Jn. 27; Rev. 29; Jas. 15; Matt. 6; Mk. and Lk. twice each; Heb. 9; Acts 10; 1 and 2 Pet. twice each; the Johannine letters 5; and Jude once), *ergasia*, business, 6 times (4 in Acts and once each in Lk. and Eph.), and *ergatēs*, workman, 16 times (Synoptics 10 times; 4 times in Acts; and once each in Jn. and Jas.). The basic meanings of the word-group in the NT correspond to those mentioned above in CL 1. Rev. 18:7 is noteworthy: to work the sea means to navigate. *ergon* stands alongside both *logos* (→ word; e.g. in Lk. 24:19; Acts 7:22; 2 Thess. 2:17; 2 Cor. 10:11), and also *boulē* (plan, intention; Acts 5:38). As a designation of the actions of the believer, *ergon* can be used synonymously with *karpos*, → fruit. The expressions *ergon* or *ergazesthai*, to work a work (e.g. Matt. 26:10 par. Mk. 14:6; Jn. 3:21; 6:28; 9:4; Acts 13:41; 1 Cor. 16:10) are common. As synonyms, there are *ergon* and the plur. *erga poiein*, to do a work (Matt. 23:3, 5; Jn. 5:36; 7:21; 8:31; 10:37; 14:10, 12; 15:24; 2 Tim. 4:5; 3 Jn.

10; Rev. 2:5; cf. Jas. 1:25, *poiētēs*), and in one place *erga prassein* (Acts 26:20).

1. (a) In the Synoptic Gospels theological usage of the word-group can be detected. *ergazesthai* denotes activity in a quite general sense (cf. Lk. 13:14; Matt. 21:28, in the vineyard), the performing of some work (e.g. Matt. 26:10 par. Mk. 14:6, the anointing at Bethany). There is a distinct nuance in the meaning of *ergasia* in Lk. 12:58, where it is best translated by "make an effort" (RSV, NEB). The relatively commonly used *ergatēs* denotes (in accordance with its natural sense) someone who works for wages (Matt. 20:1, 2, 8), then a witness standing in Christ's service and sent into the world (Matt. 9:37 f. par. Lk. 10:2), but also an evil-doer, *ergatēs adikias*, who will not stand in the judgment (Lk. 13:27; cf. Matt. 7:23). Whereas the Pharisees are censured by Jesus for doing their works "in order to be seen by men" (Matt. 23:5), the deed of the woman who anointed him is called an *ergon kalon*, a lovely act, Matt. 26:10 par. Mk. 14:6; and the disciples are enjoined, "Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works and give glory to your Father who is in heaven" (Matt. 5:16; cf. 1 Pet. 2:12). The Synoptics certainly stress that man has no legal claims before God to any particular remuneration for his deeds (cf. Lk. 17:10; Matt. 20:1–16); but they put the challenging question as to the fruits of faith quite clearly. W. Joest goes so far as to say: "Synoptic paraenesis frees the work of the disciple from the *securitas* of the pride of merit, but not from the fear of winning or losing salvation" (*Gesetz und Freiheit*, 1961[3], 160).

ergon is related to the work of Christ in Matt. 11:2 and Lk. 24:19, where it embraces his effective working in deed and word.

(b) In John's Gospel the word group is specifically used to illustrate the unique activity of Jesus, which is inextricably bound up with the working of God, the Father, as (e.g.) Jn. 5:17 bears witness: "My Father is working still, and I am working too" (cf. Jn. 4:34; 17:4). Jesus understands his working as the fulfilment of his divinely-appointed mission (cf. Jn. 9:4; 5:36; 10:25), which aims to awake faith in the One who has been sent as the Revealer of God (cf. Jn. 6:29). Jesus' miracles also serve this end (→ Miracle, art. *sēmeion*; Jn. 14:11; cf. 10:25). In the revelatory work of Jesus, which is also "the work of the Judge" (R. Bultmann, *The Gospel of John*, 1971, 246), the spirits divide (cf. Jn. 3:19–21; 15:24); the unbeliever now no longer has any excuse for his sin (Jn. 15:22 ff.). The believer, on the other hand, is given the promise that he will do even greater works than Jesus (Jn. 14:12). Works done "in God" (*en theō*; Jn. 3:21) contrast with *erga ponēra*, evil works (Jn. 3:19; 7:7; cf. 1 Jn. 3:12), which are committed in alliance with the devil (Jn. 8:41, 44; cf. 1 Jn. 3:8). In Jn., therefore, the concept of working gains its specific theological structure from its christological grounding, from its point of departure in Jesus' work as Revealer.

(c) Paul, by contrast, takes up more the contemporary Jewish understanding of work as an accomplishment required of men, in order to stress, by way of a blunt antithesis, that there is no → righteousness in God's sight on the basis of human achievement. There is only righteousness on the basis of the reception of grace. The way of salvation is not prescribed through the → law, but only through Jesus Christ, who is "the end of the law that every one who has faith may be justified" (Rom. 10:4). The works of the law, which play such a large rôle in Judaism, are rigorously rejected by Paul, because in his eyes they are a human substitute for the true → obedience of faith (O. Michel, *Der Brief an die Römer, KEK* 4, 1955[10], 87), the *hypakoē pisteōs* (cf. Rom. 1:5; 16:26). "Becoming righteous . . . does not come about

from fulfilling the commandments; it is fulfilled in Christ by means of faith in him" (H. Schlier, *Der Brief an die Galater*, *KEK* 7, 1962[12], 57). Paul is concerned with understanding the true significance of faith of which → Abraham is adduced as an exemplar (Rom. 4:1–25; Gal. 3:6–18). This insight into the soteriological incompatibility of a work of the law (*ergon nomou*) and → grace (*charis*) or → faith (*pistis*) forms the centre of Pauline theology (cf. Rom. 3:20, 27 f.; 4:6; 9:12, 32; 11:6; Gal. 2:16; 3:2, 10).

On the one hand, then, works are condemned as a way of salvation; yet on the other hand, there are passages where works receive a positive significance even in Paul. As Paul knows of a law of Christ besides the law which condemns (cf. 1 Cor. 9:21; Gal. 6:2), so he speaks of positive *erga* besides the works of darkness (*erga tou skotous*, Rom. 13:12) or the works of the flesh (*erga tēs sarkos*, Gal. 5:19). Missionary work, for instance, appears as a work of the Lord (*ergon kyriou*, 1 Cor. 16:10; 15:58; cf. Phil. 2:30), which Christ works through the apostles (cf. Phil. 1:6). Indeed, Paul can put to the Corinthians the rhetorical question, "Are you not my workmanship [*ergon*] in the Lord?" (1 Cor. 9:1). In the sphere of ethics, Paul upholds the validity for Christians of the imperative to do good to everyone (Gal. 6:10; cf. Rom. 2:10; 2 Thess. 2:17). There is also the notion of good works in Paul in the context of the final → judgment. On the day of "wrath when God's righteous judgment will be revealed" God will "render to every man according to his works" (Rom. 2:5 f.) without any regard for persons; and not only will the works of the heathen be judged, but those of Christians too (1 Cor. 3:11 f.; cf. Rom. 14:10; 2 Cor. 5:10; 1 Pet. 1:7; Rev. 2:23). "It is obvious that Paul knows and states that the work of Christians, by which they will be judged in the last judgment, does not provide any human ground for *kauchēma*. But now he says precisely of this work (understood, as always, as the deed of the 'unprofitable servant') that God judges, rewards and punishes on the basis of it" (W. Joest, op. cit., 175).

(d) The vibrant dialectic, distinguished in Paul by his rejection of all works-righteousness and by his simultaneous knowledge of the impossibility of an unproductive faith, appears in a somewhat different light in the Pastoral Epistles. Here it is one pole that is powerfully accentuated – that of the aspect of good works (1 Tim. 5:10, 25; 6:18; Tit. 1:16; 2:7, 14; 3:8, 14; cf. 1 Pet. 2:12).

(e) If Paul stresses faith as the decisive factor, in James it is the emphatic demand for works, extolled in the law of liberty (*nomos tēs eleutherias*, Jas. 1:25), which comes to the fore. Without works faith is dead (Jas. 2:17); it is only through works that it is perfected (Jas. 2:22, 24). The spirited advocacy of this interpretation by James must be understood from his own situation. While Paul primarily fought against the Judaic and Judaistic misunderstanding that human works lead to righteousness, James turns against the "practical aberration of a dead orthodoxy which rests on mere confession" (F. Hauck, *Die Briefe des Jakobus, Petrus, Judas und Johannes*, *NTD* 10, 1937, 20). In his own way he thus helps to describe the field of tension in which God's saving activity seeks to awaken men to faith, to whose structural elements belong obedience (*hypakoē*), → hope (*elpis*) and → love (*agapē*),

2. (a) *energeia*, working, operation, action, is found in the NT 8 times (only in the Pauline corpus), *energeō*, to be active, 21 times (18 in Paul, twice in Matt., once in Jas.), *energēma*, deed, twice, in 1 Cor. and *energēs*, effective, 3 times (twice in Paul, once in Heb.). The word-group refers, as a rule, to the working of God (e.g. 1 Cor.

12:6; Eph. 1:11) or of his antagonist, → Satan (2 Thess. 2:9; cf. Rom. 7:5; Eph. 2:2), who is also ultimately subject to God (2 Thess. 2:11), as is → death, which also appears as an active power (2 Cor. 4:12). Particular prominence is given to the efficacious power of God by which he raised Jesus Christ (Eph. 1:20; Col. 2:12). This divine power is effective both in Christ (Phil. 3:21; cf. Matt. 14:2) and in the Holy Spirit (cf. 1 Cor. 12:11, where the Holy Spirit appears as the uniform effective cause of the gifts of grace). By it the → apostles are equipped for their office (Eph. 3:7; Col. 1:29), just as by it the word becomes the authoritative judge of the thoughts and intentions of the heart (Heb. 4:12). The members of the body of Christ also come to share in it (Eph. 4:16; cf. 1 Cor. 12:10). God, the One who is at work (*energōn*), creates both the will (*thelein*) and the deed (*energein*, Phil. 2:13), which take shape in the love of the believers (cf. Gal. 5:6).

(b) *euergetēs*, in its sole occurrence in the NT (Lk. 22:25), has the sense of an honorary title (see above, CL 1 (f)), which is then, characteristically, repudiated. Jesus' disciples are not to allow themselves to be called "Benefactors", as are the rulers of the world (cf. the rejection of the titles Rabbi, Master, Father and Teacher in Matt. 23:7–12); they are called to → serve (Lk. 22:26; cf. Matt. 23:11).

The vb. *euergetein*, to do good (only in Acts 10:38) refers to the good deeds of Jesus to which his apostles testify. *euergesia* in Acts 4:9 denotes the healing of a sick man by the apostles; in 1 Tim. 6:2 the same word characterizes that attitude of a Christian master to his slaves which is in keeping with the gospel.

(c) In the NT the vb. *synergeō*, work together, is found 5 times, *synergos*, a colleague, 12 times (including 11 in Paul). In Rom. 8:28 Paul seizes on a maxim which is embedded into late Jewish tradition (O. Michel, op. cit., 179–83; cf. Test. Iss. 3:8; Test. Gad 4:7; Test. Ben. 4:5; Ber. 60b, "Let a man always accustom himself to say: All that the Almighty does, he does for good"; Taanith 21a, "That too is for good"). He states "that for those who love God, all things work together for good" (cf. AV), i.e., that for them everything is beneficial, even "the suffering and rejections, the enigmas of faith" (O. Michel, op. cit., 181). Jas. 2:22 speaks of the necessary integration of faith and works (→ Righteousness).

Otherwise, the word-group refers to the missionary situation. Mk. 16:20 belongs to the longer ending of Mk. (cf. W. R. Farmer, *The Last Twelve Verses of Mark*, *Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series* 25, 1974). It reports that the Lord worked with the disciples confirming their word by the accompanying signs. It is true that this ratificatory accompanying work of God is the decisive element in all missionary activity; but it is a real co-working, in as much as the person who has been called by God to be a witness is himself no mere inactive instrument in the proclaiming event, but equally a co-operating servant of God. Paul can therefore formulate it thus: *theou gar esmen synergoi*, "we are God's fellow-workers" (1 Cor. 3:9 RSV mg.; cf. 2 Cor. 6:1). The content of the apostolic co-operation is more exactly outlined in 1 Thess. 3:2 ("in the gospel of Christ"); Col. 4:11 ("for the kingdom of God"), 3 Jn. 8 ("for the truth") and 2 Cor. 1:24 ("for your joy").

H.-C. Hahn

ποιέω

ποιέω (*poieō*), do, make; *ποίησις* (*poiēsis*), doing, working, deed; *ποίημα* (*poiēma*), what is made, work, creation;

ποιητής (*poiētēs*), one who does something, maker, doer; ἀγαθοποιΐα (*agathopoiia*), well-doing, doing good; ἀγαθοποιός (*agathopoios*), doing good, upright, one who does good.

CL 1. The verb *poieō*, attested since Homer, and generally to be trans. to do, to make, has passed through a varied development. It is the basic term for all activity. The subjects belonging to the vb. include both divinities and human beings; more rarely they are material subjects (e.g. the soil or a tree produces).

(a) In so far as Gk. literature reports the doings of the gods, e.g. in Hesiod's theogony (*Works* 109 ff.) or later in Plato's *Timaeus* (29e ff.), the word takes on the meaning of to create, generate, give shape to.

(b) Human doing and making can refer to any kind of activity. Used intrans., *poieō* has the meaning of to act; positive or negative valuation is given from an ethical point of view. Platonic texts therefore also use the verb in the sense of making every effort (*pan poiein*, e.g. *Phaedo* 114c).

2. The noun *poiēsis* (used from Hdt. onwards) accordingly means both directed action and the manufacture of objects (e.g. Plato, *Soph.* 266d). *poiēma* (Hdt. onwards) denotes the finished work, the product (e.g. Plato, *Chrm.* 163c). It is executed by a *poiētēs*, a doer, an author (Aristophanes, *Ranae* 96, 1030), who can also be a poet.

OT 1. Semitic linguistic usage knows of only a few abstract word-formations. The LXX therefore has many sentence parts which – analogously to Eng. colloquial speech – formulate their thought with the help of *poieō*, which occurs over 3,200 times. The determinative noun is added to the verb: to do the commandment and the law (Jos. 22:5), to do work (Exod. 20:9 f.), to do good or evil (Ps. 34[33]:15; Ecc. 8:11 f.; Jer. 2:13), to make peace (Isa. 27:5), to make one's way (Jdg. 17:8), to construct a "hand-made" god (Isa. 44:9; 46:6). Naturally, *poieō* is also used absolutely (e.g. Exod. 30:25).

2. The Hebrew equivalent for to do and to make is chiefly *ʿāśâh*. So far as God's creative deeds are concerned, the Priestly account of creation (Gen. 1:1–2:4a) has in addition the word *bārāʾ*, which is reserved in the OT for the work of Yahweh. The LXX trans. *bārāʾ* in Gen. and Isa. 41–45 by *poieō*. Even the antithetical *bārāʾ* and *ʿāśâh* in Gen. 6:7 are rendered both times by *poieō*, whereas the later Gk. text of Aquila differentiates the two. 2 Macc. 7:8 stresses that God has "made everything [*epoiēsen*] out of nothing".

But Yahweh does not only act as Creator: he works also in history, and in particular directs the fortunes of his people Israel. Again, a noun describes the particularity of the respective work: Yahweh does wonders (Exod. 15:11; Jos. 3:5; Ps. 72[71]:18), makes the days (Ps. 118[117]:24), does great things (Job 5:9), "performs" his word ("to see it fulfilled", Jer. 1:12 JB).

3. The use of *poieō* for human dealings branches out in many directions. The LXX trans. again mainly goes back to *ʿāśâh*. The following scheme emerges if we attempt to distinguish formal divisions (cf. H. Braun, *TDNT* VI 467 ff.); everyday dealings not determined by commandment (Gen. 21:8; 1 Sam. 2:19), directions and prohibitions in the secular sphere which are given by commandment (Gen. 30:31; Exod. 35:33), dealings with one's neighbour as instructed by the law (Jos. 2:12; 2

Sam. 2:6) actions related to the will of God and the law which are expressly commanded (Ps. 40[39]:9; Isa. 44:28). In the latter case, the OT often adds a "whole" or "all" to the object in the text (e.g. Deut. 29:28 [EVV 29]). In this way the pious Jew recognized in his deed the required seriousness of his moral or cultic action.

4. In rabbinic Judaism, the terms which are translated by *poieō* in the LXX, are used of God's works in creation (e.g. Ber. 9:2; Aboth 4:22). With men as the subject, behaviour in accordance with the Torah involves the whole range of questions concerning obligation to Yahweh. Pious action is seen in terms of casuistical regulations for the whole range of life (e.g. Aboth 1:9).

NT The vb. *poieō* occurs 565 times in the NT, primarily in the Gospels. *poiēma*, however, is found only twice, *poiēsis* only in Jas. 1:25, *poiētēs* 6 times, of which 3 are in Jas. 1:22–25. In view of the overwhelming use of the vb., it is advisable to forgo many nuances of meaning and simply to give a systematic presentation of its essential content. The nouns are similar in both form and meaning.

1. (a) The NT reaffirms the OT statements of God as Creator (e.g. Mk. 10:6; Acts 4:24; Rev. 14:7). *poiēma*, occuring only in Rom. 1:20 and Eph. 2:10, means the works of God's creation and new creation. The same applies to the (otherwise not used) pass. form of the vb. in Heb. 12:27.

(b) Further, the statements concerning God's activity of bringing salvation in history belong here. They are modelled grammatically on the syntax of the LXX, in that *poieō* is linked with an accompanying object. The NT writers speak confidently of God's mighty historical acts, right from the earliest writings (1 Thess. 5:24, "he will do it"; similarly Rom. 4:21, "God was able to do what he had promised") to the late ones (Rev. 21:5, "I make all things new").

2. The loving dealings of God are revealed in Jesus' work and deeds (e.g. Acts 2:22). Again and again the question crops up as to the motivation, justification and significance of his work.

(a) The Synoptic Gospels depict the conflict with the scribes and others, which resulted from Jesus' deeds, in the pericope on the question of authority in Matt. 21:23–27 par. Mk. 11:27 ff.; Lk. 20:1–8. Jesus replied with a question which confronted the questioners with their failure to heed the message of John the Baptist.

(b) John, later, in his "strictly Christological limitation of the usage" (*TDNT* VI 464), points out even more clearly in the conflict-debates that Jesus fully performs the → will and the works (→ *erga*) which the Father charges him as → Son to do (Jn. 5:19; 6:38; 8:53; 10:37 f.). The works of the Father and Son belong together; for both "are one" (Jn. 10:30, 33; 14:10).

(c) According to Ephesians 2:14 f., Jesus' work consists in having "made" → peace between God and man by his death on the cross. One of the ways in which Hebrews, in a post-Pauline time, describes Jesus' saving work is by *poieō*. He "brought about" the purification of our sins (Heb. 1:3 NEB). He "made" the sacrifice for sins once and for all (Heb. 7:27). According to Rev. 1:6 and 3:12, believers are "made" kings and priests, and pillars in the future temple of God. The NT usage interprets this vb. in such a way that christology can only be unfolded in connexion with soteriological statements.

3. (a) Purely secular human activity is not particularly stressed in the NT. It covers various general activities (e.g. Mk. 11:3, 5; Jn. 19:12; Acts 9:39; Jas. 4:13).

(b) More decisive is the assessment of human action in the sight of God. Human work is never neutral; it is either obedience or disobedience *vis-à-vis* God's claim on men (1 Cor. 10:31, "Whatever you do, do all to the glory of God"). This expectation is expressed emphatically in the → parables of Jesus (e.g. Matt. 5:36; 20:11 ff.; 21:31; Lk. 12:17 f.; 16:3; 17:9 f.). The appropriate demand is often expressed in a relative clause (Rom. 1:32; Phil. 2:14; Col. 3:17, 23; 2 Pet. 1:10).

(c) Men's actions are subject to Jesus' claim to lordship. (Lk. 6:46 asks: "Why do you call me 'Lord, Lord', and not do what I tell you?" (cf. Matt. 7:21; Jn. 7:17). Actions reveal their worth in → love for one's neighbour (Matt. 25:40, 45; → Brother, art. *ho plēsion*). This is what the law is about (Matt. 22:36 ff.). It is therefore not surprising that doing – or leaving, i.e. not doing – things for or against one's neighbour is frequently mentioned in all the NT writings. It figures in different ways: positively (e.g. Matt. 5:9; 6:2 f.; Lk. 3:11; Acts 11:30; 1 Cor. 16:1; Gal. 6:9) or negatively, i.e. behaviour that is forbidden, reprehensible and loveless (e.g. Matt. 5:32; Lk. 6:26; Jas. 2:13). On account of the central significance of right action towards one's fellow-men, there is a frequent summons in the gospel of Jesus and the apostles to put the word into practice (Matt. 7:24 ff. par. Lk. 6:47 ff.; Jn. 14:12, do even greater works; Phlm. 21, do even more).

(d) The discourses of John's Gospel also speak of right action, grounded in the Lord and made possible by his Spirit. Without Christ the believer can "do nothing" (Jn. 15:5; 13:15; 14:12 ff.). Jn. 8:34–44 deals with the contrasting attitude in committing sin, which is "of the Devil" and does not stem from God and his truth.

Using *poieō* (1 Jn. 2:29; cf. 2:17; 3:7 ff.; 5:2), 1 Jn. retains the stress of the imperative to right action (*poiōn tēn dikaiosynēn*, doing righteousness). The Johannine writings indicate equally by their use of this family of words their normative significance for the beginnings of a Christian ethic.

4. (a) This actively dynamic basic trait in the NT statements, by sharp contrast with, say, quietistic Epicureanism or the Buddhist ideal of inaction, presents Christ as the *poiētēs*, the doer of the word and the law (Jas. 1:22, 23, 25; Rom. 2:13). Only Acts 17:28 uses the noun in the secular Gk. sense of poet.

(b) Two further terms occur only once in the NT: *poiēsis*, act, deed (Jas. 1:25) and *agathopoiia*, doing good (1 Pet. 4:19 NEB; "do right" RSV). Both their wording and their contexts show that blessing follows, "where that rhythm is achieved by which the received word overflows into action" (F. Hauck, op. cit., on Jas. 1:25). These two elements belong together and their order cannot be reversed. *agathopoios*, one who does good, occurs only in 1 Pet. 2:14. *F. Thiele*

πράσσω

πράσσω (*prassō*), accomplish, do; *πρᾶξις* (*praxis*), act, action, deed, function; *πρᾶγμα* (*pragma*), deed, matter, thing, undertaking, task, lawsuit, dispute; *πραγματεία* (*pragmateia*), activity, occupation, undertaking; *πραγματεύομαι* (*pragmateuomai*), do business, trade.

CL 1. In Gk. the vb. *prassō* (Attic *prattō*), to accomplish, to do, is found as early as Linear B. The original meaning of *prassō* could be inferred from epic phrases like *prēssein hala*, to cross the sea, and *prēssein keleuthon* or *hodoio* (partitive gen.), to travel along a road (Homer, *Od.* 9, 491; *Il.* 14, 282).

prassō can also be used when the subject-matter concerns procuring something, e.g. *kleos epraxen*, he won fame (Pindar, *Isth.* 5, 8). In monetary contexts, *prassō* means collecting or exacting payment of taxes or debts, e.g. *prassei me tokon*, he makes me pay interest (Homer, *Batrachomyomachia* 185). In general *prassō* denotes an "activity or industry directed to a specific goal in which the one who acts seems to be more or less claimed" (H. Schreckenberg, cf. *TDNT* VI 632, n. 2). It occurs in the phrase *prattein ta heautou*, to be concerned with one's own affairs (Plato, *Chrm.* 162a), a basic ethical requisite frequently encountered in Plato. *prassō* can have the further meaning of betray, e.g. *prattein tēn polin*, to betray the city (Polyb., 4, 17, 12). As well as the transitive form, there is also the intransitive. *prassō* then means to act, to do. It is frequently met in the fixed formula *prattein kai legein*, to do and to say. Linked with an adv., it often expresses the condition or state, say of a person, e.g. *eu prattō*, I am doing, or I feel, well.

2. The meanings of both nouns *praxis* and *pragma* partly overlap. The older one, *praxis* (Hom. onwards), denotes acting, activity, and can refer to some completed deed (act, work), the way the activity is carried out (mode of operation) or a planned action (intention). Now and then it means concretely a business or an undertaking. It commonly points to a bad act, sometimes even to magical actions.

pragma (Pindar onwards), in addition to meaning deed, act, occurrence, business, task, also means a very general matter or thing, then further, concretely, a controversial matter, lawsuit, trial.

3. Already with regard to Gk. linguistic usage, we have found that *prassō* is used only in rare cases for the action of the gods (cf. C. Maurer, *TDNT* VI 633). Even in the rare exceptional cases (e.g. Plato, *Rep.* 3, 391e) the vb. only refers to such doings of the gods which are not creative acts (for which the vbs. → *poiein*, → *ergazesthai*, *dēmiourgein* and others are used), but actions and activities which correspond to human ones, and which are in addition conceived of very abstractly. Even where *prassō* (following the rule) refers to human doings, a strong tendency to abstraction is characteristic of the word. If it is also used here and there in the same sense as *poieō*, subtle distinctions between these two verbs can still be recognized, especially in philosophic texts (e.g. Plato, *Chrm.* 163a ff.). Whereas *poieō* means more a concrete deed, *prassō* is used where the philosopher seeks to assess "human action apart from its content and objects" (*TDNT* VI 634). Thus in Platonism the necessity of right action is founded in the Idea of the Good, the knowledge of which naturally leads to *kalōs prassein* (e.g. Plato, *Prt.* 352c ff.). There is no rich tension in any contrast between knowing and doing. Defective actions are the result of defective knowledge, not of a deficient will (e.g. Epictetus, *Dissertationes* 2, 26, 3–5).

OT 1. Compared with the occurrences of *poieō* in the LXX, *prassō* recedes very considerably. Only in post-exilic writings is it found more frequently (in all 38 instances; 8 each in Job and Prov., and 7 in 1–4 Macc.). Here *prassō* renders Heb. *ʿāśâh* (do) 5 times, *pāʿal* (do) 4 times and *hālaḵ* (walk) twice. It is striking that *prassō* is variously used to describe men's bad behaviour (e.g. Job 27:6; 36:23; Prov. 10:23; Gen. 31:28). *prassō* denotes positive action only in the historical books (e.g. 4 Macc. 3:20, *kalōs prassein*, conduct oneself well).

2. Both the nouns also occur in the LXX, *pragma* leading *praxis* by 125 attestations to only 23 (the latter mostly in Hellenistically influenced literature). Whereas

the more abstract *praxis* is referred to human acts (e.g. 6 times in the sense of *res gestae*), *pragma* is also sometimes used for divine acts (e.g. Isa. 25:1; 28:22 [EVV 21]).

3. Philo mentions in one place the divine *prattein* of the Demiurge (*Abr.* 163). This, however, does not mean the act of creation (for which *poieō* is found), but an abstractly understood activity which is not given any greater precision. With reference to human beings, Philo stresses – in accord with the Stoic viewpoint – the necessity of a balanced blending of will, deed and speech. It is most proper (*to oikeiotaton*) for human nature to decide (*bouleuesthai*), to act (*prassein*) and to speak (*legein*; *Mut. Nom.* 197) well (cf. *TDNT* VI 635).

NT Of the 39 places where *prassō* occurs in the NT, 18 occur in the Pauline corpus, 13 in Acts, 6 in Lk. and 2 Jn.

1. *prassō* never refers to a divine, creative activity in the NT (cf. for this *ergazesthai* and *poieō*). It chiefly denotes a negative and more or less abstractly conceived human action; but in some places it is also used for positive dealings, or has a neutral value.

(a) In connexion with money matters it is found in John the Baptist's preaching in Lk. 3:13, where to the tax-collectors' general question, "What shall we do?" the answer is given, "Exact no more than your rate" (JB). It is stated similarly of the master in the parable, who gave his servants ten pounds, that he wanted to draw out the money with interest on his return (Lk. 19:23). In Lk. 12:39 *praktōr* means a bailiff who is in charge of the debtor's prison (cf. Matt. 5:25 f.; *TDNT* VI 642).

(b) *prassō* refers to the human condition in Eph. 6:21, and linked with the adv. *eu* it has the sense of doing well in Acts 15:29. The shout to the jailer in Philippi is also intended to serve personal well-being: "Do yourself no harm" (Acts 16:28 NEB).

(c) Finally, *prassō* is used in a neutral sense in 1 Thess. 4:11, where it means one's own affairs, whereas in the same verse *ergazesthai* suggests physical work with one's hands. Acts 5:35 speaks generally of human action, which can turn out either well or badly. There Gamaliel warns the Sanhedrin to weigh up carefully "what you want to do" with respect to the Christians (similarly Acts 19:36 contains a warning against over-hasty action).

2. (a) *prassō* chiefly indicates a deed which can neither stand in the regular earthly courts (cf. Rom. 13:4; Acts 17:7; Lk. 23:41) nor before God (cf. Rom. 2:2 f.; Jn. 5:29). Formulaic phrases frequently speak of offences which deserve death, *axia thanatou* (Lk. 23:15; Acts 25:11, 25; 26:31; Rom. 1:32). Such evil-doing (*to kakon prassein*), which is finally subject to God's wrath (Rom. 13:4), is detailed in the so-called *Lasterkatalogen* (lists of vices) in Rom. 1:28 ff. and Gal. 5:69 ff. (→ Virtue, art. *Haustafeln*). An individual concrete deed – a case of unchastity – is named in 1 Cor. 5:2; *prassō* also refers primarily to sexual sins in 2 Cor. 12:21.

(b) The "curious arts" mentioned in Acts 19:19 with a vb.-form of *prassō* belong more to the religious than to the moral realm, as it is certainly a case here of magical practices (cf. E. Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 1971, 566 ff.; → Magic). One can also number among religious offences the betrayal of Jesus (Lk. 22:23), the killing of Jesus, brought about in ignorance by the people (Acts 3:17), and Saul's hostilities directed against the name of Jesus (Acts 26:9).

(c) The power of → temptation which *to kakon prassein* has is revealed in the sec-

tion Rom. 7:14 ff., where *prassein* and *poiein* are used alongside each other. This temptation must be met, for anyone who does → evil (*phaula*) hates the → light (Jn. 3:20), anyone who does *erga tēs sarkos*, the works of the → flesh (Gal. 5:19), will not inherit the → kingdom of God (Gal. 5:21). In the old covenant, distinguished by circumcision, it was important to act in accordance with the law (Rom. 2:25; cf. also Gal. 6:13). In Acts 26:20, however, Paul enjoins his hearers to perform works of repentance (*erga tēs metanoias*), which gives *prassō* a positive significance. This also applies to Phil. 4:9, where Paul sets himself up as an example.

The notion that right action has its → reward is given clear expression in 1 Cor. 9:17. The definition of the relationship between human action and its eschatological valuation, there apprehended in individual terms, is developed in Jn. 5:29 in the form of general validity, in both positive and negative directions. One day the dead will leave their graves, "those who have done good [*agatha poiēsantes*] to the resurrection of life, and those who have done evil [*phaula praxantes*] to the resurrection of judgment." This verse makes it clear once again that *prassō* has a chiefly negative colouring. For positive activity the NT mostly has *ergazesthai* or *poiein*.

3. (a) *praxis* occurs in the NT 6 times. It has neutral and abstract meaning in Rom. 12:4, where it is laid down that not all the members of the body of Christ have the same function. In Matt. 16:27 *praxis* has to be understood ambivalently: the deed which will be judged at the parousia can be good or bad. In the other 4 places *praxis* refers to obviously evil actions: they refer to the words and deeds of opponents of Jesus (Lk. 23:51), the deeds of the old man viewed as a whole (Acts 19:18; Col. 3:9), and the *praxeis tou sōmatos*, "the deeds of the body" (Rom. 8:13), which must be put off or put to death.

(b) *pragma* (used 11 times in the NT) has a wider range of nuances. It has neutral value in Matt. 18:19, where it is used of a prayer request, and in Rom. 16:2, where it refers to Phoebe's affairs. *pragma* relates to a not entirely clear matter – probably some business transaction – in 1 Thess. 4:6. It is used of judicial proceedings in 1 Cor. 6:1; and in the sense of *res gestae* (historical events) in Lk. 1:1. Acts 5:4 and 2 Cor. 7:11 are concerned with a concrete offence. In Jas. 3:16 *pan phaulon pragma*, vile practices of every kind, describes the result of jealousy and strife. In 2 Tim. 2:4 *pragmateia* means the affairs of everyday life, whereas the vb. *pragmateuomai* means to do business, trade (Lk. 19:13). *diapragmateuomai* means to gain by trading (Lk. 19:15).

The use of *pragma* in Hebrews provides a striking contrast to previous findings. In Heb. 6:18 *pragma* means two facts (the promise and oath of God) by means of which God declares his truth. Heb. 10:1 contrasts the → shadow of the good things to come contained in the law with the → image of the things themselves (*eikōn tōn pragmatōn*). Faith relates to these things, even when it cannot see them (Heb. 11:1).

H.-C. Hahn

→ Adam, → Conversion, → Faith, → Fruit, → Goal, → Law, → Poor, → Possessions, → Reward, → Righteousness

(a). J. B. Bauer, "Work", *EBT* III 995–1001; G. Bertram, *ergon* etc., *TDNT* II 635–55; G. Bornkamm, "Sin, Law and Death (Romans 7)", in *Early Christian Experience*, 1969, 87–104; H. Braun, *poeiō* etc., *TDNT* VI 458–84; R. Bultmann, "Christ the End of the Law", in *Essays Philosophical and Theological*, 1955, 36–66; C. E. B. Cranfield, *The Epistle to the Romans*, *ICC*, I, 1975; M. Dibelius and H. Greeven, *James*, *Hermeneia*, 1976; R. Falconer, "1 Timothy 2 14, 15", *JBL* 60, 1941, 375–79; J. A. Kleist,

"*Ergon*", *CBQ* 6, 1944, 61–68; N. J. McEleney, "Conversion, Circumcision and the Law", *NTS* 20, 1973–74, 319–41; C. Maurer, *prassō* etc., *TDNT* VI 632–44; A. Richardson, *The Biblical Doctrine of Work*, 1952; E. Troeltsch, *The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches*, I–II, 1931; J. B. Tyson, " 'Works of the Law' in Galatians", *JBL* 92, 1973, 423–31.

(b). W. Bienert, *Die Arbeit nach der Lehre der Bibel*, 1956 [2]; and "Die Arbeit nach der Lehre der Bibel", *Studium Generale*, 1961, 151–62; G. Eichholz, *Glaube und Werk bei Paulus und Jakobus*, *ThEH* Neue Folge 88, 1961; F. Flückiger, "Die Werke des Gesetzes bei den Heiden (nach Röm 2, 14 ff.)", *ThZ* 8, 1953, 17 ff.; F. Hauck, *Die Stellung des Urchristentums zu Arbeit und Geld*, *BFChTh* 2, 3, 1921; W. Joest, *Gesetz und Freiheit*, 1961 [3]; S. Kalischer, "Die Wertschätzung der Arbeit in Bibel und Talmud", *Festschrift H. Cohens*, 1912, 579–608; V. Kirchner, *Der "Lohn" in der alten Philosophie, im bürgerlichen Recht, besonders im Neuen Testament*, 1908; G. Lanczkowski, "Vergeltung", *RGG* [3] VI 1341 ff.; and "Werke", *RGG* [3] VI 1641 ff.; F. Lau, "Gute Werke", *RGG* [3] II 1915 ff.; E. Lohmeyer, "Gesetzwerke", *ZNW* 28, 1929, 177 ff.; and "Vom Baum und Frucht", *ZSTh* 9, 1931, 377 ff.; J. L. Gomez de Morales, *El Trabajo en la Biblia*, 1966; H. Rondet, *Die Theologie der Arbeit*, 1956; P. Termes Ros, *El Trabajo segun la Biblia*, 1955; A. Steinmann, *Jesus und die soziale Not der Gegenwart*, 1929[2]; E. Testa, *Il Lavoro nella Bibbia*, 1959; F. Vattioni, "Il Lavoro nei Primi Tre Capitoli della Genesi", *Studi Sociali* 1, 1961, 109–19; J. Vollmer, *'āśâh*, *THAT* II 359–70; H. Weinstock, *Arbeit und Bildung*, 1954.

Y

Yoke

ζυγός

ζυγός (*zygos*), yoke, balance; ζεῦγος (*zeugos*), a pair; ἑτεροζυγέω (*heterozygeō*), be unevenly yoked, fig. be mismated; συζεύγνυμι (*syzeugnymi*), yoke together, join together; σύζυγος (*syzygos*), yoke-fellow, comrade, possibly wife.

CL & OT 1. *ho zygos*, originally in Attic Gk. *to zygon*, has two meanings: (a) the yoke which beasts (Homer onwards) or slaves (Hdt., 7, 8, 3) wear; the cognate vb. *zeugnymi* means to unite, bind; *to zeugos* means the same as *ho zygos*, that which is held together under a yoke, a pair (cf. also Lat. *iugum* and Ger. *Joch*); (b) a row, beam of a balance or the balance itself (Aeschylus onwards); this meaning is suggested by the former picture of beasts braced together under a yoke.

2. The vb. *heterozygeō* is a development from the adj. *heterozygos* whch is used in the LXX. Lev. 19:19 refers to beasts which are *ktēnē heterozyga.* Taken literally, this could refer to the practice of yoking together different kinds of animals. This, in fact, is expressly forbidden by Deut. 22:10: "You shall not plough with an ox and an ass together." Both prohibitions come in contexts which forbid mixing of crops, animals and material. The RSV interprets Lev. 19:19a as a prohibition of interbreeding: "You shall not let your cattle breed with a different kind." The thought is found in Philo, *Spec. Leg.* 4,203 and Josephus, *Ant.* 4, 228. Apart from its sole NT occurrence in 2 Cor. 6:14, the vb. is found only in Apollonius' lexicon to Homer (1st-2nd cent. A.D.). The thought of Lev. 19:19 is developed in the Mishnah tractate Kilaim (Diverse Kinds) 8:2.

3. The OT knows both meanings of *zygos*. (a) It is found in the LXX as a translation of *mō'znayim*, scales, balances (Lev. 19:36; Job 6:2; 31:6; Ps. 62[61]:9; Prov. 11:1; 16:11; 20:23; Hos. 12:8[7]; Amos 8:5; Mic. 6:11; Isa. 40:12, 15; Jer. 32[39]:10; Ezek. 45:1; 45:10; the Aram. *mō'znayyā'* occurs in Dan. 5:27 Theodotion). Yahweh requires true scales and honest dealings among men (Lev. 19:36; Ezek. 45:11). But he also weighs men in the balances and finds them wanting. "Men of low estate are but a breath, men of high estate are a delusion; in the balances they go up; they are together lighter than a breath" (Ps. 62:9). On the other hand, Job desires his calamities to be weighed in the balances (Job 6:2). In the background stands the idea of scales as a symbol of justice, and Yahweh himself as the ultimate judge: "Let me be weighed in a just balance, and let God know my integrity!" (Job 31:6). The MT and Theodotion's translation of Dan. 5:27 interpret the word *TEKEL* in the writing on the wall at Belshazzar's feast: "you have been weighed in the balances and found wanting." Whereas the application of the idea of balances to judgment is found in the relatively late writings of the OT, it was

widespread in later Judaism (Sl. Enoch 49:2; Eth. Enoch 61:8, the messianic judge weighs with scales the deeds of the saints). The idea was thence taken over by Christian apocalyptic pictures of judgment.

(b) More frequent in the LXX is the use of *zygos* (or *zygon*) to translate the Heb. *ʿōl*, meaning a yoke (Gen. 27:40; Lev. 26:13; Num. 19:2; Deut. 21:3; 2 Chr. 10:4, 9 ff., 14; Isa. 9:3[4]; 10:27; 14:25; 47:6; Jer. 2:20; 5:5; 27[34]:8; 11; 28[35]:2, 4, 11, 14; 30[37]:8; Lam. 3:27). It is found for various other Heb. words (Lev. 19:35; Job 39:10; Ps. 2:3; Zech. 3:9; Isa. 5:18; 10:27; 14:5, 29; 46:6; Ezek. 34:27; Sir. 40:1; 42:4; 51:26), and is without Heb. equivalent, particularly in the non-canonical writings (Sir. 21:25; 28:19 f., 25; 33:26 [30:35]; Isa. 11:13; 19:10; Dan. 8:25; 1 Macc. 8:18, 31, 41; 3 Macc. 4:9). Originally it stood for the shaped piece of wood on the necks of draught-animals (Num. 19:2). But *zygos* came to stand for bondage (Lev. 26:13) and the burdensome servitude of the nation (1 Ki. 12:9 ff.). In this sense *zygos* became a symbol of suppression and has its *Sitz im Leben* in the political realm of enforced subjection and tyranny (2 Chr. 10:4, 9–14). To this context belongs the yoke which Jeremiah wore as an acted parable summoning Israel to submit to the Babylonian king Nebuchadnezzar (Jer. 27:2–11). In breaking Jeremiah's yoke, Hananiah, the prophet of national deliverance, proclaimed salvation from the foreign rule of Babylon (Jer. 28:2–11), a prophecy which was not fulfilled (Jer. 28:13–17). Ultimate liberation from suppression and enforced subjection belongs to the message of messianic prophecy (Isa. 9:3; 10:27).

4. *zygos* in the sense of yoke has an extended meaning. Wisdom literature speaks of the yoke of wisdom: "I open my mouth and speak of her, Acquire wisdom for yourselves without money, Bring your neck under her yoke, and her burden let your soul bear. She is nigh unto them that seek her, And he that is intent upon her findeth her" (Sir. 51:25 f.; cf. 6:24, 26, 30). This would have been understood as an invitation to accept the Torah, for wisdom at this period was identified with the → law. Lam. 3:27 contains the precept: "It is good for a man that he bear the yoke in his youth." Jeremiah describes Israel's true relationship with Yahweh as a yoke which the wayward shake off (Jer. 2:20; 5:5). The latter verse defines this relationship in terms of knowledge of Yahweh and his law. Later Judaism identified the yoke with the Torah in order to give expression to submission to Yahweh's will (cf. "the yoke of the Torah", Pirke Aboth 3:5; Sanhedrin 94b; Gen. R. 67:7; "the yoke of heaven", Sotah 47b; Sanhedrin 111b; "the yoke of the commandments", Berakoth 2:2; see further SB I 608 ff.; I. Abrahams, *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels*, II, 1924, 4–14; A. Büchler, *Studies in Sin and Atonement in the Rabbinic Literature of the First Century*, 1928; M. Maher, " 'Take My Yoke upon You' (Matt. xi. 29)", *NTS* 22, 1975–76, 98 f.). The man who prays the Shema (Deut. 6:4–9; → Hear, art. *akouō* OT 2 (b), NT 3) takes upon himself the yoke of the rule of heaven. He thereby confesses that he is obligated to the one true God in all his actions. This signifies a burden which marks out Israel from all other peoples. On the other hand, it gave rise to the enslavement to legalistic piety from which Jesus sought to free his people.

5. *zeugos* stands chiefly for the Heb. *ṣemeḏ*, and means a span holding a pair of animals together and hence also a couple (Jdg. 17:13, 10; 2 Sam. 16:1; 1 Ki. 19:19, 21; 2 Ki. 5:17; 9:25; Job 1:3; 42:12; Isa. 5:10).

6. *zeugnymi* stands chiefly for *ʾāsar*, bind (Gen. 46:29; Exod. 14:6; 1 Sam. 6:7, 10; 1 Ki. 18:44; 2 Ki. 9:21; cf. also 2 Sam. 20:8; Jud. 15:11; 1 Macc. 1:15).

syzeugnymi occurs only in Ezek. 1:11 for *ḥāḇar*, bind, entwine, touch (and also in v. 23 *v.l.*).

NT 1. *zygos* occurs only 6 times in the NT. (a) Only in Rev. 6:5 does it mean a balance or scales which the rider of the black horse has in his hand. The vision is a symbol of inflation and scarcity, causing hardship among the lower classes but not seriously affecting the wealthy (→ Oil, art. *elaion* NT 1). With regard to the oil and wine mentioned in v. 6, J. M. Ford draws attention to the Temple Scroll, rescued during the Six-Day War in Israel, which mentions two hitherto unknown feasts, a Feast of Oil and a Feast of New Wine (*Revelation, Anchor Bible*, 1975, 98). Oil and wine were sacrificial elements in the temple especially for the daily burnt offerings. They were kept in a special place and handled only by the priests (cf. Mishnah Middoth 2:6). Josephus describes their plundering in the time of Titus (*War* 5, 565).

(b) Slaves are addressed as those "who are under the yoke of slavery [*hosoi eisin hypo zygon douloi*]", and are exhorted to yield to the existing social order, regarding their masters (*despotas*) as "worthy of all honour, so that the name of God and the teaching may not be defamed" (1 Tim. 6:1; cf. 1 Cor. 7:21 ff.; → Slave; → Lord; → Virtue, art. *Haustafeln*). They are not to take the law into their own hands and free themselves from servitude, as once Yahweh and Moses had called upon the Israelites to do (Exod. 3:8; 4:31; 6:6). In the case of Israel the saving event consisted in the liberation from servitude in Egypt; in the case of the church it consists first and foremost in the spiritual freedom of Christ which enables a man to be free even in physical bondage.

(c) In both form and content, Jesus' invitation in Matt. 11:29 f. recalls the language and tradition of the → wisdom tradition: "Take my yoke upon you, and learn from me; for I am gentle and lowly in heart, and you will find rest for your souls. For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light" (cf. Prov. 8:1 ff.; 9:5; and especially Sir. 51:25 f., see above, OT 4). On this passage see especially H. D. Betz, "The Logion of the Easy Yoke and of Rest (Matt. 11:28–30)", *JBL* 86, 1967, 10–20; M. J. Suggs, *Wisdom, Christology and Law in Matthew's Gospel*, 1970, 77 ff.; and M. Maher, " 'Take My Yoke upon You' (Matt. xi. 29)", *NTS* 22, 1975–76, 97–103. M. Black sees here an Aramaic word-play (*An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*, 1967³, 183 f.). Jesus calls upon all the weary and burdened (*pantes hoi kopiōntes kai pephortismenoi*, v. 28) to accept his yoke. Whereas Jer. 5:5 sees the knowledge of Yahweh and his law as a yoke which is not burdensome but which wayward Israel had broken (cf. Jer. 2:20), Jesus accuses the scribes and Pharisees who sit in Moses' seat of binding heavy burdens (*phortia barea*), of laying them on men's shoulders, but of not moving them with their finger (Matt. 23:4).

The devout Jew did not consider the yoke of the law as a burden. Rabbi Nehunya ben Kanah (*c.* A.D. 100) declared that, "He that takes upon himself the yoke of the law, from him shall be taken away the yoke of the kingdom and the yoke of worldly care" (Pirke Aboth 3:5). Somewhat later Joshua ben Levi (*c.* A.D. 250) could say: "Thou findest no free man except him that occupies himself with the study of the Torah" (Pirke Aboth 6:2). Nevertheless, the way that the law was understood was not in fact a liberating experience (cf. Matt. 23 with Matt. 5:20; 6:2–18), and the immediate context of Matt. 11:29 f. underlines this point. These verses appear to in-

troduce a section beginning with Matt. 12:1 ("At that time . . .) and going on to Matt. 12:50 or even 13:58, in which the various incidents and sayings illustrate the rest that men find under Jesus's easy yoke, in contrast with the bondage that men find themselves in, when they reject God's approach to them in Jesus because they are so set in their religious attitudes. The Son of man is Lord of the → sabbath, and therefore he may authorize the disciples to pluck grain (Matt. 12:1–8), and he may also heal on the sabbath (Matt. 12:9–16). He is the Servant on whom God's Spirit rests (Matt. 12:17–21; cf. Isa. 42:1–4). He is the Son of David through whom God's Spirit works and who has bound → Satan, though the Pharisees are so set in their understanding that they cannot recognize this (Matt. 12:22–32; → Swear). Despite their profession, the scribes and Pharisees bring forth evil because their hearts are not good (Matt. 12:33–37). They seek signs even though one greater than Solomon is here (Matt. 12:38–42). The last state of empty piety is worse than the first (Matt. 12:43–45). True kinship with Jesus is not something physical: "For whoever does the will of my Father in heaven is my brother, and sister, and mother" (Matt. 12:50; cf. vv. 46–49). This leads immediately on to the → parables of the kingdom and the reflection that many took offence at Jesus (Matt. 13:1–58).

In coming to Jesus, men thus come to one who upholds the law (Matt. 5:17 f.), but also one whose interpretation of the law is not a bondage in any sense, whether recognized or unrecognized. He is the one in whom the prophecies of the law and the prophets are fulfilled (cf. Matt. 1:22 f.; 2:6, 15, 17 f., 23; 4:13–26; 12:17–21). He is the bearer of the expected salvation and the one in whom the kingdom of God has come (Matt. 4:17; 12:28). His authority has astonished his hearers (Matt. 5:21–48; 7:28 f.; 11:27; 12:41 f.; 13:17). Unlike the rabbis he does not establish his authority by citing elders or tradition. Unlike → Moses, he does not report the word of Yahweh but speaks authoritatively in his own name. He claims allegiance for his own sake (Matt. 10:39), invites people to follow him (Matt. 19:16–20), and as the risen Christ claims that all authority in heaven and earth has been given to him (Matt. 28:18). "A Christian is one who learns from Jesus not only by accepting his teaching, but also by imitating the virtues that characterized his life (cf. xi. 29). . . . The yoke of Jesus as understood by Matthew was not one of fidelity to a code but of dedication to a Person who was God's representative among men, God with men (cf. i, 23), and who could offer rest and salvation to those who were weary and heavy burdened in their struggle for redemption and union with God (cf. xi. 30)" (M. Maher, op. cit., 103). This contrasts with the picture of the Jews in Jn. 8:33 who declared that as descendants of Abraham they had never been in bondage to anyone. They were shocked at the suggestion that they were in bondage. As Maher comments, "Their zeal in bearing the 'yoke of the Torah', their genuine desire to live according to the truth as made known in the law, prevented them from accepting the word of Jesus and committing themselves to his person. They regarded his offer of a new yoke as unnecessary, and they refused the new road to salvation which he pointed out to them" (ibid.).

Various early Christian writers slipped into adopting the language of Judaism, e.g. in saying that the new law imposed no "yoke of coercion" (Barn. 2:6), that the Master's law was "the yoke of his grace" (1 Clem. 16:17), and that the follower of Christ "bore the yoke of his word" (Justin, *Dial.* 53, 1). Maher sees here a positive precedent for interpreting the Jewish attitude to the law in a positive way (op. cit., 101). But it may be asked whether, in thinking in terms of a new law, the early

church was not already taking the first steps towards the same misconception that Judaism fell into.

(d) In Gal. 5:1, Paul may well be taking up Jewish pronouncements about the yoke of the law: "For freedom Christ has set us free; stand fast therefore, and do not submit again to a yoke of slavery." Whereas Matt. 11:29 f. juxtaposes the yoke of Jesus with the yoke of the law, Paul denounces the yoke of the law as a yoke of slavery. His reason for doing so arises out of the way in which the law was understood as something to be fulfilled as a condition of divine acceptance. In particular, → circumcision was insisted upon by a party of Jewish Christians as something required by the law as the word of God and therefore to be kept. For Paul the question of circumcision epitomized the function of the law in contemporary Judaism. To keep it, as the Judaizing party understood it, was in principle to base salvation on man's righteous acts as the precondition of divine acceptance. It was therefore fundamentally at variance with the redemptive death of Christ (Gal. 3:10–14; cf. 5:3 f.) and the Spirit-led life (Gal. 5:18). For the Christian life is based on grace and promise, and those who do not live by the promises of God are not children of God but slaves (Gal. 4:28–31). In this respect the law is just like the powers of nature (*stoicheia tou kosmou*) to which the Gentile readers of Gal. were formerly subject (Gal. 4:8 f.; → Law, art. *stoicheia*). Instead of submitting to the yoke of slavery, Paul calls upon his readers to lay hold of their freedom in Christ and to walk by the Spirit (Gal. 5:1–26).

(e) Similarly, the account of the Jerusalem council in Acts 15 reports Peter as declaring: "Now therefore why do you make trial of God by putting a yoke upon the neck of the disciples which neither our fathers nor we have been able to bear?" (Acts 15:10). He appears to be taking up the Jewish language about the yoke of the law, and interpreting it like Paul as a yoke of bondage. For here too the issue was that of circumcision and whether it was necessary to insist that Gentile converts should be subjected to this legal prescription.

2. The adj. *syzygos*, yoked together, is found as a noun meaning yoke-fellow, comrade and even wife (Euripides, *Alcestis* 314, 342; *Anthologia* 8, 161, 6; 144, 2; Syntipas p. 16, 9; 18, 6; Test. Reub. 4:1; cf. Arndt, 783). The identity of the *gnēsie syzyge*, "true yoke-fellow", in Phil. 4:3 is not clear. Epaphroditus (Phil. 2:25 ff.) has been suggested. The Alexandrian theologians took it as an appeal to Paul's wife (Clement, *Strom.* 3, 53, 1; Origen, *Comm. in Ep. ad Rom.* 1, 1). The idea that it is a proper name like Euodia and Syntyche who are also mentioned in the same verse has received some support, but the use of the word as a name is not otherwise attested.

3. *zeugos* means a yoke of two animals (Lk. 14:19) and a pair (Lk. 2:24; cf. Lev. 5:11; → Bird).

4. The vb. *zeugnymi* meant to connect, join and is used of marital union in Mk. 10:9 *v.l.* Otherwise the compound *syzeugnymi* is used (Matt. 19:6 par. Mk. 10:9). Both vbs. are found in secular Gk. and Josephus (*Ant.* 6, 309; 16, 11) of marital union (cf. Arndt, 337; 783). For their precise significance in Jesus's teaching on marriage and divorce → Separate, art. *chōrizō* NT 4.

5. In 2 Cor. 6:14 Paul uses the vb. *heterozygeō* which is used of the yoking of different kinds of animals in Lev. 19:19 (cf. Philo, *Spec. Leg.* 4, 203; Josephus, *Ant.* 4, 228). C. K. Barrett translates it: "You must not get into double harness with unbelievers" (*The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, *BNTC*, 1973, 195). This, like the

ET "do not be unequally yoked", has the advantage of preserving the imagery of the original. The RSV, however, interprets the injunction as a warning against mixed marriages: "Do not be mismated with unbelievers." In favour of such an interpretation is the association of the word group in general with marriage, though this is by no means an exclusive association. In v. 16a Paul asks: "For what agreement has the temple of God with idols? For we are the temple of the living God." In 1 Cor. 6:18 Paul has used the image of the temple as an argument against sexual immorality. But the whole context and argument of 2 Cor. 6:14 ff. appears to look beyond mixed marriages to idolatry and defilement in general (cf. C. K. Barrett, op. cit., 196), although a mixed marriage could lead to such idolatry and defilement.

This wider interpretation is, as Barrett has shown (op. cit., 195 f.), consonant with the teaching which Paul has given earlier in 1 Cor. It is not simply a Christian version of the Qumran insistence upon separation from the world and from disobedient Israel. The Christian is to remain in the world, but not be a party to idolatry and moral defilement. Thus the believer should never be guilty of fornication (1 Cor. 5:9 f.). He should bring his affairs before the church rather than take his fellow believer to the secular courts (1 Cor. 6:1–6). He should not deliberately enter upon a mixed marriage with an unbeliever, but if one of the partners in a previously pagan marriage becomes a Christian the marriage should not be dissolved simply on that account, for the believer sanctifies the marriage and the unbelieving partner may be won for Christ (1 Cor. 7:12–16, 39). The believer may not, however, eat at a table in an idol's temple (1 Cor. 8:10 f.). Paul may become all things to all men (1 Cor. 9:21 f.), but not to the point of partaking of the Lord's Supper and the table of demons (1 Cor. 10:21). The believer may eat with an unbeliever, but he should not knowingly eat meat that has been sacrificed to idols (1 Cor. 10:27 ff.). He should not give offence to Jew or Greek, if he can avoid it (1 Cor. 10:32). Christian worship should be so conducted for an unbeliever who is present to be convicted (1 Cor. 14:24). In other words, Paul does not advocate an exclusive separation from the world. Believers are to remain in the world and seek to win it. But they are not to allow their faith to be compromised in any way, particularly by pagan idolatry and the sexual mores of the heathen. Conversion means a break with the world (1 Cor. 6:9 ff.). The church is the community of God's elect (1 Cor. 1:1–9). The outward shape of the world is passing away (1 Cor. 7:29 ff.), and the holy people will judge the world (1 Cor. 6:2 f.). *H.-G. Link, C. Brown*

→ Separate, → Slave

(a). H. D. Betz, "The Logion of the Easy Yoke and of Rest (Matt. 11:28–30)", *JBL* 86, 1967, 10–20; M. Maher, " 'Take My Yoke upon You' (Matt. xi, 29)", *NTS* 22, 1975–76, 97–103; M. Rist, "Is Matt. 11:25–30 a Primitive Baptismal Hymn?", *JR* 15, 1935, 63–77; M. J. Suggs, *Wisdom, Christology and Law in Matthew's Gospel*, 1970, 77–97.

(b). T. Arvedson, *Das Mysterium Christi*, 1937; J. B. Bauer, "Das milde Joch und die Ruhe (Matt. 11, 28 f.)", *ThZ* 17, 1961, 99–106; E. Norden, *Agnostos Theos*, (1913) 1956, 277–311.

Z

Zeal

The intense and earnest efforts to reach a goal for which "zeal" is used in Eng. (but "jealousy" for its perversion) is expressed by various word-groups in Gk. Here *zēlos* and *spoudē* are considered; *zēteō* will be found under → Seek and other words are treated under → Burden. *spoudē* is used always in a good sense of the seriousness and effort of such activity, but *zēlos*, when used of selfish motives which damage or destroy fellowship, can have a bad sense.

ζῆλος

ζῆλος (*zēlos*), zeal; *ζηλόω* (*zēloō*), to be zealous; *ζηλωτής* (*zēlōtēs*), a zealot.

CL *zēlos* (from the Attic tragedians on) has zeal as its underlying idea, and means an emotional going out to a person, idea or cause. There are two clear meanings depending on the object of the zeal. Where the goal is good, *zēlos* means eager striving, competition, enthusiasm, admiration, and in suitable contexts praise, glory. In a bad sense, the zeal has had a wrong goal and has become a defect; it then means jealousy, ill-will, envy. Accordingly, *zēlōtēs*, zealot, can mean one seeking to reach good goals or a jealous man, an envious man. Equally, according to the context, the vb. *zēloō* can mean be zealous, consider fortunate, strive after or envy, be jealous.

OT The word-group is found only in the later portions of the LXX (e.g. Prov. 6:34), for emotions in the human realm. The concept of striving for ethical perfection – the only use found in Philo (cf. *Deus Imm.* 60 f.; *TDNT* II 879 f.) – does not appear. In its place we find *zēlos* with the special connotation of zeal directed to God, of the passionate readiness for service which allows itself to be controlled by the will of God, by the Law (cf. Ps. 69[68]:9; 1 Ki. 19:10, 14; 2 Ki. 15:16. "This zeal for Yahweh was laid on Israel, and the special call of Israel can be recognized by it" (O. Michel, *Der Brief an die Römer*, *KEK* 4, 1966[13], 233).

More frequent are the passages that speak of God's zeal, when it means the intensity, the uncompromising involvement with which God deals with men. Some ETs have retained the possibly misleading rendering "jealous". In Exod. 20:5 God calls himself *zēlōtēs*. In connexion with this, the twofold manner in which God's zeal works is mentioned. He turns it against the evildoers to punish them, and here *zēlos* connotes God's wrath (*orgē*, Deut. 29:20; *thymos*, Num. 25:11; → Anger). On the other hand, it shows itself as → mercy towards those that fear him (Isa. 63:15). God's zeal is especially mentioned in his rôle as Lord of history; he displays it in his support of his people Israel against the other nations (e.g. 2 Ki. 19:31; Ezek. 36:6; 38:19; Isa.

9:7; 26:11; 37:32; 42:13, RSV "fury"; 63:15, etc.). The exclusiveness of Yahweh's relationship to Israel is shown also by his showing *zēlos*, i.e. jealousy, at her unfaithfulness, which is often presented as adultery (Ezek. 16:38; 23:27; → Marriage, arts. *moicheuō* and *nymphē*).

The OT usage continued in Palestinian Judaism. The Qumran texts speak of God's zeal which is expressed in his righteous judgments. The rabbis show a certain reserve in speaking of God's zeal or jealousy. The OT passages using *zēlos* are circumvented. This dislike of anthropomorphisms is seen even more clearly in Hellenistic Judaism (*TDNT* II 880).

NT *zēlos* is found 17 times in NT, *zēlōtēs* 8 times; and the verbal forms of *zēloō* or *zēleō* 12 times.

Both the good and bad senses of the word group are found in the NT. The bad sense of jealousy is found in Acts 7:9 (of Joseph's brothers); 5:17; 13:45; 17:5 (of the Jews' jealousy of the apostles' success, though the concept of zeal for God may be dimly perceived). Jealousy and strife are a deadly danger to the continued existence of a church (Jas. 3:16; cf. v. 14, 1 Cor. 3:3; 2 Cor. 12:20). A Christian must not show jealousy but is to walk by the Spirit (Gal. 5:16, 20) and deal lovingly (Rom. 13:13). The NT takes up a critical attitude not only to ethically reprehensible jealousy but also to zeal for the → law. Thus Paul rejects his previous zeal "for the traditions of my fathers" (Gal. 1:14). It was just this "being zealous for God" (Acts 22:3) that had caused him to become a persecutor of the church (Phil. 3:6). As he looked back, he recognized that he had acted as a pious Israelite who was not enlightened, as was the case with the majority of the Jews in his time (Rom. 10:2).

But zeal in itself is not rejected. Quite the contrary is true. Paul rejoiced that "godly grief" had produced repentance and zeal (2 Cor. 7:11), and he expressly called men to zeal, for it is good, if it is for Christ's sake, who himself was zealous for God (Jn. 2:17). He expressly praised the missionary zeal which surrounds others with good (Gal. 4:18, RSV "to be made much of"; cf. 2 Cor. 11:2, where Paul speaks of "a divine jealousy"). Especially there is the call to "earnestly desire" (*zēloute*) the gifts of the Spirit → grace (*charisma*, 1 Cor. 12:31; 14:1, 12, RSV "you are eager"; 14:39), which can be rightly used in love which is free of jealousy (1 Cor. 13:4). Finally, there is a positive zeal for the welfare of others (2 Cor. 7:7; 9:2), for the right (1 Pet. 3:13) and good works (Tit. 2:14), but here too love must take preeminence over zeal.

zēlōtēs, as an epithet for Simon (Lk. 6:15; Acts 1:13), has a special meaning; it shows that he was earlier a member of the anti-Roman, theocratic, party of the Zealots. He is presumably identical with Simon the Cananean (Mk. 3:18; Matt. 10:4), where *ho kananaios* may translate Aram. *qan'ān*, zealot, i.e. *zēlōtēs* (cf. F. C. Burkitt, *Syriac Forms of New Testament Proper Names*, 1912, 5; Arndt, 403).

The term Zealot has been generally applied to the resistance fighters from Judas the Galilean (6 B.C.) to the defenders of the fortress Masada (A.D. 74). Josephus claimed that the entire resistance movement went back to Judas the Galilean (*Ant.* 18, 6). At least five resistance groups are known: the Sicarii (from the Lat. *sicarius*, dagger-man, assassin), beginning with Judas and ending with their mass suicide at Masada in A.D. 74, though the term is also used of Jewish refugees who fled to Egypt at the end of the war; the Zealots, a title of honour, used by the group

who occupied the temple area under the priest Eleazar; the followers of John of Gischala who united with the Zealots and enjoyed a periodic realm of terror in Jerusalem (*War* 4, 326 f.); the followers of Simon bar Giora who controlled South Judea and who were called upon to help fight the Zealots in Jerusalem (*War* 4, 514, 544, 567); the Idumeans who were successively linked with the three previous groups (*War*, 4, 224; 4, 567; 5, 250).

When Judea was made a Roman province in 6 B.C. Judas the Galilean and Zadok the Pharisee established the "fourth school of Jewish philosophers" (*War* 2, 118). Judas interpreted the First Commandment to mean that none but God should be honoured as king or lord. The payment of taxes to the emperor would mean implicit rejection of this commandment. This situation sheds light on the question of paying tribute money, since it raises the question in an acute way of whether Jesus would side with this purist movement for national liberation and whether his teaching on the kingdom of God would be assimilated to Zealot ideals (Matt. 22:15–22 par. Mk. 12:13–17; Lk. 20:20–26). The Zealots themselves suffered willing martyrdom for their beliefs (Josephus, *War* 2, 170 f.; 3, 9). But when they captured Jerusalem in A.D. 66 the first thing they destroyed was the city archives with records of debts (*War* 2, 427). In A.D. 68 Simon bar Giora proclaimed general emancipation of Jewish slaves (*War* 4, 508).

The Zealots observed the sabbath strictly (*War* 2, 454). They demanded circumcision even of the heathen. Like the Pharisees, they had rigorous requirements for cleanliness. The Masada fortress contained a ritual bath and a synagogue. They appear to have held strong eschatological beliefs, which may well explain their readiness for self-sacrifice.

Some scholars have seen strong links between Jesus and the Zealot movement (cf. S. G. F. Brandon, *Jesus and the Zealots: A Study of the Political Factors in Primitive Christianity*, 1967). But the presence of a former Zealot among the disciples does not imply an endorsement of the movement, and to interpret the cleansing of the temple (Matt. 21:12–17 par. Mk. 11:15–19; Lk. 19:45 f.; cf. Jn. 2:13–17) as an act of resistance is to read a theory into the evidence. Jesus' teaching on the tribute money is a firm repudiation of Zealot ideals, as is his attitude to the → sabbath (e.g. Mk. 2:23–27; 3:1 ff.) and ceremonial washing (e.g. Mk. 7:15; → Baptism; → Hand).

H.-C. Hahn

σπουδή

σπουδή (*spoudē*), zeal; σπουδαῖος (*spoudaios*), zealous; σπουδάζω (*spoudazō*), to be zealous.

CL From the basic vb. *speudō*, intrans., speed oneself, trans. hasten, strive for, there was derived the noun *spoudē* (from Homer on), and from this in the classical period the adj. *spoudaios* and the vb. *spoudazō*. The word-group denotes first of all quick movement in the interests of a person or cause, and means hasten oneself (vb.), quickly (adv.), haste, speed involved in the carrying out of a matter (noun). Then it suggests inner movement, as a vb., be zealous, give oneself trouble, seek to do, be concerned for; as an adj., busy, active, industrious; as a noun, zeal, industry, effort, pains, sometimes in contrast to sloth. When they are used in contrast to play and joking, they stress serious preoccupation with something and the taking seriously of

persons and things; i.e. vb., do or take seriously; adj., serious; noun, seriousness. When used with a moral connotation *spoudē* means willingness, good will; *spoudaios* implies a man concerned with the good, the virtuous man (the one aiming at *aretē*, virtue), the noble man. For Aristotle it is the man of true quality and morals, for the Stoics the truly moral man. In religious contexts the vb. means to involve oneself whole-heartedly; the noun means noble zeal. In Hellenistic philosophy, *spoudē* is used in contexts of moral effort in the individual's conquest of his environment and self-perfection. In letters it is used to reinforce urgent requests.

OT *spoudē* is normally used in the LXX with the meaning of urgency and haste (e.g. Gen. 19:15; Exod. 12:11, 33). Only later, and then rarely, does it mean zeal (Sir. 27:3; Wis. 14:17). There is no real equivalent in Heb. It is often used to render *bāhal*, be alarmed, dismayed (Job 4:5; 21:6; Isa. 21:3), which involves weakening the force of the Heb.

NT In the NT also *spoudē* means haste (Lk. 1:39; 2:16; 19:5 f.). It can also be so understood in Phil. 2:28; 2 Tim. 4:9, 21; Tit. 3:12; but this meaning is recognized by NEB only in the last, and by RSV not at all. In Lk. 7:4 the adv. *spoudaiōs* stresses the intensity of the request by which opposition should be overcome and in 2 Tim. 1:17 it brings out the intensity of the search overcoming obstacles. In 1 Thess. 2:17 the vb. underlines the intensity of Paul's efforts to see them again. The adv. is used in Tit. 3:13 for the thorough equipping of travellers. In 2 Pet. 1:15 the vb., and in Jude 3 the noun, are used in connection with the writing of an important letter.

For Paul *spoudē* is a necessary expression of the life of the Christian community; it determines its ethical actions and behaviour. It is a gift of God which must be developed. Its power should be seen in the effort to maintain unity (Eph. 4:3), in aiding other Christians (Gal. 2:10; 2 Cor. 8:7, 6, 16), in the making good of a wrong done (2 Cor. 7:11 f.), and in the leadership of the church (Rom. 12:8; RSV apparently understands it of practical help). All are expected to give themselves completely (Rom. 12:11), and the example can prove infectious (2 Cor. 8:8).

In the later writings of the NT *spoudē* has a somewhat more general and fundamental meaning. The whole conduct of life must be moulded by it, if the Christian is not to lose what he has been given and risk failure to reach the goal set before him (2 Tim. 2:15; 2 Pet. 1:5, 10; 3:12, 14; Heb. 4:11; 6:11). In such passages it expresses something of the greatness of the Christian's responsibility for the development of his life.

Other words in the NT which stress haste are *nyn*, now, *sēmeron*, today, *euthys*, immediately, and *tachys*, quickly. *W. Bauder*

→ War

(a). J. M. Allegro, *The Treasure of the Copper Scroll*, 1960; S. G. F. Brandon, "Zealots", *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, XIV 947–50; and *Jesus and the Zealots: A Study of the Political Factors in Primitive Christianity*, 1967; O. Cullmann, *Jesus and the Revolutionaries*, 1970; W. D. Davies, *The Gospel and the Land: Early Christianity and Jewish Territorial Doctrine*, 1974; W. R. Farmer, *Maccabees, Zealots and Josephus*, 1956; and "Zealot", *IDB* IV 936–39; G. Harder, *spoudazō* etc., *TDNT* VII 559–68; M. Hengel, *Was Jesus a Revolutionist?*, 1971; *Victory over Violence*, 1973; *Judaism and Hellenism*, I–II, 1974; and *Christ and Politics*, 1977; K. Kohler, "Zealots", *Jewish Encyclopedia*, XII, 639–43; A. R. C. Leaney and J. Neusner, "The Roman Period", in J. H. Hayes and

J. M. Miller, eds., *Israelite and Judaean History*, 1977, 605–77; H. Merkel, "Zealot", *IDB Supplementary Volume*, 1976, 979–82; M. Pearlman, *The Zealots of Masada*, 1969; E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C. – A.D. 135)*, ed. G. Vermes and F. Millar, 1973, 243–557; M. Smith, "Zealots and Sicarii", *HTR* 64, 1971, 1–19; A. Stumpf, *zēlos* etc., *TDNT* II 877–88; Y. Yadin, *The Excavation of Masada 1963/64*, 1965; and *Masada: Herod's Fortress and the Zealots' Last Stand*, 1966.

(b). G. Baumbach, *Jesus von Nazareth im Lichte der jüdischen Gruppenbildung*, 1971; M. Hengel, *Die Zeloten. Untersuchungen zur Freiheitsbewegung in der Zeit von Herodes I bis 70 n. Chr.*, *Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Spätjudentums und Urchristentums* 1, 1961; and "Zeloten und Sikarier", in O. Betz, K. Haacker and M. Hengel, eds., *Josephus-Studien. Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Christentum und dem Neuen Testament Otto Michel zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet*, 1974, 175–96; H. Kreissig, *Die sozialen Zummenhänge des jüdischen Krieges*, 1970; A. Strobel, "Eifer", *BHHW* I 379; K. Wegenast, "Zeloten", Pauly-Wissowa, IX A 2, 2474–99.

Appendix

Prepositions and Theology in the Greek New Testament

Outline of Contents

I *General Observations*
- A *The Origin and Function of Prepositions*
- B *Distinctive Features of Prepositional Usage in NT Greek*
  1. Characteristics in keeping with tendencies of Hellenistic Greek: (a) preference for acc., (b) prep. phrases for simple cases, (c) "improper" preps. more numerous, (d) preps. combined with advs., (e) cl. Gk. variety of usage curtailed, (f) "overlap" of preps.
  2. Characteristics reflecting Semitic influence: (a) certain preps. or prep. usages more frequent or with new significance, (b) repetition of preps. with copulated nouns
- C *Exegetical Dangers*
  1. Insistence on classical Greek distinctions
  2. Failure to make adequate allowance for a writer's stylistic variation
  3. Disregard of probable distinctions
  4. Denial of a *double entendre*
  5. Neglect of the possible significance of (a) the non-repetition of the prep. with copulated nouns, and (b) the order of nouns that follow a prep.

II *Some Theologically Important Instances of the Major Prepositions*
- A *anti*: 1. Equivalence 2. Exchange 3. Substitution
- B *apo*: 1. *apo* and *ek*. 2. Some notable instances: (a) 1 Cor. 11:23 (b) Heb. 5:7 (c) Rev. 1:4
- C *dia*: 1. Means or instrument 2. Attendant circumstances 3. Cause or Ground 4. Purpose
- D *eis*: 1. Relation to other prepositions: (a) *pros* (b) *en* 2. Telic and ecbatic *eis* 3. Causal *eis*? 4. *logizesthai eis*
- E *ek*: 1. Basic signification 2. Some notable instances: (a) Jn. 15:19; 17:14, 16 (b) Rom. 1:3 f. (c) Rom. 1:17 (d) Rom. 3:30 (e) 2 Cor. 13:4
- F *en*: 1. Extended NT use 2. Its versatility and ultimate disappearance 3. Exegetical ambiguities 4. Figurative sense 5. Causal *en* 6. *en Christō*
- G *epi*: 1. Basic meaning and versatility 2. Some notable uses: (a) *epi to auto* (b) *eph' hō* (c) Matt. 19:9 (d) 1 Pet. 2:24a
- H *hyper*: 1. With the acc. 2. With the gen.
- I *hypo*: 1. *hypo* and *dia* 2. *hypo* and *apo* 3. *hypo* and *para*

J *kata*: 1. Root meaning 2. *kata sarka* and *kata pneuma* 3. *kata* denoting correspondence or conformity 4. Distributive *kata*
K *meta*
L *para*: 1. Basic sense 2. Transferred meanings 3. *para* in the Fourth Gospel
M *peri*
N *pros*: 1. Jn. 1:1b 2. 2 Cor. 5:8 3. 1 Jn. 5:16 f.
O *syn*: 1. Relation to *meta* 2. *einai syn Christō* in Paul

III *SPECIAL PROBLEMS*
A *Prepositions with baptizō*
1. Non-prep. constructions 2. Prep. constructions: (a) *peri* (b) *pros* (c) *dia* (d) *en* (e) *epi* with dat. (f) *epi* with acc. (g) *eis* with acc. 3. Concluding observations
B *Prepositions with pisteuō (and pistis)*
1. Non-prep. constructions 2. Prep. constructions: (a) *peri* (b) *pros* (c) *dia* (d) *en* (e) *epi* with dat. (f) *epi* with acc. (g) *eis* with acc. 3. Concluding observations

IV *SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY*

The discussion that follows is not intended as a comprehensive classification of the meanings and uses of all prepositions ("proper" and "improper") which occur in NT Gk. (on which see the standard lexica and grammars). Attention is focused on some uses of the major prepositions which are judged to be theologically significant. There is no treatment of the meaning of prepositions in compounds (on which see Moulton, *Grammar*, II, 292–328).

I *GENERAL OBSERVATIONS*

A. *The Origin and Function of Prepositions*

To judge from Vedic Sanskrit and Homeric Gk., preps. were originally adjuncts to verbs, "adverbs". How adverbs came to be attached to nouns is illustrated by Homer, *Il.* 11, 89, "desire for sweet food seizes his heart round about" (*peri phrenas*). In Homer most preps. were also used adverbially, but in the NT only rarely is this original adverbial nature of preps. apparent (e.g., *hyper egō*, "I more," 2 Cor. 11:23), although words such as *engys* and *exō* are used either as adverbs or as preps. Recognizing that in origin preps. were "ad-verbs," grammarians have traditionally (if arbitrarily) referred to preps. that can be compounded with verbs as "proper" (some 18 in the NT); those that cannot, are termed "improper" (42 in the NT).

Most preps. may denote three relations (local, temporal, mental or ideal) but the primary representation is local: (1) motion to – *eis* (into), *pros* (to); (2) motion from – *ana* (up from), *apo* (from), *dia* (through), *ek* (out of), *kata* (down from); (3) at rest – *anti* (over against), *en* (in), *epi* (upon), *hyper* (over, above), *hypo* (under, beneath), *meta* (behind), *para* (beside), *peri* (around), *pro* (before, in front of), *syn* (with). However, it is not always possible to trace clearly this basic spatial sense (the "root meaning") in extended metaphorical uses of the preps. With regard to the main ideal

relations, the preps. may be grouped as follows (reflecting principal usage): (1) origin (*apo*, *ek*, *para*); (2) cause or occasion (*dia*, *epi*, *ek*, *apo*); (3) purpose or object (*eis*, *pros*, *epi*, *hyper*); (4) result (*eis*, *pros*); (5) association or identification (*syn*, *meta*, *en*, *dia*); (6) relation (*peri*, *hyper*, *pros*, *eis*); (7) agency (*hypo*; sometimes *apo*, *dia*, *para*, or *en*); (8) instrumentality or means (*dia*, *ek*, *en*); (9) correspondence (*kata*, *pros*); (10) opposition (*kata*, *para*, *pros*).

Strictly speaking, from the point of view of historical development, a prep. does not "govern" the case of a noun but rather adds a certain precision to the case-meaning of the noun whose case is determined by its relation to the verb or to another noun. For example, *ēlthen eis tēn polin*, "he went to-the-city [acc. denoting motion to] inwards [adverb]," i.e. "he went into the city." But, in ever-increasing measure, the case-ending itself came to be divested of special significance because inflection expressed such diversified relations, and the accompanying prep. assumed part of the meaning of the case. Therefore it is somewhat artificial to analyse the case of a noun in cl. or Hel. Gk. apart from the "meaning" of the adjoining prep.; the writers themselves probably regarded preps. as "governing" or determining the case of the noun.

In seeking to determine the meaning of a prep. phrase the NT exegete should (at least ideally) consider: (1) the primary meaning of the prep. in itself (i.e. the local relation) and then its range of meanings when used with a particular case; (2) the basic significance of the case that is used with the prep.; (3) the indications afforded by the context as to the meaning of the prep.; (4) the distinctive features of prep. usage in the NT which may account for seeming irregularities.

B. *Distinctive Features of Prepositional Usage in NT Greek*

1. *Several characteristics are in keeping with general tendencies apparent in Hel. Gk.*

(a) Preps. followed by the acc. are, in general, preferred over preps. used with the dat. (although *en* with the dat. gains ground and *peri* with the acc. loses ground in comparison with cl. usage). This occasions no surprise since the dative case, which is found in modern demotic Gk. only in a fossilized form, had already begun to be eclipsed in the NT era, although its disappearance was not complete until the tenth century A.D. (see J. Humbert, *La Disparition du Datif en Grec*, 1930; P. F. Regard, *Contribution à L'Étude des Prépositions dans la Langue du Nouveau Testament*, 1919, 325–376, 677).

(b) Prep. phrases are often used instead of simple cases (e.g., *eis hymas* in 1 Pet. 1:4 replaces *hymin*; *en* with the dat. serves for the simple dat.; compare Matt. 7:2 and Lk. 6:38) (see further N. Turner in Moulton, *Grammar*, III, 251–253).

(c) "Improper" preps., used only with the gen. (except for *engys*, *hama* and *paraplēsion*), become more numerous (42 in the NT), reflecting the tendency towards fuller expression and the preference for uniformity that mark Hel. Gk. (see M. Zerwick, *Biblical Greek*, ET 1963, *§* 83, *§§* 480 f.). For example, *emprosthen* (= Heb. *lipnê*) is preferred over *pro* to denote "before" in a spatial sense, although it is very rare outside biblical Gk.

(d) Preps. are commonly combined with adverbs, especially those denoting time

or place (e.g., *apo perysi*, "a year ago", "since last year', 2 Cor. 8:10; 9:2) (see Regard, *Prépositions*, 679).

(e) In comparison with cl. Gk., the variety in the use of "proper" preps. is curtailed. When a prep. has multiple uses, the least important usage tends to disappear (Regard, *Prépositions*, 681). In the NT only *epi*, *para* (and *pros*: once with the gen.) take three cases, while the dat. is no longer used with *meta*, *peri*, and *hypo* (as it was in cl. Gk.). *ana* and *anti* have restricted use.

(f) Undoubtedly the tendency of the greatest significance for NT exegesis and theology is that the "overlap" or "confusion" between various preps. (when bearing certain senses) becomes more apparent. Evidence of such occasional *enallage* may be derived from: parallel passages in the synoptic gospels; repetition of an identical noun with different preps. within a single context or within a literary corpus; textual variants, which sometimes represent a scribal attempt to clarify meaning by removing ambiguities and irregularities in prep. use; the proleptic or pregnant use of preps., especially in a local sense; the use of two different preps. in close proximity, apparently without distinction; and, on occasion, simply the seemingly irregular use of a prep.

The more important instances of this "interchange" include the following: (i) *hyper* and *peri* (e.g., *peri pollōn* in Matt. 26:28 is *hyper pollōn* in Mk. 14:24; Lk. 22:20); following *deēsis*, Rom. 10:1 compared with Eph. 6:18 f.; note also Jn. 1:30; Acts 8:24; 2 Cor. 1:7 f.; 7:14; 8:23; 12:8; 2 Thess. 2:1; and the textual variants in Gal. 1:4; Heb. 5:1, 3; 1 Pet. 3:18; (ii) *apo* and *ek* (e.g., Lk. 2:4; Jn. 11:1; 1 Thess. 2:6; with *dekatē*, Heb. 7:2, 4; Matt. 7:16 compared with Lk. 6:44; and the textual variants in Matt. 28:7; Mk. 3:8; Lk. 15:16; Acts 18:1; 2 Pet. 2:21; Rev. 1:5; 6:4; 20:9); (iii) *apo* and *para* (e.g., Jn. 13:3 compared with Jn. 16:27, 28 *v.l.*, 30); (iv) *apo* or *ek* may stand for *hypo* (e.g., *apo* – Matt. 11:19; Acts 15:4 *v.l.* and cf. 15:3; 2 Cor. 7:13; *ek* – 2 Cor. 1:11; 7:9; cf. 1 Cor. 2:12a and b; (v) *pros* and *eis* (e.g., Mk. 5:38 f.; 11:1; Jn. 20:3; Phlm. 5); (vi) *en* and *dia* (e.g., 1 Sam. 28:6, *ter*; Heb. 1:2, "the *en* signifies *dia*," Chrysostom); (vii) *en* and *eis* (e.g., Mk. 1:9; 8:26; Lk. 4:44 *v.l.*; 9:61; 11:7; 23:42 *v.l.*; with *kolpos*, Jn. 1:18 compared with Jn. 13:23; with *cheir*, Jn. 3:35 compared with Jn. 13:3; Acts 7:53; 1 Pet. 5:12); (viii) *hyper* may stand for *anti* (e.g., Jn. 11:50; Phlm. 13).

Some of these examples are debatable, to be sure, but it is now generally recognized by grammarians that in Hel. Gk. the distinction between some preps. used in certain senses was becoming more and more blurred. This is not to suggest, however, that preps. were arbitrarily or indiscriminately substituted for one another. Indeed, the incidence of such "interchange" needs to be carefully analysed, for each preposition has its own history and each writer his own idiosyncrasies. Concerning *eis* and *en*, for example, it appears that apart from Mark and Luke-Acts, where *eis* may stand for *en* and *en* for *eis*, the exegete should presume that *eis* retains its distinctive sense until the context or other considerations show that this is impossible or improbable (cf. Zerwick, *Biblical Greek*, § 106; N. Turner in Moulton, *Grammar*, III, 255).

2. *As a result of Semitic influence, often mediated through the Septuagint, the NT use of preps. gained several distinctive characteristics.*

(a) Certain preps. or prep. usages become more frequent or assume a new significance. It is not that the following constructions or uses are without parallel in

contemporary papyri, inscriptions or literary usage. Sometimes it is the greater number of instances that points to direct or indirect Semitic influence. Notably, under the influence of the Heb. *b*^{e}, *en* often expresses accompaniment ("with") (e.g., Mk. 5:2, 25; 1 Cor. 4:21; Heb. 9:25), instrumentality (e.g., Lk. 22:49; Rev. 6:8; and note *en haimati* [where *en* = *Beth pretii*, cf. Gesenius–Kautzsch, *Grammar*, § 119p] in Rom. 3:25; 5:9; Rev. 5:9; but cf. 1 Pet. 1:18 f.), and causality (e.g., Isa. 61:6; Matt. 6:7; Acts 7:29; 24:16; Rom. 1:24; 1 Cor. 7:14; Col. 1:21; and note the conjunction *en hō*, "because," e.g., Rom. 8:3; Heb. 2:18). For a contrary view, see H. St. J. Thackeray, *The Old Testament in Greek*, 1903, 47. Also to be mentioned here is the frequent use of *emprosthen* (84 times in LXX for Heb. *lipnê*) (e.g., Matt. 11:26; 18:14) which is very rarely found outside biblical Gk.; the temporal force of *en tō* with the infinitive (a characteristically Lukan feature), reflecting the Heb. *b*^{e} with the infinitive construct; the gerundival use of the infinitive (with or without *tou*, *eis to* or *pros to*) [cf. the Heb. and Aram. *l*^{e} with the infinitive] (for this, see M. Zerwick, *Biblical Greek*, §§ 391 f.) (e.g. Matt. 5:28); the frequency of prep. phrases (using *apo*, *epi*, and *pro*) with *prosōpon* (Moulton, *Grammar*, II, 466); the frequency of a prep. phrase with *eis* after *ginesthai*, *einai* or *logizesthai* (cf. Heb. *l*^{e} with *hāyâh*) instead of a nominative predicate (Matt. 19:5 f., where *sarx mia* follows *eis sarka mian*; 21:42; Acts 19:27; Rom. 2:26; 4:3; 9:8; 1 Cor. 15:45, *bis*; 2 Cor. 6:18). G. A. Deissmann's inscriptional parallels (*Light from the Ancient East*, ET 1927, 120 n. 10, 121 n. 1) to this latter construction are unconvincing since they relate only to *einai eis* and only to the sense "be for the purpose of."

(b) The repetition of a prep. with each noun connected by *kai*, occurs so frequently in certain NT books as to be a feature of biblical Gk. attributable to Semitic influence. Of course in itself a repeated prep. need not betray Semitic practice, for any Gk. writer may repeat a prep. with several substantives in one regimen in order to highlight the distinction between them. N. Turner has ascertained that, when there is an opportunity to repeat a prep. with a series of nouns, LXX Ezekiel (B-text) accepts it 84% of the time (78:93), Revelation 63% (24:38), Romans, 1 Cor. 58% (14:24), Eph. 37% (6:16), Pastorals 17% (4:24), John 53% (8:15), Mark 38% (10:26), Matthew 31% (11:35), and Luke-Acts 23% (25:111) (Moulton, *Grammar*, III, 275; Moulton, *Grammar*, IV, 93), while such repetition is infrequent in the Ptolemaic papyri (E. Mayser, *Grammatik*, II. 2, 516). See the debate on this matter between A. W. Argyle ("An Alleged Semitism," *ExpT* 66, 1954–5, 177; 67, 1955–6, 247) and N. Turner ("An Alleged Semitism," *ExpT* 66, 1954–5, 252–254).

C. *Exegetical Dangers*

Not only is the detailed examination of prep. usage richly rewarding; it is an undertaking made hazardous by several pitfalls that must be carefully avoided. To isolate these hazards will be useful before we examine some of the theologically significant uses of the major preps.

1. *Insistence on classical Greek Distinctions.* One of the principal characteristics of NT Gk. in general, highlighted by N. Turner (Moulton, *Grammar*, III, 2 and *passim*; cf. P. F. Regard, *Prépositions*, 688), is the absence of cl. Gk. standards. In the days before the papyri finds from Egypt were available for comparison with the NT texts, it was not uncommon, for example, for commentators to find in the Johan-

nine use (in Jn. 1:1, 18) of *pros* and *eis* (preps. that denote direction or movement in cl. usage) proof of an intertrinitarian relationship involving either "eternal generation" or reciprocity of fellowship. It was not recognized that in Hel. Gk. both preps. *could* express location; there was no need, simply because *these* preps. were used, to find indications of motion. Or again, the extent of the "overlap" of preps. in Hel. Gk. has not always been generally recognized (see above, I.B.1.(f)).

2. *Failure to Make Adequate Allowance for a Writer's Stylistic Variation.* Given the general tendency in Hel. Gk. towards laxity of usage and overlap of function with respect to preps., the exegete should not assume that a change of prep., a change of case with a repeated prep., or the use and non-use of a prep. in successive phrases or parallel passages, *always* marks a change of meaning. A writer may simply wish to avoid repetition or vary his style.

It seems arbitrary and unwarranted, for example, to distinguish between *ex anthrōpōn* and *aph' hymōn, ap' allōn* in 1 Thess. 2:6; between *apo* (applying to domicile) and *ek* (applying to birthplace) in the Fourth Gospel (see E. A. Abbott, *Johannine Grammar*, 1906, *§§* 2289 f.), since the distinction is inapplicable in 6:33, 41; 7:41 f.; 11:1 (and note that both *apo* and *ek* are used with *tou ouranou katabebēka*, 6:38, 42); between *hon* and *hyper hou* in Jn. 1:15, 30; between *peri pantōn tōn hagiōn* and *hyper emou* after *proseuchomenoi* in Eph. 6:18 f., as if Paul were indicating that "all the saints" were to be the *subject* (*peri*) of his addressees' prayer but that his own *welfare* (*hyper*) was also to be their prayerful concern; between *pros* and *eis* in Rom. 3:25 f. and in Phm. 5; between *dia doxēs* and *en doxē* in 2 Cor. 3:11; between *epi* with the dative and genitive in Eph. 1:10; between *nekroi tois paraptōmasi* (Eph. 2:1) and *nekroi en tois paraptōmasi* (Col. 2:13); between *logō, tē glōssē*, and *en ergō* in 1 Jn. 3:18; between *ek pisteōs* and *dia tēs pisteōs* in Rom. 3:30 (see below, II.E.2.(d)).

3. *Disregard of Probable Distinctions.* This danger is the opposite of the last. A writer must be permitted to alter his terminology either to vary his style but not change his meaning *or* to express a distinction in sense. One must assume that a writer chooses his preps. with care. In the discussion of 2 Jn. 7, to treat *en sarki* as equivalent to *eis sarka* would be to embrace a species of Apollinarianism. As it is, Jesus Christ came "in the flesh," not "into flesh." In 1 Pet. 1:23 regeneration is said to have its origin or source (*ek*) in an act of immortal procreation or in imperishable seed, but is effected by means of (*dia*) the living and abiding word of God. To cite another example, Paul disowned his adequacy, on his own initiative or in his own wisdom (*aph' heautōn*), to reckon any positive result of his ministry as actually originating from himself (*ex heautōn*). Only God was able to assess the true outcome of his ministry and supply the power for its accomplishment (2 Cor. 3:5). In the interpretation of the last clause of the Lord's Prayer (Matt. 6:13b), it is relevant to observe that not *ek* but *apo* follows *rhysai.* In the NT *rhyesthai ek* denotes deliverance from non-personal evil (7 times; note especially 2 Pet. 2:9, *ek peirasmou*), never personal enemies, while (elsewhere) *apo* is twice used with persons (Rom. 15:31; 2 Thess. 3:2) and once with a non-personal object (2 Tim. 4:18). These tendencies conform with general LXX usage (see especially Ps. 39:2, LXX). From the viewpoint of *linguistic* usage, then, the probability is that *tou ponērou* means "the Evil One" rather than "evil" (see J. B. Bauer, "Libera nos a malo", *Verbum Domini* 34, 1956, 12–15). Or again, in 2 Pet. 3:5 the earth is said to have been formed out of the

material of water or to rise from and above water (*ex hydatos*) (a gloss on Gen. 1:2, 6–8) and to stand amidst water or to exist by the action of water (in descending to fill low areas and ascending to form clouds) (*di' hydatos*).

In addition, a distinction usually should be drawn between the same preposition used in the same sentence or in parallel or similar passages with different cases (e.g., *dia* in 1 Cor. 11:9, 12; Heb. 2:10; but note *epi* with the gen. and acc. in Matt. 19:28 and with the acc. and dat. in Matt. 24:2 and Mk. 13:2 *v.l.*, in parallel passages, with apparently no difference in meaning).

4. *Denial of a Double Entendre.* No one will doubt that a repeated preposition may bear two different senses with the same case within one sentence (e.g., 2 Cor. 2:12, local and telic *eis* expressing movement and purpose; Heb. 9:11 f., instrumental *dia* and *dia* expressing attendant circumstances; 2 Pet. 1:4, local and instrumental *en*). But in addition it seems illegitimate, simply on *a priori* hermeneutical principles, to exclude the possibility that *on occasion* an author may use a single preposition in a dual sense. For example, it is not because of any reluctance to make a decision between evenly balanced exegetical possibilities but because the author may have intended a double meaning that some commentators (e.g., E. G. Selwyn, *The First Epistle of St. Peter*, 1946, 202 f.; J. N. D. Kelly, *The Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, *BNTC*, 1969, 159) take *diesōthēsan di' hydatos* in 1 Pet. 3:20 to mean both "they were brought safely through water" (local *dia*) and "they were preserved by means of water" (instrumental *dia*). Kelly's rendering, "a few (eight persons, in fact) were saved through water" (op. cit., 158), retains the ambiguity in translation. 1 Tim. 2:15 affords a comparable example. The woman who continues in faith, love, holiness and modesty will be "saved *through* child-bearing" (*sōthēsetai . . . dia tēs teknogonias*). Does the exegete have to choose between the concepts of "priority in time" and "supremacy in rank" in discussing *autos estin pro pantōn* in Col. 1:17 (cf. F. F. Bruce in *Commentary on The Epistles to the Ephesians and the Colossians*, *NLC*, 1957, 200: "the words not only declare His temporal priority to the universe, but also suggest His primacy over it"; so also B. F. C. Atkinson, *The Theology of Prepositions*, 1944, 8, but with a reversal of emphasis)? Certainly, editors of the Greek text must choose between two accentuations of *estin*; but Moffatt appears to reproduce the ambiguity of *pro* in his translation "he is prior to all". But care needs to be exercised in determining an intended *double entendre.* It would scarcely be defensible to find in the phrase *en pneumati hagiō* (which appears in the midst of a catalogue of moral virtues, 2 Cor. 6:6) both the sense "in holiness of spirit" and the meaning "by gifts of the Holy Spirit" (NEB).

But what of prepositional phrases that may be construed either with what precedes or with what follows? Is a *double entendre* ever to be found here? Probably not. The exegete must choose between "Christ is the goal of the law, and so [ecbatic *eis*] righteousness is available to every believer" and "In the case of every believer, Christ is the end of the law viewed as a means of gaining (telic *eis*) righteousness" (or, "in its relation to righteousness," referential *eis*) (*eis dikaiosynēn*) (Rom. 10:4; cf. 10:5; Phil. 3:9). Similarly, in the Pauline citation of Habakkuk 2:4 in Rom. 1:17 and Gal. 3:11, *ek pisteōs* must be taken either with *ho (de) dikaios* ("it is the person who is righteous by faith that will live") or with *zēsetai* ("the person who is righteous will live by faith"). It would hardly be permissible to affirm that Paul is saying both that faith is characteristic of the life of the person who is righteous before God and that

faith in Christ is the means to divine approval and eternal life. There is a comparable ambiguity of construction in Lk. 4:21; Jn. 3:15; Acts 22:3; Rom. 4:18; 1 Cor. 3:13; 2 Cor. 5:16; Phil. 2:13; Col. 3:16; 1 Thess. 4:14; Heb. 2:9; 9:11.

5. *Neglect of the Possible Significance of (a) the Non-repetition of the Preposition with Copulated Nouns, and (b) the Order of Nouns that follow a Preposition.* Generally speaking, a prep. tends to be repeated before a series of nouns joined by *kai* more frequently in biblical Gk. (under Semitic influence) than in non-biblical Gk. (see above, I.B.2.(b)). Sometimes, therefore, the non-use of a second or third prep. in NT Gk. may be theologically significant, indicating that the writer regarded the terms that he placed in one regimen as belonging naturally together or as a unit in concept or reality. *ex hydatos kai pneumatos* (Jn. 3:5) shows that for the writer (or speaker) "water" and "Spirit" together form a single means of that regeneration which is a prerequisite for entrance into the kingdom of God (= birth *anōthen*, Jn. 3:3, 7). No contrast is intended between an external element of "water" and an inward renewal achieved by the Spirit. Conceptually the two are one. Similarly, in Matt. 3:11 the phrase *en pneumati hagiō kai pyri* points not to two baptisms (viz., the righteous with the Holy Spirit, the wicked with fire), but to a single baptism in Spirit-and-fire, that may be interpreted either as the messianic purification and judgment that would be effected by the Spirit (cf. Isa. 4:4; 30:28) and experienced by all, or as the outpouring of the Spirit on believers at Pentecost that would refine and inflame them. (See further on these two examples J. D. G. Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, *SBT*, Second Series 15, 1970, 8–14, 190–192.) The fact that "God our Father" and "the Lord Jesus Christ" are joined together under the bond of a single prep. (*apo*) in all Pauline salutations (e.g., 1 Cor. 1:3) suggests that the apostle envisaged the Father and the Son as a joint source of "grace and peace," rather than as distinct sources or as source and channel (respectively). They sustain a single relation (not two diverse relations) to the grace and peace that come to believers.

A related matter concerns the order of nouns that follow a prep. (see the discussion of A. Buttmann, *A Grammar of the New Testament Greek*, ET 1873, § 295). If a prep. is followed by two anarthrous substantives both in the genitive case, it always qualifies the former. *ex ergōn nomou* (Rom. 3:20; Gal. 2:16 *bis*; 3:2, 5, 10) means "by the works of the law," not "by the principle of works." (Cf. *ek dexiōn mou*, Matt. 20:23, 22:44; *dia mesou autōn*, Lk. 4:30.) Thus in 2 Cor. 3:18 *apo kyriou pneumatos* does not mean "by the Spirit of the Lord," but "by the Lord (= Yahweh, 3:16 f.) who is the Spirit" or "by the Lord (Jesus) who is spirit" (cf. 1 Cor. 15:45; 2 Cor. 3:6). Even when the prep. is followed by a noun in a case other than the genitive, the limiting genitive generally follows the prep. phrase (e.g. *eis aphesin hamartiōn*, Mk. 1:4; but note the exceptional Matt. 13:33; Rev. 7:17). Similarly, when the nouns involved are articular, any limiting genitive usually follows the prep. phrase (e.g., *apo tou nomou tēs hamartias kai tou thanatou*, Rom. 8:2), but occasionally it may be inserted according to the ABBA word-order (e.g., *ek tēs tou diabolou pagidos*, 2 Tim. 2:26).

II *Some Theologically Important Instances of the Major Prepositions*

References to discussions of individual preps. in the standard monographs on the subject (viz., R. Helbing, M. Johannessohn, F. Krebs, W. Kuhring, C. Rossberg)

may be found in the relevant footnotes in Moulton, *Grammar*, III, 249–280.

A. *anti*

Since the root sense of *anti* is "(set) over against, opposite" (cf. German *ant-* in *antworten*), the prep. naturally came to denote equivalence (one object is set over against another as its equivalent), exchange (one object, opposing or distinct from another, is given or taken in return for the other), and substitution (one object, that is distinguishable from another, is given or taken instead of the other).

1. *Equivalence* ("for", "as the equivalent of"; cf. Homer, *Il.*, 9, 116 f.). Under the *lex talionis* (Exod. 21:23–25), one eye was required as equivalent compensation for another eye (*ophthalmon anti ophthalmou*, Matt. 5:38), a tooth for a tooth. In 1 Cor. 11:15 Paul's point is not that a veil is superfluous for a woman since nature has given her hair *in place of* a covering, but rather, arguing analogically, he infers from the general fact that "hair has been given *to serve as* a covering" (*anti peribolaiou*) (p^{46}D G omit *autē*, "to her") that the more generous supply of hair that a woman has when compared with a man shows the appropriateness of her being covered when she prays or prophesies in the Christian assembly.

2. *Exchange* ("in return for", "for the price of"). In return for evil received (*anti kakou*) the Christian is not to do evil (Rom. 12:17; 1 Thess. 5:15; 1 Pet. 3:9), when abused he is not to give abuse in exchange (*loidorian anti loidorias*, 1 Pet. 3:9). It was for the price of a meal (*anti brōseōs*) that Esau sold his birthright (Heb. 12:16; see Arndt, 73 s.v. *anti* 3).

3. *Substitution* ("instead of", "in the place of"). It is improbable that *anti* ever has the diluted sense of "for the benefit of", "on behalf of". The half-shekel tax alluded to in Matt. 17:24 was regarded as redemption money (Heb. *kōper*, LXX *lytron*, Exod. 30:12) that would release the donor from hypothetical slavery or absolve him from the divine anger (cf. T. Shek. 1:6). Accordingly, when Jesus commanded Simon Peter to give the collectors the shekel he would find in the fish's mouth *anti emou kai sou* ("for me and for yourself", Matt. 17:27), Matthew probably wished his readers to understand that the redemption tax was a substitutionary offering designed to release the giver from obligation (see further R. E. Davies, "Christ in our place – the Contribution of the Prepositions", *TB* 21, 1970, 79 f.; N. Turner, *Grammatical Insights into the New Testament*, 1965, 173). In its prevailing sense in LXX Gk. (see M. Johannessohn, *Der Gebrauch der Präpositionen in der Septuaginta*, 1926, 198–200), as in non-biblical Gk. (e.g., Xen. *Anab.* 1, 1, 4) including the papyri (Moulton-Milligan, 46; cf. *antis* in modern Gk.), *anti* clearly denotes a substitutionary exchange. Abraham offers up the ram as a burnt offering instead of (*anti*) Isaac his son (Gen. 22:13). Judah offers to remain in Egypt instead of (*anti*) Benjamin as a slave to Joseph (Gen. 44:33). Lamenting the death of his son Absalom, David says "Would that I had died instead of [*anti*] you, I instead of [*anti*] you" (2 Sam. 19:1, LXX). Archelaus reigns over Judea in place of (*anti*) his father Herod (Matt. 2:22). See also Lk. 11:11; Jas. 4:15. In Jn. 1:16 *charin anti charitos* ("grace upon grace"; "one blessing after another", New International Version) denotes a perpetual and rapid succession of blessings, as though there were no interval between the arrival of one blessing and the receipt of the next. Alternatively, the idea of constant renewal may be less prominent than the notion of the replacement of

"old" grace by "new" grace (sometimes taken to refer to the spiritual presence of the Holy Spirit in place of the physical presence of Christ). Two disputed passages remain to be discussed. When the author of Hebrews observes that Jesus endured the cross *anti tēs prokeimenēs autō charas* (Heb. 12:2), the meaning of the prep. phrase could be (a) "in exchange for" or "in order to obtain" the joy that was in prospect for him, that of seeing "the fruit of the travail of his soul" (Isa. 53:11); or (b) "instead of" the joy of continued fellowship in God's immediate presence that lay before him as a distinct possibility within his grasp. The second alternative seems preferable in light of: the use of *prokeimai* in Heb. 6:18; 12:1 (cf. 2 Cor. 8:12) to denote a present reality; the prevailing substitutionary sense of *anti*; the inappropriateness of any hint of reciprocal bargaining between Jesus and God, or of personal advantage as the primary motive of Jesus for his suffering; the parallel in 11:25 f. with reference to Moses. (This view is defended by P. Andriessen and A. Lenglet, "Quelques passages difficiles de l'Épître aux Hébreux (5:7, 11; 10:20; 12:2)", *Bib.* 51, 1970, 207–220.) Finally, *anti pollōn* in Mk. 10:45 (= Matt. 20:28) should be construed not with *dounai* ("to give . . . on behalf of [= *hyper*] many) but with *lytron* ("a ransom in the place of many"). The life of Jesus, surrendered in a sacrificial death, brought about the release of forfeited lives. He acted on behalf of the many by taking their place. As in 1 Tim. 2:6 (*antilytron hyper pantōn*), the notions of exchange and substitution are both present. It is hardly a sound hermeneutical procedure to appeal to a contestable "wider" sense of *anti* (viz. "on behalf of") in Matt. 17:27 (or Gen. 44:33) as the key to the proper understanding of *anti* in this passage where the customary sense of the prep. (viz., exchange-substitution) gives an unobjectionable meaning and the term *lytron* is applied to a human life. For a discussion of the theological implications of "substitution", see J. I. Packer, "What did the Cross achieve? The Logic of Penal Substitution", *TB* 25, 1974, 3–45.

B. *apo*

1. *apo and ek.* In general they are related as *ab* is to *ex* in Lat. *apo* denotes motion from the edge or surface of an object; *ek*, motion from within. But often *apo* marks simply the general point from which movement or action proceeds. Thus "Joseph went up from [*apo*] Galilee, out of [*ek*] the city of Nazareth" (Lk. 2:4). However the fact that *apo* is regularly used with *exerchomai* in Lk. (13 times) shows that even the broad distinction is not everywhere applicable. In fact the process in which *apo* ultimately absorbed *ek* has already commenced in Hel. Gk. So we find that both preps. may be used in the following senses: (a) temporal (e.g., *apo*, Matt. 11:12; *ek*, Jn. 9:1); (b) causal (*apo*, Matt. 18:7; Lk. 19:3; Acts 12:14; 22:11; *ek*, Jn. 4:6; Rev. 16:10–12); (c) instrumental (*apo*, Matt. 11:19 = Lk. 7:35; *ek*, Lk. 16:9; Jn. 6:65); (d) adverbial (*apo*, 2 Cor. 1:14; 2:5; *ek*, 2 Cor. 9:7); (e) to denote place of origin (*apo* and *ek* together, Jn. 1:44; 11:1); (f) to denote membership (*apo*, Acts 12:1 "church members"; *ek*, Acts 6:9 "members of the synagogue"). Such overlapping of function between *apo* and *ek* makes one hesitate to distinguish between the *ek tou hydatos* of Mk. 1:10 (cf. Acts 8:38 f.) and the *apo tou hydatos* of Matt. 3:16 (both phrases being preceded by a form of *anabainō*, "go up"), as though the later Matthean tradition testified to baptism by affusion or aspersion rather than by immersion (as in the Markan tradition). The preps. throw no definitive light on the mat-

ter (*pace* N. Turner, *Insights*, 29; but see his earlier remark in Moulton, *Grammar*, III, 259). The most that may be said, if the preps. are here distinguishable, is that Matthew's *apo* does not exclude Mark's *ek*. On the relation of *apo* to *hypo*, see below II.I.2. For the influence of the Heb. prep. *min* on the NT use of *apo*, see Moulton, *Grammar*, II, 460–462.

2. *Some Notable Instances of apo.*

(a) *1 Cor. 11:23.* In the controversial phrase *apo tou kyriou* (D reads *para*) the use of *apo* is in itself indecisive as to the nature of the transmission and accords with either of the following views: (i) the Lord was the ultimate origin of a tradition that reached Paul in reliable form through unbroken transmission; (ii) the Lord was the immediate source or originator of the tradition or the authority constantly operating through human tradition and confirming it by his Spirit. That intermediaries were involved is not suggested by the use of *apo* (as though *para* necessarily implied immediate communication) but by the two verbs *paralambanō* (= Heb. *qibbēl*) and *paradidōmi* (= Heb. *māsar*) which were technical terms for the transmission of tradition. See the discussions of E. B. Allo, *Première Épître aux Corinthiens*, 1956², 309–316; O. Cullmann, "*Kyrios* as Designation for the Oral Tradition concerning Jesus", *SJT* 3, 1950, 180–197.

(b) *Heb. 5:7. eisakoustheis apo tēs eulabeias* could mean "his prayer was heard (and so he was delivered) from his anxious dread (of death)," but more probably *apo* is causal ("he was heard on account of his godly fear") since *eulabeia* in Heb. 12:28 and *eulabeomai* in Heb. 11:7 both refer to reverent awe before God. But see Funk, *§* 211.

(c) *Rev. 1:4.* The remarkable phrase *(eirēnē) apo ho ōn kai ho ēn kai ho erchomenos* has been explained as: the result of the Seer's reverence for the divine name which kept him back from submitting it to declensional change (R. H. Charles, *The Revelation of St. John*, *ICC*, 1920, I, 10); a paraphrase of the indeclinable tetragrammaton YHWH, "He who is" (J. M. Ford, *Revelation*, *Anchor Bible*, 1975, 376); a nominative apposition which was originally preceded by four dots standing for the tetragrammaton (G. Mussies, *The Morphology of Koine Greek as Used in the Apocalypse of St. John*, 1971, 93 f.).

C. *dia*

Originally *dia* signified "passing through and out from," a sense reflected in Matt. 4:4 ("... every word that proceeds from [*ekporeuomenō dia*] the mouth of God") and 1 Cor. 3:15 ("he himself will be saved, but only as one who escapes through fire", *dia pyros*). When this notion of "extension through" is applied to temporal categories, the meaning is "during the course of" (e.g., *dia nyktos*, "during the night", Acts 23:31). In itself *di' hēmerōn tesserakonta* (Acts 1:3) could mean either "continuously throughout a 40-day period" (though this would more commonly be expressed by *tesserakonta hēmeras*) or "intermittently (or repeatedly) during the course of 40 days" (cf. Acts 13:31, "over a period of (*epi*) many days"), but the references to "many (separate) convincing proofs" (1:3a) and to various self-presentations (1:3a; *parestēsen* is a constative aorist) and repeated appearances (1:3b; *optanomenos* implies iteration) clearly show that the prep. here signifies "intermittently throughout" (so also Funk, *§* 223 (1) and see references in A. Oepke, *dia*,

TDNT II 66 n. 3). Earth was not necessarily the place of Jesus' whereabouts in the interval between his resurrection and ascension.

1. *Means or Instrument.* From the local sense of *dia* there naturally developed the instrumental sense, which marks the medium *through* which an action passes before its accomplishment. Thus, in the expression *pistis di' agapēs energoumenē* (Gal. 5:6), love is specified as the means by which faith becomes visibly operative or effective. Expressions of love (= good works) must intervene between faith in its infancy and faith in its maturity. Thus stated, Paul's view of the interrelationship of faith and (good) works is similar to that of James (Jas. 2:14–26). Several more examples of this instrumental use of *dia* may be given. Paul represents the angels not as the authors (*hypo*) of the law but as the mediate agents (*dia* in its enactment or transmission, Gal. 3:19). When the apostle says that at the tribunal of Christ recompense will be received for both good and bad actions that have been performed by means of the earthly body (*dia tou sōmatos*, 2 Cor. 5:10) and therefore during life on earth, he excludes the possibility of reward or punishment for any conceivable *post-mortem* action. Again, everything that pertains to life and godliness is granted to believers by God's divine power but comes through (*dia*) the knowledge of Christ (2 Pet. 1:3). Sometimes, however, *dia* seems to express not the efficient cause but the principal or sole cause, not mediation but agency (e.g., Rom. 11:36 where God the Father is designated the source (*ek*), agent (*dia*), and goal (*eis*) of all creation; 1 Cor. 1:9; Heb. 13:11). It follows, as M. Zerwick observes, that when the rôle of Christ as creator (e.g., Jn. 1:3, 10) or redeemer (e.g., Rom. 5:9) is expressed by *dia*, the idea of his mediation may not be prominent (*Biblical Greek*, § 113). Accordingly, Col. 1:16 (*ta panta di' autou . . . ektistai*) may be emphasizing the agency, rather than the mediation, of Christ in creating and sustaining the universe. On the other hand, in 1 Cor. 8:6 the function of God the Father as the source of creation (*ex hou ta panta*) is distinguished from Christ's rôle as mediator of creation (*di' hou ta panta*), while in 2 Cor. 5:18 God is the reconciler and Christ the divinely appointed means (*dia Christou*) of reconciliation (cf. Rom. 5:11; Col. 1:20). On the relation between *dia* and *hypo*, see below, II.I.1.

2. *Attendant Circumstances.* Not infrequently *dia* expresses the circumstances that accompany an action or state, and in this function the prep. overlaps with *en*. Abraham received the sign of circumcision as a seal of the faith-righteousness which he had while he was as yet uncircumcised (*en tē akrobystia*), thus becoming the father of all who are believers while being uncircumcised (*di' akrobystias*) (Rom. 4:11). Since, then, *dia* may denote accompaniment as well as instrumentality, it is special pleading to distinguish between *meta* in 1 Tim. 4:14 (used of the elders' imposition of hands) and *dia* in 2 Tim. 1:6 (used of Paul's imposition of hands) in regard to the consecration of Timothy, as if an apostolic laying on of hands were a prerequisite for "ordination" while the imposition of presbyters' hands was simply a desirable concomitant (*contra* F. Prat, *The Theology of St. Paul*, ET 1945, II, 270 n. 1). On the other hand, if *dia tēs epitheseōs tōn cheirōn mou* (2 Tim. 1:6) does denote the instrumental cause of Timothy's receipt of his gift, the actual participation of the body of elders in this imposition of hands need not be excluded: the presbytery and the apostle may have acted conjointly. The use of *meta* rather than *dia* in 1 Tim. 4:14 may well be explained (on this view) by the presence of another *dia* phrase (*dia prophēteias*). *dia pisteōs* in 2 Cor. 5:7 also probably belongs to this category of ac-

companying circumstances ("we walk in the realm of faith, not of sight") since it is difficult to take *(peripatoumen ou) dia eidous* in a modal sense. This use of *dia* extends even to marking circumstances that turn out not to help but sometimes even to hinder an action. "Even with" (= "in spite of one's having") the written code and circumcision (*dia grammatos kai peritomēs*), transgression of the law occurs (Rom. 2:27; cf. 5:20a), although one would expect such circumstances to aid in keeping the precepts of the law. *dia tou pneumatos* in Acts 21:4 is difficult, since the advice not to go on to Jerusalem given to Paul by the Tyrian disciples (= prophets? cf. Acts 11:28) "through the Spirit" conflicted with his own resolve "in the Spirit" (*en tō pneumati*, Acts 19:21) and with the constraint and testimony of the Spirit (Acts 20:22 f.). It is noteworthy that Agabus's subsequent prophecy at Caesarea (Acts 21:11) that predicts Paul's suffering in Jerusalem and begins "Thus says the Holy Spirit" does not include an injunction or exhortation to Paul not to go to Jerusalem (but cf. Acts 21:12–14). Perhaps therefore the crucial prep. phrase in Acts 21:4 should be rendered "while under the inspiration of the Spirit" (but C. F. D. Moule, *Idiom-Book*, 57 tentatively suggests "as a spiritual insight"). In his condensed statement Luke has not distinguished between a prophecy regarding Paul's suffering at Jerusalem (doubtless given by the Tyrian disciples before their exhortation) that was delivered at the direction of the Spirit (cf. Acts 21:11) and their own personal exhortation (cf. Acts 21:12) that was occasioned by the prediction and immediately followed it. The verse may be paraphrased thus: "Prompted by a prediction of the Spirit they told Paul not to go on to Jerusalem."

3. *Cause or Ground.* The two principal non-local meanings of *dia* are "by means of", "through" (Lat. *per*) and "on account of", "because of" (Lat. *ob* and *propter*). The inter-relation of these two senses is evident from the fact that *dia* with the acc. may occasionally denote the efficient cause (e.g., Jn. 6:57a, the Father is the source of the Son's life, as in Jn. 5:26; Rev. 12:11; see Arndt 180, s.v. *dia*, B. II. 4), and is well illustrated by the textual variants in Rom. 8:11, where the revivification of mortal bodies is attributed to the agency of the indwelling Spirit (*dia* with gen.) who already is active in the transformation of character (2 Cor. 3:18) or (in the inferior reading of *dia* with acc.) it is grounded in the fact that a life-giving Spirit (Rom. 8:2; 1 Cor. 15:45; 2 Cor. 3:6) indwells believers, the Spirit of him who raised Jesus from the dead. On other occasions these two most common uses of *dia* are found juxtaposed (in paronomasia, Heb. 2:10 where *di' hou* refers to the Father as the principal cause and *di' hon* perhaps stands for the Pauline *ex autou kai ... eis auton* [Rom. 11:36]; 1 Cor. 11:9, *dia tēn gynaika*, and 11:11, *dia tēs gynaikos*; and cf. Rom. 12:3 and 15:15).

4. *Purpose.* Just as there has been debate whether *eis* ever bears a retrospective (= causal) sense in the NT (see below, II. D. 3), so there is no unanimity concerning the alleged prospective (= telic) sense of *dia*. If, occasionally, it were to bear this meaning in the NT, it should occasion no surprise since: (a) *dia* with the acc. exceptionally has a prospective sense in cl. Gk. (e.g., Thuc., *History*, ii. 89. 2; v. 53; Aristot., *Eth. Nic.*, 4, 3, 31; Plato, *Rep.* 524 C – cited by H. G. Meecham "Romans iii, 25 f., iv, 25 – the meaning of *dia c. acc.*", *ExpT* 50, 1938–9, 564; cf. Liddell-Scott, 389 s.v. *dia* B. III. 3) and Hel. Gk. (e.g., Polyb. 2, 56, 12); (b) in modern Gk. *yia* (= *dia*) with the acc., "for," is used to express purpose (G. N. Hatzidakis, *Einleitung in die neugriechische Grammatik*, 1892, 212 f.). There are, in fact, several

NT examples where *dia* approaches a prospective sense (Matt. 24:2; Mk. 2:27; Jn. 11:42; 12:30; Rom. 11:28; M. Zerwick, *Biblical Greek*, § 112, compares the *dia touto ... hina* formula in Rom. 4:16; 1 Tim. 1:16; Phlm. 15), but the alleged instances that are most regularly adduced are Rom. 3:25; 4:25. In the former verse *dia tēn paresin* seems to mean "on account of his passing over" rather than "with a view to (or, through) his forgiving". Paul is observing that the purpose or outcome of God's provision of Christ as a propitiatory sacrifice was the demonstration of his own righteousness, a righteousness that needed vindication because, in his patience (not his indifference), God had refrained from exacting the full and proper penalty for acts of sin committed previously. God had not always left sin unpunished, but he had temporarily suspended, withheld or set aside appropriate punishment in light of his eternal purpose to provide an altogether adequate basis for the forgiveness of sin in the atoning death of Christ. It seems that *paresis* (= remission of punishment or debt) should be distinguished from *aphesis* (= remission of sin) (references in Moulton-Milligan, 493 s.v. *paresis*, and the distinctive view of S. Lyonnet, *Exegesis Epistulae ad Romanos*, 1963 [3], 217 f., 222–238, that this whole phrase refers to the provisional and anticipatory remission of sin accorded the Jewish people) and that an unusual telic or instrumental sense need not be given to *dia* with the acc. when the more regular causal meaning accords with the context. The matter is more complex in Rom. 4:25, where there is a parallelism between the two *dia* phrases (*dia ta paraptōmata hēmōn* and *dia tēn dikaiōsin hēmōn*) that would suggest *prima facie* that each should be taken in the same sense, yet a causal sense is difficult in v. 25b (viz. "and was raised to life because of our justification"). Three solutions may be mentioned (in ascending order of probability). (i) *dia* in final in both clauses: "in order to deal with", v. 25a (cf. 1 Cor. 15:3); "with a view to", v. 25b. (ii) *dia* is causal in v. 25a ("because of"; cf. Isa. 53:12, LXX) but final in v. 25b ("in order to achieve", or, better, "to confirm [or, guarantee]"). (iii) *dia* is causal in both clauses: "because of (the need to atone for)", v. 25a; "because of (the need to achieve or confirm)", v. 25b (cf. the parallel in Rom. 13:5); or, alternatively, just as the delivering up of Jesus to death was the consequence of our sin, so his resurrection was the consequence of our justification (that had been achieved by his death, Rom. 5:9 f.). On this latter view, the conceptual sequence would then be: our sin – Jesus' death – our justification – Jesus' resurrection, with the resurrection being *here* regarded as the inevitable consequence of, and the seal of divine approval on, Christ's procurement of our justification. But see *per contra* D. M. Stanley, *Christ's Resurrection in Pauline Soteriology, AnBib* 13, 1961, 171–173.

D. *eis*

1. *Its relation to other Preps.*

(a) *pros*. Although the distinctions are not uniformly maintained, it is generally true that with regard to literal movement *eis* denotes entry ("into") and *pros* approach ("up to"), and (correspondingly) that *eis* is used with impersonal objects and *pros* with personal (e.g., 2 Cor. 1:15 f.; and see the argument of E. de W. Burton, *The Epistle to the Galatians, ICC*, 1921, 96–99, based on Paul's twofold use of *eis* in Gal. 2:9, that the apostolic division of labour was primarily territorial [Jewish lands – Gentile lands] rather than racial [Jews – Gentiles]). That these are simply tenden-

cies is apparent from Mk. 5:38 f.; Jn. 20:3–6, 8; Phlm. 5. As for metaphorical use, both preps. may express purpose (e.g., Rom. 3:25 f.) and result (e.g., *eis*, Rom. 1:20; *pros*, 1 Jn. 5:16 f., on which see below II. N. 3).

(b) *en*. There are two reasons why it is not surprising that *eis* and *en* shared some common territory in Hel. Gk. (i) Etymologically *eis* was a later variation of *en*, being originally *ens*, the *s* having been added to *en* on the analogy of *ex* (= *ek-s*). With the disappearance of the *n* in *ens*, compensatory lengthening produced *eis* (see A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, 1934 [4], 584–586, 591). The obsolescence of the dat. case in Gk. meant the disappearance of *en* from the modern Gk. vernacular where only *eis* (with the acc.) is found (cf. G. N. Hatzidakis, *Grammatik*, 210 f.). (ii) Hel. Gk. is marked by a general tendency to confuse the categories of linear motion ("to") and punctiliar rest ("in"). The confusion was in both directions: *eis* denoting position (e.g., Gen. 37:17A; Jos. 7:22) and *en* implying movement (e.g., Exod. 4:21; Tob. 5:5). Examples of this interchange are not lacking in cl. Gk. but they are relatively infrequent, especially in narrative.

It was observed above (I. B. 1 (f)) that the interchange of *eis* and *en* is not promiscuous in NT Gk. and that the idiosyncrasies of each author must be examined. Only in Mk. and Lk.-Acts does this interchange occur with any frequency. In Rev. there is only one clear example (Rev. 11:11, where, surprisingly, the *eis* of Ezek. 37:10 [LXX] has become *en*). All the apparent exceptions in the Fourth Gospel to the cl. use of *eis* and *en* have been examined by J. J. O'Rourke, who concludes that only in Jn. 1:18 and 19:13 does *eis* possibly stand for *en* (1.08% of Jn's. 183 uses of *eis*) and only in Jn. 3:35 is *en* (218 uses) possibly used for *eis* ("EIS and EN in John", *Bible Translator* 25, 1974, 139–142).

What did John mean when he affirmed (Jn. 1:18) that "the only Son, who is all that God is and who resides *eis ton kolpon tou patros* – he has revealed him"? The imagery (*kolpos*, "bosom") suggests the exclusive and privileged intimacy of a deeply affectionate inter-personal relationship, but what is the import of *eis*? Some give the prep. a dynamic sense, noting that it normally denotes not simply orientation or direction but "movement towards or into". I. de la Potterie, for example, renders the whole phrase "turned towards the Father's bosom", and finds two theological truths expressed: a personal distinction between Father and Son; "the constant orientation of the Son towards the bosom of the Father as towards his origin (*eis*, not *pros*), as towards the source of his own life (*eis ton kolpon*)" ("L'emploi dynamique de *eis* dans Saint Jean et ses incidences théologiques", *Bib.* 43, 1962, 366–387; quotation from page 386). For de la Potterie it is not simply a matter of "filiation" (as in Jn. 1:1b and 1 Jn. 1:1), but of "eternal generation" (cf. *ōn* and Jn. 6:57) (*op. cit.*, 385), "the eternal act of receiving divine life from the Father" (*op. cit.*, 386). But the idea of eternal generation would comport better with the preps. *para* (cf. Jn. 6:46) or *ek* (cf. the reading *ek tou kolpou* reflected in syr [c]). If any element of movement is implied in *eis*, its direction is in effect reversed, on this view. Other scholars have seen *eis* as both static and dynamic in sense. In 1880, before the influence of the papyri finds had been felt, B. F. Westcott wrote: "There is the combination (as it were) of rest and motion, of a continuous relation, with a realisation of it (comp. i. 1, *ēn pros*). The 'bosom of the Father' (like heaven) is a state and not a place" (*The Gospel According to St. John*, 1958 ed., 15, a thought developed still further by E. A. Abbott, *Johannine Grammar*, 1906, *§§* 2706, 2712). Now, however, the view that prevails

among grammarians (e.g., A. N. Jannaris, *An Historical Greek Grammar*, 1897, § 1548; Funk, §§ 205, 218; F. M. Abel, *Grammaire du Grec Biblique*, 1927, § 47 (a)), lexicographers (e.g., Arndt, 229 s.v. *eis* 9a; Moulton-Milligan, xiv; A. Oepke, *eis*, *TDNT* II 433) and commentators (e.g., W. Bauer, M. Lagrange, R. Bultmann, E. C. Hoskyns, R. Schnackenburg, C. K. Barrett) is that *eis ton kolpon* is equivalent to *en tō kolpō* (Jn. 13:23).

But few scholars are content to affirm that the phrase denotes simply the personal juxtaposition of Son and Father. For G. B. Winer, the phrase indicates that the Son "is laid upon" or "rests against" the bosom of the Father, which would imply personal intercommunion (*A Grammar of the Idiom of the New Testament*, ET 1872, 415 and n. 1). Some of the Greek Fathers, giving *eis* a static sense, believed that the verse described the consubstantiality of the Father and Son. Chrysostom, for example, speaks of the Son's dwelling in the Father's bosom as involving "affinity of essence": "the Father would not have in his bosom one of another essence" (*Homilies on the Gospel of St. John*, XV). Again, some find in *eis* a hint of the suppression of a preceding idea of movement (see, e.g., T. Zahn, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, 1908², 96; cf. Liddell-Scott, 491, s.v. *eis*, I. 2). But the difficulty with the suggestion that *eis* implies an earlier entrance *into* the Father's bosom (J. H. Greenlee, "The Preposition *EIS* in the New Testament", *Bible Translator* 3, 1952, 13) or points to the Son's *return* to his pre-incarnate state through the Ascension (H. A. W. Meyer, *The Gospel According to St. John*, ET 1885, 70), is that the preceding *ho ōn* depicts a supra-temporal condition that had no beginning. In the case of Jn. 1:18 the real choice is not between *eis* = eternal generation and *eis* = *en* = consubstantiality, but more generally between the static and dynamic senses of *eis*. While in Jn. 1:1 *pros ton theon* may point to an active relation of the Logos with God, in 1:18 *eis ton kolpon tou patros* seems to stand for the passive notion *en tō kolpō tou patros* (cf. Jn. 13:23). The difference between the two verses is that between *pros* with the accusative of the person (*theos*) and *eis* with the accusative of the thing (*kolpos*), a distinction generally observed in NT Gk. Any notion of dynamic interpersonal relationship found in v. 18 stems from the nouns *kolpos* and *patēr*, not from the prep. *eis*.

To sum up. In any discussion of the inter-relation of *eis* and *en* in NT Gk., two dangers are to be avoided: to treat them as everywhere synonymous; always to insist on a distinction between them. Of the NT writers, only Matthew seems never to confuse *eis* and local *en* (notwithstanding Matt. 28:19 – on which see below, III. A. 3. (c)). Elsewhere, the exegete's presumption ought to be that, except for Luke (in the Third Gospel and Acts) and perhaps Mark, NT authors do not ordinarily use *eis* for *en*.

2. *Telic and Ecbatic eis*. No one has ever questioned that *eis* can express metaphorical direction, i.e. goal or purpose (final or telic *eis*). A celebrated example is the *eis auton* of Col. 1:16 (wrongly rendered *in ipso* in the Vulgate) which indicates that as well as being the efficient cause (*di' autou*) of creation, Christ is its ultimate goal. Just as there is creatorial coherence in the sustaining power of Christ (*ta panta en autō synestēken*, Col. 1:17b; cf. Heb. 1:3), so there is a teleological convergence of reality on Christ. Then *eis* can mark the divine appointment (*tassō*, *tithēmi*) of believers to eternal life (Acts 13:48), or of unbelievers to "stumbling" over the Stone because of their deliberate rejection of the message (1 Pet. 2:8; "they who do not

believe, stumble; they who stumble are also appointed for stumbling", J. A. Bengel, *Gnomon of the New Testament*, ET 1863, V, 55). Whatever construction we put on the notoriously difficult *skeuē orgēs katērtismena eis apōleian* in Rom. 9:22 ("the objects of his wrath, fit only for destruction"), it must be noted that (i) *katērtismena* should be distinguished from *ha prohetoimasen* (Rom. 9:23); and (ii) God would hardly be said to have "tolerated most patiently" a situation that he himself had ordained.

But whether *eis* ever expresses a purpose that is actually realized (consecutive or ecbatic *eis*), as opposed to a result that is simply aimed at, has been an issue hotly debated by grammarians and commentators. That *eis* sometimes expresses result (cf. the occasional ecbatic use of *hina*) seems now to be generally recognized (see, e.g., C. F. D. Moule, *Idiom-Book*, 70; A. Oepke, *eis*, *TDNT* II 429–431). In a thorough article that deals with "The Articular Infinitive with *eis*" in both cl. and Hel. Gk. (*JBL* 15, 1896, 155–167), I. T. Beckwith concludes that in 8 NT passages (viz., Rom. 1:20; 7:5; 12:2; 2 Cor. 8:6; Gal. 3:17; Phil. 1:10; Heb. 11:3; Jas. 3:3) a consecutive sense for *eis* with the articular infinitive is highly probable. Oepke (*op. cit.*) gives further examples, in which ecbatic *eis* is followed by articular or anarthrous substantives (e.g., 1 Cor. 11:17; 2 Cor. 7:9 f.). In Rom. 10:10 *eis dikaiosynēn* means "[for with his heart a man believes] and so is justified", although earlier (v. 4) the same phrase may bear a telic sense "[Christ is the end of the law] viewed as a means of gaining righteousness". (Compare a similar alternation of senses for *eis to* with the infinitive in Rom. 4:11, 16, 18.) Finally, if the consecutive sense of *eis* is recognized in Rom. 12:2, Paul's point is not that the aim of the transformation of character is the discernment of God's will (= telic *eis*), but rather that the Christian's ability to ascertain ("determine by scrutiny"; cf. Lk. 12:56) God's will naturally results from the renewal of the mind (cf. ecbatic *eis* with verbs denoting renewal in Col. 3:10; Heb. 6:6). Often, however, the categories of purpose and result merge, for a result may be a *designed* consequence. Therefore it is sometimes impossible to determine which is intended (e.g., in the phrase *eis doxan theou* in 2 Cor. 4:15; Phil. 1:11; 2:11; but in 1 Cor. 10:31 it is undoubtedly telic), especially when a divine action is spoken of (e.g., *eis hen sōma ebaptisthēmen*, 1 Cor. 12:13).

3. *Causal eis*? Can *eis* be retrospective, giving the cause, as well as prospective, defining the purpose or result? Such a sense for *eis* seems unlikely in any one of the passages sometimes adduced (see, e.g., J. R. Mantey, "The Causal Use of *Eis* in the New Testament", *JBL* 70, 1951, 45–48): Mk. 15:34 (and Matt. 14:31, "why?"); Matt. 3:11 (see below, III. A. 3. (a)); 10:41 (*eis onoma prophētou*, "within the category 'prophet' " = "because he is a prophet" – Arndt 577, s.v. *onoma* II; cf. M. Zerwick, *Biblical Greek*, § 106); 12:41 (= Lk. 11:32; "*at* the preaching of Jonah"); Acts 2:38 (see below, III. A. 3. (a)); 7:53 ("*as* delivered by angels," RSV); Rom. 4:20 ("*looking to* the promise of God"); 11:32 ("consigned *to* disobedience"; cf. Ps. 77:62, LXX); 2 Tim. 2:25 ("repentance that *leads to* a knowledge of the truth"); 2:26 ("entrapped by him *to do* his will", Weymouth); Tit. 3:14 ("*to supply* the necessities"); Heb. 12:7 ("it is *for the benefits of* discipline [or, *as* a discipline] that you have to endure"); 1 Jn. 5:10 ("he has refused to believe the testimony"). Liddell-Scott list no causal uses of *eis*.

4. *logizesthai eis*. This phrase, which in the LXX renders *ḥāšaḇ lᵉ*, occurs in the quotation of Gen. 15:6 found in Rom. 4:3 (cf. vv. 9, 22); Gal. 3:6; Jas. 2:23:

"Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned to him as righteousness (*elogisthē autō eis dikaiosynēn*)." With regard to Pauline usage, the verse has been interpreted in several ways: (a) Righteousness was reckoned to the account of (= imputed to) Abraham on the basis of his faith (cf. 1 Macc. 2:52 A; Rom. 9:30; 10:6; Heb. 11:7) (see the discussion of J. Murray, *The Epistle to the Romans, NLC*, 1959, I, 127–139, 336–362, especially 343, 359, where it is argued that the "correlativity" [not the equation] of faith and righteousness permitted Paul to say that "faith was reckoned to Abraham as righteousness", Rom. 4:9). (b) Abraham's faith was reckoned as a substitute for (law-)righteousness (H. Cremer, *Biblico-Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek*, ET 1895, 399). (c) Abraham's faith in God was equivalent to righteousness, i.e. it was in itself the ground of his acceptability (see the comprehensive discussion in J. A. Ziesler, *The Meaning of Righteousness in Paul*, 1972, 43, 172–185, 195 f.; and cf. H. W. Heidland, *logizomai*, *TDNT* IV 289–292).

On the use of *eis* with *baptizō*, see below III. A. 3; with *pisteuō*, III. B. 2. (g) and 3.

E. *ek*

1. *Its Basic Signification.* Originally *ek* signified an exit "from within" something with which there had earlier been a close connexion. Therefore it naturally came to be used to denote origin, source, derivation or separation. So, for example, the prep. is used of the material out of which something is made (Matt. 27:29), the country of one's origin (Acts 23:34) or a person with whom a connexion is (to be) severed (Jn. 17:15). Having this root sense, *ek* is sometimes equivalent to the subjective genitive (e.g., 2 Cor. 8:7 *v.l.*). However in the stereotyped *ho ek* or *hoi ek* before a noun (e.g., *hoi ek nomou*, "nomists" or "partisans of the law", Rom. 4:14; *hoi ek pisteōs*, "men of faith", Gal. 3:7, 9) the notion of belonging is more prominent than that of origin. The ubiquitous *ek (tou) theou* depicts: (i) the agency of God in effecting spiritual regeneration (Jn. 1:13; 1 Jn. 3:9 *bis*; 4:7; 5:1, 4, 18a; cf. Jn. 8:47 *bis*; 1 Jn. 4:4, 6; 5:19; 3 Jn. 11), corresponding to the rôle of the male in the act of physical procreation (cf. Matt. 1:18) (cf. Arndt, 234 s.v. *ek* 3a); (ii) God as the authoritative source of Jesus' teaching (Jn. 7:17), the giver of the Holy Spirit (1 Cor. 2:12a) and of spiritual gifts (1 Cor. 7:7), the source of all life, both physical (1 Cor. 11:12b) and spiritual (2 Cor. 5:18), the one who empowered Paul to carry out his divine commission (2 Cor. 3:5b), the architect of the resurrection body of believers (2 Cor. 5:1), the one who provides a new and right relationship with himself (Phil. 3:9), and the one true source of love (1 Jn. 4:7).

On the relation of *ek* to *apo* see above II. B. 1.

2. *Some Notable Instances of ek.*

(a) *Jn. 15:19 bis; 17:14, 16.* Parallel to the Pauline antithesis between living *en sarki* and yet not acting *kata sarka* (e.g., 2 Cor. 10:3) is the Johannine contrast between living *en tō kosmō* (Jn. 17:11; cf. 17:15) yet not being *ek tou kosmou* (Jn. 15:19 *bis*; 17:14b, 16a; cf. 18:36 *bis*). Christians must live in the world (or flesh) but must not display the characteristics of the world (or flesh) (cf. Ep. Diog. 6, 3).

(b) *Rom. 1:3 f.* These two verses refer to two successive stages of Christ's existence, not to two coexisting states (*kata sarka . . . kata pneuma hagiōsynēs*). With respect to human descent (*kata sarka*; cf. Rom. 9:5) Jesus Christ was born of David's stock (*ek spermatos Dauid*). On the other hand, his installation as Son of

God in power, accomplished by the power of the Holy Spirit (*kata pneuma hagiōsynēs*; cf. Gal. 4:29), took its rise, temporally and instrumentally (or, causally), in his resurrection from the dead (*ex anastaseōs nekrōn*). Not only "from the time of" the resurrection but also "through" (or, "as a result of") the resurrection itself, Jesus was visibly designated Son of God. (For *ek* as introducing the means used to achieve a definite purpose ["through"] or the reason which forms a presupposition for something ["as a result of"], see Arndt, 234, s.v. *ek* 3 f.) In the crucial phrase *ex anastaseōs nekrōn* ("the resurrection of the dead"), the primary allusion in this context must be to Christ's own resurrection from the dead, but the absence of *ek* before *nekrōn* (cf. 1 Pet. 1:3) and the use of the plural *nekrōn* suggest that Paul envisaged the resurrection of all believers as ideally achieved in the resurrection of Christ (cf. 1 Cor. 15:20, 23; Col. 1:18). The general, inclusive category, "the resurrection of the dead," includes the first determinative instance, "his resurrection from the dead." For a full discussion see C. E. B. Cranfield, *The Epistle to the Romans*, *ICC*, I 1975[6], 57–64.

(c) *Rom. 1:17.* A myriad of proposals have been made in regard to the meaning of the phrase *ek pisteōs eis pistin*, such as: from the faith of the preacher to the faith of the hearer; from God's faithfulness to man's faith; from smaller to greater degree of faith (cf. *apo doxēs eis doxan*, 2 Cor. 3:18); from faith as a starting-point to faith as a permanent condition. But it seems more natural to construe *ek* as indicating not the source or starting-point ("from faith") but the basis or means ("by faith"; as in Hab. 2:4), with the *eis pistin* either intensifying the effect of *ek pisteōs* (thus, "by faith from first to last", New International Version), or denoting the goal of God's impartation to men of a righteous status ("leading to faith"). On either of these latter views, faith is portrayed as the vital and perpetual characteristic of Christian experience.

(d) *Rom. 3:30.* On the basis of the difference between *ek pisteōs* and *dia tēs pisteōs*, it has been maintained that: (i) while the Jew is justified by faith (as "the moving cause", *ek pisteōs*) through the channel of circumcision (supplying *dia peritomēs*; cf. Rom. 4:12), the Gentile is justified by faith as both "moving cause" (*ek pisteōs*) and "sole condition" or channel (*dia tēs pisteōs*) (W. Sanday and A. C. Headlam, *The Epistle to the Romans*, 1902[5], 95, 96; this view highlights the contrast between *peritomēn* and *akrobystian*); (ii) Jews were to be justified by a subjective belief in the messiah, "by starting from and developing their existing faith in a coming messiah", whereas Gentiles would be justified through the instrumentality of that developed and objective Faith of Christendom, about which they as yet knew nothing (H. P. Liddon, *Explanatory Analysis of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans*, 1977 reprint of 1899 work, 79, 80); (iii) God will justify the Jews as a result of their own faith, but Gentiles by means of the faith of the Jews (*tēs* being an anaphoric article) as in Rom. 11:15 (N. Turner, *Insights*, 107–110).

If any distinction is intended between these two prep. phrases, it is formal not substantial: God justifies the Jew as a result of his faith (*ek pisteōs*), and the Gentile on the same ground, viz. by means of that same kind of faith (*dia tēs pisteōs*). Against there being any substantial difference between the justification of Jew and Gentile, several points may be urged. (i) Both prep. phrases (*ek pisteōs* and *dia [tēs] pisteōs*) may mean "through faith" or "by faith", since both preps. may express either the effective means or the efficient cause (see Arndt, 178, s.v. *dia* III. 1. a, d; 234, s.v. *ek* 3. e, f). (ii) Elsewhere Paul uses either *ek* or *dia* to denote the immediate means or cause

of justification or salvation (*ek* – Rom. 1:17 *bis*; 3:26; 5:1; 9:30, 32; Gal. 2:16; *dia* – Rom. 3:22, 25; Gal. 2:16; 3:26; Eph. 2:8). (iii) There is a comparable change from *dia pisteōs* to *ek pisteōs* in Rom. 3:25 f. and in Gal. 2:16 (in reference to *anthrōpos*). (iv) In Gal. 3:26 the Jews and Gentiles of the Galatian churches (*pantes*; cf. Gal. 3:28) are said to be sons of God *dia tēs pisteōs*; similarly Rom. 3:22, 25. (v) Any suggestion that there are two distinct means or grounds of justification (mentioned in Rom. 3:30) would tend to undermine Paul's earlier insistence that there is no difference between Jew and Gentile with respect to sinfulness (Rom. 3:22 f.) or the ultimate ground (= grace) and means (= redemption) of justification (Rom. 3:24). (vi) Stylistic or rhetorical variation is not untypical of Paul (e.g., Rom. 4:11; 10:17).

(e) *2 Cor. 13:4*. Without the wider context of 2 Cor. 10–13, one would be tempted to render *estaurōthē ex astheneias*, "he was crucified in (a condition of physical) weakness", but *ek* probably bears a causal sense "because of (his weakness)" (thus Arndt, 234 s.v. *ek* 3 f.). The weakness referred to it not physical or moral, but the "weakness" – in men's eyes – of non-retaliation or non-aggressiveness (cf. 2 Cor. 10:1 f., 10 f.; 11:20 f., 30; 12:9 f.; 13:4b, 9 f.), the "weakness" of obedience to God's will, which, for Christ, involved death on a cross (Phil. 2:8). But in such weakness, divine power comes to its full strength (2 Cor. 12:9).

F. *en*

1. *Its Extended NT Use.* This is the most popular prep. in the NT (some 2,698 uses). N. Turner isolates three factors that contributed to its extended NT use: (a) the increasing imprecision of the dat.; (b) LXX usage, where *en* generally rendered the diversified b^e (see above, I. B. 2 (a)); (c) the influence of distinctively Christian ideas, such as *en Christō*, *en pneumati* (Moulton, *Grammar*, III, 261).

2. *Its Versatility and Ultimate Disappearance.* All the more remarkable, therefore, is the fact that in modern demotic Gk. the prep. is no longer used. The ultimate disappearance of *en* from the spoken language is related to two facts: (a) the disappearance of the dat. case, a process completed by the tenth century; (b) the extremely diversified use of *en* in Hel. Gk. Commenting on this latter point, P. F. Regard notes that in the case of the infin. also there was an extension of usage simultaneously with signs of its ultimate eclipse; the more a particular linguistic form is employed, the more it is subject to weakening (*Prépositions*, 323 f.). In its diversification (note the 20 uses of *en*, with various senses, in one sentence in 2 Cor. 6:3–7a), *en* encroached on the territory of *eis* (in being employed with verbs expressing motion – e.g., Lk. 23:53; 2 Cor. 8:16), *dia* with the acc. (in expressing the ground – e.g., Matt. 6:7), *dia* with the gen. (in expressing instrumentality or agency – e.g., Lk. 22:49; Matt. 9:34), *meta* or *dia* with the gen. (in denoting attendant circumstances – e.g., Col. 2:7c; 4:2c); *syn* (in expressing accompaniment – e.g., Lk. 14:31), and even *kata* (in indicating a standard of judgment – e.g., Eph. 4:16, see Weymouth). It is not that the distinction between *en* and any other prep. was obliterated, but the area and frequency of overlap in usage became greater in Hel. and especially biblical Gk. than it had been earlier. Each potential example of such overlapping needs to be carefully weighed. For example, in Jas. 5:3 we should render *en eschatais hēmerais* "(you have piled up wealth) *in* the last days" rather than "*for* the last days (as if *en* = *eis*)," given the fact that James does not confuse *eis* and *en*

and the NT conviction that with the coming of Jesus the "last days" had dawned (Acts 2:16 f.; 2 Tim. 3:1; Heb. 1:2; 1 Pet. 1:20). On the relation of *en* to *eis* see above II.D. 1. (b).

3. *Exegetical Ambiguities.* A corollary of the versatility of *en* is the exegetical ambiguity that often attaches to its use. For instance, does the phrase *panta en pasin* in 1 Cor. 15:28 (cf. Eph. 1:23; Col. 3:11) mean that, at the end, God will be "all in all" (KJV) (denoting his unchallenged supremacy in the universe) or "everything to (= in the case of) everyone" (Moffatt, RSV) (denoting his indwelling of all members of the redeemed community)? Sometimes all the exegete can do is to reduce the number of possible meanings of *en* by examining the context. But even when it proves impossible to eradicate all ambiguity, a prep. phrase may be of crucial import. *en de eirēnē* (1 Cor. 7:15), which is emphatic by position, may well be the key to the proper understanding of this difficult passage. The reason (*de*, "for" RSV) a Christian partner in a mixed marriage is not bound to persist in seeking a reconciliation (when the non-Christian partner has initiated a separation) is the fact that God has called Christians (i) into a state of peace *in* which they should now live (pregnant or proleptic *en*; cf. 1 Thess. 4:7) or (ii) *in the sphere of* (Christian) peace (locatival *en*). To cause wrangling and discord is inappropriate for those with such a calling.

4. *Figurative Sense.* The basic figurative sense of *en* corresponds to its original local signification. It is used to denote the sphere within which some action occurs or the element or reality in which something is contained or consists. Phrases such as *en kyriō*, *en pneumati*, *en heni sōmati*, *en pistei* and *en alētheia* indicate states in which Christians live and act. In Col. 3:20 children's obedience to their parents is said to be pleasing (to God) *en kyriō*, that is, provided it arises from Christian motives. Similarly, the Christian widow is free to remarry, says Paul (1 Cor. 7:39), but only "in the (sphere of the) Lord", that is, she may marry only a fellow-Christian (see Arndt, 259, s.v. *en* I. 5. d). Again, it was *en tō Iēsou*, "in the case of Jesus", that is, by appealing to the fact and precedent of Jesus' resurrection, that the apostles Peter and John established the general idea of resurrection from the dead (Acts 4:2). NT writers never argue from a general resurrection of all men to the resurrection of Jesus or of believers. "Those who belong to Christ" will be made alive "at his coming", but only because Christ is the firstfruits, the pledge of the full harvest (1 Cor. 15:22 f.). A final example of this basic locatival sense of *en* may be found in Gal. 1:16, where Paul is describing how he received his gospel. *en emoi* means "(with)in me", "in (the sphere of) my soul", not "through me" (which would more commonly be *di' emou*), since (a) a personal revelation is to be distinguished from a public proclamation; (b) the revelation was visual as well as verbal (Acts 9:17, 27; 22:14; 26:16, 19; 2 Cor. 4:4); (c) it is the following statement of purpose – *hina euangelizōmai* – that points to Paul's agency in proclaiming the revelation he had received. (See further E. de W. Burton, *The Epistle to the Galatians*, *ICC*, 1921, 49–51.) By *en emoi* Paul is stressing the inward and intensely personal character of God's revelation to him of the risen Jesus. But it is not impossible that the phrase could mean "to me" (thus RSV), involving a pleonastic *en* (cf. 1 Cor. 14:11), a confusion of *en* and *eis*, a proleptic *en* (cf. Lk. 23:19), or the influence of the *en tois ethnesin* that follows.

5. *Causal en.* Of considerable importance for theology is "causal *en*" (usually regarded as a sub-division of "instrumental *en*"). After citing several LXX passages

(Deut. 24:16; 2 Sam. 3:27; Pss. 6:8; 30:11; 41:10) in which *en* = *b*^{e} = "on account of", "because of", H. A. A. Kennedy adduces comparable examples from the Pauline epistles (Rom. 1:21, 24; 5:3; 1 Cor. 4:4; 7:14; 2 Cor. 12:5, 9; Phil. 1:13) ("Two Exegetical Notes on St. Paul. I. A Special Use of *en*", *ExpT* 28, 1916–17, 322 f.). To these might be added Matt. 6:7; Jn. 16:30; Acts 7:29; 24:16; Rom. 14:21; Col. 1:21. For instances from the papyri, see C. Rossberg, *De . . . Usu*, 1909, 29 and Moulton-Milligan, 210.

6. *en Christō*. In the many uses of this common Pauline formula, the *en* has no uniform function but seems to express the following range of ideas or relationships. A paraphrase will bring out the import of the expression in the examples cited.

(a) *Incorporative union*: "So that, incorporate in the person of Christ, we might become the righteousness of God" (2 Cor. 5:21). "There is therefore now no penal servitude for those who are in union with Christ Jesus" (Rom. 8:1). "Consequently, if anyone is united to Christ, there is a new creation" (2 Cor. 5:17).

(b) *Sphere of reference*: "I know a Christian man" (2 Cor. 12:2). "We make our boast in the sphere of Christ Jesus" (Phil. 3:3). "They were Christians before I was" (Rom. 16:7).

(c) *Agency or instrumentality*: "They are justified freely by his grace through the redemption accomplished by Christ Jesus" (Rom. 3:24). "The veil is not lifted because only through Christ is it removed" (2 Cor. 3:14).

(d) *Cause*: "You have come to completeness as a result of being in him (Christ)" (Col. 2:10). "All will be made alive by virtue of their connexion and solidarity with Christ" (1 Cor. 15:22).

(e) *Mode*: "You are all one by being in Christ Jesus" (Gal. 3:28).

(f) *Location*: "The love of God that is focused in Christ Jesus our Lord" (Rom. 8:39). "Have this attitude among you that also characterized Christ Jesus" (Phil. 2:5).

(g) *Authoritative basis*: "We urge you on the authority of the Lord Jesus" (1 Thess. 4:1).

For the immense literature on the subject, see E. Best, *One Body in Christ*, 1955, 8–19. If the concept that lies behind Paul's *en Christō* formula is that of Christ as a universal personality (A. Oepke, *en*, *TDNT* II 542), an inclusive personality (C. F. D. Moule, "The Corporate Christ" in his *The Phenomenon of the New Testament*, *SBT*, Second Series 1, 1967, 26), or a corporate personality (E. Best, *op. cit.* 29), so that believers as a corporate whole dwell "in Christ," in the complementary expression, "Christ (Jesus) in you" (*en hymin*) (Rom. 8:10; 2 Cor. 13:5; Col. 1:27; cf. Gal. 2:20), the notion of a direct relation between two individuals is more pronounced. Only in Johannine thought is there the idea of personal co-inherence (Jn. 6:56; 14:20; 15:4 f.; 1 Jn. 3:24; 4:13, 15 f.), patterned on the archetype of divine co-inherence (Jn. 10:38; 14:10 f., 20; 17:21, 23). It is also noteworthy that Paul more often depicts Christians as being *en Christō* and the Spirit as *en hymin* than Christ as *en hymin* and Christians as *en pneumati*. On the relationship between the expressions *en Christō* and *en pneumati* in Paul, see F. Prat, *The Theology of Saint Paul*, II, ET 1945, 394 f.; F. Neugebauer, "Das Paulinische 'In Christō' ", *NTS* 4, 1957–8, 124–138; H. F. Woodhouse, "Life in Christ and Life in the Spirit", *Anglican Theological Review* 47, 1965, 289–293.

2 Cor. 5:19a may be translated in two basic ways: "that through Christ (*en*

Christō) God was reconciling the world to himself" or "that God was in Christ, reconciling the world to himself." Nothing in the immediate context demands that either of these renderings be excluded as inappropriate, and each embodies a typically Pauline sentiment. What makes the second translation preferable are the following considerations: (i) it would be awkward for the two elements of a periphrastic (imperfect) construction (*ēn* ... *katallassōn*) to be separated by three words (cf. Gal. 1:22 f.; Phil. 2:26; Tit. 3:3 is no real parallel); (ii) elsewhere when Paul uses the verb *katallassein* and specifies Christ as God's agent in effecting reconciliation, the *dia* phrase employed to express the latter idea either precedes (as in Col. 1:20; cf. Rom. 5:11) or follows (as in Rom. 5:10; 2 Cor. 5:18; cf. Col. 1:22) the fixed order: verb (*katallassein*) – object(s) of reconciliation – goal of reconciliation. This might lead us to expect, if *en Christō* in 2 Cor. 5:19 specified agency and *ēn* ... *katallassōn* were a periphrastic imperfect, that the *en Christō* would precede the *theos* or follow the *heautō* (although, on any view, *kosmon* is not in its normal position). The finite verb (*ēn*) and the participle (*katallassōn*) are perhaps related as expressing something akin to cause and effect: it was only because God in all his fullness had chosen to dwell in Christ (Col. 1:19), only because there dwelt embodied in Christ the total plenitude of Deity (Col. 2:9), that reconciliation was accomplished. A functional christology presupposes, and finds its ultimate basis in, an ontological christology. Not only was Christ God's agent in effecting reconciliation (Rom. 5:10 f.; 2 Cor. 5:18; Col. 1:19–22); he also mediated the divine presence, thus giving validity to his reconciliatory sacrifice. God was in Christ and therefore acted through Christ (cf. Jn. 14:10b, "the Father who dwells in me does his works"). Paul here alludes to Christ as the locus of divine revelation ("God was in Christ") and therefore as the means of divine redemption ("reconciling the world to himself"; cf. 2 Cor. 5:18). There is also established an identity between the redemptive action of God and that of Christ. *Ubi Christus, ibi Deus*: where Christ is, there is God.

G. *epi*

1. *Its Basic Meaning and Versatility.* Basically denoting position *on* something which forms a support or foundation, *epi* is the opposite of *hypo* ("under") and differs from *hyper* ("above") in implying actual rest upon some object. In this primary local sense of "on", "upon", *epi* is followed by the acc., the gen. or the dat., often without distinction in meaning (e.g., with *kathēmenos* and *thronos*, Rev. 4:2 acc., 4:9 f. gen., 21:5 dat.; see also Matt. 25:21). *epi*, the one NT prep. used frequently with three cases (acc. 464 times, gen. 216, dat. 176 – Moulton, *Grammar*, I, 107), has a versatility of use that is matched only by *en*. From the simple spatial meaning of *epi* there naturally developed a multitude of derived senses, so that the prep. may express, *inter alia*: addition (Lk. 3:20; 2 Cor. 7:13; Col. 3:14); superintendence (Matt. 2:22; Lk. 12:44; Rom. 9:5); cause or basis (Matt. 4:4; Lk. 5:5; Acts 3:16; 1 Tim. 5:19); circumstance (Rom. 8:20; 1 Cor. 9:10; Tit. 1:2); and purpose or destination (Gal. 5:13, "you were called to freedom", *ep' eleutheria*, a statement that epitomizes the argument of this epistle, "the charter of Christian liberty"; Eph. 2:10, "created ... for doing good deeds"; 1 Thess. 4:7). Of special interest is the use of *epi* (with the acc.) to denote the recipients of various spiritual blessings or experiences, such as a trance (Acts 10:10), the word of God (Lk. 3:2), the kingdom of God (Matt.

12:28; Lk. 10:9), the Holy Spirit (Acts 2:17 f.; 10:45; Tit. 3:6; 1 Pet. 4:14), the power of Christ (2 Cor. 12:9), or the grace of God (Lk. 2:40).

2. *Some Notable Uses of epi.*

(a) *epi to auto.* In the LXX (e.g., 2 Sam. 2:13; Pss. 2:2; 33:4) the meaning of this prep. phrase is "together" or "at the same place", while in the papyri it is frequent in the sense "in all" (denoting the sum total of an account) (E. Mayser, *Grammatik*, II. 2, 418 n. 2). The phrase has the sense of "together" in Acts 4:26 (quoting Ps. 2:2) and in Matt. 22:34; Lk. 17:35. As a euphemism for sexual intercourse, *epi to auto einai* occurs in 1 Cor. 7:5. Adducing illuminating parallels from the Qumran Manual of Discipline (e.g., 1QS 5:7), M. Wilcox has shown that in Acts 2:47 (as in 1:15; 2:44, 46D) the phrase is not a mistranslation of the Aram. *laḥdā'* (as C. C. Torrey maintained – see Moulton, *Grammar*, II, 473) but a quasi-technical expression denoting the union of the Christian fellowship: "the Lord was day by day incorporating into the Fellowship those who were being saved" (*The Semitisms of Acts*, 1965, 93–100). That *epi to auto* and *en ekklēsia* are sometimes virtually synonymous, signifying "in church fellowship", seems evident from the parallelism of 1 Cor. 11:18 and 11:20. This meaning, common in the Apostolic Fathers (e.g., 1 Clem. 34:7; Ign. *Eph.* 5:3; 13:1; *Mag.* 7:1; *Phil.* 6:2; 10:1; Barn. 4:10 – cited by E. Ferguson, " 'When You Come Together': *Epi to Auto* in Early Christian Literature", *Restoration Quarterly* 16, 1973, 205 f.), should be given to the phrase in Acts 2:1, 44 *v.l.*, 46D, 47; 1 Cor. 11:20; 14:23 and possibly Acts 1:15. The "togetherness" of the early Christians was expressed principally in their meeting for public worship "in church fellowship" or "in the assembly".

(b) *eph' hō.* The innumerable interpretations of Rom. 5:12 fall into two main grammatical categories: those that construe *hō* as a relative pronoun (whose antecedent may be either *ho thanatos*, "death", or *henos anthrōpou*, "one man"), with *epi* meaning "in" or "because of"; and those that treat *eph' hō* as a conjunction, equivalent to *epi toutō hoti*, "on the ground of this fact, that", "because." The former alternatives must be pronounced improbable since elsewhere in Paul (viz., 2 Cor. 5:4; Phil. 3:1; 4:10) *eph' hō* is conjunctional, whatever its precise nuance. The focus of exegetical attention therefore naturally moves to *pantes hēmarton*, which may refer to man's corporate involvement in the transgression of Adam or to men's personal sin in imitation of Adam or as a result of inheriting a corrupt Adamic nature. Then, since some nexus between Adam and his descendants with regard to sin seems demanded by Paul's Adam-Christ analogy (see Rom. 5:18 f.; cf. 1 Cor. 15:22), the most likely options seem to be: (i) "death spread to all men because all sinned" (either actually in Adam's primal transgression or in their federal representative, Adam) (*hēmarton* being a constative aorist); (ii) "death spread to all men because all (since the time of Adam) have sinned" (*hēmarton* a constative aorist), or ". . . do sin" (*hēmarton* a gnomic aorist) (as those who have inherited Adam's nature). See further the discussions of S. Lyonnet, "Le sens de *eph' hō* en Rom. 5:12 et l'exégèse des Pères grecs", *Bib* 36, 1955, 436–456; C. E. B. Cranfield, *The Epistle to the Romans*, *ICC*, I 1975[6], 274–281; and S. L. Johnson, Jr., "Romans 5:12 – An Exercise in Exegesis and Theology", in *New Dimensions in New Testament Study*, ed. R. N. Longenecker and M. C. Tenney, 1974, 298–316.

As for 2 Cor. 5:4 the vast majority of commentators agree that a causal sense should be given to *eph' hō*. The only viable alternative, viz. *eph' ho* = "on condition

that" (proposed by M. E. Thrall, *Greek Particles in the New Testament*, 1962, 94). labours under a twofold difficulty: it demands the insertion of a complex parenthesis before the prep. phrase to complete the sense, "(but such sighing is permissible only) on condition that"; and it overlooks the parallelism between 5:2, "we groan *because* we long to put on over it (*ependysasthai epipothountes*) (viz. our earthly tent-dwelling) our heavenly habitation", and 5:4, "we groan with a sense of oppression because, so far from wishing to become disembodied, we desire to put on (our heavenly dwelling)" (*thelomen ... ependysasthai*). The origin of Paul's groaning or sighing (*stenazomen*, 5:2, 4), that is, his sense of frustration under the limitations of a *sarx*-dominated *sōma*, is not to be located in a Hellenistic depreciation of corporeality but in his yearning (*epipothountes*, 5:2) or wish (*thelomen*, 5:4) for "super-investiture" (*ependysasthai*, 5:2, 4), for the acquisition of a spiritual body (cf. 1 Cor. 15:44). And if Paul "groaned" in physical embodiment *because* he longed for spiritual corporeality, that longing arose because God had given him the Spirit as the pledge of the resurrection transformation (5:4b, 5).

(c) *Matt. 19:9.* In itself the crucial phrase *mē epi porneia* (lit. "not on the basis of immorality") in this famous Matthean divorce-saying could conceivably be interpreted as parenthetical, providing a negative explanatory refinement: "it is also not allowed on the ground of fornication" (A. Ott, *Die Auslegung der neutestamentlichen Texte über die Ehescheidung*, 1911, 299, cited by F. Hauck and S. Schulz, *pornē*, *TDNT* VI 592 n. 75), "not [even] for immorality [can he divorce her]". But in light of the unambiguous parallel in Matt. 5:32, *parektos logou porneias*, "except for [the reason of] immorality" (cf. Arndt, 479 s.v. *logos* 2. d), the *mē* of Matt. 19:9 should be treated as equivalent to *ei mē*, introducing an exception, "except on the basis of immorality" (cf. Arndt, 287 s.v. *epi* II. b. *gamma*), "except for immorality". The difference between the two Matthean phrases (viz. *parektos logou porneias* and *mē epi porneia*) is formal rather than substantial. To treat *mē epi* as meaning "not in addition to" yields no satisfactory sense in the context. Many identifications have been proposed for the *porneia* (here listed in descending order of probability): (i) adultery (cf. Sir. 23:23); (ii) marriage (entered in good faith) within the prohibited degrees of consanguinity (Lev. 18:6–18; cf. Acts 15:20, 29; 1 Cor. 5:1 where incest = *porneia*), where *porneia* = Heb. *zᵉnûṯ*; (iii) pre-marital unchastity discovered after marriage (cf. Deut. 22:13–21); (iv) moral or spiritual adultery (since figuratively *zᵉnûṯ* can denote apostasy or violation of the covenant, e.g., Num. 14:33) ;(v) *logos porneias* (Matt. 5:32) = Heb. *'erwaṯ dāḇār* (Deut. 24:1, LXX *aschēmon pragma*), "some indecency"; (vi) a mixed marriage between a Jew or Christian and a pagan; (vii) prostitution. For further discussion → Separate, art. *chōrizō*.

(d) *1 Pet. 2:24a.* Two translations of this verse may be offered: (i) "He himself bore our sins in his body on the cross"; (ii) "He himself, in his own person, carried our sins up on to the cross." While it is true that *anapherō* may mean nothing more than *pherō* (cf. LXX Isa. 53:4 *pherei*, 53:12 *anēnenken*, both rendering Heb. *nāśā'*) and *epi* with the acc. can denote location (Arndt, 288 s.v. *epi* III. 1. *zeta*), there are several reasons for preferring the second translation. (i) If 1 Pet. 2:24a is a combination of Isa. 53:12 and Deut. 21:23 ("cursed by God is everyone who hangs on a tree," *epi xylou*), Peter's change to *epi to xylon* is significant. (ii) It is the combination of *ana-* and *epi* with the acc. that is remarkable. A distinction should be drawn between *(an)ēnenken epi tou xylou*, "he bore on the cross," and Peter's *anēnenken* ...

epi to xylon, "he carried up ... on to the cross." (iii) Although *anapherō* is a technical term describing the priest's task of bringing a sacrifice and placing it on the altar (e.g., Lev. 14:20), here the verb does not mean "offer up in sacrifice" (as it does in Heb. 7:27; Jas. 2:21), since sins could never be conceived of as an offering to God and Peter has preferred the term *xylon* ("gibbet") over *thysiastērion* ("altar"); rather the verb should be understood in a non-technical sense, "carry up". The picture is not of Christ as a priest and the cross as an altar but of Christ as the sin-bearer (cf. Jn. 1:29) and the cross as the place where sin was destroyed (cf. Col. 2:14 f.). E. G. Selwyn finds a possible allusion to Peter's actually having seen Jesus ascend Golgotha as the sin-bearer (*The First Epistle of St. Peter*, 1946, 96, 181). For the view that *anapherō epi* is a forensic technical expression for the laying of one person's debt upon another, see G. A. Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, ET 1901, 88–91.

On the use of *epi tō onomati* after *baptizō*, see below III. A. 5; and of *epi* with *pisteuō*, III. B. 2. (e) and (f).

H. *hyper*

Its original local sense of "over", "above" (Lat. *super*) is found in cl. Gk. (e.g. Hdt. 2, 6, 19) and occasionally in the papyri (C. Rossberg, *De ... Usu*, 40) but not in the LXX or NT. The commonest meaning this preposition bears (viz. "on behalf of") seems to have arisen from the image of one person standing or bending *over* another in order to protect or shield him, or of a shield lifted *over* the head which suffers the blow instead of the person (cf. *hyperaspizein*, "cover with a shield").

1. *With the Accusative.* Although ingenious efforts have been made to explain the awkward *to mē hyper ha gegraptai* in 1 Cor. 4:6 as a scribe's marginal gloss that crept into the text (see the survey of views in W. F. Howard, "1 Corinthians iv. 6 (Exegesis or Emendation?)", *ExpT* 33, 1921–2, 479 f.), the phrase is better understood as a quotation (note the *to*) of a Pauline slogan (viz., "Do not go beyond what stands written") or (conceivably) as Paul's repudiation of a Corinthian watchword (viz., "Beyond Scripture") (cf. M. D. Hooker, " 'Beyond the Things which are Written': An Examination of 1 Cor. iv. 6," *NTS* 10, 1963–64, 127–132).

2. *With the Genitive.* When the prep. expresses some advantage or favour that accrues to persons, its sense is "on behalf of" (representation) or "in the place of" (substitution). When the benefit is gained by things, the meaning will be "for the sake of", which approaches a causal sense ("because of").

To act on behalf of a person often involves acting in his place. Hence *hyper* not infrequently has the sense of *anti* (as in the papyri – Rossberg, *De ... Usu*, 41). Thus *sou allagma* is parallel to *hyper sou* in Isa. 43:3, *antallagē* to *lytron hyper hēmōn* in Ep. Diog. 9:2, 5, and Irenaeus has *hyper tōn hēmeterōn psychōn* in parallelism with *anti tōn hēmeterōn sarkōn* (*Haer.* 5, 1, 2). Of Onesimus, Paul says to Philemon: "I would have been glad to keep him with me, so that he might serve me as your proxy (*hyper sou*) during my imprisonment for the gospel" (Phlm. 13). For the relevant phrase, Moffatt has "as your deputy", and Goodspeed, "in your place". Commenting on *hyper hēmōn* in Col. 1:7, J. B. Lightfoot observes that "as the evangelist of Colossae, Epaphras had *represented* St. Paul there and preached in his stead" (*Saint Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon*, 1900, 134). As recorded in the Fourth Gospel, Caiaphas remonstrates with the Jewish leaders: "You do not un-

derstand that it is expedient for you that one man should die for the people (*hyper tou laou*)" (Jn. 11:50; similarly in 18:14). It is clear that *hyper* here denotes substitution, not simply benefit or representation, since Caiaphas remarks that such a death "for the people" would ensure that "the whole nation" did not perish (Jn. 11:50b; *laos* and *ethnos* both refer to the (same) Jewish nation; cf. *hyper tou ethnous*, vv. 51 f.). That is, politically the death of the one (as a scapegoat) would be a substitute for the death of the many. As John saw it (10:41 f.; 18:14), Caiaphas had unwittingly expressed a theological profundity: Christ's suffering was vicarious and redemptive (cf. E. A. Abbott, *Johannine Grammar*, 1906, 276). Very similar is the Pauline affirmation that "one died for all" (*heis hyper pantōn apethanen*), where, as R. Bultmann notes (*Der Zweite Brief an die Korinther*, 1976, 152 f.), *hyper* is shown to bear a substitutionary sense by the inference Paul draws: "therefore all died" (2 Cor. 5:14). The death of Christ was the death of all, because he was dying their death. In becoming the object of divine wrath against human sin, Christ was acting vicariously, viz., *hyper hēmōn*, not only "on our behalf" or "with a view to our good" but "in our place" (2 Cor. 5:21; Gal. 3:13). He assumed the liabilities of others in "being made sin" and "becoming a curse" (*katara, "abstractum pro concreto*: bearer of the curse", H. Riesenfeld, *hyper, TDNT* VIII 509; see also A. T. Robertson, *Grammar*, 631). However, in several places where the phrase *apothanein* (or its equivalent) *hyper* occurs, it is difficult to determine whether or not the prep. denotes substitution (e.g., Rom. 8:32; Gal. 2:20; Eph. 5:2, 25; 1 Thess. 5:10; Tit. 2:14). In Rom. 14:15 (*hyper hou*, note the singular), any substitutionary notion is unlikely since a parallel in 1 Cor. 8:11 has *di' hon*. It is striking that, in addition to affirming that Christ died for persons (*hyper asebōn*, Rom. 5:6; *hyper pantōn*, 2 Cor. 5:14 f., 1 Tim. 2:6; *hyper hēmōn*, Rom. 5:8; 1 Thess. 5:10), Paul can say that he died or gave himself *hyper tōn hamartiōn hēmōn* (1 Cor. 15:3; Gal. 1:4, *v.l.*; cf. Heb. 5:1; 7:27), "with reference to our sins", i.e. "to deal with our sin", "to expiate our sins". But why does Paul never say that Christ died *anti hēmōn* (1 Tim. 2:6 is the nearest he comes – *antilytron hyper pantōn*)? Probably because the prep. *hyper*, unlike *anti*, could simultaneously express representation and substitution (similarly R. C. Trench, *Synonyms of the New Testament*, 1948 reprint of ninth edition, § lxxxii, 310–313; E. K. Simpson, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 1954, 110–112, "Note on the Meaning of HYPER in Certain Contexts," where there is an impressive assembling of evidence from cl. and Hel. Gk. to show that *hyper* not uncommonly denotes proxyship, "in lieu of"; but see *per contra* F. Prat, *The Theology of Saint Paul*, 1945, II, 197). It is significant that in the papyri we find that a semi-technical formula (*egrapsa hyper autou agrammatou*) is used to indicate that one person had written or signed a letter on behalf of and in place of another person who was illiterate (see E. Mayser, *Grammatik*, II. 2, 460; and A. T. Robertson, "The Use of *hyper* in Business Documents in the Papyri", *The Expositor* 8th series 18, 1919, 321–327). We may conclude that the *emphasis* in *hyper* is on representation, in *anti* on substitution; yet a substitute represents and a representative may be a substitute. That is, *hyper* sometimes implies *anti*.

On the use of *hyper* in 1 Cor. 15:29, see below III. A. 1.

I. *hypo*

There are several ways in which agency is expressed in the NT: *hypo* (Matt. 4:1,

bis), *dia* (2 Cor. 1:19), *apo* (2 Cor. 3:18), *ek* (Gal. 4:4) and possibly *para* with the gen., *en* with the dat. (Matt. 9:34), or the simple dat. (Matt. 6:1) (see A. T. Robertson, *Grammar*, 635 f., 820).

1. *hypo and dia.* It cannot be maintained that while *dia* denotes the inanimate instrument, *hypo* specifies the personal agent, for *dia* may express personal agency (e.g., 1 Cor. 15:21) and *hypo* may be applied to inanimate agencies (e.g., *hypo tou noos*, Col. 2:18), to non-human agents (e.g., *hypo tōn thēriōn*, Rev. 6:8) or to personified forces (e.g., *hypo anemou*, Lk. 7:24). Where the two preps. may be distinguished, *dia* marks intermediate agency and *hypo* ultimate or original agency. Thus in Matt. 1:22, the Lord as the ultimate author (*hypo kyriou*) of the prophetic word is distinguished from the prophet Isaiah who acted as a mediate agent (*dia tou prophētou*) in speaking the divine word. Compare the similar distinction between primary origin and subordinate agency in the *ek* (of God the Father) – *dia* (of Jesus Christ) contrast in 1 Cor. 8:6 with regard to creation and preservation.

2. *hypo and apo.* The distinction here, when it obtains, is that between immediate and active causation (*hypo*) and less immediate and less active causation (*apo*), between the direct and indirect origination of an action (cf. Arndt, 87 s.v. *apo* V. 6), between an internal and an external causal relation (cf. A. Buttmann, *Grammar*, 325), or between the efficient cause and the occasional cause ("that from which a result ensued") (G. B. Winer, *Grammar*, 369). In such cases *apo* may be rendered "at the hands of" (e.g., Mk. 8:31; 2 Cor. 7:13), "by the will (or command) of" (e.g., Rev. 12:6) or "as a result of" (Rev. 9:18). In the expression *apo theou peirazomai* (Jas. 1:13a), God is viewed as the ultimate cause of temptation but not directly as the tempter. James is saying: "Let nobody say when he is tempted, 'I am being tempted by circumstances and influences that come from God or are permitted by him.' " However the following rebuttal of this sentiment ("he himself tempts no one", v. 13c) shows that a direct divine temptation was also in mind. (For the view that James is here re-interpreting Matt. 6:13a in a distinctively Christian sense, see N. Turner, *Insights*, 161–163.) But that *apo* occasionally stands for *hypo* seems incontestable (see Lk. 7:35; Acts 2:22; 15:4, 33; 20:9; 2 Cor. 7:13; cf. Thuc., *History*, 4, 25, 5).

3. *hypo and para.* There is no clear instance where *para* replaces *hypo* (but see Mk. 10:40 *v.l.*; Acts 10:33 *v.l.*; 22:30 *v.l.*). In Lk. 1:45 (". . . what was spoken to her [Mary] *para kyriou*") the prep. may allude to the intermediate agency of the angel (see M. Zerwick, *Biblical Greek*, § 90). Whereas *para* traces an action back to its point of departure or source, *hypo* relates an action to its efficient cause (so G. B. Winer, *Grammar*, 365).

Observing that *apo*, *ek*, *para* and *hypo* all denote "issuing, proceeding from," Winer ranges these four preps. in the following order with regard to the degree of intimacy of connexion between the objects in question, *ek* representing the most intimate and *apo* the most remote: *ek*, *hypo*, *para*, *apo*. Only *apo* and *ek* directly imply "disjoining" and "removal" (*op. cit.*, 364 f.).

J. *kata*

1. *Root Meaning.* The primary, local meaning of *kata* seems to have been either "down (from or upon)" (expressing vertical extension) or (less probably) "along while remaining in contact with" (expressing horizontal extension). That *kata* is

closely related to *ana* is clear from the fact that "down" and "up" simply represent the same idea from opposite viewpoints. Just as *ana* corresponds to *anō*, "up(wards)", so the prep. *kata* answers to the adv. *katō*, "down(wards)". Examples of the spatial meaning of *kata* (with the gen.) include Matt. 8:32; Acts 27:14 ("a tempestuous wind swept down from it" [*kat' autēs*] = the island of Crete with its mountain ravines); 1 Cor. 11:4. 2 Cor. 8:2 affords a clear example of the developed metaphorical sense: "poverty reaching down to the depths" (*kata bathous*) = "extreme poverty." From the local meaning, "down upon", there naturally arose the idea of hostile movement directed against someone or something (where *kata* is the opposite of *hyper*; cf. Rom. 8:31, 33 f.) (e.g., Acts 6:13; 1 Cor. 4:6). In this regard 2 Cor. 13:8 should not be taken to mean that truth is its own defence (contrast Rom. 1:18; Jude 3) ("for we cannot do anything against the truth [*kata tēs alētheias*]"). Explaining why he does not expect the Corinthians to discover him to be a false apostle or counterfeit Christian, Paul is asserting that he would never be able to bring himself to propagate falsehood or to hinder the advance of the truth without first changing his identity as an apostle. In Gal. 5:17 the active mutual antagonism of two irreconcilable adversaries – the flesh and the Spirit – is expressed by the words *epithymei kata*: "the cravings of our old nature conflict with the Spirit, and the Spirit with our old nature." Again, Paul speaks of God's obliteration, through the cross of Christ, of the signed acknowledgment of indebtedness (*cheirographon*) "that stood against us [*kath' hēmōn*] with its regulations and was directly hostile to us [*hypenantion hēmin*]" (Col. 2:14). The former phrase emphasizes the brute fact of indebtedness, while the latter stresses the active hostility produced by this fact; J. A. Bengel finds the distinction to be that between "a state of war and an actual engagement" (*Gnomon of the New Testament*, ET 1863, IV, 172).

Attention may now be given to several uses of *kata* that provide theologically significant statements.

2. *kata sarka and kata pneuma. kata sarka* sometimes means simply "with respect to (physical) descent" (Rom. 1:3; 4:1; 9:3). Appearing in the form *to kata sarka*, the phrase has the purpose in Rom. 9:5 either of pointing to a complementary antithesis (as if *to kata pneuma* stood after "God over all") or of affirming that it is only "as far as human descent is concerned" (cf. Funk, § 266 (1)) that the messiah (= Christ) belongs to the Jewish people. Not a few commentators find in 2 Cor. 5:16b a Pauline disavowal of interest in the historical Jesus (*kata sarka Christon*). But *kata sarka* here signifies "from a worldly [or nationalistic] point of view" and qualifies *egnōkamen* ("we regarded"), rather than qualifying *Christon* with the whole phrase meaning "a physical Christ." Since the time of his conversion Paul had ceased making superficial judgments based on external appearances (cf. 2 Cor. 5:12). Just as he now repudiated as totally erroneous his sincere yet superficial pre-conversion estimate of Jesus as a misguided messianic pretender whose followers must be extirpated (Acts 9:1 f.; 26:9–11), so he regarded the time-honoured division of mankind into Jew and Gentile (2 Cor. 5:16a) as less significant for him than the believer-unbeliever distinction (see, e.g., Rom. 2:28 f.; 10:12 f.; 1 Cor. 5:12 f.; Gal. 6:10) which was based on a *kata pneuma* ("in light of the Spirit") or *kata stauron* ("in the light of the cross") attitude. Two basic and profound changes had been brought about in Paul's attitude as a result of his Damascus encounter with the risen Jesus: he now acclaimed Jesus as messiah and Lord (Acts 9:22; 17:3; Rom. 10:9);

he now viewed Gentile believers as Abraham's offspring, fellow-citizens, brothers in Christ (Gal. 3:26–29; Eph. 2:11–21) and Jewish unbelievers as needing salvation in Christ (Rom. 10:1–4). For a review of the various interpretations of 2 Cor. 5:16, see J. W. Fraser, "Paul's Knowledge of Jesus: II Corinthians v. 16 once more", *NTS* 17, 1970–1, 293–313.

The opposition between "flesh" and "Spirit" is an important ingredient in Pauline theology (e.g., Gal. 5:16–24); so too, then, is the contrast between *kata sarka* and *kata pneuma*. Paul can use *en sarki* in a neutral or non-moral sense, referring to mortal embodiment or existence (2 Cor. 10:3; Gal. 2:20), but in Rom. 7:5; 8:8 f. it is equivalent to *kata sarka*. The sense of Rom. 8:5 is that "those who are controlled by (or live in obedience to) their old nature" (*hoi kata sarka ontes* = *hoi sarkikoi*, cf. 1 Cor. 3:3) are earthly-minded or take the side of the flesh in the Spirit-flesh conflict (cf. Gal. 5:17); "those whose lives are directed by the Spirit" (*hoi kata pneuma* = *hoi pneumatikoi*, cf. 1 Cor. 2:15; 3:1) give their attention to spiritual matters or take the side of the Spirit. In this *kata sarka – kata pneuma* antithesis the contrast is between two diametrically opposed determinative principles of action, two radically different sources for the prompting of conduct. But the contrast is given another turn in Gal. 4:21–31. Here *ho kata sarka gennētheis* ("he who was born in the ordinary course of nature", v. 29a) refers to Ishmael as "the son of the slave" (v. 23a) and then (allegorically) to the descendants of Abraham who do not have his faith, while *ho kata pneuma (gennētheis)* ("who was born by the power of the Spirit", v. 29b) refers first to Isaac as "the son of the free woman in fulfilment of the promise" (v. 23b) and then to all those who share Abraham's faith as "children of promise" (v. 28).

3. *kata Denoting Correspondence or Conformity.* Often the noun that follows *kata* specifies the criterion, standard or norm in the light of which a statement is made or is true, an action is performed, or a judgment is passed. The prep. will mean "according to", "in conformity with", "corresponding to". This use is common in reference to the precise and impartial standard of judgment that will be applied at the great Assize (Matt. 16:27; Rom. 2:6; 1 Cor. 3:8; 2 Tim. 4:14; 1 Pet. 1:17; Rev. 2:23). Noteworthy too is the twice-repeated *kata tas graphas* ("in accordance with the Scriptures") in 1 Cor. 15:3 f., which constitutes an appeal to OT predictions of (i) the death of Christ or his death to atone for sins (Isa. 53:4–6, 10–12), and (ii) the resurrection of Christ (Ps. 16:10; Isa. 53:10b, 11a; 54:7) or his resurrection on the third day (Hos. 6:2; Lev. 23:10 f.), in confirmation of the reliability of the NT kerygma and the continuity of God's action in the two Ages. Both the death and the resurrection of Christ formed part of the age-long plan of God (cf. Acts 2:23–32; 13:34–37). *kata theon* may signify "in accordance with God's will" (Rom. 8:27), "in the image of God" (Eph. 4:24; cf. Col. 3:10), "as God intends" (1 Pet. 5:2), "in a godly way" (2 Cor. 7:9, 11), or simply "godly" (*hē kata theon lypē*, "godly sorrow," 2 Cor. 7:10). There is an interesting contrast of two *kata* phrases in 1 Pet. 4:6. Addressing a concern some believers evidently felt about the fate of Christian martyrs (cf. 1 Thess. 4:13–18), Peter observed that the very reason for the proclamation of the good news to such Christians who were now deceased was that, although in men's estimation (*kata anthrōpous*) they had been physically judged by death, they should live in a spiritual state as God does (*kata theon*). There is no need to insist that *kata* should bear an identical sense in both parts of the verse. Elsewhere (1 Pet.

3:7) Peter encourages Christian husbands to live with their wives *kata gnōsin*, which may mean: (i) in a considerate and tactful manner; (ii) in light of the knowledge of God's will and character; or (iii) in accordance with Christian knowledge about husband-wife relations in general and sexual relations in particular (cf. 1 Cor. 7:3–5). Sometimes the ideas of "standard" and "reason" merge: *hoi kata prothesin klētoi* (Rom. 8:28) indicates that God's calling is in accord with and because of his purpose (thus Arndt, 408 s.v. *kata* II. 5. a. *delta*). Or the notion of "conformity" may be totally displaced, with *kata* denoting the "basis." Thus, election is based on (*kata*) the foreknowledge of God the Father, is effected by (*en*) the sanctifying work of the Spirit, and aims at or achieves (*eis*) obedience and the constant sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ (1 Pet. 1:1 f.). Similarly, in Peter's view, regeneration is the result of the Father's great mercy (*kata to poly autou eleos*, 1 Pet. 1:3a) and an act of immortal procreation (*ek sporas . . . aphthartou*, 1 Pet. 1:23a), is achieved by means of (*dia*) God's living and enduring word (1 Pet. 1:23b), and results in (*eis*) the possession of a vibrant hope (1 Pet. 1:3b).

4. *Distributive kata.* The use of *kat' oikon* ("in the various houses", Arndt, 407 s.v. *kata* II. 1. d.) affords evidence that, at least in the earliest days of the Jerusalem church, daily (*kath' hēmeran*; cf. Acts 6:1) celebrations of the Lord's supper (Acts 2:46) and daily (*pasan hēmeran*, "[throughout] every day") teaching and preaching (Acts 5:42) took place "by households" (Moulton-Milligan, 443 s.v. *oikos*). And with regard to ecclesiastical polity, the phrase *kat' ekklēsian* ("in each individual church", Arndt, 240 s.v. *ekklēsia* 4. b) implies that every Pauline church in South Galatia had a plurality of elders ("And they had appointed elders [*presbyterous*] for them in every church . . .", Acts 14:23).

K. *meta*

See the discussion under *syn* below II. O. 1.

L. *para*

1. *Its Basic Sense.* This is one of the two NT preps. (the other is *epi*) regularly used with three cases. If its radical signification is "by the side of", "beside", *para* with the acc. (60 times in the NT) designates movement "to a position beside" (Mk. 4:4; Acts 4:35; but cf. Mk. 4:1; 10:46 where no idea of movement is implied); with the gen. (78 times), movement or procession "from beside" (Jn. 1:6; but note Lk. 6:19, where *para* follows a vb. compounded with *ek* [*ex*]); with the dat. (50 times), rest or position "beside" (Lk. 9:47; Jn. 8:38; 19:25, the latter being the only NT use with a thing, not a person).

2. *Transferred Meanings.* By transference from the local sense it bears with the gen., *para* with the acc. came to mean "beyond" and then "contrary to" (used of that which goes *beyond* specified limits). Consequently when Paul anathematized anyone who preached a gospel *at variance with* (*para*) the gospel he proclaimed and the Galatians had received (Gal. 1:8 f.), he implies that Judaistic teaching was not conforming to the apostolic norm. The opposite of *para* in this sense is *kata* ("in accordance with"). As well as expressing this notion of contrariety, *para* may mark a comparison by indicating that one thing lies beyond and therefore is superior to

something else (e.g., Rom. 14:5, "one man approves one day in preference to another", Moulton-Milligan, 479). Where this comparison is heightened, there is present the idea not merely of preference ("more than") but of exclusiveness ("instead of"). One aspect of Paul's indictment of mankind in Rom. 1:18–32 is that they worshipped and served created things instead of (*para*) the Creator. The apostle is not implying (as the rendering "... more than the Creator" might suggest) that "creature-worship" is permissible provided it does not usurp the place of "Creator-worship". (But it is just possible that *para* here means "(passing) beyond" = "neglecting.") In a similar way, Lk. 18:14 ("this man went home justified rather than [or, instead of, *para*] the other") does not point to two types or degrees of justification ("... more than the other"), one of which was experienced by the tax collector, the other by the Pharisee; only the former was justified (see Arndt, 616 s.v. *para* III. 3; H. Riesenfeld, *para*, *TDNT* V 734 f.). On the relation of *para* to *hypo*, see above II. I. 3.

The phrase *para* (*tō*) *theō* ("in the sight [or judgment] or God") (Rom. 2:13; 1 Cor. 3:19; 7:24 [on which see Arndt, 615 s.v. *para* II. 2. 3]; Jas. 1:27; 1 Pet. 2:20) or *para kyriō* (2 Pet. 2:11, *v.l.*) indicates the ultimate standard – the purity of the divine life and the clarity of the divine vision – by which all aspects of thought and conduct, whether human or angelic, should now be assessed and will in the end be judged.

3. *para in the Fourth Gospel.* In the Fourth Gospel this prep. figures prominently in denoting the relation of the Son to the Father, where "is from [beside]" (Jn. 6:46; 7:29; 9:33) means "came from [beside]" (Jn. 16:27 f.; 17:8). Elsewhere in John, some have found associated with *para* the doctrines of the eternal generation of the Son (*monogenous para patros*, Jn. 1:14) and the eternal procession of the Spirit (*to pneuma tēs alētheias ho para tou patros ekporeuetai*, Jn. 15:26). It is, however, unlikely that either verse supports this particular interpretation. Etymologically *monogenēs* is associated not with begetting (*gennaomai*) but with existence (*gignomai*). It means "of sole descent" (F. Büchsel, *monogenēs*, *TDNT* IV 738), referring to the only child in a family, a meaning attested in secular Gk. literature (e.g., Hesiod, *Works*, 376), the LXX (e.g., Jdg. 11:34; Tob. 3:15) and other Jewish literature (e.g., Josephus, *Ant.* 1, 222; 5, 264), and the NT (Lk. 7:12; 8:42; 9:38). From the personal application of *monogenēs* to "the only member of a kin" there developed a non-familial and (sometimes) non-personal use in reference to "the only member of a kind" (*unicus*, "sole", "unique"; cf. *monos*, "alone" and *genos*, "species"). But in Johannine usage the conjunction of *monogenēs* and *hyios* (Jn. 3:16, 18; 1 Jn. 4:9) shows that it is not the personal uniqueness of Jesus in itself that John is emphasizing but his being "of sole descent" as the Son of God. He is without spiritual siblings. No one else can lay claim to the title Son of God in the sense in which it applies to Christ. It seems that the impulse to render *monogenēs* by *unigenitus* (as in the comparatively late Greek creeds translated into Latin) rather than by *unicus* (as in the earlier Latin renderings) arose from christological dispute and in particular the desire to establish from Scripture the doctrine of the generation of the Son by and from the Father (see F. J. A. Hort, *Two Dissertations*, 1876, 48–53). In Jn. 1:14, then, *para patros* following *hōs monogenous* is equivalent not to *tou ontos ek patros* but to *tou exerchomenou* (or *exelthontos*) *para patros* (cf. Jn. 16:27 f.; 17:8), "[the glory of an only Son] coming from the Father." It is the Son's mission, not his eternal generation, that may be traced back (cf. *para*) to God the

Father. (It is the context, and not the preposition itself that has theological implications; not only Jesus [Jn. 9:33] came "from God" [*para theou*], but John also [Jn. 1:6].)

Similarly in Jn. 15:26 it is not inter-trinitarian relations that John is discussing but Christ's sending of the Spirit from the presence of the Father. (i) Although *ekporeuetai* could imply either an emanation from a divine source or a procession on a mission, only *ek tou patros* would be appropriate to denote an eternal procession from the being of the Father (as the creeds testify, which read *to ek tou patros ekporeuomenon* – a combination of Jn. 15:26 and 1 Cor. 2:12, *to pneuma to ek tou theou*). Compare Rev. 22:1, where the river of the water of life is described as flowing from (*ekporeuomenon ek*) the throne of God and of the Lamb. (ii) *para tou patros* is unlikely to bear two different senses in successive parallel statements. (iii) Following *pempsō* and preceding *martyrēsei*, the verb *ekporeuetai* should probably be taken as a futuristic (not a timeless) present. (iv) Just as Jesus was sent by God and therefore could be said to have come forth from him (Jn. 8:42), so the Spirit would be sent by the Father (Jn. 14:26) and therefore could be said to proceed from him (Jn. 15:26). (v) In the context, with its emphasis on the truth of the Spirit's witness to Christ (Jn. 15:26b), it would hardly be necessary for John to have indicated the eternal mode of the Spirit's personal and essential subsistence. For a defence of the view that interprets the verse as relating to "the procession of the Spirit", see M. J. Lagrange, *Évangile selon Saint Jean*, 1948, 413.

M. *peri*

The basic, local sense of *peri* is "around" or "encircling" (Lat. *circum*) (as in Acts 22:6). In its derived, figurative meanings, it designates a centre of activity, an object around which an action or a state revolves. Thus *hoi peri ton Paulon* (Acts 13:13, "Paul and his companions") marks out the apostle as a sun with several satellites. Standing absolutely at the beginning of a sentence, *peri (de)* means "(now) concerning" (for parallels in the papyri, see Moulton-Milligan, 504) and marks a new section of thought (e.g., 1 Cor. 7:1, 25; 8:1; 12:1; 16:1), a point of importance for the reconstruction of the Corinthian letter to Paul which he answers in 1 Cor. 7–16. On the partially overlapping functions of *peri* and *hyper* (e.g., Heb. 5:1, 3), see above I. B. 1. (f).

Generally the LXX renders Heb. *ḥaṭṭa't* (which may mean "sin", "sacrifice for sin", or "sacrificial victim") by *peri hamartias* (e.g., Lev. 7:37; 16:5; Ps. 39:7) or, less commonly, by *to* (or *ta*) *peri tēs hamartias* (Lev. 6:23; 14:19). With the abbreviated phrase *peri hamartias* one should understand *to* (*dōron*), "the offering (that relates to sin)". In Heb. 10:6, 8 (citing Ps. 39:7, LXX) and probably in Heb. 13:11 (cf. Lev. 16:27) this phrase means "sin-offering". It is possible that the plural *peri (tōn) hamartiōn* has this sense in Heb. 5:3 (note the double *peri*), but not in Heb. 10:18, 26; 1 Pet. 3:18; 1 Jn. 2:2 (where the phrase is dependent on a noun). In Rom. 8:3 *peri hamartias* could mean "in reference to sin" (= "to atone for sin," *Twentieth Century New Testament*; "to deal with sin", Weymouth), but, given OT usage, the rendering "as a sacrifice for sin" (NEB; similarly RV) seems more apposite (see further S. Lyonnet and L. Sabourin, *Sin, Redemption, and Sacrifice*, *AnBib* 48, 1970, 194, 212, 249 f.).

N. *pros*

In cl. Gk. *pros* was regularly followed by three cases, but in the NT there is only one instance of the gen. (Acts 27:34; and only 23 in the LXX) and 6 with the dat., compared with 679 instances with the acc. (Moulton, *Grammar*, I, 106). In its basic spatial sense *pros* denotes actual motion or literal direction (e.g., Matt. 26:57; 1 Thess. 3:6), but the developed sense of mental direction or tendency followed naturally, referring to relationships that are friendly (e.g., Jn. 6:37 *bis*; 2 Cor. 3:16; Gal. 6:10; Eph. 3:14) or hostile (e.g., 1 Cor. 6:1; Col. 2:23). In turn, this notion of psychological orientation led to the use of *pros* to express the ideas of estimation, "in view of" (Matt. 19:8), purpose, "with a view to" (1 Cor. 10:11), conformity, "in accordance with" (Lk. 12:47; 2 Cor. 5:10; Eph. 4:14) and reference (Lk. 18:1; Gal. 2:14; Heb. 1:7). On the relation between *pros* and *eis*, see above II. D. 1 (a).

1. *Jn. 1:1b.* In itself Jn. 1:1a ("in the beginning the Word already existed") speaks only of the pre-temporality or supra-temporality of the Logos, but by his conjunction of *en archē* and *ēn* John clearly implies the eternal pre-existence of the Word whose true sphere was not time but eternity. Having defined the relation of the Word to time, John specifies his relation to the Father: "The Word was *pros ton theon.*" There seem to be three alternatives with respect to the meaning of *pros* in this verse. First, after *logos*, *ēn pros* could conceivably mean "spoke to". In questioning the customary translations "near" or "with" for *pros*, C. Masson argues that since a "word" is spoken to a person, one might expect after v. 1a an answer to the question "*To whom* was the word spoken?" (*pros* with the acc., *ēn pros ton theon*) rather than "*Where* was the Word?" (*para* with the dat., *ēn para tō theō*). ("Pour une traduction nouvelle de Jean 1:1b et 2," *Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie* 98, 1965, 376–381). Masson believes that his rendering of 1:1b, "et la Parole parlait (s'adressait) à Dieu", appropriately reflects the dynamic nature of the Word. "Thus, for faith, 'in the beginning' there is not an unknown and unknowable God, some indeterminate and nameless Being, enveloped by night and by silence; there is the God who speaks and whose Word in time, in creation and in redemption is the eternal Word" (*ibid*, p. 381). This rendering ("the Word spoke to God") was suggested earlier by F. C. Burkitt, *Church and Gnosis*, 1932, 95. However, it is just as reasonable to think that 1:1b answers the question "What was the eternal relationship of the Logos to the Father?" (cf. 1 Jn. 1:2). Moreover, Masson is scarcely justified in filling out the meaning of *ēn pros* on the basis of an accompanying substantive (*ho logos*) that here functions as a proper noun.

A second alternative is to take *pros* with the acc. as equivalent to *para* with the dat. after *einai*, denoting position: "with" (thus e.g. Funk, *§* 239 (1); C. F. D. Moule, *Idiom-Book*, 52 f.; N. Turner in Moulton, *Grammar*, III, 274). The prep. does not imply any movement or action on the part of the Logos in his relation to the Father. Support for this view may be found in the NT parallels where *pros* with the acc., often following the verb *einai*, denotes not linear motion but punctiliar rest (Matt. 26:18, 55 *v.l.*; Mk. 6:3 (= Matt. 13:56); 9:19 (= Lk. 9:41 but Matt. 17:17 has *meth' hymōn*); 14:49; 1 Cor. 16:6 f.; 2 Cor. 5:8; 11:9; Gal. 1:18; 4:18, 20; Phil. 1:26; 1 Thess. 3:4; 2 Thess. 2:5; 3:10; Phlm. 13; Heb. 4:13; 1 Jn. 1:2). This usage reflects (i) the blurring of the notions of movement and rest in Hel. Gk.; (ii) the reduction of the dat. case and the extension of the acc. case in Hel. Gk.; (iii) "an extension of many

classical usages, particularly in such phrases as *enthymeisthai pros hauton*" (G. R. Driver, cited in Moulton, *Grammar*, II, 467), rather than Aramaic influence (e.g., C. F. Burney, *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel*, 1922, 29, suggests that the translator of an Aramaic original, finding Aram. *l*ʿ*wāṯ*, rendered it by *pros* rather than *para* under the influence of the more common use of the Aram. prep., viz. to express motion towards). But, as I. de la Potterie has pointed out ("L'emploi dynamique de *eis* dans Saint Jean et ses incidences théologiques", *Bib.* 43, 1962, 379), elsewhere John uses *para tini* to express the proximity of one person to another (Jn. 1:39; 4:40; 8:38; 14:17, 23, 25; 19:25; cf. 14:23; note also *meta tinos* in Jn. 3:22, 25 f. etc.) or the nearness of the Son to the Father (Jn. 8:38; 17:5), never *pros tina.*

On a third view, the sense is: "the Word was (in active communion) with the Father." This seems to be the import of John's statement, whether or not *pros* bears a dynamic sense, for when *pros* describes a relationship between persons it must connote personal intercourse rather than simply spatial juxtaposition or personal accompaniment. Used of divine persons, the prep. points to eternal intercommunion. But L. M. Dewailly (" 'La Parole parlait à Dieu'?", *Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie* 100, 1967, 128) rightly warns against discovering in Jn. 1:1b "all the patristic and conciliar christology which was much later attached to it, still less the speculation of Eastern or Western traditions concerning the existential (*subsistentes*) relations." Some commentators seem to have erred here. J. A. Bengel, for example, claims that "*pros* . . . denotes a perpetual, as it were, tendency of the Son to the Father in the unity of essence" (*Gnomon of the New Testament*, ET 1863, II, 234). H. Alford alleges that "both the inner substantial union, and the distinct personality of the *logos* are here (in 1:1b) asserted" (*The Greek Testament*, 1958 revision by E. F. Harrison, I, 681). And while I. de la Potterie (loc. cit., 381 n. 3) believes that the Son's "filiation" is expressed by the Johannine formula *pros ton theon*, he rejects the view of J. Isaac (*La Révélation Progressive des Personnes Divines*, 1960, 80) that the mutual belonging (*appartenance*) or immanence of the Father and Son is indicated, since this would presuppose that *pros* had both a static and a dynamic sense at the same time.

2. *2 Cor. 5:8.* In 2 Cor. 5:6 Paul states that as long as he continued to dwell in a mortal body he was (spatially) absent from the Lord. Because he knew (*eidotes*) this, he preferred to leave his present form of embodiment and take up residence *pros ton kyrion*, "with (or, in the presence of) the Lord". The prep. phrase may simply be equivalent to *emprosthen tou kyriou* or *para tō kyriō*, for in itself the prep. *pros* contains no idea of reciprocal action. On the other hand, if the believer's future destiny may be summed up in the phrase *endēmein pros ton kyrion* ("dwelling in the company of the Lord") (= *syn Christō einai*, "being with Christ," Phil. 1:23), something more must be signified than an impassive spatial proximity to Christ. As in Jn. 1:1b, where a pre-temporal divine relationship is being affirmed, so in 2 Cor. 5:8, where an eternal human-divine relationship is being depicted, *pros* implies (rather than expresses) dynamic interpersonal communion, a settled mutual fellowship. A. T. Robertson (*Grammar*, 625) comments: "It is the face-to-face converse with the Lord that Paul has in mind", *pros* being "employed for living relationship, intimate converse." Similarly W. Grundmann, *dēmos, TDNT* II 64.

3. *1 Jn. 5:16 f.* In the context these two verses identify one prayer of intercession that is "according to God's will" and therefore will be answered (1 Jn. 5:14 ff.; cf.

3:21 f.), viz. prayer for a fellow-believer who has sinned. But John places one restriction on the scope of such prayer: he does not counsel intercession for a person who has committed a sin *pros thanaton*, since the granting of pardon or life (*zōēn*, v. 16) to such a person would be contrary to God's will. The prep. phrase may be rendered either "tending to death" or "issuing in death". In one case, death is the natural but not necessary outcome; in the other, death is the actual result or a necessary consequence. It is difficult to understand "life" and "death" as referring to eternal life and eternal death, since (i) eternal life could scarcely be said to be given to an erring believer as a result of vicarious intercession, and (ii) John is unlikely to have countenanced the idea of sins that do not "tend towards" or "result in" eternal death. While the "death" could be that of exclusion from the Christian community (= excommunication; cf. Num. 15:30 f.), it is better understood as physical death, regarded as a penalty administered not by man (cf. Num. 18:22; Deut. 22:25 f.) but by God (as in 1 Cor. 11:30–32; cf. Acts 5:1–10), and accordingly *pros* will denote not tendency but result (as in Jn. 11:4, "this illness will not end in death", *ouk estin pros thanaton*). (That *pros* is consecutive in 1 Jn. 5:16 f. is recognized by Arndt, 717 s.v. *pros* III, 3b; B. Reicke *pros*, *TNDT* VI 725.) On this view the apostle is encouraging intercession for any believer whose sin has not met with immediate divine judgment. As a result of intercessory prayer God will grant such a person the boon of further physical life and of renewed spiritual life – in spite of his open or wilful sin (such as may be seen, *idē*, v. 16a). But he discourages intercession for any believer who has experienced divine judgment in the form of death. Such prayer for the dead would be contrary to God's will. As for the identification of the "sin that leads to death", it may be: (i) the open and deliberate rejection of Christ, the "anti-christian" denial of the incarnation or messiahship of Jesus (1 Jn. 2:22; 4:2 f.; 2 Jn. 7); in other words, apostasy, as evidenced in the promulgation of heretical doctrine (1 Jn. 2:18–27; cf. Heb. 6:4–8); (ii) blasphemy against the Holy Spirit (Mk. 3:28–30); (iii) deliberate sin (cf. Heb. 10:26–31), sin performed "with a high hand" (Num. 15:30 f.), such as premeditated murder or persistent hatred.

O. *syn*

1. *Its Relation to meta.* In Attic Gk. *syn* meant "including" and "with the aid of" and *meta* "(in company) with", but in Hel. Gk. they are virtually synonymous (for LXX usage see M. Johannessohn, *Präpositionen*, 1926, 202–212). *syn* has not survived in modern demotic Gk. (where *me* with the acc. means "with") and is only rarely used in the so-called "purist" language (where *meta* with the gen. is found). Of the 127 NT uses of *syn*, 75 are in Lk.-Acts (Morgenthaler, 145). As a NT prep. *meta* (with the gen.) is more common (364 uses) than *syn*, but, unlike *syn*, is rarely used in compound verbs. Both preps. are used in connexion with Christian discipleship, fellowship meals and eschatology (W. Grundmann, *syn - meta* with the Genitive, *TDNT* VII 794–797).

In spite of the general interchangeability of the two preps., it is significant that Paul regularly ends his letters with the prayer that grace be with (*meta*, never *syn*) his addressees, whereas he depicts the Christian life as one of identification with Christ and the Christian's destiny as "being with Christ" (*syn*, not *meta*, in both cases). This would suggest that, of the two preps., *syn* was the more suited to express intimate

personal union (e.g., Col. 3:4), and *meta* the more suited to denote close association or attendant circumstances (e.g., 1 Thess. 3:13).

2. *einai syn Christō in Paul.* Paul's distinctive description of Christian existence is embodied in the phrase *einai en Christō* (e.g., 2 Cor. 5:17). There is no evidence in the Pauline corpus that death removes the Christian from his *en Christō* incorporation: this persists at and after death, as the expression *hoi nekroi en Christō* ("the dead [who are] in Christ", 1 Thess. 4:16; not "those who died in Christ" = *hoi koimēthentes en Christō*, 1 Cor. 15:18) would indicate. When the believer dies, there is added to *en Christō* corporeity a personal and "spatial" *syn Christō* dimension (Phil. 1:23). When used to indicate a relation between two persons known to and esteemed by each other, the prep. *syn* must signify more than mere spatial juxtaposition (as if two objects were being related) and even more than co-existence (as if two persons were being related who were either unacquainted or unfriendly). The destiny of believers after death or after the parousia (*syn kyriō einai*, 1 Thess. 4:17; *syn Christō einai*, Phil. 1:23) is not simply spatial proximity to Christ but active communion with Christ. G. A. Deissmann mentions a *graffito* from Alexandria, perhaps of the Imperial period, where a deceased person is addressed thus: "I would that I were soon in fellowship with you" (*syn soi einai*) (*Light from the Ancient East*, ET 1927, 303 n. 1). This parallel to the Pauline use of *syn* is all the more impressive when one recalls that the person to whose presence the Christian departs at death is not dead but alive. Only if Christ had not risen from the grave could Paul have spoken of departed saints as *hoi kekoimēmenoi syn Christō* ("those who have fallen asleep with Christ"), *syn Christō einai* (never used of the earthly experience of Christians), primarily an individual and active experience, is not related to *en Christō einai*, essentially a corporate and passive experience, by succession, since *hoi nekroi* remain *en Christō* (1 Thess. 4:16). The difference between "the dead in Christ" and living Christians is not in their status (*en Christō* in both cases), but in the quality of their fellowship with Christ and the degree of their proximity to Christ. J. Dupont has distinguished two phases in Paul's use of the *syn Christō* concept. In 1 Thess. 4:17 (and 5:10) "being (or living) with the Lord" emphasizes believers' sharing in the eschatological blessings of the Kingdom enjoyed by Christ since his resurrection, whereas in Phil. 1:23 ("being with Christ") and 2 Cor. 5:8 ("dwelling with the Lord") the emphasis falls on intimate fellowship with the King in the Kingdom (*SYN CHRISTŌ*, 1952, 39–47, 95 f., 112–115, 170–173, 186 f.).

For a discussion of the compounds in *syn-* which develop the *syn Christō* formula, see W. Grundmann, *TDNT* VII 786–794; on the general theme of identification with Christ, see R. C. Tannehill, *Dying and Rising with Christ*, 1967.

III *Special Problems*

A. *Prepositions with baptizō*

1. *hyper (1 Cor. 15:29, bis).* To be satisfactory, any proposed interpretation of this *crux interpretum* must meet two requirements: (a) *hyper* should not be given a sense unparalleled in the Greek Bible (since the customary meanings of the preposition afford a suitable sense); (b) the resultant meaning of the verse should contribute to Paul's argument in the chapter. It is highly improbable, for example, (a) that *hyper* is

local ("over [the graves of] the dead"), or means "in memory of" or "out of respect for"; (b) that *hoi baptizomenoi* refers to all new converts who were, by their baptismal incorporation into the church, filling up the ranks left depleted by Christian martyrs (*hoi nekroi*). M. Raeder gives *hyper* a final sense: converts to Christianity were having themselves baptized in order to be united with their departed relatives and friends at the resurrection ("Vikariatstaufe in 1 Kor. 15:29?" *ZNW* 46, 1955, 258–260). More probably, some baptized Corinthians who had a semi-magical view of baptism were being rebaptized vicariously for certain deceased Corinthians (the articular *tōn nekrōn* presents no difficulty for this view) who were thought to be at a disadvantage because they had not been baptized before being overtaken by death. On this interpretation Paul is using an *ad hominem* argument (as also in vv. 30–32, where he refers to his apostolic peril and labour) in support of a conclusion already established (viz. that the dead in Christ will rise) and is appealing to an aberrant practice (otherwise unknown to us in the first century), without giving it his approval. (That Paul could argue *e concessis* is evident from 1 Cor. 8:10; cf. 10:20 f.) The verse may be paraphrased thus: "Otherwise [viz. if there is no resurrection of the Christian dead] what will those people achieve by way of advantage who are going to the trouble of having themselves baptized in place of the dead?" A close parallel to this sense of *hyper* ("in place of") is afforded by Dion. Hal. 8: additional soldiers were enrolled in the place of (*hyper*) those who were dying in battle. For the history of the interpretation of this verse, see M. Rissi, *Die Taufe für die Toten*, 1962; and cf. G. R. Beasley-Murray, *Baptism in the New Testament*, 1962, 185–192; C. K. Barrett, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, *BNTC*, 1968, 362 ff.

2. *hypo*. There are 7 instances of *baptizesthai hypo* in the NT (all in the Synoptic gospels) in which the prep. points to the personal agent administering the rite of water baptism (Matt. 3:6 [= Mk. 1:5], 13, 14; Mk. 1:9; Lk. 3:7; 7:30). It was probably John the Baptist's personal administration of the rite that in part accounted for his title, *ho baptistēs* or *ho baptizōn* (proselytes immersed themselves in the presence of two or [later] three rabbis who constituted a court).

3. *eis*. (a) *Matt. 3:11 and Acts 2:38*. The causal sense of the prep. in these verses has been vigorously defended by A. T. Robertson (*Grammar*, 389, 592; *Word Pictures in the New Testament*, III [1930], 35 f.) and J. R. Mantey (*A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, 1927, 104; "The Causal Use of *Eis* in the New Testament", *JBL* 70, 1951, 45–48; "On Causal *Eis* Again", *ibid.*, 309–311, replying to the rejoinder of R. Marcus, "On Causal *Eis*", *ibid.*, 129 f.; and cf. E. J. Goodspeed's rendering, "in token of your repentance"). Mantey has not adduced any convincing example from extra-biblical Hel. Gk., where *eis* expresses "immediate and direct cause", while in Gen. 4:23 *eis* (*bis*) = l^e = "regarding, in view of" (see *BDB*, 514, s.v. 5 f., but cf. 5 g.). In Matt. 3:11 *eis* may be telic ("with a view to, in order to obtain"), consecutive ("resulting in"), or possibly even temporal (*eis* = *en* = "at, upon"; cf. Weymouth, "on a profession of repentance," but see his note; and Matt. 3:6 where the participle *exhomologoumenoi* suggests the simultaneity of baptism and confession of sin [= repentance]). However, since elsewhere John's baptism is termed a "baptism of (= relating to, marked by) repentance", "a repentance baptism" (Mk. 1:4; Lk. 3:3; Acts 13:24; 19:4), *eis* may simply mean "in relation or reference to." Similarly, in Acts 2:38 forgiveness of sin could be the purpose of repentance and baptism (final or telic *eis*) (cf. 1 Pet. 3:21) or their outcome (ec-

batic or consecutive *eis*), or else forgiveness is being regarded as conceptually (but not necessarily chronologically) coincident with baptism (*eis* = temporal *en*) or as connected with baptism (referential *eis*). It is significant that A. Oepke, who notes an occasional causal *eis* in the NT, finds *eis* to be final in both Matt. 3:11 and Acts 2:38 (*eis*, *TDNT* II 429).

(b) Incorporation into the one Body of Christ is the purpose and effect (*eis*, "so as to form") of "baptism in the Spirit" (1 Cor. 12:13); or the baptized may be conceived of as entering *into* (local *eis*) the Body of Christ that already exists (see E. Percy, *Der Leib Christi*, 1942, 15 ff.). Identification with Moses or allegiance to him as leader was the goal and outcome (*eis*) of the Israelite submission to baptism (*ebaptisanto*, 1 Cor. 10:2 *v.l.*). To be baptized "into the death of" Christ Jesus (Rom. 6:3b) is to participate in all of the saving benefits of "his death to sin" (Rom. 6:10), or to submit to a water-baptism that relates to his death. In Mk. 1:9 *eis ton Iordanēn* may denote the element into which the baptizand was plunged, but more probably *eis* = local *en*.

(c) Baptism *eis to onoma (tinos)*. Three principal views have been taken of this prep. phrase. They are mentioned here in descending order of probability. First, it may denote a transference of ownership, as when money is paid "(in)to the account of" a certain individual or is credited "to the name of" someone (thus W. Heitmüller, *Im Namen Jesu*, *FRLANT* 1, 2, 1903, 100 ff., especially 127). On this understanding, the person being baptized passes into the possession of the Triune God (Matt. 28:19) or the Lord Jesus (Acts 8:16; 19:5; cf. 1 Cor. 1:13, 15 where baptism into Paul's name is equated with belonging to Paul, 1:12) and comes under his control and protection (Arndt, 575 s.v. *onoma* I. 4. c. *beta*). G. Delling, on the other hand, argues that since the salvific work of Jesus is inextricably linked to his name, "to baptize into the name of the Lord Jesus" means to endow a person, through baptism, with the benefits of the salvation accomplished by Jesus Christ (*Die Zueignung des Heils in der Taufe*, 1961). A third interpretation, recently defended by L. Hartman (" 'Into the Name of Jesus'. A Suggestion Concerning the Earliest Meaning of the Phrase", *NTS* 20, 1973–4; 432–440; "Baptism 'Into the Name of Jesus' and Early Christology. Some Tentative Considerations," *StTh* 28, 1974, 21–48), traces the origin of the phrase *eis to onoma* to the Heb. *l*^{e}*šēm* or Aram. *l*^{e}*šûm*, often used in the Mishnah and Talmud with the meaning "with reference to," denoting the fundamental reference or purpose of some thing, rite or action. Baptism "with respect to" Jesus was a "Jesus baptism", which distinguished Christian baptism from other rites, especially John's baptism. According to Hartman, the "high" christology which the phrase presupposes may have used Son of man categories but not the actual title "Son of man."

(d) *eis Christon (Iēsoun)* (Rom. 6:3a; Gal. 3:27) is generally taken to be brachylogy for "into the Body of Christ" (i.e. the church, so that to be baptized into Christ = to put on Christ (Gal. 3:27b) = to be in Christ (Gal. 3:28)), or "into the name of Christ" (thus Arndt, 131 s.v. *baptizō* 2. b. *beta*; F. Prat, *The Theology of Saint Paul*, ET, 1945, II, 462–466, who distinguishes the mystical Christ [e.g. Gal. 3:27] from the physical Christ [e.g. Acts 8:16]; M. Barth, *Die Taufe – Ein Sakrament?*, 1951, 223–226), but the phrase may also describe the believer's entry into (local *eis*) personal union and communion with Christ ("into fellowship with Christ"). But E. de W. Burton renders the phrase "with reference to Christ", which he takes to mean "with mention or confession of" the name of Christ (*A Critical and*

Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians, 1921, 203–205; similarly B. N. Kaye, "*Baptizein eis* with Special Reference to Romans 6", in *Studia Evangelica*, VI [ed. E. A. Livingstone], 1973, 281–286, who stresses the need for *baptizein eis* to have the same meaning in Rom. 6:3a and 3b).

4. *en.* Generally this has a local sense when used with *baptizō*: in the (river) Jordan (Matt. 3:6; Mk. 1:5 [= *eis ton Iordanēn*, 1:9], in the desert (Mk. 1:4), in Aenon (Jn. 3:23), in the cloud and in the sea (1 Cor. 10:2). *en hydati* denotes the element in which the baptized were "immersed" or with which they were "drenched" (Matt. 3:11; Jn. 1:26, 31, 33; Acts 11:16; cf. the simple dative *hydati* in Mk. 1:8 *v.l.*; Lk. 3:16; Acts 1:5; 11:16). So also with the phrase *(en) pneumati (hagiō)*, which is generally contrasted with *(en) hydati* (Matt. 3:12; Mk. 1:8 *v.l.*; Lk. 3:16; Jn. 1:33; Acts 1:5; 11:16): believers are either immersed "in" the Spirit, or drenched "with" the Spirit (for a defence of the latter view, see I. H. Marshall, "The Meaning of the Verb 'to baptize' ", *EQ* 45, 1973, 130–140). Personal agency cannot be expressed simply by *pneumati* (cf. Funk, *§* 195). For several reasons it seems probable that *en heni pneumati* in 1 Cor. 12:13 means not "by one Spirit" but "in (or with) one Spirit". (a) Elsewhere *hypo* expresses personal agency with *baptizō* (see above, III. A. 2.). (b) There is no certain instance of an instrumental *en* with *baptizō*: in the other examples of *en pneumati*, the parallel with *en hydati* dictates that *en* should mean "in" or "with" and not "by (means of)", denoting the "sphere" or "material" but not the agent (but for instrumental *en* denoting personal agency, see Matt. 9:34; 12:24, 28; Acts 17:31 [cf. 4:12]; Phil. 4:13). (c) In the logia of John the Baptist regarding "Spirit-baptism", it is always Jesus who is the baptizer, never the Spirit. Accordingly in 1 Cor. 12:13, the agent should be taken as implied (viz. Jesus Christ). (d) In the one place Paul uses *en* with *baptizō* (1 Cor. 10:2), the prep. is local in sense ("in the cloud and in the sea"). (e) The following phrase "we were all given one Spirit to drink" (1 Cor. 12:13b) suggests an inward participation in the Spirit to which a preceding outward "immersion in the Spirit" would correspond. The Spirit is both around (v. 13a) and within (v. 13b; cf. Eph. 5:18). (f) The parallel *en heni pneumati* in Eph. 2:18 cannot be an instrumental use of *en*, since *di' autou* (= Christ) precedes (but cf. Eph. 3:5; 4:30). However *en tō heni pneumati* in 1 Cor. 12:9 is undoubtedly instrumental in sense, in light of the preceding *dia tou pneumatos* (1 Cor. 12:8; cf. vv. 7, 8b, 11). To deny that *en* is instrumental in 1 Cor. 12:13 is not, of course, to deny the personality of the Spirit, but simply to recognize that *baptizō* need not always mean "to baptize *in water*", but may be used metaphorically of immersion, inundation or deluging (see Arndt 131 s.v. *baptizō* 3. c).

5. *en/epi tō onomati.* Some commentators find no distinction between the three phrases *eis to onoma*, *en tō onomati* and *epi tō onomati* after *baptizō*, (e.g., S. New, "The Name, Baptism, and the Laying on of Hands", in Vol. V of *The Beginnings of Christianity* [ed. K. Lake and H. J. Cadbury] 1966 reprint [= 1933], 123 n. 3), while others distinguish *eis* (= Hebrew *l*^{e}, "with regard to") both from *en* (= Hebrew *b*^{e}, "on the authority of") and from *epi* ("resting upon" or "devoted to" the name [= person] of Christ) (e.g., R. Abba, "Name," *IDB*, III, 507a). Probably *en tō onomati* (Acts 10:48; cf. 2:38 *v.l.*) and *epi tō onomati* (Acts 2:38) are identical in sense ("at, in the name") referring either to the candidate's confession of faith in the name of Jesus Christ (cf. Acts 22:16) or to the administrant's acting on the authority of Christ or his invocation of the name of Jesus during the baptismal rite (cf. Arndt, 287, s.v. *epi*

II. 3). These two prep. phrases would then describe the administration or operation of the rite, and *eis to onoma* its nature or goal (on which see above, III. A. 3. c.).

B. *Prepositions with pisteuō (and pistis)*

For a convenient analysis of the meaning of *pisteuō* and *pistis* in cl. Gk., the LXX, and the Pseudepigrapha, see E. de W. Burton, *Galatians*, 1921, 475–478. A chart that classifies NT uses of *pisteuō* (when it is not used absolutely and does not mean "entrust") may be found in Moulton, *Grammar*, I, 68 n. 2, although some of the statistics mentioned below differ slightly.

Apart from the many instances where *pisteuō* is used absolutely (a rare use in the LXX – Isa. 7:9; 28:16), either in a religious sense ("have faith", e.g. Mk. 5:36; 9:23 f.; 2 Cor. 4:13; or "have faith [in Christ]", e.g., Jn. 3:18b; Acts 2:44; 2 Thess. 1:10) or in a non-religious sense ("give credence", e.g., Mk. 13:21; Lk. 22:67), there are numerous constructions found with this verb in the NT.

1. The non-prep. constructions are:

(a) Acc. of the thing, where the verb means "believe", "be convinced of" (Jn. 11:26b; 1 Cor. 11:18; 13:7; 1 Jn. 4:16) or "entrust" (Lk. 16:11; and with the "retained accus." after a pass. Rom. 3:2; Gal. 2:7; 1 Thess. 2:4; 1 Tim. 1:11; Tit. 1:3) or acc. of the person, where the verb means "entrust" (Jn. 2:24).

(b) Acc. and infin. (Acts 8:37 *v.l.*; cf. Acts 15:11).

(c) Infin. (Rom. 14:2), where *pisteuei* means "has confidence" and/or "has [sufficiently strong] faith (to eat)".

(d) *hoti* (= Heb. *he'emîn kî*), with the verb signifying "believe that", "be convinced that" (Lk. 1:45; Jn. 20:31a; Rom. 6:8; 10:9; 1 Thess. 4:14; Jas. 2:19a).

(e) Dat. with *hoti* following (Jn. 4:21; Acts 27:25).

(f) Dat. (= Heb. *he'emîn l^e* or *b^e*; see M. Johannessohn, *Präpositionen*, I, 1910, 60 f.) of the thing believed (Lk. 1:20; Jn. 4:50; Acts 24:14) or the person believed. In the latter category, the sense of *pisteuō* will range from "give credence to (the testimony of)" men or God (e.g., Mk. 11:31; Jn. 6:30; Acts 8:12; 26:27a; 1 Jn. 5:10b) to "entrust oneself to" God (Acts 16:34; Tit. 3:8) or Christ (e.g., Jn. 8:31; 2 Tim. 1:12).

2. The prep. constructions that follow *pisteuō* (and *pistis*) are, in ascending order of frequency:

(a) *peri* with *hoti* following (Jn. 9:18; cf. Plut., *Luc.* 19, 4; Josephus, *Ant.* 14, 267).

(b) *pros*. In Phlm. 5 both prep. phrases (*pros ton kyrion Iēsoun* and *eis pantas tous hagious*) probably refer to both *pistin* (which must therefore signify "fidelity" rather than "[saving] faith") and *agapēn*. Even if the structure is chiastic (ABBA), *pros* modifies *pistin*. The phrase *pros ton theon* depicts the object of *pistis* in 1 Thess. 1:8, although such a construction is rare in the LXX (4 Macc. 15:24; 16:22). *pros* never follows *pisteuō* in biblical Gk.

(c) *dia. di' autou* (or *di' hōn*) is found following *pisteuō* (Jn. 1:7, of John the Baptist; 1 Cor. 3:5, of Paul and Apollos) with Christ probably as the object of faith, and following *pistis* (Acts 3:16, probably of Jesus) and *pistos* (*tous di' autou pistous eis theon*, 1 Pet. 1:21a, certainly of Jesus; on this verse see F. J. A. Hort, *The First Epistle of St. Peter. I. 1–II. 17*, 1898, 81–84) with God as the object of faith. This prep. phrase therefore expresses the human or divine instrument by which persons come to faith in Christ or God.

(d) *en.* Each of the three possible instances is contested. It is unlikely that *pisteuete* is absolute in Mk. 1:15, with *en* meaning "in the sphere of" (A. Deissmann, *Die neutestamentliche Formel "In Christo Jesu"*, 1892, 46 f.; and note J. H. Moulton's change of mind on the matter, *Grammar*, I, 67 f.; II, 464) since there are several LXX instances (Jer. 12:6; Pss. 77:22; cf. 77:32; 105:12; Dan. 6:24, Theod.) in which *en* after *pisteuō* denotes the object of faith. Nor should *en* be rendered "on the basis of". The verse may be translated "believe (in) the Good News". P. F. Regard (*Prépositions*, 339) paraphrases thus: believe "in the truth of the substance of the Gospel." In Eph. 1:13 *en hō* should be construed with *esphragisthēte*, not *pisteusantes*. Finally, the uncertainty in Jn. 3:15 is textual (p^{75} B *al.* read *en autō* after *pas ho pisteuōn*, but other MSS read *ep' autō*, *eis auton*, or *ep' auton*) and exegetical (*en autō* may be construed with what precedes or what follows). Probably *en autō* should be read and the phrase should be taken with *hina . . . echē zōēn aiōnion* (cf. Jn. 5:39; 16:33 and note that John generally uses *eis* with *pisteuō*): "that everyone who believes might in him have eternal life".

In the 4 instances where *en* is to be construed with *pistis* (Eph. 1:15; Col. 1:4; 1 Tim. 3:13; 2 Tim. 3:15; but not Rom. 3:25 and probably not Gal. 3:26), the prep. phrase is as likely to mark out the sphere or realm in which faith was operative and evident as to specify the actual object of faith. For example, Col. 1:4 may be rendered "your faith (that rests) in Christ Jesus" (= *pistis eis Christon* = *pistis Christou*) or "your faith experienced in fellowship with Christ Jesus".

(e) *epi with dat.* Four times this construction (with *pisteuō*) is used with a personal object (Rom. 9:33; 10:11; 1 Pet. 2:6 [these three verses being citations of Isa. 28:16]; 1 Tim. 1:16; see also the textual variants in Mt. 27:42 *v.l.*; Jn. 3:15 *v.l.*), once with an impersonal object (Lk. 24:25). In the former cases, *pisteuō epi* denotes the placing of one's reliance upon a person who affords a firm support or a solid foundation.

(f) *epi with acc.* The idea of metaphorical movement that is implied in the 7 instances that occur with *pisteuō* (Matt. 27:42; Acts 9:42; 11:17; 16:31; 22:19; Rom. 4:5, 24; cf. Wis. 12:2) and the one example with *pistis* (Heb. 6:1) may derive from the notion of turning away from former objects of devotion that brought disappointment to a new personal object of faith in whom one has confidence.

(g) *eis with acc.* Examples of this construction with *pisteuō*, which is modelled on the Heb. *he'emîn b^e* (not the Gk. *epistrephō epi* or *pros*), are lacking in cl. Gk. and the LXX (but see Sir. 38:31). In the NT it is a characteristically Johannine idiom, with only 8 of the 45 NT uses being found outside the Fourth Gospel and 1 Jn. (viz., Matt. 18:6; Acts 10:43; 14:23; 19:4 (?); Rom. 10:14; Gal. 2:16; Phil. 1:29; 1 Pet. 1:8; and note Mk. 9:42 *v.l.*). *epi* never follows *pisteuō* in the Johannine corpus, but elsewhere it is more frequently used (12 times) than *eis* (8 times). There is no doubt that occasionally John uses the dat. with the same sense as *eis* with the acc. (viz. Jn. 5:24, 38; 8:31; cf. 8:30, *eis auton*), but it ought not to be assumed that the two constructions are completely interchangeable, for *pisteuō* with the dat. of the person believed sometimes means simply "give intellectual credence to" (Jn. 4:21; 5:46 *bis*, 47 *bis*; 8:45 f.; 10:37, 38a; 14:11a, 14:11b *v.l.*), a meaning *pisteuō eis* never bears (compare Jn. 6:29 and 6:30) (but see *per contra*, R. Bultmann, *pisteuō*, *TDNT* VI 203 and n. 221, 210 f.). Furthermore it is clear that for John *pisteuō eis* is intimately connected with *erchomai eis* (Jn. 5:40; 6:35, 37, 44 f., 65; 7:37) and *pisteuō eis to*

onoma (Jn. 1:12; 2:23; 3:18; 1 Jn. 5:13; cf. 1 Jn. 3:23, *tō onomati*). This latter phrase probably means "believe in the person of" but it could possibly be related to the formula *baptizō eis to onoma* and imply a transfer of ownership, resulting in a new allegiance (but this view is scarcely possible in Jn. 2:23; cf. 2:24). But Jn. 3:18 shows that *pisteuō eis to onoma* may simply be a variant of *pisteuō eis* and that the absolute *pisteuō* may stand for either (see the discussion of C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, 1953, 182–186).

In Gal. 2:16 it is apparent that *pisteuō eis Christon Iēsoun* = *pistis Christou* (see W. Kramer, *Christ, Lord, Son of God*, *SBT* 50, ET 1966, 10 f.). The objective genitive after *pistis* may stand in the place of (i) *eis* after *pisteuō*, and (ii) *pistis eis* (a phrase found in Acts 20:21; 24:24; Col. 2:5; cf. Acts 26:18; 1 Pet. 1:21b).

It follows that *eis* after *pisteuō* denotes, as a minimum, the object of faith (P. F. Regard, *Prépositions*, 341 f.) or the direction of faith (R. Schnackenburg, *Baptism in the Thought of St. Paul*, ET 1964, 23; cf. his *Der Glaube im vierten Evangelium*, 1937, 6–11). But more seems to be implied. *pisteuō* (or *pistis*) *eis Christon* depicts the committal of one's self to the person of Christ, something more than an intellectual acceptance of the message of the gospel or a recognition of the truth about Christ (which may be expressed by *pisteuō hoti* or *pisteuō* with the dat.). But the two aspects are intimately related. Since the person of Christ is the essence of the message that is proclaimed and accepted, to accept the message concerning him is to accept him. *pisteuō hoti* naturally becomes *pisteuō eis* or *epi*, as Jn. 20:31 and Rom. 10:9–11 clearly establish. So then *to eis auton* (sc. *Christon*) *pisteuein* (Phil. 1:29) describes the Christian condition, the state in which the Christian lives, while entrance into that state is denoted by *hoi pisteusantes* (sc. *eis Christon*) (Acts 2:44; 4:32; 2 Thess. 1:10; cf. Gal. 2:16) (cf. W. H. P. Hatch, *The Pauline Idea of Faith*, 1917, 46).

3. *Concluding Observations.*

(a) As used in profane Gk., *pisteuō* (or *pistis*) with the dat. emphasized the element of intellectual apprehension or simple credence. The twofold moral emphasis in the Heb. use of *he'mîn*, viz. personal trust and confident reliance, is reflected in the Christian coinage of the phrases *pisteuō eis* (denoting personal trust; never found in the LXX) and *pisteuō epi* (with acc., denoting confidence, and found only in Wis. 12:2 in the LXX; with dat., denoting reliance). It is true that the dat. case was beginning to wane in the NT period (see above, I. B. 1 (a)) but this fact in itself cannot account for the coinage of these two prep. phrases. If no new connotation were intended by NT writers in using *eis* and *epi* after *pisteuō*, one might have expected *en* with the dat. after *pisteuō* to be far more frequent (it is found only in Mk. 1:15 – see above, III. B. 2. (d)), for one tendency of Hel. Gk. was for *en* to be added to the simple dat. case.

(b) Nowhere is *pisteuō eis* used with a human object of faith (note that in Gal. 5:10 *egō pepoitha eis hymas* means "I am confident with respect to [= in] you"; cf. 2 Cor. 8:22) and only once is the expressed object impersonal (1 Jn. 5:10c; but even here *eis tēn martyrian* signifies God's testimony concerning his Son; see also Jn. 12:36). In NT usage "believing" connotes the confident trust that an individual places in a divine person, not merely the simple credence he gives to verifiable facts. It involves not only recognition and acceptance of the truth but also adherence and allegiance to the Truth.

(c) The fact that God is (relatively speaking) so infrequently held up as the object of faith (only in Jn. 12:44c; 14:1a; Acts 16:34; Rom. 4:3, 5, 17, 24; Gal. 3:6; 1 Thess. 1:8; Tit. 3:8; Heb. 6:1; 1 Pet. 1:21; cf. Acts 11:17 D; Acts 13:12 D) and Christ so frequently, indicates that it is in Christ that God meets the individual in salvation. There are not two competing personal objects of human faith.

IV *SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY*

(a). E. A. Abbott, *Johannine Grammar*, 1906; B. F. C. Atkinson, *The Theology of Prepositions*, 1944; I. T. Beckwith, "The Articular Infinitive with *eis*," *JBL* 15, 1896, 155–167; F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament*, ET and revision by R. W. Funk, 1961, 110–125; F. Büchsel, *anti*, *TDNT* I 372 f.; A. Buttmann, *A Grammar of the New Testament Greek*, ET 1873, 321–344; R. E. Davies, "Christ in our Place – the Contribution of the Prepositions", *TB* 21, 1970, 71–91; G. A. Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East*, ET 1927; Emily H. Dutton, *Studies in Greek Prepositional Phrases: dia, apo, ek, eis, en*, 1916; E. Ferguson, " 'When you Come Together': *Epi To Auto* in Early Christian Literature", *Restoration Quarterly* 16, 1973, 202–208; B. L. Gildersleeve, *Syntax of Classical Greek from Homer to Demosthenes*, I 1900, II 1911; P. Giles, *A Short Manual of Comparative Philology*, 1901[2]; W. Grundmann, *syn - meta* etc., *TDNT* VII 766–797; L. Hartman, " 'Into the Name of Jesus.' A Suggestion Concerning the Earliest Meaning of the Phrase", *NTS* 20, 1973–4, 432–440; A. N. Jannaris, *An Historical Greek Grammar*, 1897, 365–399; W. E. Jelf, *A Grammar of the Greek Language. II. Syntax*, 1861; B. N. Kaye, "*Baptizein eis* with Special Reference to Romans 6", in *Studia Evangelica*, VI (ed. E. A. Livingstone) 1973, 281–286; H. A. A. Kennedy, "Two Exegetical Notes on St. Paul. I. A Special Use of *en*", *ExpT* 28, 1916–17, 322 f.; W. A. Lamberton, "*Pros* with the Acc.", *Publications of the University of Pennsylvania. Series in Philology*, I. 3, 1891, 1–47; J. R. Mantey, "Unusual Meanings for Prepositions in the Greek New Testament", *Expositor*, 8th Series, 25, 1923, 453–460; "The Causal Use of *Eis* in the New Testament", *JBL* 70, 1951, 45–48; and "On Causal *Eis* Again" *ibid.*, 309–311; R. Marcus, "On Causal *Eis*", *JBL* 70, 1951, 129 f.; C. F. D. Moule, *An Idiom-Book of New Testament Greek*, 1960[2], 48–92; J. H. Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, I 1908[3], 98–107 and *passim*; II (ed. W. F. Howard), 1919–1929, 292–332, 460–467; III (by N. Turner), 1963, 249–280; IV (by N. Turner), 1975; A. Oepke, *dia*, *TDNT* II 65–70; *eis*, *TDNT* II 420–434; and *en*, *TDNT* II 537–543; J. J. O'Rourke, "*EIS* and *EN* in John", *Bible Translator* 25, 1974, 139–142; B. Reicke, *pro*, *TDNT* VI 683–688; and *pros*, *TDNT* VI 720–725; E. H. Riesenfeld, *para*, *TDNT* V 727–736; *peri*, *TDNT* VI 53–56; and *hyper*, *TDNT* VIII 507–516; A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*, 1934[4], 553–649; and "The Use of *hyper* in Business Documents in the Papyri", *Expositor* 8th series 18, 1919, 321–327; E. K. Simpson, "Note on the Meaning of HYPER in Certain Contexts", in his *The Pastoral Epistles*, 1954, 110–112; P. Southern, *The New Testament Use of the Preposition KATA with Special Reference to its Distributive Aspects*, unpublished D. Theol. Dissertation, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky, 1948; P. T. Stevens, "Aristotle and the Koine (Notes on the Prepositions)", *Classical Quarterly* 30, 1936, 204–217; H. St. J. Thackeray, *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint. I. Introduction, Orthography and Accidence*, 1909; A. Thumb, *Handbook of the Modern Greek Vernacular*, ET 1912; N. Turner, *Grammatical Insights into the New Testament*, 1965; and "The Preposition *en* in the New Testament", *Bible Translator* 10, 1959, 113–120; G. B. Winer, *A Grammar of the Idiom of the New Testament*, ET 1872, 358–433; M. Zerwick, *Biblical Greek*, ET 1963, 27–46.

(b). F. M. Abel, *Grammaire du grec biblique suivie d'un choix de papyrus*, 1927; P. Barale, "Uso di *en* instrumentale", *Didaskaleion* 2, 1913, 423–439; K. Beyer, *Semitische Syntax im Neuen Testament. I. Satzlehre*, 1968[2]; K. Brugmann, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*, I, II. 1–3, 1897–1916; G. A. Deissmann, *Die neutestamentliche Formel "in Christo Jesu"*, 1892; B. Delbruck, *Vergleichende Syntax* I 1893; G. Delling, "Der Bezugnahme von neutestamentlichen *eis* auf Vorgegebenes", in O. Böcher and K. Haacker, eds., *Verborum Veritas. Festschrift für Gustav Stählin Zum 70. Geburtstag*, 1970, 211–24; J. Dupont, *SYN CHRISTŌ. L'Union avec le Christ suivant Saint Paul*, 1952; G. N. Hatzidakis, *Einleitung in die neugriechische Grammatik*, 1892; W. Heitmüller, *Im Namen Jesu*, *FRLANT* 1:2, 1903; R. Helbing, *Die Präpositionen bei Herodot und anderen Historikern*, 1904; J. Humbert, *La disparition du datif en grec*, 1930; and *Syntaxe Grecque*,

1945, 298–344; M. Johannessohn, *Der Gebrauch der Kasus und der Präpositionen in der Septuaginta. I. Gebrauch der Kasus*, 1910; and *Der Gebrauch der Präpositionen in der Septuaginta*, 1926; J. Käser, *Die Präpositionen bei Dionysius von Halicarnassus*, 1915; F. Krebs, *Die Präpositionen bei Polybius*, 1882; and *Die Präpositionsadverbien in der späteren historischen Gräcität*, I 1889; P. Kretschmer, *Die Entstehung der Koine*, 1901; R. Kühner, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*, II. 1 (ed. by B. Gerth), 1898 [3], 448–555; W. Kuhring, *De praepositionum Graecarum in chartis Aegyptiis usu quaestiones selectae*, 1906; H. Ljungvik, *Beiträge zur Syntax der spätgriechischen Volkssprache*, 1932; E. Lohmeyer, *"Syn Christō"*, in *Festgabe für Adolf Deissmann*, 1927, 218–257; S. Lyonnet, "Le sens de *eph' hō* en Rom 5:12 et l'exégèse des pères grecs", *Bib* 36, 1955, 435–456; E. Mayser, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit*, II. 2, 1934, 337–543; K. Meisterhans, *Grammatik der attischen Inschriften*, 1900[3] ; T. Mommsen, *Die Präpositionen syn und meta bei den nachhomerischen Epikern*, 1879; and *Beiträge zu der Lehre von den griechischen Präpositionen*, 1895; F. Neugebauer, "Das paulinische 'In Christo' ", *NTS* 4, 1957–8, 124–138; and *In Christus. Untersuchung zum paulinischen Glaubensverständnis*, 1961; I. de la Potterie, "L'Emploi Dynamique de *eis* dans Saint Jean et ses Incidences Théologiques", *Bib* 43, 1962, 366–387; L. Radermacher, *Neutestamentliche Grammatik*, 1925[2], 137–146; P. F. Regard, *Contribution à l'Étude des Prépositions dans la Langue du Nouveau Testament*, 1919; B. I. Ricardo, *De praepositionis para usu atque significatione in Pentateuchi versione Alexandrina*, 1917; C. Rossberg, *De praepositionum Graecarum in chartis Aegyptiis Ptolemaeorum aetatis usu*, 1909; A. Rüger, *Die Präpositionen bei Pausanias*, 1897; A. Schettler, *Die paulinische Formel "durch Christus"*, 1907; E. Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik*, II, ed. A. Debrunner, 1950, 12; D. Tabachovitz, *Die Septuaginta und das Neue Testament. Stilstudien*, 1956; A. Thumb, *Die griechische Sprache im Zeitatter des Hellenismus*, 1901; J. Wackernagel, *Vorlesungen über Syntax mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Griechisch, Lateinisch und Deutsch*, II, 1928 [2], 153–248; E. Wissmann, *Das Verhältnis von PISTIS und Christusfrömmigkeit bei Paulus*, 1926.

M. J. Harris

Indexes

Index of Hebrew and Aramaic Words

'āḇ **Vol. 1:** 617 f., 621
Vol. 3: 870
'āḇaḏ **Vol. 1:** 463
'aḇaddôn **Vol. 1:** 463 f.
'āḇâh **Vol. 3:** 1016, 1019
'āḇal **Vol. 2:** 422 f.
'āḇaq **Vol. 1:** 645
'abbā' **Vol. 1:** 614 f., 620
Vol. 2: 867, 869, 896
Vol. 3: 639
'āḇî **Vol. 1:** 614
'āḇîḇ **Vol. 2:** 675
Vol. 3: 422
'aḇnēṭ **Vol. 3:** 120
'aḇrāhām **Vol. 1:** 76
'āḏām **Vol. 1:** 84
Vol. 2: 160, 502, 564, 571
Vol. 3: 613
'aḏāmâh **Vol. 1:** 84
Vol. 2: 564
'aḏarkōnîm
Vol. 2: 848
'āḏōm **Vol. 1:** 205
'āḏôn **Vol. 2:** 509, 511 f., 562, 590
'aḏōnay **Vol. 1:** 71
Vol. 2: 69, 71, 512
Vol. 3: 786
'aḡam **Vol. 3:** 992
'āḡam **Vol. 2:** 423
'āḥ **Vol. 1:** 255, 258, 260
Vol. 2: 739
'ahaḇ **Vol. 2:** 551
'ahaḇâh **Vol. 2:** 105, 539, 547
'ahaḇaṭ ḥeseḏ **Vol. 2:** 105
'aḥāḏîm **Vol. 2:** 716
'aḥar **Vol. 1:** 492
Vol. 2: 55 f.
Vol. 3: 178, 262
'aḥarê **Vol. 1:** 321, 481
'aḥarîṯ hayyāmîm **Vol. 2:** 56
'aḥarôn **Vol. 1:** 326
Vol. 2: 61
'aḥaṯ **Vol. 2:** 716 f., 720
'āḥaz **Vol. 2:** 860
'āḥēḇ **Vol. 2:** 539, 547
'aḥîyâh **Vol. 2:** 521
'aḥîyāhû **Vol. 2:** 521
'aḥuzzâh **Vol. 3:** 256
'āḵal **Vol. 2:** 268
'al **Vol. 3:** 153
'ālâh **Vol. 3:** 474, 739
'ālēp̄ **Vol. 3:** 760
'alᵉp̄ê yiśrā'ēl **Vol. 2:** 698
'allâp̄ **Vol. 3:** 769
'allûp̄ **Vol. 2:** 698
'almānâh **Vol. 3:** 1073, 1077
'āmal **Vol. 2:** 422
'āman **Vol. 1:** 97, 100, 595–597, 599, 601
Vol. 2: 837
Vol. 3: 368, 878, 902
'ᵃmānâh **Vol. 1:** 598
'āmar **Vol. 2:** 488
Vol. 3: 821, 1087, 1144 f.
'āmēn **Vol. 1:** 97 f.
'ᵃmorā'îm **Vol. 1:** 69
'ānâh **Vol. 2:** 423
'ānaḥ **Vol. 2:** 423
'ānaq **Vol. 2:** 423
'ᵃnāqâh **Vol. 2:** 423
'ᵃnî **Vol. 2:** 278
'ᵃnî hû' **Vol. 2:** 279
'ᵃnî YHWH **Vol. 2:** 278
'ānōḵî **Vol. 2:** 278
'anšê 'ᵃmānâh **Vol. 1:** 598
'anšê gᵉ'ullāṯeḵā **Vol. 3:** 190
'ap̄ **Vol. 1:** 106, 108
'ap̄îq **Vol. 3:** 985
'āreṣ **Vol. 1:** 539
Vol. 2: 456
'armôn **Vol. 1:** 661
'ārôn **Vol. 3:** 812
'ārûr **Vol. 1:** 416
'āšām **Vol. 2:** 406
Vol. 3: 171, 420, 437 f., 856
'āsap̄ **Vol. 2:** 32
Vol. 3: 255
'ᵃsar **Vol. 2:** 732
Vol. 3: 188
'āsar **Vol. 1:** 171, 472
Vol. 2: 732
Vol. 3: 591, 1161
'āšar **Vol. 1:** 215
'ᵃšer **Vol. 2:** 68, 888
'ašᵉrê **Vol. 1:** 215 f.
'ᵃšērîm **Vol. 3:** 865
'ašmâh **Vol. 3:** 156
'āsôn **Vol. 3:** 999
'aššāp̄ **Vol. 3:** 1035
'aššap̄îm **Vol. 2:** 555
'aṯā' **Vol. 2:** 895
'āṯam **Vol. 3:** 950
'āwâh **Vol. 1:** 456
'āwen **Vol. 1:** 550
Vol. 3: 1024
'ᵃwîl **Vol. 3:** 1037
'ayyēh **Vol. 3:** 267
'āzal **Vol. 1:** 698
'āzar **Vol. 2:** 222
'ᵃzārâh **Vol. 3:** 156
'azkārâh **Vol. 3:** 233, 238 f., 423
'dm **Vol. 1:** 84
'ēḇel **Vol. 2:** 422
Vol. 3: 720
'eḇen **Vol. 3:** 388, 391, 398
'eḇen yiśra'ēl **Vol. 3:** 398
'eḇyôn **Vol. 2:** 820–822, 829
Vol. 3: 93
'eḥāḏ **Vol. 1:** 665, 678
Vol. 2: 498, 716, 720, 725
'ehᵉzeh **Vol. 3:** 178
'ᵉḥî **Vol. 3:** 267
'ehyeh 'ᵃšer 'ehyeh **Vol. 2:** 68
'el **Vol. 3:** 1090
'ēl **Vol. 1:** 103, 190, 296
Vol. 2: 67, 70, 86 f., 304 f.
'ēl-'elyôn **Vol. 3:** 36, 457
'elep̄ **Vol. 2:** 698
'ēlî **Vol. 2:** 82, 637
'ēlîyyâh, 'ēlîyyâhû **Vol. 1:** 543
'ēlleh **Vol. 2:** 739
'ᵉlôaḥ **Vol. 2:** 67, 70
Vol. 3: 178
'ᵉlōhêḵem **Vol. 3:** 239
'ᵉlōhēnû **Vol. 2:** 720
'ᵉlōhîm **Vol. 1:** 56
Vol. 2: 67, 70, 502, 591
Vol. 3: 264, 631
'elōi **Vol. 2:** 82
'ēm **Vol. 1:** 87
Vol. 3: 1069, 1077
'ēmer **Vol. 3:** 1087
'ᵉmeṯ **Vol. 2:** 119
Vol. 3: 354, 358, 877–892, 902
'ᵉmûnâh **Vol. 1:** 597, 601, 714
Vol. 3: 368, 878 f., 882
'ēn mispār **Vol. 2:** 683
'ēn qēṣeh **Vol. 2:** 683
'ᵉnôš **Vol. 2:** 562, 564
Vol. 3: 613
'ēp̄ôḏ **Vol. 3:** 36
'eppattaḥ **Vol. 2:** 560, 729
'ereḵ 'appayim **Vol. 2:** 769

'ereṣ **Vol. 1:** 517
Vol. 2: 209
Vol. 3: 105, 160, 249
'ēš **Vol. 1:** 654, 658
'eṣba' **Vol. 2:** 150
'ēšēr **Vol. 1:** 215
'ēšeṯ ba'ᵃlaṯ-'ôḇ **Vol. 2:** 554
'eškār **Vol. 3:** 139
'eṯ **Vol. 3:** 777
'eṯnâh **Vol. 3:** 139
'eṯnan **Vol. 3:** 139
'eṯnān **Vol. 3:** 139
'eṯpattaḥ **Vol. 2:** 560, 729
'ᵉwîl **Vol. 3:** 126, 1024 f.
'î **Vol. 3:** 1051
'iggereṯ **Vol. 1:** 246
'iḳḇôḏ **Vol. 2:** 45
'im **Vol. 1:** 210
Vol. 3: 420
'immā' **Vol. 1:** 614
'imrâh **Vol. 3:** 1087
'iš **Vol. 2:** 562, 564, 571, 739
Vol. 3: 680, 1075
'iš hā'ᵉlōhîm **Vol. 3:** 77
'iššâh **Vol. 2:** 587
Vol. 3: 1055, 1065, 1075, 1077
'istallaq **Vol. 3:** 631
'iṯṯer **Vol. 2:** 414
'iṯṯîm **Vol. 2:** 555
'iwweleṯ **Vol. 3:** 125 f., 1024 f.
'mn **Vol. 1:** 100, 606
Vol. 2: 837
Vol. 3: 877 f.
'ōhel **Vol. 1:** 294
Vol. 3: 811
'ōhel 'ēḏûṯ **Vol. 3:** 811
'ōhel mô'ēḏ **Vol. 3:** 811, 815
'ōmnâh **Vol. 3:** 878
'ôr **Vol. 2:** 488, 496
Vol. 3: 318
'ôṣār **Vol. 2:** 830
'ôṯ **Vol. 2:** 350, 501, 626 f., 629, 634
'ōṯô **Vol. 3:** 264
'ōṯôṯ ûmôp̄ᵉṯîm **Vol. 2:** 627
'ôy **Vol. 3:** 1051
'ôyēḇ **Vol. 1:** 553
'ōzen **Vol. 3:** 125
'ûlām **Vol. 3:** 782
'wn' **Vol. 3:** 229
'zn **Vol. 2:** 175

'āḇaḏ **Vol. 2:** 164, 876
Vol. 3: 550, 1148
'ᵃḇāḏîm **Vol. 3:** 593, 608 f.
'āḇar **Vol. 1:** 699
Vol. 3: 255, 583
'aḇdê hammeleḵ **Vol. 3:** 608
'aḇdekā **Vol. 3:** 244
'aḇdî **Vol. 3:** 639
'ᵃḇôḏâh **Vol. 3:** 552, 595
'āḏaṗ **Vol. 2:** 130
'ᵃḏî **Vol. 1:** 522
'al **Vol. 1:** 632, 636
Vol. 2: 184
Vol. 3: 178
'al habbayiṯ **Vol. 2:** 254
'ālâh **Vol. 2:** 185
Vol. 3: 421, 860
'ālaz **Vol. 3:** 29
'ālᵉmā' **Vol. 1:** 523
Vol. 2: 514
'ᵃlî **Vol. 3:** 459
'allîz **Vol. 3:** 29
'almâh **Vol. 2:** 87
Vol. 3: 1071 f.
'ām **Vol. 1:** 292–294, 539
Vol. 2: 456, 789 f., 792 f., 796–801
Vol. 3: 105
'am hā'āreṣ **Vol. 1:** 539
Vol. 2: 456, 801, 805
Vol. 3: 105, 756
'am sᵉgullâh **Vol. 2:** 839 f.
'am YHWH **Vol. 2:** 796
'āmaḏ **Vol. 1:** 380, 474
Vol. 2: 136
Vol. 3: 224, 228, 279
'āmāl **Vol. 1:** 262
'ammî **Vol. 2:** 796
'ammîm **Vol. 1:** 96
Vol. 2: 790, 792, 799
'ammûḏ **Vol. 3:** 795
'āmōq **Vol. 2:** 197
'anā **Vol. 3:** 822
'ānaḡ **Vol. 2:** 735
'ānâh **Vol. 2:** 175, 179, 260, 468, 821
Vol. 3: 1041
'ānāw **Vol. 2:** 257, 829
'ᵃnāwâh **Vol. 2:** 260, 264
'ānî **Vol. 2:** 257 f., 820–822, 829
'ānî wᵉ'ebyôn **Vol. 2:** 822
'ᵃniyyîm **Vol. 2:** 829
'āpār **Vol. 1:** 520
Vol. 3: 178
'āqaḇ **Vol. 2:** 431
'aqrāḇ **Vol. 1:** 510
'ᵃrāḇâh **Vol. 1:** 411
'ārâh **Vol. 1:** 549
Vol. 2: 854
'ārap̄ **Vol. 3:** 192
'ārîṣ **Vol. 3:** 29
'ārōm **Vol. 1:** 412
'āśâh **Vol. 3:** 1148, 1153, 1156, 1159
'āśâh ṣᵉḏāqâh **Vol. 2:** 597
'āšaq **Vol. 3:** 379, 574
'āśar **Vol. 2:** 693
'ᵃṣārâh **Vol. 2:** 234
'aṣēl **Vol. 3:** 1024
'āṣᵉmû missappēr **Vol. 2:** 683
'āšîr **Vol. 2:** 841
'āšûq **Vol. 2:** 138
'aṯar **Vol. 2:** 862 f.
'ᵃṯārâh **Vol. 1:** 405
'āṯēq **Vol. 2:** 714
'aṯîḏ **Vol. 1:** 326
'āwâh **Vol. 3:** 859
'āwaṯ **Vol. 2:** 370
'āwel **Vol. 3:** 586 f.
'awlâh **Vol. 3:** 574
'āwōn **Vol. 2:** 138
Vol. 3: 574, 577, 587
'ᵃwōnōṯām **Vol. 3:** 420
'āyēp̄ **Vol. 2:** 265
'ayin **Vol. 2:** 501
Vol. 3: 985
'ᵃzā'zēl **Vol. 1:** 451, 698
'āzaḇ **Vol. 3:** 248
'ᵃzaḇtānî **Vol. 2:** 82
'bd **Vol. 3:** 593
'eḇeḏ **Vol. 1:** 283
Vol. 2: 164
Vol. 3: 593, 597, 607–611, 618, 637, 639–641, 664
'eḇeḏ kᵉna'ᵃnî **Vol. 3:** 593
'ēḇer **Vol. 2:** 305
'eḇrâh **Vol. 1:** 108
'ēḏ **Vol. 3:** 1041
'ēḏâh **Vol. 1:** 190, 292–296, 302
'ēḏen **Vol. 2:** 761
'ēḏer **Vol. 3:** 564
'ēḏûṯ **Vol. 3:** 1040
'ērāḇôn **Vol. 2:** 39
'erwâh **Vol. 3:** 310, 562
'erwaṯ dāḇār **Vol. 3:** 1195
'ēṣ **Vol. 3:** 865, 870
'ēṣâh **Vol. 3:** 1016
'eśeḇ **Vol. 1:** 743
Vol. 2: 211
'eśer **Vol. 3:** 851
'eštōnôṯ **Vol. 3:** 820
'ēṯ **Vol. 3:** 827, 835, 841, 850
'ēzer **Vol. 2:** 576, 637
'iḇrî **Vol. 2:** 305
Vol. 3: 593
'immānû 'ēl **Vol. 2:** 86
'innâh **Vol. 1:** 495, 612
'inyân **Vol. 3:** 799
'îr **Vol. 2:** 802
'iwwēr **Vol. 1:** 218
'izzaḇôn **Vol. 3:** 139
'ōl **Vol. 3:** 1161
'ōlâh **Vol. 3:** 421–423, 432, 434, 438
'ôlāl, 'ôlēl **Vol. 1:** 281
'ôlām **Vol. 1:** 164, 476, 523, 526
Vol. 2: 67, 105, 514, 931
Vol. 3: 237, 827–829, 850
'ôlām habbā' **Vol. 3:** 70, 829
'ôlām lᵉḏōrōṯām **Vol. 3:** 828
'ōmer **Vol. 3:** 421
'ôp̄ **Vol. 1:** 172
'ôrî **Vol. 3:** 178
'orlāṯ lēḇāḇ **Vol. 2:** 184
'ormâh **Vol. 1:** 412
'ōšer **Vol. 2:** 841

ʻōz **Vol. 2:** 602
ʻôz **Vol. 2:** 602
Vol. 3: 817
ʻšr **Vol. 2:** 841
ʻûr **Vol. 3:** 279

baʻal **Vol. 1:** 75
Vol. 2: 511, 562, 677
Vol. 3: 469, 1006, 1065
baʻal habayiṯ **Vol. 2:** 510
baʻal ʾiššâh **Vol. 3:** 1065
baʻal šāmēm **Vol. 3:** 1006
baʻal zᵉḇūḇ, zᵉḇûḇ **Vol. 3:** 469
baʻal zᵉḇūl **Vol. 3:** 469
baʻal zibbūl **Vol. 3:** 469
baʻar **Vol. 3:** 1024 f.
bāʻar **Vol. 3:** 1024
bāḇel **Vol. 1:** 140
baḏ **Vol. 2:** 723
baḏ bᵉḇaḏ yihyeh **Vol. 2:** 723
bāḏāḏ **Vol. 2:** 723
bāḏal **Vol. 3:** 392
bāḡaḏ **Vol. 1:** 461
bāhal **Vol. 3:** 1169
bāḥan **Vol. 1:** 503
Vol. 3: 355, 808
bāḥar **Vol. 1:** 503, 534, 537 f.
bahereṯ **Vol. 2:** 465
bāḥîr **Vol. 1:** 537 f.
Vol. 3: 641
bāḥûr **Vol. 1:** 537 f.
bāḵâh **Vol. 2:** 416, 422
bāḵar **Vol. 1:** 667 f.
bālaʻ **Vol. 2:** 677
bālaḡ **Vol. 3:** 254
bālâh **Vol. 2:** 714
bālal **Vol. 2:** 649
bāmâh **Vol. 2:** 199, 205
Vol. 3: 418, 426
bammeh **Vol. 2:** 116
bāmôṯ **Vol. 2:** 199
Vol. 3: 1010
bānâh **Vol. 2:** 251
bāqar **Vol. 1:** 189
bāqaš **Vol. 2:** 164
Vol. 3: 530
bar **Vol. 2:** 144, 331
Vol. 3: 924
bar ʾᵉnāš **Vol. 3:** 614
bar ʾᵉnāšāʼ **Vol. 3:** 614
bar nāšāʼ **Vol. 3:** 614 f., 617, 619, 623 f., 627, 630, 665
bārāʼ **Vol. 1:** 378–380, 388, 672
Vol. 3: 119, 1153
bāraḥ **Vol. 1:** 558
bāraḵ **Vol. 1:** 207–209, 218
Vol. 2: 778
Vol. 3: 816
bārar **Vol. 1:** 537
bārûḵ **Vol. 1:** 210
bārûḵ ʾattâh **Vol. 1:** 207
barzel **Vol. 2:** 97
bāṣaʻ **Vol. 3:** 137
bāṣār **Vol. 3:** 1145
bāśār **Vol. 1:** 233, 434, 672 f., 675 f., 678
Vol. 2: 477, 565, 571
Vol. 3: 178
baššîr **Vol. 3:** 669
baṯ **Vol. 3:** 403, 911
baṯ qôl **Vol. 2:** 174
Vol. 3: 51, 80, 113
bāṭaḥ **Vol. 1:** 327, 589, 596, 599, 601
Vol. 2: 240
Vol. 3: 70
baṭṭēl **Vol. 3:** 187
bayiṯ **Vol. 2:** 247, 254, 256, 510
Vol. 3: 782, 786
bayyôm hahû **Vol. 2:** 890
bāzâh **Vol. 1:** 461
bᵉ **Vol. 3:** 1175, 1190, 1192, 1210–1212
beʾᵉmûnāṯô **Vol. 3:** 366
bᵉʾēr **Vol. 3:** 986
bᵉʻaḏ **Vol. 3:** 153, 160
beʻēl dᵉḇāḇā **Vol. 3:** 469
beʻēl diḇaḇā **Vol. 3:** 469
bᵉʻênê **Vol. 3:** 821
bᵉaḥᵃrîṯ hayyāmîm **Vol. 2:** 56
beḡeḏ **Vol. 1:** 316
bᵉḵî **Vol. 2:** 416
bᵉḵôr **Vol. 1:** 667
Vol. 3: 416
bᵉliyyaʻal **Vol. 3:** 1024
bᵉlēḇ šālēm **Vol. 3:** 572
bēn **Vol. 1:** 283, 285, 287
Vol. 3: 244
ben ʾāḏām **Vol. 1:** 84
Vol. 2: 502
Vol. 3: 613 f., 617, 619, 622 f.
ben Dāwîḏ **Vol. 3:** 619, 652
bᵉnê **Vol. 2:** 652
bᵉnê ʾāḏām **Vol. 3:** 613 f.
bᵉnê hāʾāḏām **Vol. 3:** 613
bᵉnê yiśrāʾēl **Vol. 2:** 791
bᵉrāḵâh **Vol. 1:** 217 f.
Vol. 2: 779
bᵉrāḵôṯ **Vol. 1:** 212
bᵉrēḵâh **Vol. 3:** 992
bᵉrîʼē bāśār **Vol. 1:** 672
bᵉrîʼôṯ **Vol. 3:** 614
bᵉrûṯ **Vol. 1:** 224, 365–368, 376
Vol. 2: 600
bᵉriyyâh hᵃḏāšâh **Vol. 2:** 672
beṣaʻ **Vol. 3:** 29, 137
bᵉṣelemʾᵉlōhîm **Vol. 2:** 292
bᵉšēm **Vol. 2:** 650, 652, 656
bᵉśōrâh **Vol. 2:** 108 f.
bêṯ **Vol. 1:** 170
bêṯ ʾāḇ **Vol. 3:** 870
bêṯ ʿᵃḇāḏîm **Vol. 3:** 593
bêṯ hakkapporeṯ **Vol. 3:** 156
bêṯʾēl **Vol. 2:** 67
beṭaḥ **Vol. 1:** 663
Vol. 2: 777
bᵉṭāḥâh **Vol. 3:** 70
beṭen **Vol. 2:** 599
bᵉṭûlâh **Vol. 3:** 1071 f., 1076
bᵉyāḏ **Vol. 2:** 149
bᵉyarkᵉṯê **Vol. 3:** 794
bᵉyōšer lᵉḇaḇô **Vol. 3:** 572
bî **Vol. 2:** 860
biḡlal **Vol. 2:** 116
bikkûrîm **Vol. 2:** 675
bimᵉṯē mᵉʻâṯ **Vol. 2:** 683
bîn **Vol. 1:** 694
Vol. 2: 397, 616
Vol. 3: 124 f., 130, 351, 760, 1028 f.
bînâh **Vol. 3:** 125, 130, 1027
biśrāʾ **Vol. 2:** 532
biśśar **Vol. 2:** 108 f.
biṯṯāḥôn **Vol. 1:** 589, 600 f.
biyḏê **Vol. 1:** 636
bôʾ **Vol. 2:** 898
bōʾ **Vol. 1:** 327
bôḡereṯ **Vol. 2:** 588
bōḥan **Vol. 3:** 388 f.
bôḵ **Vol. 2:** 416
bôš **Vol. 3:** 562, 1024
bōšeṯ **Vol. 3:** 562
brk **Vol. 1:** 218, 263
Vol. 3: 799
bsr **Vol. 1:** 682
bûšâh **Vol. 3:** 562
bûz **Vol. 1:** 461

dāʻaḵ **Vol. 3:** 109
daʻaṯ **Vol. 1:** 600
Vol. 2: 391, 397, 616
Vol. 3: 640, 1027, 1029
dāḇaq **Vol. 2:** 349
dāḇār **Vol. 1:** 63, 597
Vol. 2: 173, 512
Vol. 3: 345, 483, 502, 820, 878, 1087, 1094, 1096, 1103, 1116, 1119–1121, 1125, 1195
dāḡ **Vol. 1:** 670 f.
dāḡâh **Vol. 1:** 670
daḵā **Vol. 2:** 260
dāḵâh **Vol. 2:** 260
dakkāʼ **Vol. 2:** 261
dal **Vol. 2:** 260, 820, 822
dālal **Vol. 2:** 260
dām **Vol. 1:** 224, 226
Vol. 3: 158
dāmâh **Vol. 2:** 501
dāraḵ **Vol. 2:** 369
dāraš **Vol. 1:** 64, 580
Vol. 2: 489, 554
Vol. 3: 93, 531
darkᵉmônîm **Vol. 2:** 848
dāṯ **Vol. 2:** 439, 441
dāwîḏ **Vol. 1:** 425
Vol. 3: 244, 652
day **Vol. 3:** 728–730

dbr **Vol. 1:** 332
Vol. 3: 268
dᵉḇar YHWH **Vol. 3:** 1087, 1090
dᵉḇārеyḵā **Vol. 3:** 267
deḇer **Vol. 3:** 1116
dᵉḡaṯ-hayyām **Vol. 1:** 670
deleṯ **Vol. 2:** 30
dᵉmā' **Vol. 2:** 532
dᵉmûṯ **Vol. 2:** 287, 501 f.
dᵉpûs **Vol. 3:** 904
dᵉraš **Vol. 2:** 488
dereḵ **Vol. 3:** 937
dešeʾ **Vol. 1:** 743
Vol. 2: 211
diḇaḇā **Vol. 3:** 469
dibbâh **Vol. 3:** 346
dibber **Vol. 3:** 324
dibbēr **Vol. 1:** 333
Vol. 3: 1121
dibbᵉrâh **Vol. 3:** 1120
dibbᵉrôṯ **Vol. 3:** 1120
dibbûr **Vol. 3:** 1121
diḇrê hamᵉʾōrôṯ **Vol. 2:** 512
diḵtîḇ **Vol. 3:** 487
dîlēh **Vol. 2:** 840
dîn **Vol. 1:** 503
Vol. 2: 363
dōḇer **Vol. 2:** 586
dôr **Vol. 2:** 35 f.
dōrēš el hammēṯîm **Vol. 2:** 554
dûmiyyâh **Vol. 2:** 669

gʾl **Vol. 3:** 222
gāʾâh **Vol. 3:** 29
gāʾal **Vol. 1:** 267
Vol. 3: 178, 190–194, 201 f., 222
gaʾᵃyôn **Vol. 3:** 29
gāʿar **Vol. 3:** 346
gāḇah **Vol. 2:** 199, 201
gāḇar **Vol. 1:** 103
gāḇaṣ **Vol. 2:** 32
gāḇîš **Vol. 3:** 394
gāḇōah **Vol. 3:** 29
gaḇrāʾ **Vol. 3:** 614
gaḇrîʾēl **Vol. 1:** 103
gādaḏ **Vol. 3:** 377
gādal **Vol. 2:** 201, 369
gādap̄ **Vol. 3:** 341, 345
gādēr **Vol. 3:** 950
gādôl **Vol. 1:** 188, 670 f.
Vol. 2: 425
Vol. 3: 1087
gālâh **Vol. 2:** 212
Vol. 3: 310, 318, 590
gālûṯ **Vol. 1:** 685
Vol. 3: 590
gan **Vol. 2:** 761
gānaḇ **Vol. 2:** 377
gannāḇ **Vol. 2:** 377
gannâh **Vol. 2:** 761
gāraʿ **Vol. 3:** 379
gāraš **Vol. 1:** 453
gaṯ šᵉmānê **Vol. 2:** 710
gāzal **Vol. 2:** 377, 601
gdl **Vol. 2:** 425
gē hinnōm **Vol. 2:** 208
gēʾ **Vol. 3:** 29
gᵉʾālēnû **Vol. 3:** 194
gēʾeh **Vol. 3:** 29
gᵉʾûlîm **Vol. 3:** 193
gᵉʾullâh **Vol. 3:** 190, 193
gᵉḇal **Vol. 1:** 243
gᵉḇîr **Vol. 2:** 511
gᵉḇûrâh **Vol. 2:** 602
gᵉḇûrôṯ **Vol. 2:** 602 f.
gᵉḏērâh **Vol. 3:** 950
gᵉḏûḏ **Vol. 3:** 377
gᵉḏûlâh **Vol. 2:** 116
gēhinnām **Vol. 2:** 208
gᵉmar haqqēṣ **Vol. 2:** 61
gᵉmārāʾ **Vol. 1:** 58
gᵉnāzim **Vol. 3:** 796
gepen **Vol. 3:** 918
gēr **Vol. 1:** 258, 360, 684, 689 f.
Vol. 2: 636
gᵉûrâh **Vol. 2:** 602
gēwâh **Vol. 3:** 29
gᵉwiyyaṯ bᵉśārô **Vol. 1:** 676
gezaʿ **Vol. 3:** 867
gᵉzerâh **Vol. 1:** 580
gibbôr **Vol. 2:** 562, 602
gibbôrîm **Vol. 2:** 602
gîl **Vol. 2:** 353, 356
gillûlîm **Vol. 2:** 284 f.
gōʾᵃlî **Vol. 3:** 178
gōʾēl **Vol. 3:** 178, 190–192, 194, 218
gōlâh **Vol. 1:** 685
Vol. 3: 590
gôrāl **Vol. 2:** 296, 298
gôy **Vol. 2:** 790–792, 796, 805
gôyîm **Vol. 1:** 58, 96
Vol. 2: 790–793
gûp̄ **Vol. 1:** 673
Vol. 2: 730
gupāʾ **Vol. 2:** 532
gûr **Vol. 1:** 684, 690
Vol. 2: 91

hʾmyn **Vol. 3:** 368, 800
hāʾeḇen habbᵉḏîl **Vol. 3:** 391 f.
hāʾeḇen hārōʾšâh **Vol. 3:** 391
haʿᵃṯîḏîm **Vol. 1:** 326
hāʿēḏ **Vol. 3:** 1041
hāʿôlām habbāʾ **Vol. 3:** 829
hāʿôlām hazzeh **Vol. 3:** 829
hāḏar **Vol. 3:** 30
haddāḡâh **Vol. 1:** 670
hāḡār **Vol. 1:** 80
haggāḏâh **Vol. 1:** 58, 581, 633 f.
Vol. 2: 522
hahîʾ gaḇrāʾ **Vol. 3:** 614
hahûʾ gaḇrāʾ **Vol. 3:** 614
haḥozîm bakkôḵāḇîm **Vol. 2:** 555
hakkōhēn haggāḏôl **Vol. 3:** 35
hakkōl **Vol. 1:** 522
hālaḵ **Vol. 1:** 481, 683
Vol. 2: 777, 815
Vol. 3: 264, 933, 943, 946, 1156
hᵃlāḵâh **Vol. 1:** 59
hālal **Vol. 1:** 99
Vol. 2: 422, 862
Vol. 3: 668 f., 816
hālam **Vol. 3:** 396
halᵉlû-ʾeth-yahweh **Vol. 1:** 99
halᵉlûyâh **Vol. 1:** 99
Vol. 2: 862
Vol. 3: 669
hallēl **Vol. 1:** 633
Vol. 3: 817
hāmâh **Vol. 2:** 423
Vol. 3: 112
hamᵉʾōrôṯ **Vol. 2:** 512
hāmôn **Vol. 2:** 800, 842
hanniśʾārîm bāʾāreṣ **Vol. 3:** 249
haṗṭārâh **Vol. 3:** 485
haqqēṣ hāʾaḥᵃrôn **Vol. 2:** 61
har **Vol. 3:** 1009
hāraḡ **Vol. 1:** 429
hārâh **Vol. 1:** 176, 186, 343
hašḥîṯ **Vol. 1:** 685
hattaḥtîṯ **Vol. 2:** 209
hāwâh **Vol. 3:** 760
hāyâh **Vol. 3:** 823, 1091, 1175
hāyâh kᵉ **Vol. 3:** 821
hayyôm **Vol. 2:** 890
heʾᵉmîn **Vol. 1:** 597
Vol. 3: 1211–1213
heʾᵉzîn **Vol. 2:** 175
heʿᵉrâh naṗšô **Vol. 1:** 548
hēʿîḏ **Vol. 3:** 1042
heḇel **Vol. 1:** 550 f.
heḏyôṯ **Vol. 2:** 456
hêḵāl **Vol. 3:** 782 f., 786 f.
hêlēl **Vol. 2:** 495
Vol. 3: 468
hēmānûṯāʾ **Vol. 1:** 98
hēqîm bᵉrîṯ **Vol. 1:** 368
hērôn **Vol. 2:** 423
hēšîḇ **Vol. 3:** 134, 420
hēsîr **Vol. 1:** 606
hēzîḏ **Vol. 3:** 28
hî **Vol. 3:** 1051
higgāyôn **Vol. 3:** 673
hillēl **Vol. 3:** 817
himnon **Vol. 3:** 669
hiqṭîr **Vol. 2:** 293
hištaḥᵃwâh **Vol. 2:** 862, 876
hiṯhallēl **Vol. 1:** 227
hiṯnabbēʾ **Vol. 1:** 527
hittîr **Vol. 2:** 732
hô **Vol. 3:** 1051
hōḇēl **Vol. 1:** 194
hôḏ **Vol. 3:** 926
hôlîḏ **Vol. 1:** 177
hôn **Vol. 1:** 381
Vol. 3: 727

hôp̄ia‘ **Vol. 2:** 735
hôšēa‘ **Vol. 3:** 208
hôšî‘âh **Vol. 3:** 207
hôšî‘âh nā’ **Vol. 1:** 100
hôwâh **Vol. 3:** 1051
hôy **Vol. 3:** 1051
hû’ **Vol. 2:** 279
hûm **Vol. 3:** 112
hwh **Vol. 2:** 68
hwy **Vol. 2:** 68

ḥāḇā’ **Vol. 2:** 214
ḥāḇal **Vol. 1:** 468
Vol. 3: 858
ḥāḇar **Vol. 1:** 636, 641
Vol. 3: 1162
ḥāḇēr **Vol. 1:** 259
ḥ^{a}*ḇērîm* **Vol. 2:** 810
ḥ^{a}*ḇûrâh* **Vol. 1:** 641, 643
Vol. 2: 810
ḥaḏ **Vol. 1:** 665
ḥāḏāš **Vol. 2:** 670, 675
ḥag **Vol. 1:** 626
ḥag ḥ^{a}*mûššîm yôm* **Vol. 2:** 783
ḥag šāḇu‘ôṯ **Vol. 2:** 783
ḥāgar **Vol. 3:** 120
ḥ^{a}*gôr* **Vol. 3:** 120
ḥ^{a}*gôrâh* **Vol. 3:** 120
ḥai **Vol. 1:** 87
ḥāḵâh **Vol. 2:** 239, 772 f.
Vol. 3: 226
ḥāḵām **Vol. 1:** 486
Vol. 2: 616
Vol. 3: 479, 1024, 1027 f.
ḥ^{a}*ḵam ḥ*^{a}*rāšîm* **Vol. 2:** 555
ḥ^{a}*ḵāmîm* **Vol. 3:** 479
ḥāḵîm **Vol. 3:** 1028
ḥālâh **Vol. 2:** 164, 860
Vol. 3: 720, 997
ḥālal **Vol. 1:** 164
ḥālāl **Vol. 1:** 444
ḥālāq **Vol. 2:** 116
ḥālaq **Vol. 1:** 534
ḥālaṣ **Vol. 3:** 201
ḥalḥālâh **Vol. 3:** 858
ḥ^{a}*lîp̄âh* **Vol. 3:** 166
ḥāmaḏ **Vol. 1:** 456
ḥāmâh **Vol. 3:** 948
ḥāmal **Vol. 3:** 720
ḥāmam **Vol. 1:** 318
ḥāmās **Vol. 3:** 574
ḥ^{a}*mîšî* **Vol. 2:** 303
ḥānan **Vol. 2:** 594, 778, 860
ḥānaṯ **Vol. 1:** 264
ḥānēp̄ **Vol. 2:** 468
ḥ^{a}*nôḵ* **Vol. 3:** 264
ḥap̄ **Vol. 2:** 144
Vol. 3: 924
ḥāp̄aś **Vol. 3:** 533
ḥāp̄ēṣ **Vol. 1:** 534
Vol. 3: 1016, 1019
ḥāqaq **Vol. 1:** 333
ḥāqar **Vol. 3:** 808
ḥ^{a}*qēl d‘ma’* **Vol. 1:** 93
ḥāraq **Vol. 2:** 421
ḥārāš **Vol. 1:** 279
ḥ^{a}*rāšîm* **Vol. 2:** 555
ḥārēḇ **Vol. 3:** 1004 f.
ḥārōḇ **Vol. 3:** 1005
ḥārôn **Vol. 1:** 108
ḥarûṯ **Vol. 3:** 488
ḥarṭōm **Vol. 2:** 555
ḥarṭummîm **Vol. 1:** 574
Vol. 2: 555
ḥārûṣ **Vol. 2:** 95
ḥāšaḇ **Vol. 3:** 820 f., 823–825, 1187
ḥāsâh **Vol. 1:** 589
Vol. 2: 91
ḥāṣâh **Vol. 1:** 534
Vol. 2: 240
ḥ^{a}*sar-lēḇ* **Vol. 3:** 1024
ḥāsîḏ **Vol. 2:** 237 f., 600 f.
ḥ^{a}*sîḏîm* **Vol. 2:** 237, 810
Vol. 3: 270
ḥāṣîr **Vol. 1:** 743
Vol. 2: 211
ḥašmal **Vol. 2:** 97
ḥ^{a}*ṣōṣ*^{e}*râh* **Vol. 3:** 873
ḥāṭā’ **Vol. 3:** 101, 104, 419
ḥ^{a}*ṭā’âh* **Vol. 3:** 171
ḥāṭâh **Vol. 3:** 166
ḥāṭam **Vol. 3:** 497
ḥaṭṭā’ṯ **Vol. 3:** 156, 171, 419, 434, 437, 577, 1203
ḥawwâh **Vol. 1:** 87
ḥay **Vol. 2:** 477
Vol. 3: 743
ḥāyâh **Vol. 2:** 477, 483
Vol. 3: 206, 255
ḥayil **Vol. 2:** 602, 800, 842
ḥaylâh **Vol. 3:** 457
ḥayyâh **Vol. 1:** 113
Vol. 2: 478 f.
Vol. 3: 679
ḥayyîm **Vol. 2:** 477
ḥāzâh **Vol. 2:** 395
Vol. 3: 513
ḥāzaq **Vol. 1:** 663
Vol. 2: 154, 767
Vol. 3: 713, 716
ḥāzāq **Vol. 3:** 112
ḥāzôn **Vol. 1:** 574
Vol. 3: 1093
ḥbwrh **Vol. 2:** 814
ḥē **Vol. 3:** 743
ḥeḇel **Vol. 2:** 298
Vol. 3: 858
ḥeḵa **Vol. 2:** 848
ḥêl **Vol. 3:** 949
ḥel’âh **Vol. 2:** 27
ḥēleḇ **Vol. 3:** 416
ḥeleḏ **Vol. 1:** 711
ḥēleq **Vol. 2:** 298, 303
ḥelqâh **Vol. 2:** 303
ḥēmâh **Vol. 1:** 106, 108
Vol. 2: 27
ḥēn **Vol. 2:** 116 f., 123, 356, 600, 815
Vol. 3: 528, 818
ḥēq **Vol. 1:** 78
ḥērem **Vol. 1:** 413
ḥereš **Vol. 2:** 555
ḥerûṯ **Vol. 3:** 488
ḥeseḏ **Vol. 1:** 367
Vol. 2: 105, 116 f., 119, 123 f., 237, 540, 550, 594 f., 600 f.
Vol. 3: 354, 358, 429, 879 f., 882, 889
ḥēṭ’ **Vol. 3:** 419
ḥezyôn **Vol. 2:** 622
ḥgg **Vol. 1:** 626
ḥîḏâh **Vol. 1:** 575
Vol. 2: 745
ḥîl **Vol. 3:** 858
ḥillâh **Vol. 3:** 149, 152
ḥillēl **Vol. 2:** 224
ḥinnām **Vol. 1:** 550
Vol. 2: 41
ḥiṭṭē’ **Vol. 3:** 149, 152, 419
ḥiwyā’ **Vol. 1:** 87
ḥkm **Vol. 3:** 1027
ḥnn **Vol. 2:** 117, 123, 598
ḥôḇ **Vol. 2:** 666–668
ḥôḇâh **Vol. 2:** 667
ḥōḇēr ḥāḇēr **Vol. 2:** 554
ḥōḇrê šāmayim **Vol. 2:** 555
ḥōḏeš **Vol. 3:** 733
ḥoḵmâh **Vol. 3:** 130, 1027, 1029
ḥōl **Vol. 2:** 224
Vol. 3: 104
ḥ^{o}*lî* **Vol. 3:** 997, 999
ḥōm **Vol. 1:** 652
ḥômâh **Vol. 3:** 948
ḥômōṯayim **Vol. 3:** 948
ḥōnāḵ **Vol. 2:** 815
ḥōq **Vol. 1:** 332 f.
Vol. 2: 439 f.
Vol. 3: 354
ḥorbâh **Vol. 3:** 1005
ḥōreḇ **Vol. 1:** 652
ḥôrēḇ **Vol. 3:** 1013
ḥōrîm **Vol. 1:** 716
ḥôṯām, ḥōṯām **Vol. 3:** 497
ḥōṯer **Vol. 1:** 407
Vol. 3: 867
ḥôzeh **Vol. 3:** 77, 513
ḥqq **Vol. 2:** 573
ḥṭ’ **Vol. 3:** 587
ḥûḇ **Vol. 2:** 370
ḥûl **Vol. 1:** 324
Vol. 3: 350, 858
ḥuqqâh **Vol. 1:** 332 f.
Vol. 2: 439, 441
Vol. 3: 354
ḥuqqaṯ ’ôlām **Vol. 3:** 237
ḥuqqōṯ **Vol. 2:** 441
ḥwh **Vol. 3:** 316

kāḇaḏ **Vol. 3:** 109

kāḇēḏ **Vol. 1:** 230, 261
kāḇôḏ **Vol. 1:** 122, 211, 261, 735
Vol. 2: 45–47, 49, 336, 485, 502
Vol. 3: 262, 514
kāḏaḏ **Vol. 3:** 396
kaḏkōḏ **Vol. 3:** 396
kāhan **Vol. 2:** 234
Vol. 3: 36
kāhaš **Vol. 1:** 455
Vol. 2: 470, 474
kālā' **Vol. 2:** 222
kālâh **Vol. 2:** 60
Vol. 3: 255
kālam **Vol. 3:** 98, 345
kālîl **Vol. 3:** 421
kallâh **Vol. 2:** 584
kammōn **Vol. 2:** 211
kāna' **Vol. 2:** 260
kānan **Vol. 3:** 350
kānāp̄ **Vol. 1:** 172
Vol. 3: 797
kāp̄ar **Vol. 1:** 455
Vol. 3: 176
kappōreṯ **Vol. 3:** 153, 156, 163, 812
kar **Vol. 3:** 951
kāra' **Vol. 2:** 876
kārâh **Vol. 3:** 139
kārar **Vol. 3:** 951
kāraṯ **Vol. 1:** 307, 368
kāraz **Vol. 3:** 51
kārôz **Vol. 2:** 682
Vol. 3: 51
karpas **Vol. 2:** 522
kāsal **Vol. 3:** 1024 f.
kāšal **Vol. 2:** 705, 707
Vol. 3: 801, 994
kāšēr **Vol. 2:** 452
kāṯaḇ **Vol. 3:** 483, 487
kāṯûḇ **Vol. 3:** 485, 487
kāzāḇ **Vol. 1:** 550
Vol. 2: 471
kbd **Vol. 1:** 261
Vol. 2: 52
kᵉ **Vol. 2:** 498, 501
Vol. 3: 614, 821
kᵉ'erkî **Vol. 2:** 498
kᵉḇar ʾᵉnāš **Vol. 3:** 614
kᵉḇēḏuṯ **Vol. 3:** 711
kᵉḇeś **Vol. 2:** 410, 412
kᵉhunnâh **Vol. 3:** 36
kᵉlal **Vol. 3:** 350
kᵉlāyôṯ **Vol. 2:** 181
kᵉlî **Vol. 1: 522**
Vol. 3: 1065
kᵉlimmâh **Vol. 3:** 856
kᵉmišpāṯ **Vol. 2:** 437
kᵉmô **Vol. 2:** 501
kᵉnā'âh **Vol. 1:** 711
kᵉna'ᵃnî **Vol. 3:** 593
kᵉništā' **Vol. 1:** 295
kēp̄ **Vol. 3:** 381
kêp̄ā' **Vol. 3:** 381, 383, 386
kerem **Vol. 3:** 918
kerem bᵉyaḇneh **Vol. 3:** 921
kᵉrîṯûṯ **Vol. 1:** 505
kᵉrûḇ **Vol. 1:** 279
kesel **Vol. 3:** 1024
kesep̄ **Vol. 2:** 96
kᵉsîl **Vol. 3:** 1024, 1037
kᵉsîlûṯ **Vol. 3:** 1024
kᵉṯāḇ **Vol. 3:** 487
keṯer **Vol. 1:** 405
Vol. 3: 182
kᵉṯîḇ **Vol. 3:** 487
kᵉṯûḇîm **Vol. 3:** 485, 487
khd **Vol. 2:** 215
kî **Vol. 3:** 264, 1211
kipper **Vol. 1:** 698
Vol. 3: 149–155, 160, 190, 192, 196, 419, 423
kippurîm **Vol. 3:** 153, 156
kislâh **Vol. 3:** 1024
kissâh **Vol. 2:** 212
kissē' **Vol. 2:** 612
kiššēp̄ **Vol. 2:** 555
kiṯᵉḇê-haqqōḏeš **Vol. 3:** 487
kô'ªḥ **Vol. 2:** 602
kôaḥ **Vol. 2:** 602
Vol. 3: 713
kōhēn **Vol. 2:** 234
Vol. 3: 33
kōhēn hārō'š **Vol. 3:** 35
kōhēn-ṣeḏeq **Vol. 2:** 591
Vol. 3: 36
kôḵîm **Vol. 1:** 264
kōl **Vol. 1:** 87, 97, 522
kōnām **Vol. 2:** 43
kōp̄er **Vol. 3:** 153, 155, 166, 190, 192, 1179
kōrēm **Vol. 3:** 918
kōṯereṯ **Vol. 3:** 389
kpr **Vol. 2:** 294
ktb **Vol. 3:** 483
kûl **Vol. 2:** 773
kûn **Vol. 1:** 380
Vol. 2: 69, 489
Vol. 3: 117, 350, 966

la'ªnâh **Vol. 2:** 27, 663
lāḇān **Vol. 1:** 204
lāḇaš **Vol. 1:** 314
lāḥam **Vol. 3:** 959
laḥaṣ **Vol. 2:** 807
lāḥaṣ **Vol. 2:** 807
lāḥaš **Vol. 2:** 554
laḥdā' **Vol. 3:** 1194
lāmaḏ **Vol. 1:** 69, 484–486
Vol. 3: 760, 766
lāmâh **Vol. 2:** 82
lamᵉnaṣṣēaḥ **Vol. 2:** 60
lāneṣaḥ **Vol. 2:** 60
lappîḏ **Vol. 2:** 485
lāqaḥ **Vol. 1:** 364, 475
Vol. 3: 262, 264–266, 745, 747
lāšan **Vol. 3:** 345
lāṣôn **Vol. 3:** 29, 1078
ld't **Vol. 3:** 800
lᵉ **Vol. 2:** 502, 876
Vol. 3: 1175, 1187, 1208, 1210 f.
lᵉ'azkārâh **Vol. 3:** 239
lᵉ'ummîm **Vol. 2:** 793
lēḇ **Vol. 1:** 230, 349
Vol. 2: 181 f., 184, 565
Vol. 3: 124 f., 679, 1024
lēḇāḇ **Vol. 1:** 230
Vol. 2: 177, 181, 184, 565
Vol. 3: 124 f.
lᵉḇaḏ **Vol. 2:** 723
lᵉbāḏāḏ **Vol. 2:** 723
lᵉbārek **Vol. 1:** 217
lᵉḇônâh **Vol. 2:** 293
lᵉḥaṭṭā't **Vol. 3:** 171
leḥem **Vol. 1:** 170, 249
Vol. 2: 521
Vol. 3: 423, 814
leḥem hamma'ªreḵeṯ **Vol. 3:** 814
leḥem happānîm **Vol. 3:** 814
leḥem-pānîm **Vol. 3:** 423
lᵉḵapper bᵉ'aḏ hā-'āreṣ **Vol. 3:** 160
lᵉlammēḏ **Vol. 3:** 769
lᵉpānāyw **Vol. 3:** 267
leqaḥ **Vol. 2:** 777
lᵉrō'š pinnâh **Vol. 3:** 388
lešem **Vol. 3:** 396
lᵉšēm **Vol. 2:** 652, 655
Vol. 3: 1209
lᵉšēm haššēm **Vol. 2:** 652
lᵉšēm šāmayim **Vol. 2:** 652
lêṣṭāyûṯ **Vol. 3:** 377
lêṣṭês **Vol. 3:** 377
lêṣṭyā' **Vol. 3:** 377
lᵉšûm **Vol. 3:** 1209
lᵉṭabbālā' **Vol. 3:** 448
lᵉwāṯ **Vol. 3:** 1205
lēwî **Vol. 2:** 466
lᵉyômā' **Vol. 1:** 251
lᵉzabbālā' **Vol. 3:** 448
lᵉzikkārôn **Vol. 3:** 239
lîḏē **Vol. 2:** 149
lîlîṯ **Vol. 1:** 451
limmaḏ **Vol. 3:** 760 f., 763 f., 766
lîn **Vol. 3:** 178, 255
lip̄nê **Vol. 3:** 1173, 1175
lip̄nê YHWH **Vol. 3:** 239, 422
liṣ **Vol. 1:** 194, 580
lišān **Vol. 3:** 1078
liškâh **Vol. 3:** 796
liwyāṯān **Vol. 1:** 670
lmd **Vol. 3:** 760 f.
lō' 'ammî **Vol. 2:** 581, 797
lō' ḥākām **Vol. 3:** 1024
lō' ḵiḥēḏû **Vol. 2:** 489
lō' nuppāh **Vol. 3:** 111
lō' ruḥāmâh **Vol. 2:** 581

lōṭ **Vol. 2:** 294
lû **Vol. 2:** 666
lû' **Vol. 2:** 666
lûn **Vol. 3:** 178
lûṣ **Vol. 1:** 580
Vol. 3: 29, 1024

m'ûm **Vol. 3:** 924
m'l **Vol. 3:** 587
mā'as **Vol. 1:** 455
mā'ēn **Vol. 3:** 1016, 1019
ma'al **Vol. 3:** 586
mā'al **Vol. 1:** 606, 609
Vol. 3: 585 f.
mā'ᵃmāḏ **Vol. 1:** 711
ma'ᵃmaqqîm **Vol. 2:** 197
ma'ᵃśēr **Vol. 2:** 693
Vol. 3: 416, 851
mā'ôn **Vol. 2:** 586
ma'yān **Vol. 3:** 985
mabbua' **Vol. 3:** 985
mabbûl **Vol. 3:** 991
māḏaḏ **Vol. 3:** 402
māḏôn **Vol. 3:** 346
māhaḥ **Vol. 2:** 773
Vol. 3: 227
māḥâh **Vol. 1:** 471
maḥᵃlâh **Vol. 3:** 999
maḥᵃlōqeṭ **Vol. 1:** 534
maḥᵃluyîm **Vol. 3:** 999
māhār **Vol. 1:** 251
maḥᵃšāḇâh **Vol. 3:** 125, 820
maḥᵃšeḇeṭ **Vol. 3:** 1027
maḥšāḵ **Vol. 3:** 859
maḵ'ôḇ **Vol. 3:** 999
mākar **Vol. 1:** 268
mal'āḵ **Vol. 1:** 104 f., 194
mālaḥ **Vol. 3:** 444
mālaḵ **Vol. 2:** 373
mālaṭ **Vol. 1:** 186
Vol. 3: 206, 209
mālē' **Vol. 1:** 734 f., 743
malᵉḵûṯ **Vol. 2:** 376, 389
malᵉḵûṯ šāmayim **Vol. 2:** 376
malᵉḵûṯ YHWH **Vol. 2:** 376
malkî-ṣeḏeq **Vol. 2:** 590
Vol. 3: 36
mamleḵeṯ kōhᵃnîm **Vol. 3:** 36
māmôn **Vol. 2:** 836
māmônā' **Vol. 2:** 836
mān **Vol. 1:** 252
mān hû' **Vol. 1:** 252
māna' **Vol. 2:** 222
mānâh **Vol. 2:** 303
Vol. 3: 823
mānôaḥ **Vol. 3:** 255
mānôṭ **Vol. 3:** 255
maptēaḥ **Vol. 2:** 730
māqaq **Vol. 1:** 689
Vol. 3: 559
māqôm **Vol. 1:** 538
Vol. 2: 191, 369
Vol. 3: 786 f.
māqôr **Vol. 3:** 985
mār **Vol. 2:** 513
mar'eh **Vol. 1:** 704
mārā' **Vol. 2:** 511, 514
mara' 'aṭa' ('aṭe') **Vol. 2:** 897
māraḏ **Vol. 1:** 606
mārâh **Vol. 1:** 589
māran **Vol. 2:** 513, 895
māran 'ᵃṯā' **Vol. 2:** 895
māranā' **Vol. 2:** 895
māranā' ṯā **Vol. 2:** 895
mārē' **Vol. 2:** 513 f.
mārē' 'ālᵉmā' **Vol. 2:** 514
mārî **Vol. 2:** 513 f.
Vol. 3: 115
mārôm **Vol. 2:** 199
māṣā' **Vol. 3:** 318, 528, 727
māšaḥ **Vol. 1:** 120 f.
Vol. 2: 335
mašâh **Vol. 2:** 636
māsāḵ **Vol. 3:** 794
māšāl **Vol. 2:** 202, 744–746, 757 f.
māšal **Vol. 1:** 165
Vol. 2: 518
māsar **Vol. 3:** 772, 1181
mašber **Vol. 3:** 858
māšîaḥ **Vol. 1:** 53, 63
Vol. 2: 334 f.
Vol. 3: 244
maśkîl **Vol. 3:** 766
maśkōreṯ **Vol. 3:** 139
māṣôr **Vol. 3:** 951
māsōreṯ **Vol. 1:** 63
Vol. 3: 772
mašrîṯā' **Vol. 1:** 295
maśśā' **Vol. 1:** 712
Vol. 3: 673
maṣṣāḇ **Vol. 1:** 711
massâh **Vol. 3:** 799
maṣṣēḇâh **Vol. 1:** 711
maṣṣeḇeṭ **Vol. 3:** 867
maṣṣôṯ **Vol. 1:** 249, 625 f., 628, 632 f.
Vol. 3: 422
maṭlā' **Vol. 2:** 745
maṭṭeh **Vol. 1:** 407 f.
Vol. 3: 870
māweṯ **Vol. 1:** 432
Vol. 3: 267, 388
mayim **Vol. 3:** 988
mazkîr **Vol. 3:** 233, 247
mazzîqîm **Vol. 1:** 451
meʿûrâh **Vol. 2:** 586
meʿārâh **Vol. 3:** 380
mēʿaṭ **Vol. 2:** 428
meʿaṭ mēʾᵉlōhîm **Vol. 2:** 502
meʿônâh **Vol. 2:** 586
meʿônēn **Vol. 2:** 554
meḇaqqēr **Vol. 1:** 190
Vol. 3: 196
meḇaśśēr **Vol. 2:** 109
meḇuḵâh **Vol. 2:** 416
meḏînā' **Vol. 3:** 456
meḥabbᵉlîm **Vol. 1:** 451
meḥîr **Vol. 3:** 139, 166, 190
meḵaššēp **Vol. 2:** 554
meḵes **Vol. 3:** 756
melaḥ **Vol. 3:** 444
melaḥᵃšîm **Vol. 2:** 554
meleḵ **Vol. 1:** 581
Vol. 2: 375 f., 390
mēlîṣ **Vol. 1:** 373
meʿlummāḏâh **Vol. 3:** 769
mêm **Vol. 3:** 488
mêmrā' **Vol. 1:** 63
Vol. 3: 1116, 1120
memšālâh **Vol. 1:** 165
Vol. 2: 607 f.
meʿnaḥᵃmîm **Vol. 1:** 89
meʿnaḥēš **Vol. 2:** 554
meʿnaṭ **Vol. 2:** 303
meʿnûḥâh **Vol. 3:** 255 f., 258
meʿqalᵉlîm **Vol. 1:** 416
meʿqôm haqqōḏeš **Vol. 3:** 787
meʿqôm miqdāšî **Vol. 3:** 786
meʿqôm qoḏšô **Vol. 3:** 786
meʿrōrâh **Vol. 2:** 27
meʿšārēṯ **Vol. 1:** 485
meʿšîḥā' **Vol. 2:** 334 f.
meʿšo'âh **Vol. 3:** 859
meʿṣôḏîm **Vol. 3:** 952
meʿšōmēm **Vol. 3:** 1006
meʿṣōrā' **Vol. 2:** 464
meʿśûkkâh **Vol. 3:** 950
meʿṣûlâh **Vol. 2:** 197
meʿṣûqâh **Vol. 2:** 663
mēṯ **Vol. 1:** 444
meʿṭabbal **Vol. 3:** 447
mēṭeḵa **Vol. 3:** 268
meʿṭurgām **Vol. 1:** 580
meʿṭurgᵉman **Vol. 3:** 485
meʿzimmâh **Vol. 3:** 820
mibbᵉśārî **Vol. 1:** 434, 672
Vol. 3: 178
mibbêṯ lᵉ **Vol. 3:** 794
miḏbār **Vol. 1:** 411
Vol. 3: 1004
middâh **Vol. 2:** 683
Vol. 3: 402
middōṯ **Vol. 1:** 580
miḏrāḵ **Vol. 2:** 369
miḏrāš **Vol. 1:** 64, 580 f.
Vol. 3: 483
miḏyān **Vol. 3:** 346
miḡdāl **Vol. 2:** 369
miḥyâh **Vol. 1:** 711
Vol. 2: 169
mîkā'ēl **Vol. 1:** 104
mikᵉsâh **Vol. 3:** 756
miksâh **Vol. 2:** 683
mikšôl **Vol. 2:** 705, 707
Vol. 3: 98, 856, 994
miktāḇ **Vol. 1:** 246
milḥāmâh **Vol. 1:** 645
Vol. 3: 959
millâh **Vol. 3:** 1087, 1120
millē' **Vol. 2:** 60
millᵉṯā' **Vol. 3:** 1120

millû'îm **Vol. 2:** 61
mîn **Vol. 1:** 534
Vol. 2: 35, 501
Vol. 3: 463
min **Vol. 2:** 312
Vol. 3: 178, 1181
min hā'ôlām wᵉ'aḏ hā'ôlām **Vol. 3:** 828
minḥâh **Vol. 1:** 250
Vol. 2: 41
Vol. 3: 38, 421 f., 431 f., 434
minyān **Vol. 2:** 683
miplāś **Vol. 1:** 503
miqdāš **Vol. 2:** 224
Vol. 3: 786
miqdaš 'ᵉlōhâw **Vol. 3:** 786
miqdāšî **Vol. 3:** 786
miqneh **Vol. 2:** 837
miqrā' **Vol. 1:** 272
Vol. 3: 485
miqweh **Vol. 2:** 773
miškāḇ **Vol. 2:** 586 f.
miškān **Vol. 3:** 811
miskēn **Vol. 2:** 822
miskēnuṯ **Vol. 2:** 822
mišnâh **Vol. 1:** 54, 64
mišpāḥâh **Vol. 2:** 698, 789
Vol. 3: 870 f.
mišpāḥôṯ **Vol. 1:** 194
mispār **Vol. 1:** 574 f.
Vol. 2: 683
mišpāṭ **Vol. 2:** 777
Vol. 3: 354, 359
mispô' **Vol. 1:** 743
misrayim **Vol. 1:** 530
mišteh **Vol. 2:** 576
Vol. 3: 745
miswâh **Vol. 1:** 331–333
mittaḇal **Vol. 3:** 447
miṯṯâh **Vol. 1:** 408
miṯṯᵉḇel **Vol. 3:** 447
mizbēaḥ **Vol. 3:** 418
mizmôr **Vol. 3:** 671, 673
mizreh **Vol. 1:** 685
mlk **Vol. 2:** 389
mlṯ **Vol. 3:** 253
mō'znayim **Vol. 3:** 1160
mō'znayyā' **Vol. 3:** 1160
mô'ēḏ **Vol. 1:** 294, 626
Vol. 3: 835, 1040–1042
mōhar **Vol. 2:** 578
môḵîaḥ **Vol. 1:** 373
môleḏeṯ **Vol. 1:** 181
mōleḵ **Vol. 2:** 375
môpēṯ **Vol. 2:** 350, 627, 633
mōqēš **Vol. 2:** 705, 707
mōr, môr **Vol. 2:** 294
môreh **Vol. 3:** 766
mōšeh **Vol. 2:** 635
môšᵉḵôṯ **Vol. 3:** 950
môsēr **Vol. 3:** 591
môšîa' **Vol. 3:** 217
mōṣôq **Vol. 2:** 663
mŝḥ **Vol. 1:** 124
mûl **Vol. 1:** 307
mûsāḏ **Vol. 3:** 388
mûsar **Vol. 3:** 1027
mûsār **Vol. 3:** 776 f.
muṣṣāḇ **Vol. 3:** 951
mûssāḏ **Vol. 3:** 388
mûṯ **Vol. 1:** 429 f., 432
mûṯ **Vol. 3:** 559

nā' **Vol. 2:** 860
nā'âh **Vol. 2:** 669
nā'aḇ **Vol. 1:** 498
Vol. 2: 582
nā'aq **Vol. 2:** 423
nā'ar **Vol. 3:** 560
nā'aṣ **Vol. 3:** 341
nā'weh **Vol. 2:** 668
nā'al **Vol. 2:** 730
na'ar **Vol. 1:** 281, 283
Vol. 2: 675
na'ᵃrâh **Vol. 3:** 1071 f.
nāḇā' **Vol. 3:** 77
nāḇal **Vol. 3:** 1024 f.
nāḇāl **Vol. 3:** 1024 f., 1037
nāḇaṭ **Vol. 3:** 126
nāḇî' **Vol. 3:** 77
nāḇôn **Vol. 3:** 351
nāḏaḇ **Vol. 3:** 821
nāḏâh **Vol. 1:** 414
nāḏān **Vol. 3:** 139
nāḏar **Vol. 1:** 344
nāḏîḇ **Vol. 3:** 821
nāḡa' **Vol. 2:** 349
Vol. 3: 860
nāḡaḏ **Vol. 3:** 45
nāḡah **Vol. 2:** 485
nāḡan **Vol. 3:** 671
nāḡaṯ **Vol. 2:** 705
nāḡaś **Vol. 2:** 53, 349
nāhal **Vol. 3:** 255
naḥal **Vol. 3:** 985
naḥᵃlâh **Vol. 2:** 298, 300
Vol. 3: 140
naḥᵃlaṯ YHWH **Vol. 3:** 140
naḥam **Vol. 2:** 421
nāḥam **Vol. 2:** 423
nāḥam **Vol. 1:** 356, 569
Vol. 3: 155, 255
nāḥār **Vol. 3:** 985
nāḥāš **Vol. 1:** 509
naḥaṯ **Vol. 3:** 255
nāḵā' **Vol. 3:** 109
nāḵeh **Vol. 2:** 414
nāḵōaḥ **Vol. 3:** 1028
nāmaqqû **Vol. 3:** 559
nāṗal **Vol. 1:** 608
Vol. 2: 863
nāṗaṣ **Vol. 2:** 33 f.
nāṗaš **Vol. 3:** 255
naṗšām **Vol. 3:** 158
naṗšô **Vol. 3:** 420
nāqaḇ **Vol. 3:** 341
nāqam **Vol. 3:** 93, 134
nāqām **Vol. 3:** 93
nāqaṗ **Vol. 3:** 178
nāqî **Vol. 2:** 144
Vol. 3: 103, 355
nāqî' **Vol. 3:** 355
nāśā' **Vol. 1:** 587, 698, 743
Vol. 2: 201
Vol. 3: 152, 177, 266, 559, 747, 821, 1195
nāśā' pānîm **Vol. 2:** 622
nāšā' **Vol. 2:** 666
nāṣaḇ **Vol. 3:** 951
nāṣaḥ **Vol. 1:** 650
nāsâh **Vol. 3:** 799 f.
nāsaḵ **Vol. 1:** 476
Vol. 2: 854
nāṣal **Vol. 3:** 201, 211
nāšal **Vol. 3:** 177
nāšaq **Vol. 2:** 876
nāṣar **Vol. 2:** 132, 134, 349
Vol. 3: 201
nāsî **Vol. 1:** 165
nāśî' **Vol. 2:** 562
nāṭâh **Vol. 1:** 407
Vol. 2: 199
Vol. 3: 870
nāṭan **Vol. 2:** 41, 69, 367, 587
nāṭar **Vol. 3:** 177, 183
nāṭaṣ **Vol. 3:** 178
nāṭaš **Vol. 3:** 560
nāzâh **Vol. 1:** 144, 152, 225
nāzal **Vol. 1:** 683
Vol. 3: 988
nāzar **Vol. 1:** 405
nāzîr **Vol. 2:** 224
nᵉ'āqâh **Vol. 2:** 423 f.
ne'aṣâh **Vol. 3:** 341
nᵉ'um YHWH **Vol. 2:** 173
Vol. 3: 1098
nᵉḇālâh **Vol. 3:** 1024 f.
nᵉḇēlāṯî **Vol. 3:** 268
nᵉḇî'îm **Vol. 3:** 485
nebraštā' **Vol. 2:** 485
nᵉḏaḇâh **Vol. 1:** 344, 534
Vol. 3: 423
nēḏer **Vol. 1:** 344
Vol. 2: 41
Vol. 3: 423
neḡeḇ **Vol. 3:** 1004
nᵉḡînâh **Vol. 3:** 669
nᵉḡînôṯ **Vol. 3:** 673
nᵉhar **Vol. 3:** 985
nᵉḥōšeṯ **Vol. 2:** 97
nepēš **Vol. 1:** 444, 495, 548, 555, 612
Vol. 2: 158, 181, 477 f., 565
Vol. 3: 158, 234, 420, 679 f., 687–689
nᵉqāmâh **Vol. 3:** 93
nᵉqēḇâh **Vol. 2:** 569
nᵉqûddâh **Vol. 3:** 182
nēs **Vol. 2:** 350
nēṣaḥ **Vol. 1:** 650
nᵉšāmâh **Vol. 3:** 680, 690, 707
neseḵ **Vol. 3:** 423

nēṣer **Vol. 2:** 333
Vol. 3: 867
nešer **Vol. 1:** 172
nᵉṣûrê **Vol. 1:** 685
nēṭaḥ **Vol. 1:** 230
nēzer **Vol. 1:** 405
niddaḥ **Vol. 1:** 685
niddûy **Vol. 1:** 414
niḥam **Vol. 1:** 357
Vol. 3: 149, 152
nînᵉwēh **Vol. 2:** 679
niplā'ôṯ **Vol. 2:** 622
niqqᵉpû **Vol. 3:** 178
nirpaś **Vol. 3:** 950
niškâḥ **Vol. 3:** 796
nissāḥôn **Vol. 1:** 648
nō'am **Vol. 2:** 485
nôaḥ **Vol. 3:** 255
nōaḥ **Vol. 2:** 681
nokrî **Vol. 2:** 360, 684, 687
Vol. 2: 742
nōpeh **Vol. 3:** 396
nôrā' **Vol. 2:** 622
Vol. 3: 318
nôrā'ôṯ **Vol. 3:** 318
nosrî **Vol. 2:** 333
nṣrṯ **Vol. 2:** 333 f.
nûaḥ **Vol. 2:** 681
Vol. 3: 254–256, 258
nûḇ **Vol. 1:** 683
nûḏ **Vol. 2:** 422 f.
nûs **Vol. 1:** 558 f.
nûš **Vol. 3:** 859

pā'âh **Vol. 2:** 767
pā'al **Vol. 3:** 350, 1148, 1156
pa'am **Vol. 2:** 716
pāḏâh **Vol. 3:** 190, 192–194, 201 f., 223
pāḥaḏ **Vol. 1:** 622
Vol. 3: 557
pālā' **Vol. 2:** 622
pālal **Vol. 2:** 862 f.
pālaṭ **Vol. 3:** 201, 248
pallēṭ **Vol. 3:** 192
pānîm **Vol. 1:** 211, 585 f.
Vol. 2: 622
pāqaḏ **Vol. 1:** 189, 332 f.
Vol. 3: 93, 134
pāqaḥ **Vol. 2:** 726
pāqîḥ **Vol. 1:** 190
pāraḏ **Vol. 1:** 472
pārâh **Vol. 2:** 128
pāraq **Vol. 3:** 192
pārar **Vol. 3:** 166, 583
pāraṣ **Vol. 3:** 377, 950
pāraš **Vol. 1:** 581
Vol. 2: 810
Vol. 3: 760
pārāšâh **Vol. 3:** 69
pardēs **Vol. 2:** 761
pārîṣ **Vol. 3:** 377
parnāsîm **Vol. 3:** 545
parnēs **Vol. 3:** 545
pārōḵeṭ **Vol. 3:** 794
pārûš **Vol. 2:** 810
parzel **Vol. 2:** 97
pāša' **Vol. 1:** 606
pāsaḥ **Vol. 1:** 632
pāṣâh **Vol. 2:** 726
Vol. 3: 192, 201
pāṣaḥ **Vol. 3:** 673
pāšar **Vol. 1:** 581
pāšaṭ **Vol. 1:** 581
pasḥā' **Vol. 1:** 632
pāṯâh **Vol. 2:** 458
pāṯaḥ **Vol. 1:** 581
Vol. 2: 726
Vol. 3: 177
pāṯar **Vol. 1:** 581
paṯbaḡ **Vol. 2:** 521
pᵉ'ullâh **Vol. 3:** 139
pᵉḏûyîm **Vol. 3:** 190
pᵉḡa'îm **Vol. 1:** 451
peh **Vol. 2:** 726
pele' **Vol. 3:** 503
pᵉlištîm **Vol. 2:** 124
pᵉnîmî **Vol. 3:** 794
pᵉnînîm **Vol. 3:** 395
pᵉqûḏâh **Vol. 1:** 189
pᵉquddâh **Vol. 1:** 189, 333
Vol. 2: 684, 777
pᵉraq **Vol. 3:** 192
pᵉraqlēṭ **Vol. 1:** 89
pērēḵ **Vol. 3:** 711
pereṣ **Vol. 3:** 950
pᵉrî **Vol. 1:** 721
pᵉrîšayyā' **Vol. 2:** 810
peša' **Vol. 3:** 574, 577, 586
pᵉšā'îm **Vol. 1:** 555
pesaḥ **Vol. 1:** 626, 628, 632
pᵉšar **Vol. 1:** 65
pᵉšaṭ **Vol. 3:** 488
pēšer **Vol. 1:** 581, 629
peṯaḥ **Vol. 2:** 29 f.
pᵉṯaḥ **Vol. 2:** 560, 729
peṯî **Vol. 1:** 281
Vol. 3: 1024
piḏyôm **Vol. 3:** 190
piḏyôn **Vol. 3:** 190
pillēl **Vol. 3:** 152
pinnaṯ **Vol. 3:** 388
piqqûḏîm **Vol. 1:** 332 f.
pišrô **Vol. 3:** 487
pissēaḥ **Vol. 2:** 415
plṭ **Vol. 3:** 253
pō'al **Vol. 3:** 139
pqd **Vol. 1:** 332 f.
ptb **Vol. 3:** 268
pûṣ **Vol. 2:** 33

qāḇar **Vol. 1:** 264
qāḇaṣ **Vol. 3:** 745
qabbālâh **Vol. 3:** 1121
qāḏar **Vol. 2:** 422
qāḏôš **Vol. 2:** 224
Vol. 3: 101, 104, 787
qāhāl **Vol. 1:** 292–298, 302, 304 f., 641
Vol. 2: 796, 800
Vol. 3: 670
qālal **Vol. 3:** 29
qallēl **Vol. 1:** 415 f.
qan'ān **Vol. 3:** 1167
qānâh **Vol. 1:** 380
Vol. 2: 649
Vol. 3: 192
qānēh **Vol. 3:** 399
qārā' **Vol. 1:** 271, 409–411
Vol. 3: 823
qāraḇ **Vol. 1:** 322
Vol. 2: 53
Vol. 3: 860
qārâh **Vol. 3:** 48, 50 f.
qārōḇ **Vol. 2:** 53
qāšâh **Vol. 2:** 154
qāṣar **Vol. 3:** 525
qāṣeh **Vol. 2:** 60, 303
qāṣîn **Vol. 1:** 165
qāṣîr **Vol. 3:** 525 f.
qāṭāḇkā **Vol. 3:** 267
qāṭān **Vol. 2:** 428, 675
qaṭêḡôr **Vol. 1:** 83
qāṭêḡôr **Vol. 1:** 83
qāṭōn **Vol. 2:** 428, 675
qāw **Vol. 2:** 239
qāwâh **Vol. 2:** 239 f., 772 f.
qayiṣ **Vol. 2:** 432
qeḇer **Vol. 1:** 264
Vol. 3: 238
qᵉḇûrâh **Vol. 1:** 264
Vol. 3: 238 f.
qeḏem **Vol. 1:** 164, 665
qᵉḏēšôṯ **Vol. 1:** 625
qᵉhillā' **Vol. 1:** 295 f.
qᵉlālâh **Vol. 1:** 416
qᵉrē' **Vol. 3:** 487
qeren **Vol. 1:** 721
Vol. 3: 714
qereš **Vol. 3:** 795
qēṣ **Vol. 2:** 56, 60 f., 432
Vol. 3: 835
qᵉṣāṯ **Vol. 2:** 60
qeṣeṗ **Vol. 1:** 108
qešeṭ **Vol. 3:** 1002
qᵉṭōreṭ **Vol. 2:** 293
qhl **Vol. 1:** 307
Vol. 2: 805
qibbēl **Vol. 3:** 748, 1181
qiddûš **Vol. 2:** 522
qin'âh **Vol. 1:** 558
qinyān **Vol. 1:** 381
qîr **Vol. 3:** 948
qiryâh **Vol. 2:** 802
qiṭrēg **Vol. 1:** 83
qiṯṯēr **Vol. 2:** 293
qōḏeš **Vol. 1:** 272
Vol. 3: 786
qodšô **Vol. 3:** 786
qôl **Vol. 1:** 292
Vol. 2: 174, 863
Vol. 3: 51, 113

qōmâh **Vol. 2:** 199
qômâh **Vol. 1:** 92
qôm^{e}miyyûṯ **Vol. 2:** 735
qôr **Vol. 1:** 318
qôrâh **Vol. 3:** 948
qorbān **Vol. 2:** 41, 43
Vol. 3: 423
qôṣ **Vol. 3:** 182
qôṣâh **Vol. 3:** 182
qōsēm q^{e}sāmîm **Vol. 2:** 554
qr' **Vol. 3:** 543
qsr nrwn **Vol. 2:** 684
qûm **Vol. 2:** 773
Vol. 3: 224, 226, 279
quppâh **Vol. 3:** 545
qwh **Vol. 2:** 246

r'š **Vol. 3:** 743
rā'âh **Vol. 2:** 395, 488 f.
Vol. 3: 126, 318, 513, 569 f.
ra' **Vol. 1:** 459, 562, 565
Vol. 2: 103
Vol. 3: 1087
rā'aḇ **Vol. 2:** 265
rā'âh **Vol. 1:** 258, 451, 562
Vol. 3: 564, 569
rā'aṗ **Vol. 1:** 683
rā'aš **Vol. 3:** 556 f.
rā'ēḇ **Vol. 2:** 265
ra'yôn **Vol. 3:** 820
raḇ **Vol. 3:** 115, 766, 889
rāḇâh **Vol. 1:** 732
Vol. 2: 130
rāḇaṣ **Vol. 2:** 349, 586
Vol. 3: 255
rabbaṯ **Vol. 2:** 511
rabbî **Vol. 1:** 67
Vol. 3: 115, 766 f.
rabbî ûmārî **Vol. 3:** 116
rabbîm **Vol. 1:** 95 f.
Vol. 2: 800
Vol. 3: 195 f.
rabbûnî **Vol. 3:** 115
rabym **Vol. 3:** 196
rāḏaṗ **Vol. 2:** 805
rāḡa' **Vol. 3:** 255
rāḡaz **Vol. 3:** 557
raḥaḇ **Vol. 1:** 670
Vol. 3: 29
raḥam **Vol. 2:** 116
rāḥam **Vol. 2:** 594
rāḥām **Vol. 1:** 172
raḥ^{a}mîm **Vol. 2:** 105, 594, 598 f.
rāḥaq **Vol. 2:** 53
rāḥaṣ **Vol. 1:** 144, 151 f., 225
rānan **Vol. 2:** 353, 355
Vol. 3: 668
rāṗā' **Vol. 2:** 167
rāṗâh **Vol. 3:** 255
rāṗaś **Vol. 3:** 950
rāqîa' **Vol. 1:** 523
rāš **Vol. 2:** 820, 822
rāšā' **Vol. 2:** 370
Vol. 3: 577
rāšâh **Vol. 2:** 817
Vol. 3: 177, 745
rāṣôn **Vol. 2:** 116–118, 818
Vol. 3: 745
rāšûṯ **Vol. 2:** 608
rāwaḥ **Vol. 3:** 255
rāz **Vol. 3:** 502 f.
rāzîm **Vol. 1:** 578
rb **Vol. 3:** 196
rē'šîṯ **Vol. 1:** 165
Vol. 3: 415
rēa' **Vol. 1:** 255, 258 f.
Vol. 2: 548, 739, 803
Vol. 3: 820
rēḇeṣ **Vol. 2:** 586
Vol. 3: 255
reḡa' **Vol. 3:** 255, 827
r^{e}ḡaz **Vol. 2:** 653
reḡeš **Vol. 2:** 653
rēqā' **Vol. 1:** 417 f.
rêqā' **Vol. 1:** 417
r^{e}šā'îm **Vol. 2:** 829
r^{e}shûṯā' **Vol. 2:** 608
r^{e}šûṯ **Vol. 2:** 608
r^{e}šûyôṯ **Vol. 2:** 608
rḥm **Vol. 2:** 544, 598 f.
ri'šôn **Vol. 1:** 165, 665, 667
rîḇ **Vol. 2:** 363
Vol. 3: 93, 346, 355, 820, 1050 f.
ribbōnô šel 'ôlām **Vol. 2:** 514
riḡšā' **Vol. 2:** 653
riḥam **Vol. 3:** 152
rinnâh **Vol. 2:** 860
rîq **Vol. 1:** 417, 546
rō'eh **Vol. 3:** 77
rō'š **Vol. 1:** 165, 665
Vol. 2: 27, 157 f., 683
Vol. 3: 388
rōḇ **Vol. 1:** 732
Vol. 2: 842
rōḡez **Vol. 1:** 108
Vol. 2: 652
rûa' **Vol. 3:** 50, 816
rûaḥ **Vol. 1:** 102, 451, 672, 674
Vol. 2: 479, 565
Vol. 3: 125, 680, 690 f., 694, 708
rûḥôṯ **Vol. 1:** 102, 674
rûm **Vol. 2:** 199, 201
Vol. 3: 29
ruqqamtî **Vol. 1:** 712
rûṣ **Vol. 3:** 946
rwb **Vol. 3:** 196

sāḡar **Vol. 2:** 730
sāḵal **Vol. 3:** 1024 f.
sāḵan **Vol. 3:** 760
sālaḥ **Vol. 1:** 698
Vol. 3: 149, 152, 155, 157
sālal **Vol. 3:** 951
sāmaḵ yāḏayim **Vol. 2:** 151
sanheḏrîn **Vol. 1:** 363
sāṗaḏ **Vol. 2:** 417
sāṗar **Vol. 1:** 574
Vol. 3: 52, 478
sappaḥaṯ **Vol. 2:** 465
sārîs **Vol. 1:** 560
sarsōr **Vol. 1:** 374
sāṯam **Vol. 3:** 950
sātān **Vol. 3:** 468
sāṭāna' **Vol. 3:** 468
ṣdq **Vol. 3:** 358
s^{e}'ārâh **Vol. 3:** 266, 559
s^{e}ḡiḏ **Vol. 2:** 876
s^{e}ḡullâh **Vol. 2:** 297 f., 838–840
seḵel **Vol. 3:** 1024
sela' **Vol. 3:** 381
s^{e}lîḥâh **Vol. 3:** 156
sēmān **Vol. 3:** 904
semel **Vol. 2:** 287
sēmel **Vol. 2:** 287
s^{e}mîḵâh **Vol. 3:** 115
s^{e}nêgôr **Vol. 1:** 83
sēper **Vol. 1:** 243, 246, 505
Vol. 3: 483
s^{e}ṯar **Vol. 3:** 177
sētîm **Vol. 3:** 583
siḡ **Vol. 3:** 808
siḵlûṯ **Vol. 3:** 1024
sînay **Vol. 3:** 1013
sôḏ **Vol. 1:** 611, 712
Vol. 3: 311, 502 f.
sōl^{e}lâh **Vol. 3:** 951
sōleṯ **Vol. 3:** 422
sōmēm **Vol. 1:** 75
sôpēr, sōpēr **Vol. 1:** 64
Vol. 3: 247, 478 f., 485
sōp^{e}rîm **Vol. 3:** 478
sr' **Vol. 3:** 447
sry **Vol. 3:** 447
sûḡ **Vol. 3:** 950
sûḵ **Vol. 1:** 120 f.
sukkâh **Vol. 3:** 811
sûr **Vol. 1:** 606
Vol. 3: 166, 583
sûṯ **Vol. 3:** 557

ṣā'îr **Vol. 2:** 675
ṣā'aq **Vol. 1:** 409 f.
ṣāḇā' **Vol. 1:** 522
Vol. 2: 602, 684
ṣāḇâh **Vol. 3:** 959
ṣāḏaq **Vol. 2:** 144
Vol. 3: 355, 376, 924
ṣaddîq **Vol. 3:** 354, 357, 366, 766
ṣāḏaq **Vol. 3:** 439
ṣāhal **Vol. 1:** 411
ṣaḥ **Vol. 2:** 777
ṣāḥaḥ **Vol. 2:** 485
ṣāḥaq **Vol. 2:** 430–432
ṣalmāweṯ **Vol. 3:** 554
ṣāmē' **Vol. 2:** 265
ṣāmeḵ **Vol. 3:** 488
ṣāṗâh **Vol. 3:** 126
ṣar **Vol. 1:** 553

Vol. 2: 663, 807
ṣāra' **Vol. 2:** 464
ṣāra'aṯ **Vol. 2:** 464 f.
ṣārâh **Vol. 2:** 423, 663
ṣārar **Vol. 2:** 807
ṣāreḇeṯ **Vol. 2:** 288
ṣārûa' **Vol. 2:** 464
ṣdq **Vol. 3:** 354, 356–358, 376 f.
ṣᵉḇā' **Vol. 3:** 821
ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ **Vol. 2:** 69, 602
Vol. 3: 717, 959
ṣᵉḏāqâh **Vol. 2:** 363, 594 f., 777
Vol. 3: 354, 357 f., 375 f., 766
ṣeḏeq **Vol. 1:** 581
Vol. 2: 591
Vol. 3: 354, 376
ṣēl **Vol. 3:** 554
ṣᵉla' **Vol. 2:** 863
ṣᵉlēm **Vol. 1:** 706
Vol. 2: 287
ṣelem **Vol. 2:** 287, 502
Vol. 3: 904
ṣemaḥ **Vol. 3:** 867, 870
ṣemeḏ **Vol. 3:** 1161
ṣidqōṯ YHWH **Vol. 3:** 356
ṣippôr **Vol. 1:** 172
ṣîr **Vol. 1:** 194
Vol. 3: 858
ṣiwwâh **Vol. 1:** 331, 333
ṣiyyâh **Vol. 2:** 265
ṣiyyôn **Vol. 2:** 324
ṣō'n **Vol. 2:** 412 f.
Vol. 3: 564
ṣōrēr **Vol. 3:** 468
ṣûḏ **Vol. 3:** 952
ṣûm **Vol. 1:** 612
ṣûr **Vol. 3:** 381, 399
ṣûrî **Vol. 3:** 178
ṣwh **Vol. 1:** 331
ṣwwḥ **Vol. 1:** 409

śāḇa' **Vol. 1:** 734, 743
śāḇar **Vol. 2:** 239
śāḡaḇ **Vol. 3:** 192
śāḥaq **Vol. 2:** 430 f.
śāḵaḵ **Vol. 3:** 950
śāḵal **Vol. 2:** 397
Vol. 3: 125, 1025
śāḵār **Vol. 3:** 138–140
śaḵîr **Vol. 3:** 139
śāmaḥ **Vol. 2:** 355–357, 430
śānē' **Vol. 1:** 555
śār **Vol. 3:** 468
śar **Vol. 1:** 102, 165
Vol. 2: 376
śārâ **Vol. 1:** 80
śāraḏ **Vol. 3:** 248
śārâḥ **Vol. 1:** 80
Vol. 2: 305
śāraṗ **Vol. 3:** 255
śārar **Vol. 2:** 305
śārîḏ **Vol. 3:** 248, 251
śāśōn **Vol. 2:** 356
śāṭâh **Vol. 3:** 583
śāṭān **Vol. 3:** 468 f.
śᵉ'ēṯ **Vol. 2:** 465
śᵉ'îr **Vol. 1:** 451
śᵉḥôq **Vol. 2:** 431, 433
śᵉḵār ha-niṣṣāḥôn **Vol. 1:** 648
śeḵel **Vol. 3:** 1027, 1029
śeḵer **Vol. 3:** 139
śᵉmō'l **Vol. 2:** 148
śᵉrāpîm **Vol. 1:** 509
śîaḥ **Vol. 1:** 574
Vol. 2: 140
śîḇ **Vol. 1:** 196
śiddîm **Vol. 3:** 444
śîm **Vol. 1:** 696
śimḥâh **Vol. 2:** 356 f.
śîś **Vol. 2:** 355 f.
śûḵ **Vol. 3:** 950

š'r **Vol. 3:** 254
šā'aḡ **Vol. 3:** 324
šā'âh **Vol. 3:** 112, 859
šā'al **Vol. 2:** 856, 879
šā'al bᵉšālôm **Vol. 2:** 779
šā'an **Vol. 3:** 255
šā'ar **Vol. 3:** 248
šā'ōn **Vol. 3:** 859
šā'an **Vol. 3:** 255
ša'ar **Vol. 2:** 29
šāḇa' **Vol. 1:** 344
Vol. 3: 474, 739
šāḇâh **Vol. 3:** 590
šāḇaḥ **Vol. 3:** 816
šāḇar **Vol. 3:** 109
šāḇaṯ **Vol. 3:** 255 f., 405 f.
šabbāṯ **Vol. 1:** 625
Vol. 3: 255 f., 405
šabbāṯôn **Vol. 3:** 255
šāḏaḏ **Vol. 3:** 377, 859
šadday **Vol. 2:** 67, 87, 513
Vol. 3: 717, 729
šāhâh **Vol. 2:** 876
šāhaḥ **Vol. 2:** 260
šaḥaṣ **Vol. 3:** 30
šaḥaṯ **Vol. 1:** 470
Vol. 3: 262
šāḥaṯ **Vol. 1:** 468, 470
šāḥōr **Vol. 1:** 203
šāḵaḇ **Vol. 1:** 442
Vol. 2: 586
šāḵan **Vol. 1:** 272, 380
Vol. 3: 255
šāḵēn **Vol. 3:** 255
šālâh **Vol. 3:** 341
šālaḥ **Vol. 1:** 127, 246, 475, 581
Vol. 3: 860
šālēm **Vol. 1:** 734
Vol. 2: 60, 65, 592 f.
Vol. 3: 134, 422
šālîaḥ **Vol. 1:** 127–134, 194
Vol. 3: 746
šallîṭ **Vol. 2:** 512
šālôm **Vol. 1:** 208, 211, 213
Vol. 2: 169, 237, 357, 593, 777–780, 782 f.
Vol. 3: 422, 448, 528
šālû **Vol. 3:** 341
šālûaḥ **Vol. 1:** 127 f.
šalwâh **Vol. 2:** 777
šāma' **Vol. 1:** 340
Vol. 2: 172 f., 175, 179, 395
šāmam **Vol. 2:** 622
šāmar **Vol. 2:** 132, 134, 778
šāmaṯ **Vol. 1:** 698
šamayim **Vol. 1:** 75
Vol. 2: 71, 191, 376 f., 652
šāmēm **Vol. 1:** 75, 530
Vol. 3: 1004–1006
šāmᵉrîm **Vol. 3:** 451
šāmîr **Vol. 1:** 743
šānâh **Vol. 1:** 64
Vol. 3: 1126
šāpâh **Vol. 3:** 870
šāpaḵ **Vol. 2:** 854
šāpal **Vol. 2:** 260
šāpaṯ **Vol. 1:** 503
Vol. 2: 363
Vol. 3: 355
šāqaḏ **Vol. 2:** 136 f.
šāqâh **Vol. 2:** 274
šāqaṯ **Vol. 2:** 777
Vol. 3: 255
šāqēḏ **Vol. 3:** 1096
šāraṯ **Vol. 3:** 673
šaṯ **Vol. 3:** 350
šāṭâh **Vol. 2:** 274
šāṭar **Vol. 3:** 477
šāw' **Vol. 1:** 550
šaw'âh **Vol. 2:** 860
šāwa' **Vol. 2:** 423
šāwâh **Vol. 1:** 580
šb' **Vol. 3:** 743
šbt **Vol. 3:** 414
še **Vol. 3:** 729
še'ār **Vol. 3:** 248 f., 254
še'ār yāšûḇ **Vol. 3:** 249
še'ēlâh **Vol. 2:** 879
še'ēr **Vol. 1:** 672 f., 675
še'ēr bᵉśārô **Vol. 1:** 675
še'ērîṯ **Vol. 3:** 248
še'ôl **Vol. 1:** 264, 523
Vol. 2: 206
Vol. 3: 262, 267
šeᶜārîm **Vol. 2:** 802
šeḇa' **Vol. 2:** 690
Vol. 3: 739
šebbᵉ'alpē **Vol. 3:** 488
šebbiḵtaḇ **Vol. 3:** 488
šeḇeṭ **Vol. 3:** 255
šeḇeṭ **Vol. 3:** 870
šēḇeṭ **Vol. 1:** 407
Vol. 3: 870
šᵉḇî **Vol. 3:** 590
šᵉḇô **Vol. 3:** 396
šᵉḇû'âh **Vol. 3:** 739
šeḏ **Vol. 1:** 451

šᵉḏûḏâh **Vol. 3:** 859
šᵉḵābâh **Vol. 2:** 586
Vol. 3: 255
šᵉḵem **Vol. 3:** 458
šeḵer **Vol. 3:** 859
šᵉḵînâh **Vol. 1:** 586
Vol. 2: 377
šᵉḵōḇeṯ **Vol. 2:** 587
šᵉlāmîm **Vol. 3:** 422 f., 425
šᵉlēṭ **Vol. 3:** 570, 860
šᵉlîṯ **Vol. 2:** 487
šᵉlōmōh **Vol. 3:** 605
šēm **Vol. 1:** 68, 272
Vol. 2: 71, 88, 190, 649 f., 652, 654
Vol. 3: 233, 237, 1209
šēma' **Vol. 2:** 173, 177
šᵉma' **Vol. 2:** 720, 864
šᵉma' yiśrā'ēl **Vol. 2:** 173
šᵉmayîn **Vol. 3:** 1006
šemen **Vol. 2:** 710
šemeš **Vol. 3:** 731
šᵉmiṭṭâh **Vol. 2:** 667
šᵉmōneh 'eśrēh **Vol. 2:** 864
šᵉmû'âh **Vol. 2:** 173
šēnā' **Vol. 1:** 442
šenne'ᵉmar **Vol. 3:** 487
šepā' **Vol. 2:** 842
šᵉpār **Vol. 2:** 815
šeqel **Vol. 3:** 752
šeqer **Vol. 2:** 470
Vol. 3: 574–576
šᵉrā' **Vol. 1:** 167
Vol. 2: 732
Vol. 3: 177, 188
šērēṯ **Vol. 3:** 551
šeṯeṯ **Vol. 3:** 991
šēziḇ **Vol. 3:** 192, 201
šibbōleṯ **Vol. 3:** 867
šiḡyōnôṯ **Vol. 3:** 673
šiḵbaṯ-zera' **Vol. 2:** 586
šiḵmâh **Vol. 2:** 730
šillēm **Vol. 3:** 420, 422
šilōaḥ **Vol. 1:** 581
šimᵃmâh **Vol. 3:** 1005
šiqqûṣ **Vol. 1:** 74 f.
Vol. 3: 1006
šîr **Vol. 2:** 357
Vol. 3: 668, 669, 671–673, 816
šîrâh **Vol. 3:** 673
šlm **Vol. 2:** 778
Vol. 3: 607
šō'ēl 'ôḇ **Vol. 2:** 554
šôḏ **Vol. 3:** 729, 859
šôḏēḏ **Vol. 3:** 377
šoltānā' **Vol. 2:** 607
šōmēm **Vol. 1:** 74
šômᵉrîm **Vol. 3:** 451
šômᵉrôn **Vol. 3:** 449
šôpār **Vol. 3:** 873
šōqēḏ **Vol. 3:** 1096
šōreš **Vol. 3:** 867
šōṭēr **Vol. 3:** 477
šōṭᵉrîm **Vol. 1:** 196
šqr **Vol. 3:** 587
šûa' **Vol. 2:** 69, 332
šûḇ **Vol. 1:** 354, 357 f., 362
Vol. 2: 222
Vol. 3: 134, 146, 255, 823, 933
šûr **Vol. 1:** 694

tā'âh **Vol. 2:** 458
Vol. 3: 801
tabbel **Vol. 3:** 447
taḇnîṯ **Vol. 1:** 706
Vol. 2: 501 f.
Vol. 3: 904
tāḡā' **Vol. 3:** 182
taḥᵃlû'îm **Vol. 3:** 999
taḥᵃnûn **Vol. 2:** 860, 863
taḥᵃnûnîm **Vol. 2:** 117
taḥaṯ **Vol. 2:** 586
taḥbûlôṯ **Vol. 1:** 194
taḥtî **Vol. 2:** 197
tālâh **Vol. 1:** 393
talmîḏ **Vol. 1:** 69, 481, 485–488
talmiḏîm **Vol. 3:** 767
talmûḏ **Vol. 1:** 69
Vol. 3: 769
tām **Vol. 2:** 60 f., 144, 487
Vol. 3: 924
tāmâh **Vol. 2:** 622
tāmaḵ **Vol. 1:** 663
Vol. 3: 350
tāmam **Vol. 1:** 734
Vol. 2: 60
tamhûy **Vol. 3:** 545
tāmîm **Vol. 2:** 60 f., 65, 144, 782
Vol. 3: 923 f.
tanna'îm **Vol. 1:** 69
tannîn **Vol. 1:** 670
tannînîm gᵉḏōlîm **Vol. 1:** 670
tāpēl **Vol. 3:** 1024
targēm **Vol. 1:** 69, 580 f.
targûm **Vol. 1:** 69
tāśîm **Vol. 3:** 420
tbl **Vol. 3:** 447
tᵉ'ēnâh **Vol. 1:** 723
tēḇēl **Vol. 3:** 448
tᵉḇûnâh **Vol. 2:** 287
Vol. 3: 130, 1027
tᵉhillâh **Vol. 3:** 926
tᵉhillâh **Vol. 1:** 164
Vol. 3: 669
tᵉhinnâh **Vol. 2:** 860, 863
tᵉhôm **Vol. 2:** 197, 205
Vol. 3: 983
tᵉḵûnâh **Vol. 1:** 712
tᵉmûnâh **Vol. 1:** 706
Vol. 2: 501
tᵉmûrâh **Vol. 3:** 166
tᵉnaḵ **Vol. 3:** 485
tᵉnû'âh **Vol. 2:** 144
tᵉnûpâh **Vol. 3:** 416, 424
tᵉpillâh **Vol. 2:** 862 f.
Vol. 3: 669
tēqa' **Vol. 3:** 112
tᵉqal **Vol. 3:** 994
tᵉrāpîm **Vol. 2:** 284, 317
Vol. 3: 528
tᵉrûmâh **Vol. 3:** 415
tᵉšû'âh **Vol. 2:** 144
tiṗ'ereṯ **Vol. 1:** 227, 522
tiṗlâh **Vol. 3:** 1024
tiqqāḥēnî **Vol. 3:** 262
tiqwâh **Vol. 1:** 712
Vol. 2: 239, 773
tîrôš **Vol. 3:** 918
tîrōš **Vol. 3:** 918
tmm **Vol. 2:** 778
tō'ar **Vol. 1:** 704
tō'ēḇâh **Vol. 1:** 75
tôḏâh **Vol. 1:** 344
Vol. 3: 233, 423, 673
tôheleṯ **Vol. 1:** 712
tōhû **Vol. 1:** 550
tôḵaḥaṯ **Vol. 2:** 140
tolēḏōṯ **Vol. 1:** 181
tôrâh **Vol. 1:** 54, 70, 333, 714
Vol. 2: 296, 439–441
Vol. 3: 485, 488
tôrâh šebbᵉʿalpē **Vol. 3:** 488
tôrâh šebbiḵtaḇ **Vol. 3:** 488
tôšāḇ **Vol. 1:** 684, 690
Vol. 2: 789
tpl **Vol. 3:** 447
tûḇ **Vol. 3:** 147
twḏh **Vol. 2:** 550

ṭa'am **Vol. 1:** 459
ṭā'am **Vol. 2:** 269
ṭā'an **Vol. 1:** 743
ṭāḇal **Vol. 1:** 144 f., 152
ṭabba'aṯ **Vol. 3:** 497
ṭāhar **Vol. 3:** 104
ṭāhēr **Vol. 2:** 144
Vol. 3: 924
ṭāhôr **Vol. 3:** 101, 103
ṭalyā' **Vol. 2:** 411
Vol. 3: 611
ṭāman **Vol. 2:** 773
ṭāmē' **Vol. 1:** 447
Vol. 3: 103
ṭaṗ **Vol. 1:** 281, 283
ṭāraṗ **Vol. 3:** 601
ṭbl **Vol. 3:** 447
ṭᵉḇîlâh **Vol. 1:** 150
ṭᵉlîṭā' qūm **Vol. 1:** 581
ṭihar **Vol. 3:** 419
ṭôḇ **Vol. 2:** 99, 103, 105, 116
Vol. 3: 351, 821
ṭôḇ 'ôlāmîm **Vol. 2:** 105
ṭôḇ wārā' **Vol. 2:** 103
ṭôṭāpôṯ **Vol. 3:** 559
ṭûaḥ **Vol. 1:** 120
ṭum'âh **Vol. 3:** 103
ṭûpôs **Vol. 3:** 904

wāw **Vol. 3:** 182
wayᵉhî . . . wa **Vol. 1:** 181
wayᵉhî dᵉḇar YHWH **Vol. 2:** 173
Vol. 3: 1090
wayišbōṯ **Vol. 3:** 405
wayyinnāḥem **Vol. 3:** 155
wayyiššā'er **Vol. 3:** 248
wayyiṯhallēḵ **Vol. 3:** 264
wᵉ'aḥar **Vol. 3:** 262
wᵉ'ênennû **Vol. 3:** 264
wᵉ'attâh **Vol. 1:** 246
wᵉhāyû **Vol. 3:** 239
wᵉhiš'arti **Vol. 3:** 248
wᵉniḥyeh **Vol. 3:** 267
wᵉnislaḥ lô **Vol. 3:** 155
wᵉnizkartem **Vol. 3:** 239

y'd **Vol. 1:** 626
Ya-huwa **Vol. 2:** 67
yā'al **Vol. 1:** 164
yā'aḏ **Vol. 1:** 293
yā'al **Vol. 3:** 137
yā'aṣ **Vol. 1:** 363
yā'ēp̄ **Vol. 2:** 265
yāḇēš **Vol. 3:** 999
yāḏ **Vol. 1:** 636
Vol. 2: 60, 148 f., 153, 414
Vol. 3: 860
yaḏ yᵉmînô **Vol. 2:** 414
yāḏa' **Vol. 2:** 395, 397, 408, 488 f., 587
Vol. 3: 316, 668, 760
yāḏâh **Vol. 1:** 344 f., 574
Vol. 2: 305
Vol. 3: 233, 668, 816
yāḡa' **Vol. 1:** 262
yâh **Vol. 1:** 99
Vol. 2: 862
yaḥaḏ **Vol. 3:** 766, 908
yāḥal **Vol. 2:** 239 f., 772 f.
yahᵃlōm **Vol. 3:** 395
yāḥaś **Vol. 2:** 683
yaḥdāw **Vol. 3:** 908
yāḥîḏ **Vol. 2:** 76, 725
Vol. 3: 766
yāhîr **Vol. 3:** 30
Yahweh **Vol. 2:** 67, 590
yāḵaḥ **Vol. 2:** 140
Vol. 3: 341
yālaḏ **Vol. 1:** 176 f., 186
Vol. 3: 858
yām **Vol. 1:** 670
Vol. 2: 56
Vol. 3: 983
yāmîm **Vol. 2:** 475, 889
yāmîn **Vol. 1:** 146, 414
yāp̄a' **Vol. 2:** 735
yāp̄eh **Vol. 2:** 103
yārâh **Vol. 1:** 574
Vol. 2: 296
Vol. 3: 760, 771
yāraš **Vol. 1:** 453
Vol. 2: 298, 304
yardēn **Vol. 3:** 991
yārē' **Vol. 1:** 327
Vol. 2: 91, 93
Vol. 3: 318
yāṣā' **Vol. 3:** 760
yāša' **Vol. 2:** 331
Vol. 3: 201 f., 206–208, 211, 217, 223, 588
yāṣaḇ **Vol. 1:** 474
yāšaḇ **Vol. 2:** 164, 773
Vol. 3: 224, 228, 254 f.
yāsaḏ **Vol. 1:** 379 f., 661
Vol. 3: 350
yāšān **Vol. 2:** 713
yāsar **Vol. 3:** 776
yāṣar **Vol. 1:** 380
Vol. 3: 119
yāšār **Vol. 2:** 144, 237
Vol. 3: 351, 355, 821, 924
yāšᵉp̄ēh **Vol. 3:** 395 f.
yāṣûa' **Vol. 2:** 587
yāšûḇ **Vol. 3:** 251
yāšûḇû **Vol. 3:** 233
yāṯar **Vol. 1:** 728
Vol. 3: 248
yāṯôm **Vol. 2:** 737 f.
yāwān **Vol. 2:** 124
yayin **Vol. 3:** 918
yᵉ'ōr **Vol. 3:** 985
yᵉ'ôr **Vol. 3:** 985
yᵉḥāḇ **Vol. 1:** 277
yᵉḥayyēnû **Vol. 3:** 267
Yᵉhôsēp̄ **Vol. 2:** 331
yᵉhôšûa' **Vol. 2:** 330–332
Vol. 3: 208
yᵉhôšua' **Vol. 3:** 208
yᵉhōwâh **Vol. 2:** 69
Yehuḏ **Vol. 2:** 848
yᵉhûḏâh **Vol. 1:** 61
Vol. 2: 305, 319
yᵉhûḏî **Vol. 2:** 305
yᵉhûḏîṯ **Vol. 2:** 305
yᵉḵappēr **Vol. 3:** 155
yeleḏ **Vol. 1:** 283
Vol. 2: 675
yᵉnaḥᵃmēnû **Vol. 2:** 681
yᵉqimēnû **Vol. 3:** 267
yᵉqûm **Vol. 1:** 711
yᵉqûmûn **Vol. 3:** 268
yᵉrûšālayim **Vol. 2:** 324, 592
yēša' **Vol. 3:** 217
yᵉša'yāhû **Vol. 3:** 208
yēṣer hā-raʿ **Vol. 1:** 459
yᵉsôḏ **Vol. 1:** 661
Yešû **Vol. 2:** 332
yᵉšû'âh **Vol. 3:** 207, 217
yᵉšû'āṯeḵā **Vol. 3:** 207
Yēšua' **Vol. 2:** 330–332
yēšûa' **Vol. 2:** 69
Vol. 3: 208
yeṯer **Vol. 1:** 728
Vol. 3: 248
yᵉwānîm **Vol. 2:** 124
yhw **Vol. 2:** 305
YHWH **Vol. 1:** 71 f., 208, 210 f.
Vol. 2: 68–70, 88, 173, 278, 376, 389, 512, 656, 720, 796, 887
Vol. 3: 140, 155, 239, 356, 597, 607, 777, 786, 1087, 1098, 1181
YHWH *'ᵉlōhênû* YHWH *'eḥāḏ* **Vol. 2:** 720
YHWH *ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ* **Vol. 3:** 959
yidd'ōnî **Vol. 2:** 554
yiggâh **Vol. 2:** 260
yiḥyeh **Vol. 3:** 366
yiḥyû **Vol. 3:** 268
yiqqaḥēnî **Vol. 3:** 262
yiqraṯ **Vol. 3:** 388
yir'ê šāmayîm **Vol. 1:** 360
yiṣḥāq **Vol. 1:** 80
Vol. 2: 431
yiṣhār **Vol. 2:** 710
yiśrā'ēl **Vol. 1:** 61, 294
Vol. 2: 67, 173, 304, 322, 698, 791
yissᵉḏû **Vol. 3:** 391
yiṯkappēr **Vol. 3:** 155
yiṯrōn **Vol. 3:** 137
yizkᵉrû **Vol. 3:** 233
yizzāḵēr **Vol. 3:** 232
yôḇēl **Vol. 1:** 698
Vol. 3: 191
yôḏ **Vol. 3:** 182, 484
yôm **Vol. 2:** 475, 887–890, 931
Vol. 3: 835, 841
yônâh **Vol. 2:** 350
yônēq **Vol. 1:** 281
yôṣēr **Vol. 3:** 911
yrd **Vol. 3:** 991
yš' **Vol. 2:** 332

za'am **Vol. 1:** 108
zā'aṗ **Vol. 3:** 559
zā'aq **Vol. 1:** 409
Vol. 2: 423
Vol. 3: 50
zaʿᵃwâh **Vol. 1:** 685
Vol. 2: 663
zāḇaḏ **Vol. 2:** 41
zāḇaḥ **Vol. 3:** 418
zāḏôn **Vol. 3:** 29
zāḥāḇ **Vol. 2:** 95
zāhar **Vol. 2:** 485
zaḵ **Vol. 3:** 101
zāḵâh **Vol. 2:** 144
Vol. 3: 348, 355, 924
zāḵaḵ **Vol. 2:** 144
Vol. 3: 103, 924
zāḵar **Vol. 3:** 232–234, 236, 238 f., 245
zāḵār **Vol. 2:** 569, 587
zāḵār ûnᵉqēḇâh **Vol. 2:** 569
zāmām **Vol. 3:** 820
zāmar **Vol. 3:** 668, 671
zammar **Vol. 3:** 673
zānâh **Vol. 1:** 498

zāqēn **Vol. 1:** 193, 196 **Vol. 2:** 562
zār **Vol. 1:** 684 **Vol. 2:** 742
zāra' **Vol. 3:** 521 f.
zārâh **Vol. 2:** 33 f.
zāraḥ **Vol. 3:** 318
zar^{a}ḵā **Vol. 3:** 524
zayiṯ **Vol. 2:** 711
zbḥ **Vol. 3:** 422
zeḇaḥ **Vol. 3:** 418, 422, 434, 438
zeḇaḥ hayyamîm **Vol. 3:** 437
zeḇel **Vol. 3:** 469
z^{e}ḇûḇ **Vol. 3:** 469
z^{e}ḇūl **Vol. 3:** 469
zēḏ **Vol. 3:** 29
zēḵer **Vol. 3:** 236–238
z^{e}ḵûṯ '^{e}mûnāh **Vol. 1:** 714
z^{e}ḵûṯ tôrâh **Vol. 1:** 714
z^{e}nûṯ **Vol. 1:** 499 **Vol. 3:** 1195
zera' **Vol. 1:** 177 **Vol. 3:** 521–523
z^{e}wā'âh **Vol. 2:** 663
zibbūl, zibbûl **Vol. 3:** 469
zikkārōn **Vol. 3:** 233, 236, 239
zikrōn **Vol. 3:** 238, 244
zikrōnôṯ **Vol. 3:** 233
zimmâh **Vol. 3:** 1024
zimrâh **Vol. 3:** 669
zirmâh **Vol. 3:** 561
zkr **Vol. 3:** 235 f.
zō'ṯ **Vol. 3:** 178
zûā' **Vol. 2:** 876
zûḇ **Vol. 1:** 682
zûḏ **Vol. 3:** 29

Index of Greek Words

(*chief references in* **bold figures**)

a- **Vol. 2:** 206
abba **Vol. 1: 614,** 619–621
Vol. 2: 868, **870 f.**
Abraam **Vol. 1: 76,** 181
Vol. 3: 72 f.
abyssos **Vol. 1:** 449
Vol. 2: 197, **205, 207, 210**
Vol. 3: 474, 983, 989
achatēs **Vol. 3: 396**
acheiropoiētos **Vol. 3:** 185
Acheldamach **Vol. 1: 93**
achrēston **Vol. 2:** 434
achri **Vol. 2:** 64, 530 f.
Vol. 3: 148
achri telous **Vol. 2:** 64
Adam **Vol. 1: 84,** 179
Vol. 2: 57
adēlōs **Vol. 1:** 648
adelphē **Vol. 1: 254 f.,** 539
Vol. 3: 1065
adelphia **Vol. 1:** 257
adelphos **Vol. 1:** 138, **254–257,** 259 f., 305, 373
Vol. 2: 505, 538, 547 f.
Vol. 3: 1065
adelphotēs **Vol. 1: 254, 257,** 305
adiakritos **Vol. 1: 503, 505**
adialeiptos **Vol. 3: 229**
adialeiptōs **Vol. 3: 229 f.**
adikēma **Vol. 3: 573–575,** 577
adikeo **Vol. 1:** 467
Vol. 3: 573–576, 586
adikia **Vol. 2:** 92–94, 458, 844
Vol. 3: 102, 137, 150, **352, 573–576,** 577, 580, 584, 887, 1148, 1150
adikos **Vol. 2:** 92 f.
Vol. 3: 573–576, 587
adikōs **Vol. 3: 573–575**
adō **Vol. 2:** 436
Vol. 3: 672–675, 676
adokimos **Vol. 1:** 163, 557
Vol. 3: 808–810
adolos **Vol. 3:** 1118
adynatos **Vol. 2: 601, 606**
Vol. 3: 995
aei **Vol. 2:** 420
Vol. 3: 827, 839
aeidō **Vol. 3:** 672
aēr **Vol. 1: 449**
Vol. 2: 189, 476
Vol. 3: 471
aetos **Vol.1:** 175
Vol. 3: 1054
agalliaō **Vol. 2:** 355, 436
Vol. 3: 673
agalliaomai **Vol. 2: 352–354,** 357 f., **361,** 780
agalliasis **Vol. 2: 352–354,** 358
agallō **Vol. 2:** 352
agallomai **Vol. 2:** 352
agamos **Vol. 3: 536 f.**
agan **Vol. 3:** 103
agapaō **Vol. 2: 538–540, 542–544, 547–549, 551**
Vol. 3: 173, 455, 942
agapē **Vol. 1:** 180, 256 f., 667, 695, 738
Vol. 2: 106, 123, 242 f., 427, 469 f., **538–551,** 765, 780
Vol. 3: 562, 582, 746, 929, 931, 942, 1151, 1182, 1211
agapētos **Vol. 1:** 257, 287, 541
Vol. 2: 538 f., 543 f., 551, 725
Vol. 3: 641
agathoergeō **Vol. 2: 98, 100, 102**
agathon **Vol. 2:** 98 f., 101
Vol. 3: 138, 775, 1021
agathopoieō **Vol. 2: 98, 100, 102**
agathopoiia **Vol. 2: 98, 102**
Vol. 3: 1153, 1155
agathopoios **Vol. 2: 98, 101**
Vol. 3: 1153, 1155
agathos **Vol. 1:** 348, 351, 561, 564
Vol. 2: 60, **98–106,** 239, 241, 243, 403, 476, 683, 781, 846
Vol. 3: 45, 138, 775, 1148, 1158
agathōsynē **Vol. 2: 98, 100f.,** 819
agathotēs **Vol. 2:** 290
agauos **Vol. 2:** 643
agenealogētos **Vol. 2: 35 f.**
agērochia **Vol. 3:** 29
agnoēma **Vol. 2: 406**
agnoeō **Vol. 2:** 391, 400, **406–408**
Vol. 3: 431, 573, 1036
agnoia **Vol. 1:** 422
Vol. 2: 406 f., 458
Vol. 3: 573, 577, 997
agnōsia **Vol. 1:** 513
Vol. 2: 402, **406**
agnōstos **Vol. 1:** 670
Vol. 2: 77, 394, **406 f.**
agnōstos patēr **Vol. 2: 394**
agnōstos propatōr **Vol. 2: 394**
agnōstos theos **Vol. 2: 394**
agō **Vol. 1:** 645
Vol. 2: 643, 735
agōgē **Vol. 3: 935**
agōn **Vol. 1: 644–649,** 652
Vol. 3: 946
agōnia **Vol. 1: 645 f.**
agōnizomai **Vol. 1: 644–647**
agora **Vol. 1: 267,** 291
agoraias **Vol. 1: 267**
agorazō **Vol. 1: 267 f.**
Vol. 3: 200
agoreuō **Vol. 2:** 744
agrammatos **Vol. 2:** 456
Vol. 3: 1197
agraphos **Vol. 3:** 574, 930
agrielaios **Vol. 2: 710, 712**
Vol. 3: 869
agrios **Vol. 1: 520**
agros **Vol. 1:** 93, 222, **520**
agrypneō **Vol. 2: 137**
agrypnia **Vol. 2: 137**
ahoratos **Vol. 3: 511 f., 515**
aianēs **Vol. 2:** 206
aichmalōsia **Vol. 1:** 685
Vol. 3: 590 f.
aichmalōteuō **Vol. 3: 590**
aichmalōtizō **Vol. 3: 590 f.**
aichmalōtos **Vol. 3:** 589, **590,** 597, 599
aiꜧmē **Vol. 3:** 590
Aïdas **Vol. 2:** 206
aideomai **Vol. 3: 561**
Aïdēs **Vol. 2:** 206
adiaphron **Vol. 3:** 835
aidios **Vol. 2:** 290
Vol. 3: 826 f., 829
aidoion **Vol. 3:** 561
aidōs **Vol. 3: 561 f.,** 564
Aigyptios **Vol. 1: 530**
Aigyptos **Vol. 1: 530**
Vol. 2: 835
aineō **Vol. 1:** 344
Vol. 2: 744, **855,** 868

Vol. 3: 233, **816 f.,** 819
ainesis **Vol. 3: 816 f.**
ainigma **Vol. 2: 743–746, 756, 760**
ainos **Vol. 3: 816 f.,** 819
aiōn **Vol. 1:** 105, 125, 164, 179, 325 f., 476, 523 f., 601, 708, 718, 737
Vol. 2: 37, 62, 158, 543, 609, 887, 928
Vol. 3: 276, 312, **826–833, 841,** 850, 864
aiōnes **Vol. 3:** 832
aiōnios **Vol. 1:** 442, 464
Vol. 2: 388, 480, 483, 928
Vol. 3: 98 f., 199, 517, 812, **826 f., 829 f., 832,** 844, 850, 1212
aipys **Vol. 1:** 465
airō **Vol. 1:** 701
Vol. 2: 411
aisch- **Vol. 3:** 562
aischrokerdēs **Vol. 3: 564**
aischrologia **Vol. 3: 564**
aischron **Vol. 3:** 562
aischron estin **Vol. 3: 564**
aischros **Vol. 2:** 50, 476, 658
Vol. 3: 562–564
aischrotēs **Vol. 3: 562**
aischynē **Vol. 2:** 212
Vol. 3: 561, **562–564**
aischynesthai **Vol. 3:** 562
aischynō **Vol. 3: 562–564**
aischynomai **Vol. 3:** 564
aisthanomai **Vol. 2: 390–392, 408**
aisthēsis **Vol. 2: 390 f.,** 591
aisthētērion **Vol. 2: 391**
aisthētos **Vol. 1:** 523
Vol. 2: 192
aitēma **Vol. 2: 855, 858,** 861
aiteō **Vol. 2: 855–858,** 859, 861, 868
Vol. 3: 683
aiteomai **Vol. 2: 856**
aitia **Vol. 2: 137–139**
Vol. 3: 573
aitiama **Vol. 2:** 138
aitiōma **Vol. 2: 137–139**
aition **Vol. 2:** 139
aitios **Vol. 2: 137 f.**
Vol. 3: 215
akaireomai **Vol. 3: 833, 837**
akairos **Vol. 2:** 644
Vol. 3: 833
akairōs **Vol. 3: 837 f.**
akakos **Vol. 1: 561, 563**
akantha **Vol. 1: 725 f.**
akanthinos **Vol. 1: 725**
akarpos **Vol. 1: 721, 723**
akatakalyptos **Vol. 2:** 212
akatalytos **Vol. 1:** 337
Vol. 3: 177, 189
akatastasia **Vol. 2:** 780
akatharsia **Vol. 3: 102 f.**
akathartos **Vol. 1:** 500, 637
Vol. 3: 102 f., 473, 475
akautēriastos **Vol. 2: 574**
Akeldaimach **Vol. 1: 93**
Akeldama **Vol. 1: 93**
Akeldamach **Vol. 1: 93**
Akeldamak **Vol. 1: 93**
akmaios **Vol. 2: 588**
akmazō **Vol. 2:** 588
akmē **Vol. 2:** 587 f.
akoē **Vol. 2: 172 f., 175**
akoloutheō **Vol. 1:** 324, **480–483,** 488, 493
Vol. 2: 614, 658
Vol. 3: 946
akolouthos **Vol. 1:** 484
akouō **Vol. 1:** 261
Vol. 2: 172–180, 427, 443, 643, 812, 864
Vol. 3: 113 f., 127, 173, 544, 573, 1161
akrasia **Vol. 1: 494–496**
akratēs **Vol. 1: 494–496**
akris **Vol. 1:** 119
akroatēs **Vol. 2: 172, 175, 177,** 554 f.
akrobystia **Vol. 1: 307, 309 f.**
Vol. 2: 660
Vol. 3: 1182, 1189
akrogōniaios **Vol. 1:** 541
Vol. 3: 388–390, 393, 398 f.
alalētos **Vol. 2:** 424, 882, 884
alalos **Vol. 1:** 428
alaomai **Vol. 3:** 29
alazōn **Vol. 2:** 430, **435**
Vol. 3: 28, 30–32
alazoneia **Vol. 1:** 228
Vol. 3: 28–32
alazoneuomai **Vol. 3: 29 f.**
aleiphō **Vol. 1: 119–121,** 124, 471
Vol. 2: 335, 712 f.
Vol. 3: 1060
alektorophōnia **Vol. 2:** 136
alētheia **Vol. 1:** 90, 98, 708
Vol. 2: 460, 468, 470, 472, 878
Vol. 3: 72, 242, 316, 323, 575 f., 746, **874–878, 882–893,** 902, 1045, 1191, 1199, 1202
alēthēs **Vol. 3: 874–877, 882–884, 888–891, 893**
alētheuō **Vol. 3: 874, 877, 886–888**
alēthinos **Vol. 1:** 98
Vol. 2: 280, 477, 724, 837, 878
Vol. 3: 874, 877, 883 f., 888 f., 891, 893
alēthōs **Vol. 1:** 98
Vol. 3: 462, **874, 877, 883, 888, 893**
alisgēmata **Vol. 2:** 286
Alkinoos **Vol. 2:** 233
allagma **Vol. 3:** 1196
allassō **Vol. 3:** 146, **166 f.,** 175
allēgoreō **Vol. 2: 743, 746, 755 f., 760**
allēgoria **Vol. 1:** 49
Vol. 2: 743 f., 746, 748
allēlōn **Vol. 2:** 765
allēlous **Vol. 2:** 542
Vol. 3: 353, 447
allogenēs **Vol. 1: 684 f.,** 687
Vol. 2: 739, 742
Vol. 3: 455 f.
allophylos **Vol. 1: 684 f.**
Vol. 2: 349, **739, 742**
allos **Vol. 1:** 666, 684, 691
Vol. 2: 423, 618, **739, 741 f.,** 744, 785 f.
Vol. 3: 166, 185, 1080, 1176
allōs **Vol. 2: 739**
allotriepiskopos **Vol. 2: 742**
allotrioō **Vol. 1: 684**
allotrios **Vol. 1: 683–685,** 687
Vol. 2: 739, 742
Vol. 3: 400
alogos **Vol. 1:** 674
Vol. 2: 476, 661
Vol. 3: 1081, 1118
alōpēx **Vol. 1:** 118
Alypis **Vol. 3:** 160
amachos **Vol. 1:** 646
amēchanos **Vol. 1:** 107
amemptos **Vol. 2: 137, 139, 143–145**
Vol. 3: 348, **923–925**
amemptōs **Vol. 2:** 139, **143 f.**
Vol. 3: 924
amēn **Vol. 1: 97–100**
Vol. 3: 742, 883, 1107
amerimnos **Vol. 1:** 278
ametamelētos **Vol. 1: 356 f.**
ametanoētos **Vol. 1: 357 f.**
Vol. 2: 183
ametatheton **Vol. 3:** 1018
amethystos **Vol. 3: 396 f.**
amētōr **Vol. 1:** 616
ametros **Vol. 2:** 400, **402, 404**
amiantos **Vol. 1: 447 f.**
Vol. 3: 923, 925
amnos **Vol. 2:** 194, **410–414**
Vol. 3: 611, 925
amnos tou theou **Vol. 3: 611**
amōmētos **Vol. 3: 923**
amōmos **Vol. 2:** 144
Vol. 3: 923–925
amōmotēs **Vol. 3: 924**
ampelōn **Vol. 3: 918 f.**
ampelos **Vol. 3:** 226, **918, 922 f.**
ampelourgos **Vol. 3: 919**
amphiballō **Vol. 1:** 504
amphisbēteō **Vol. 1:** 504
amphoteros **Vol. 3:** 172

amyētos **Vol. 3:** 679
ana **Vol. 1:** 373, 391, 413
Vol. 2: 765
Vol. 3: 1172, 1174, 1195, 1199
ana- **Vol. 3:** 231, 519, 1195
ana meros **Vol. 2: 303 f.**
ana meson **Vol. 1:** 373
anabainō **Vol. 2:** 42, 184 f., 199, 204, 209
Vol. 3: 203, 242, 494, 591, 941, 946, 1180
anabasis **Vol. 3:** 936
anabioō **Vol. 3: 259**
anabiōsis **Vol. 1:** 184
Vol. 3: 259
anabioskomai **Vol. 3: 259**
anablepō **Vol. 2:** 735
Vol. 3: 519
anaboaō **Vol. 1: 410 f.**
anachōreō **Vol. 3:** 265
anadeiknymi **Vol. 3: 569**
anadeixis **Vol. 3: 569**
anagennaō **Vol. 1: 176, 178, 180 f.,** 184 f., 188
Vol. 3: 215
anagennēsis **Vol. 1:** 178
anaginōskō **Vol. 1:** 243, **245,** 248
Vol. 3: 485
anagnōsis **Vol. 1: 245**
anaitios **Vol. 2: 137, 139**
anakainizō **Vol. 2:** 670
anakainoō **Vol. 2: 670–673**
anakainoomai **Vol. 2:** 675
anakainōsis **Vol. 1:** 178, 185, 708
Vol. 2: 670, 673
anakainousthai **Vol. 1:** 185
anakalyptō **Vol. 2: 212 f.**
Vol. 3: 311
anakeimai **Vol. 3:** 589
anakekalymmenos **Vol. 2:** 213
anakephalaioomai **Vol. 2: 156 f.,** 163
anakephalaōsis **Vol. 2:** 163
anaklinomai **Vol. 3:** 589
anakremannymi **Vol. 1:** 391
anakrinō **Vol. 2: 362, 364**
analambanō **Vol. 2:** 203
Vol. 3: 747, 749
analēmpsis **Vol. 1:** 738
Vol. 3: 747, 749
analmos **Vol. 3:** 443
analogia **Vol. 1:** 49 f.
analos **Vol. 3: 443**
analyō **Vol. 2:** 925
anamenō **Vol. 2:** 245
anamimnēskesthai **Vol. 3:** 231
anamimnēskō **Vol. 3: 230,** 232, **239–241, 243**
anamnēsis **Vol. 1:** 370, 483
Vol. 2: 533, 717
Vol. 3: 230 f., 238 f., 241, 243–245, 247, 260
ananeoō **Vol. 2: 674, 676**
ananeoomai **Vol. 2: 675**
ananēphō **Vol. 1: 514 f.**
anangellō **Vol. 3: 44–48,** 68
anank- **Vol. 2:** 663
anankaios **Vol. 2: 663**
anankastōs **Vol. 2: 663**
anankazō **Vol. 2: 663, 669**
Vol. 3: 951
anankē **Vol. 2: 662–664**
Vol. 3: 1054
anapauma **Vol. 3: 255**
anapauō **Vol. 3: 254, 256–258**
anapausis **Vol. 2:** 281
Vol. 3: 254–256, 407
anapherō **Vol. 3:** 435, 1195 f.
anapiptō **Vol. 3:** 589
anaplēroō **Vol. 1: 733 f., 736, 738, 340 f.**
anaplērōsis **Vol. 1:** 735
anapologētos **Vol. 2: 137–139**
anapsychō **Vol. 3: 686**
anapsyxis **Vol. 3:** 148, **686**
anaseiō **Vol. 3: 556, 558**
anaskolopizō **Vol. 1:** 391
anastasis **Vol. 1:** 434,445
Vol. 2: 504, 924
Vol. 3: 167, 231, **259, 261, 276, 278 f.,** 280, 299, 304, 439, 558, 579, 602, 677 f., 683, 936, 1189
anastatēria **Vol. 3: 261**
anastauroō **Vol. 1: 391, 394, 397**
Vol. 2: 291
anastrephō **Vol. 1:** 354
Vol. 3: 933
anastrephomai **Vol. 3: 933**
anastrophē **Vol. 3: 933, 935**
anatassomai **Vol. 1:** 576
anatellō **Vol. 2:** 557
anathema **Vol. 1: 413–415,** 418
Vol. 2: 516, 520, 741, 896
Vol. 3: 171
anathēma **Vol. 1: 413 f.**
anathematizō **Vol. 1: 413, 415**
anatlōn **Vol. 3:** 178
anatolē **Vol. 3:** 178, 867
anatrechō **Vol. 2:** 655
anax **Vol. 2:** 372
anaxios **Vol. 3: 348**
anaxiōs **Vol. 3: 349**
anazaō **Vol. 3: 259, 278**
anchisteuō **Vol. 3:** 191
anchisteus **Vol. 3:** 191
andrapodistēs **Vol. 3: 380**
andreia **Vol. 1:** 501
Vol. 3: 354, 925
andrizesche **Vol. 2: 563**
andrizomai **Vol. 2: 562 f., 571**
anechō **Vol. 2:** 776
anechomai **Vol. 2: 764–766**
Vol. 3: 165, 364
anēkō **Vol. 3:** 930
anektos **Vol. 2: 765, 767**
anektoteros **Vol. 2:** 767
aneleēmōn **Vol. 2: 594, 597**
anēleēs **Vol. 2:** 594
anelēmpthē **Vol. 2:** 203
aneleos **Vol. 2: 594, 597**
anemos **Vol. 2:** 155
Vol. 3: 690, 770, **1000 f.,** 1198
anenenkai **Vol. 3:** 435
anenklētos **Vol. 2: 137, 139**
Vol. 3: 923–925, 932
aneōgmenos **Vol. 2:** 727
anepilēmptos **Vol. 3: 750**
anēr **Vol. 1:** 92, 546, 550
Vol. 2: 91, 161 f., 234, 466, 561, **562–564,** 565, **571,** 581, 606, 615, 634, 699
Vol. 3: 172, 223, 361, 636, 680, 687, 1055, 1075, 1117
anēthon **Vol. 2: 210 f.**
anexeraunētos **Vol. 3: 532 f.**
angel- **Vol. 3:** 68
angelia **Vol. 3: 44–47, 67**
angellō **Vol. 2:** 107
Vol. 3: 44–46, 48, 50 f., 54, 68, 232
angeloi Dios **Vol. 3:** 49
angelos **Vol. 1: 101 f., 104,** 127
Vol. 2: 107, 502, 578, 791
Vol. 3: 45 f., 49, 990
anhamartētos **Vol. 3:** 579
anhistēmi **Vol. 2:** 680, 925
Vol. 3: 178, **259, 261,** 267 f., **275 f.,** 279, 281, 307, 624
anhypokritos **Vol. 1:** 351
Vol. 2: 468–470
anhypostatos **Vol. 1:** 710
aniptos **Vol. 1:** 153
ankalē **Vol. 1:** 239
ankos **Vol. 1:** 239
anō **Vol. 1:** 179
Vol. 2: 184, **187,** 191 f., 329, 619
Vol. 3: 1199
anochē **Vol. 2: 765–767,** 771
anoētos **Vol. 3: 122, 124, 126, 129**
anoia **Vol. 3: 122 f., 125, 128**
anoignymi **Vol. 2:** 726
anoigō **Vol. 2: 726–728,** 730
Vol. 3: 543, 950
anoixis **Vol. 2: 726**
anomia **Vol. 1:** 125, 556, 639
Vol. 2: 438, 440, 447–449, 709
Vol. 3: 137, 505, 573, 584, 717
anomos **Vol. 2: 438, 440, 445, 447, 449,** 468
Vol. 3: 137, 574
anomōs **Vol. 2: 446**
anosios **Vol. 2: 236 f.**

anōthen **Vol. 1:** 179
Vol. 2: 187 f.
Vol. 3: 1178
ant- **Vol. 1:** 645
antagōnizomai **Vol. 1: 644**
antallagē **Vol. 3:** 1196
antallagma **Vol. 2:** 835
Vol. 3: 153, **166, 174**
antanaplēroō **Vol. 1:** 741
antapodidōmi **Vol. 3: 134 f.**
antapodoma **Vol. 3: 134 f.**
antapodosis **Vol. 3: 134 f.**
anthos **Vol. 3:** 523, 867
anthrax **Vol. 3: 396**
anthrōpareskos **Vol. 2: 815, 817**
anthrōpinos **Vol. 2: 564 f.,** 661
Vol. 3: 719, 995
anthrōpologia **Vol. 1:** 682
anthrōpos **Vol. 1:** 50, 162, 192, 335, 374, 377, 401, 407, 535, 701
Vol. 2: 155, 160, 165, 194, 216, 233, 337, 376, 380, 385, 387, 447, 456, 473, 502–504, 510, 514, 543, **562–566, 571,** 607, 630, 672, 675 f., 723, 781, 819 f., 840, 900, 912
Vol. 3: 127, 147, 174, 181, 195, 505, 530, 539, 607, 613, 617, 620, 630, 632, 665, 680, 684, 718, 734, 770, 775, 831, 1144, 1176, 1190, 1194, 1200
anthypatos **Vol. 1: 270**
anti **Vol. 1:** 124, 400
Vol. 2: 119
Vol. 3: 195–197, 611, **1171 f., 1174, 1179 f., 1196 f.**
anti hēmōn **Vol. 3:** 1197
anti pollōn **Vol. 3:** 195, 611, 1180
Antichristos **Vol. 1: 124**
Vol. 2: 435
antidikos **Vol. 1: 553 f.**
Vol. 3: 173, 469
antiloidoreō **Vol. 3: 346**
antilytron **Vol. 3: 189,** 195, **197,** 1180, 1197
antimisthia **Vol. 3:** 197
Antiocheus **Vol. 1:** 361
antipsychon **Vol. 3:** 195
antipsychos **Vol. 3:** 157
antis **Vol. 3:** 1179
antitheos **Vol. 1:** 124
antitypon **Vol. 3: 903–906**
antitypos **Vol. 3:** 888, **903**
aoidē **Vol. 3:** 672
aoidos **Vol. 3:** 672
aoratos **Vol. 2:** 768
Vol. 3: 128
ap- **Vol. 2:** 241, 856
ap' allōn **Vol. 3:** 1176
apaideutos **Vol. 3:** 1026
apaiteō **Vol. 2: 855, 858**
apallassō **Vol. 3: 166 f., 173 f.**
apallotrioō **Vol. 1:** 684 f.
Vol. 2: 742
apangellō **Vol. 3: 44–48,** 68, 1046
apantaō **Vol. 1: 324 f.**
apantēsis **Vol. 1: 324 f.**
Vol. 3: 603
aparabatos **Vol. 3: 583–585**
paraklētos **Vol. 1:** 89
aparaskeuastos **Vol. 3: 119**
aparchē **Vol. 1:** 166, 669
Vol. 2: 40, 288, 883 f.
Vol. 3: 72, 277, 303, **415–417,** 437, 701, 1078
aparneomai **Vol. 1: 454 f.**
apataō **Vol. 2: 457–461**
apatē **Vol. 2: 457–459,** 843 f.
Vol. 3: 875
apatheia **Vol. 3:** 719
apathēs **Vol. 3:** 724
apatōr **Vol. 1: 615 f., 619, 621**
apaugasma **Vol. 2:** 284, **289 f., 293**
apechō **Vol. 2:** 433
apechomai **Vol. 2:** 765
apedokimasan **Vol. 1:** 74
apeirastos **Vol. 3: 798 f., 802, 809**
apeiron **Vol. 2:** 244
apeiros **Vol. 3:** 840
apeitheia **Vol. 1: 588 f., 593**
apeitheō **Vol. 1: 588 f., 591, 593**
apeithēs **Vol. 1: 588 f., 593**
apekdechomai **Vol. 1:** 289
Vol. 2: 244 f., 774, 883
Vol. 3: 745
apekdyō **Vol. 1:** 314 f.
apekdyomai **Vol. 1: 314**
apekdysis **Vol. 1: 314 f.**
apeleutheros **Vol. 1: 715, 717 f.**
Vol. 3: 598
apelpizō **Vol. 2: 238, 241,** 244
apēlthen **Vol. 2:** 217
aperchomai **Vol. 1: 320 f.,** 608
Vol. 2: 217
aperitmētos **Vol. 1: 307, 309**
apestalmenos **Vol. 1:** 127, 581
apestrepsen **Vol. 2:** 215
aph' hymōn **Vol. 3:** 1176
aphaireō **Vol. 3:** 153
aphanizō **Vol. 2:** 433, 831
aphesis **Vol. 1:** 160, **697 f., 700–703**
Vol. 2: 533, 667
Vol. 3: 52, 55, 191, 1178, 1184
aphiēmi **Vol. 1: 697 f., 700–703**
Vol. 2: 668
Vol. 3: 167, 172, 188
aphistēmi **Vol. 1: 606–608,** 611
Vol. 3: 585 f.
aphobōs **Vol. 1:** 181
aphōmoiōmenos **Vol. 2:** 505
aphomoioō **Vol. 2: 500–502, 505 f.**
aphorizō **Vol. 1: 472 f.**
aphormē **Vol. 1:** 336
Aphroditē **Vol. 3:** 318
aphrōn **Vol. 2:** 766
Vol. 3: 1023–1026
aphrosynē **Vol. 3: 1023–1026**
aphtharsia **Vol. 1: 467–470**
Vol. 2: 480, 924
Vol. 3: 281, 302, 995
aphthartos **Vol. 1: 467 f.**
Vol. 3: 1201
aphthoros **Vol. 3:** 1071
apisteō **Vol. 1: 591, 594**
apistia **Vol. 1: 594**
Vol. 3: 227
apistos **Vol. 1: 594, 602**
Vol. 2: 457
apo **Vol. 1:** 51, 126, 181, 284, 320, 377, 414, 476, 487, 607, 622 f., 684, 697
Vol. 2: 35, 55, 91, 172, 175, 222, 241, 244 f., 586, 780, 789, 912
Vol. 2: 173, 181, 188, 204, 309 f., 318, 375, 416, 773, 828 f., 834, **1171–1176, 1178, 1180 f., 1188 f., 1198,** 1214
apo merous **Vol. 2: 303 f.**
apoblepō **Vol. 2:** 835
apodechomai **Vol. 3: 744, 746**
apodeiknymi **Vol. 3: 570 f.**
apodeixis **Vol. 1:** 588
Vol. 3: 570
apodekateuō **Vol. 2: 693 f.**
Vol. 3: 851
apodekatoō **Vol. 2: 693 f.**
Vol. 3: 851
apodektos **Vol. 3: 744–746**
apodēmeō **Vol. 2: 790**
apodidōmi **Vol. 2:** 115
Vol. 3: 134–136, 145, 754
apodochē **Vol. 3: 744, 746**
apodokimasthēnai **Vol. 3:** 723
apodokimazō **Vol. 3: 808 f.**
apogegrammenos **Vol. 1:** 304
apoginomai **Vol. 1: 181**
apoginōskō **Vol. 2:** 244
apographō **Vol. 1:** 304
apoikesia **Vol. 1:** 685
apoikia **Vol. 1:** 685
apoikismos **Vol. 1:** 685
apoinos **Vol. 3:** 152
apokalypuis **Vol. 1:** 50, 737
Vol. 2: 517
Vol. 3: 310 f., 313–316, 502
apokalyptō **Vol. 2:** 212
Vol. 3: 309–312, 314, 316, 321
apokaradokeō **Vol. 2: 244**
apokaradokia **Vol. 2: 238, 244–246**

Vol. 3: 745
apokatallassō **Vol. 3: 166 f., 171 f.**
apokatastasis **Vol. 1:** 521
Vol. 2: 920
Vol. 3: 146–148, 192
apokathistanō **Vol. 3: 146**
apokathistēmi **Vol. 3: 146 f.**
apokekrymmenēn **Vol. 2:** 217
apokoptō **Vol. 2:** 418
apokrypha **Vol. 2:** 214
apokryphos **Vol. 1:** 50
Vol. 2: 214–216
apokryptō **Vol. 1:** 50
Vol. 2: 214–217
apokteinō **Vol. 1: 429 f.,** 463
Vol. 3: 172
apokyeō **Vol. 1:** 178, 187
apolambanō **Vol. 3: 747, 751**
apolauō **Vol. 3:** 377
apolaustikos **Vol. 2:** 475
apolegō **Vol. 2:** 244
apōleia **Vol. 1: 462–466,** 471
Vol. 2: 126
Vol. 3: 1187
Apollōn **Vol. 1:** 463
apollymi **Vol. 1: 462–464,** 471
Vol. 3: 530
apollyō **Vol. 1:** 463
Vol. 2: 460
Apollyōn **Vol. 1: 462–464,** 471
apolō **Vol. 1:** 74
apologeomai **Vol. 1:** 51
apologia **Vol. 1:** 51
Vol. 3: 38, 97, 1018
apolouō **Vol. 1: 150–152**
apolouomai **Vol. 1:** 701
apolyō **Vol. 1: 505**
Vol. 3: 177, 188 f., 534
apolytrōsis **Vol. 1:** 268, 301, 701
Vol. 2: 388, 839, 883
Vol. 3: 189 f., 193, 199 f.
apōn **Vol. 2:** 899
apopheugō **Vol. 1: 558 f.**
apophthengesthai **Vol. 3: 1080**
apoplanaō **Vol. 2: 457, 459**
apoplanaomai **Vol. 2: 457, 459**
apopnigō **Vol. 1: 226**
aposkiasma **Vol. 3: 553–556**
apostasia **Vol. 1:** 51, **606 f.**
apostasion **Vol. 1: 505 f. 606 f.**
Vol. 3: 1064
apostasis **Vol. 1:** 606
apostatēs **Vol. 1:** 606
apostellō **Vol. 1: 126–128, 133 f., 136,** 332
apostereō **Vol. 3: 379 f.**
apostolē **Vol. 2:** 111, 299
apostolos **Vol. 1: 126–130, 133 f., 136,** 199, 275
Vol. 2: 695
Vol. 3: 48, 52, 767
apostrephō **Vol. 1: 354 f.,** 608
Vol. 2: 215
aposynagōgos **Vol. 1:** 181
apothanōn **Vol. 2:** 375
apothaumazō **Vol. 2:** 621
apothesis **Vol. 1: 314 f.**
Vol. 3: 815
apothnēskō **Vol. 1:** 327, **430 f., 435,** 443
Vol. 3: 375, 1197
apotinassō **Vol. 3: 560 f.**
apotithēmi **Vol. 1: 314 f.**
Vol. 3: 886
apotrepō **Vol. 3: 902 f.**
apotrepomai **Vol. 3: 903**
aproskopos **Vol. 2: 705–707**
aprosōpolēmptōs **Vol. 1: 585, 587**
apseudēs **Vol. 2: 470, 472**
Vol. 3: 71, 876
apsinthia **Vol. 2:** 27
apsinthion **Vol. 2:** 27
apsinthos **Vol. 2: 27–29**
Vol. 3: 737
ar- **Vol. 2:** 815
Vol. 3: 349, 834, 1004
ara **Vol. 1: 416,** 418
Vol. 2: 683
araomai **Vol. 1:** 416
arariskō **Vol. 3:** 925
archai **Vol. 2: 608 f.,** 614
archaia **Vol. 1:** 165
archaios **Vol. 1: 164 f., 167,** 508, 666
Vol. 2: 671, 713
archangelos **Vol. 1: 101, 103**
Vol. 3: 622
archē **Vol. 1:** 64 f., **164–167, 169,** 377, 383, 536, 588, 628, 665, 712
Vol. 2: 49, 59, 61, 64, 157 f., 162, 452, 608, 614, 669, 912
Vol. 3: 215, 416, 723, 1118, 1204
archēgos **Vol. 1: 164 f., 168,** 668 f.
Vol. 2: 64, 505
Vol. 3: 199, 215, 723
archētypos **Vol. 3:** 554, **904**
archieraomai **Vol. 2:** 234
archierateuō **Vol. 2:** 234
archieratikos **Vol. 3: 32, 40**
archiereus **Vol. 1:** 198 f.
Vol. 2: 232–236, 238
Vol. 3: 32, 35, 39 f., 44, 162
archierōsynē **Vol. 2:** 234
archipoimēn **Vol. 3: 564, 568**
architektōn **Vol. 1: 279,** 377
Vol. 2: 555
architelōnēs **Vol. 3: 755, 758**
archō **164 f., 167, 169**
Vol. 3: 509, 822
archōn **Vol. 1:** 105, **164 f., 168 f.,** 407, 536 f., 665
Vol. 2: 609, 777
Vol. 3: 199, 469 f.
arēn **Vol. 2: 410 f.**
Arēs **Vol. 3:** 318
areskeia **Vol. 2: 814 f., 817**
areskō **Vol. 1:** 537
Vol. 2: 814–816, 820
Vol. 3: 264, 925
areskos **Vol. 2: 815**
arestos **Vol. 2: 814–816**
Vol. 3: 925
aretē **Vol. 1:** 459, 645
Vol. 2: 61, 290, 477, 815
Vol. 3: 138, 354, 562, 776, 923, **925–927,** 932, 936, 1148
argia **Vol. 3:** 407, 409
argos **Vol. 1:** 73
Vol. 2: 96
argyrion **Vol. 2: 96,** 845, **851**
argyros **Vol. 2: 96,** 845
argyrous **Vol. 2: 96**
ari- **Vol. 3:** 925
aristeros **Vol. 2: 148**
aristos **Vol. 3:** 925
arithmeō **Vol. 2:** 703
arithmos **Vol. 1:** 665
Vol. 2: 683 f., 703
arkeisthai **Vol. 3: 727**
arkeō **Vol. 3: 726–728,** 730
arketos **Vol. 3: 727**
arkos **Vol. 1:** 118
arneomai **Vol. 1:** 347, **454–456,** 608
Vol. 3: 1050
arnion **Vol. 2: 410–413**
Vol. 3: 568
arnos **Vol. 2:** 413
arōma **Vol. 2:** 295
arrabōn **Vol. 1:** 372, 375, 638 f.
Vol. 2: 39 f., 44
Vol. 3: 72, 499, 701
arrēn **Vol. 2:** 569 f.
arrhētos **Vol. 2:** 763
arrostēma **Vol. 3: 997**
arrōsteō **Vol. 3: 997**
arrostia **Vol. 3: 997**
arsēn **Vol. 2:** 562 f., **569 f.**
arsenokoitēs **Vol. 2: 569 f.**
Artemisia **Vol. 2:** 27
arthmos **Vol. 2:** 683
arti **Vol. 1:** 282
Vol. 2: 756
Vol. 3: 409, **833 f., 837,** 850
artios **Vol. 3:** 348, **349 f.,** 352
artiōs **Vol. 3:** 350
artos **Vol. 1: 249,** 251, 253, 586
Vol. 2: 194, 520, 524, 530
Vol. 3: 814
artynō **Vol. 3:** 349
artyō **Vol. 3:** 349, 445, 449
asaleutos **Vol. 3: 558–560**
asbestinos **Vol. 3:** 111
asbestos **Vol. 3: 110 f.,** 447

aschēmōn **Vol. 3:** 1195
asebeia **Vol. 1:** 622
Vol. 2: 91–94
Vol. 3: 49, 573, 576, 580, 584
asebeō **Vol. 2:** 93
asebēs **Vol. 2: 91–95,** 468
Vol. 3: 574 f., 577, 580, 995, 1197
aselgeia **Vol. 2:** 587
askeō **Vol. 1: 494 f.,** 503
askēsis **Vol. 2:** 659
askētēs **Vol. 1:** 495
asma **Vol. 3:** 673
asophos **Vol. 3: 1026**
asōtōs **Vol. 2:** 480
aspasmos **Vol. 1: 206 f.**
aspazomai **Vol. 1: 206, 213,** 218
asphaleia **Vol. 1: 663 f.**
Vol. 3: 771
asphalēs **Vol. 1:** 660, **663**
asphalizō **Vol. 1: 663**
asphalōs **Vol. 1: 663**
aspilos **Vol. 3: 923–925,** 932
aspis **Vol. 3:** 966
astēr **Vol. 2:** 27, 555, 557
Vol. 3: 734–737
astheneia **Vol. 3:** 281, **993–996, 998,** 1190
astheneō **Vol. 3: 993–995,** 997
asthenēs **Vol. 2:** 828
Vol. 3: 993–995, 1000
asthenōn **Vol. 3: 993–995**
asthenountes **Vol. 3:** 994 f.
astocheō **Vol. 1:** 608
astorgos **Vol. 2: 538 f., 542**
astrapē **Vol. 3: 1000 f.**
astrologoi tou ouranou **Vol. 2: 555**
astrologos **Vol. 2:** 555
astron **Vol. 3: 734–737**
asynetos **Vol. 3: 131 f.**
ata **Vol. 2:** 349
ataraxia **Vol. 1:** 68
atē **Vol. 2:** 349
atelestos **Vol. 3:** 679
atenizō **Vol. 3:** 519, **520**
athanasia **Vol. 1:** 58, **430–432, 435**
Vol. 2: 477
Vol. 3: 302
athanatos **Vol. 2:** 232, 476, 480
Athēna **Vol. 3:** 1036, 1144
Athēnaiōn **Vol. 2:** 847
atheos **Vol. 2:** 639
atheotēs **Vol. 2:** 92
atheteō **Vol. 1: 74,** 462
athetēsis **Vol. 1:** 337
athetēsō **Vol. 1:** 74
athleō **Vol. 1:** 645 f.
athlēsis **Vol. 1:** 645 f.
athlētēs **Vol. 1:** 646
athlon **Vol. 1:** 648
athōoō **Vol. 3:** 152
athroizō **Vol. 2:** 31, **33**
atimazō **Vol. 2: 48, 50**
atimazomai **Vol. 2:** 50
atimia **Vol. 2: 48–50**
Vol. 3: 281
atimos **Vol. 2: 48–50**
atomos **Vol. 2:** 925
atychēma **Vol. 3:** 577
aucheō **Vol. 1:** 227
augazō **Vol. 2: 289,293**
augē **Vol. 1:** 711
Vol. 2: 289 f.
aulē **Vol. 3:** 565, 568
auleō **Vol. 2:** 436
autarkeia **Vol. 2:** 820
Vol. 3: 727 f.
autarkēs **Vol. 3: 727**
authentein **Vol. 3:** 1066
auto **Vol. 2:** 363
autokatakritos **Vol. 2:** 363, **365**
autolexei **Vol. 1:** 580
automaton **Vol. 2:** 657
automatos **Vol. 1:** 723
autos **Vol. 1:** 181, 400 f., 569, 591, 669, 704, 707 f., 712, 731, 741
Vol. 2: 288, 290, 387, 433, 437, 452, 477, 489, 495, 502–504, 586, 618 f., 661, 692, 733, 735, 766, 772, 781, 839, 882, 900 f.
Vol. 3: 53, 71 f., 128, 166, 168, 170–174, 180, 185, 195, 207, 210, 218, 228, 242, 258, 264, 267, 276, 278, 392, 420, 509, 519, 603, 660, 711 f., 716, 765, 828, 846, 850, 892, 908, 925, 1018, 1022, 1073, 1177–1180, 1182 f., 1186, 1188, 1194, 1199, 1201, 1210–1214
auxanō **Vol. 1:** 732
Vol. 2: 128–130
auxēsis **Vol. 2: 128**
auxō **Vol. 2: 128 f.**
axioō **Vol. 3: 348**
axios **Vol. 3: 348 f.,** 352, 673, 1157
axiōs **Vol. 3:** 55, **348 f.,** 933, 944
azyma **Vol. 2: 463**
azymos **Vol. 2: 461, 463**

Babylōn **Vol. 1: 140**
bainō **Vol. 1:** 658
Vol. 2: 184, 196
balantion **Vol. 1: 142**
ballantion **Vol. 1: 142 f.**
ballō **Vol. 1:** 376, 454
Vol. 2: 299, 743
Vol. 3: 468
baptisma **Vol. 1: 144, 146, 149 f.,** 160, 703
Vol. 3: 52, 55
baptismos **Vol. 1: 144, 146, 149 f.**
Vol. 3: 770
baptistēs **Vol. 1:** 145, 149 f.
Vol. 3: 1208
baptizō **Vol. 1: 143–146, 149,** 152 f., 224 f.
Vol. 2: 672
Vol. 3: 205, 447, 501, **1172,** 1187 f., 1196, **1207–1210, 1213 f.**
baptizomenos **Vol. 3: 1208**
baptizōn **Vol. 3: 1208**
baptō **Vol. 1: 143–145,** 152, 160, 224
barbaros **Vol. 2:** 790
bareisthai **Vol. 1:** 261
bareō **Vol. 1: 260 f.**
bareōs **Vol. 1:** 261
baros **Vol. 1: 260 f.,** 263
barynō **Vol. 1: 260 f.**
barys **Vol. 1: 260–262**
Vol. 3: 1162
baryteros **Vol. 1:** 261
barytimos **Vol. 1: 260**
basanismos **Vol. 3: 855 f.**
basanistēs **Vol. 3:** 758, **855 f.**
basanizō **Vol. 3: 855 f.**
basanos **Vol. 3:** 353, **855 f., 859**
basileia **Vol. 1:** 298, 300–302, 329, 369, 508, 657
Vol. 2: 54, 74, 112, 192, 234, **372–382, 386–388,** 502, 580, 613, 714
Vol. 3: 52, 55 f., 181, 511, 584, 746, 832
basileia tōn ouranōn **Vol. 2:** 192, 376, **381,** 502, 714
Vol. 3: 55, 181
basileia tou theou **Vol. 2: 381 f., 386–388**
Vol. 3: 511, 746, 832
basilēē **Vol. 2:** 373
basileion hierateuma **Vol. 3:** 37
basileios **Vol. 1:** 305
Vol. 2: 372 f., 380
basileuō **Vol. 2:** 120, **372 f., 377 f., 380 f.,**
basileus **Vol. 1:** 665
Vol. 2: 69, **372 f., 377 f., 389,** 449, 511, 615, 781
Vol. 3: 608
basilikos **Vol. 3: 372 f.,** 449
basilis **Vol. 2:** 373
basilissa **Vol. 2: 372 f., 381,** 511
basis **Vol. 2:** 415
baskainō **Vol. 2: 552, 559**
bassa **Vol. 2:** 197
bastazō **Vol. 1:** 403
bathos **Vol. 2: 197–199,** 204
bathy **Vol. 2:** 197
bathys **Vol. 2: 197 f.**

Vol. 3: 1199
battalogeō **Vol. 2:** 795
bdelygma **Vol. 2:** 284
bdelygma tēs erēmōseōs **Vol. 1: 74 f.**
Vol. 2: 912
Vol. 3: 1006, 1008
bebaioō **Vol. 1: 658 f.**
Vol. 3: 924
bebaios **Vol. 1: 658–660,** 663
bebaiōsis **Vol. 1: 658 f.**
Beelzeboub **Vol. 3: 468 f.**
Beelzeboul **Vol. 3:** 344, **469, 472**
Beelzebul **Vol. 3: 468**
Beezeboul **Vol. 3: 468 f., 472,** 476
Belial **Vol. 3: 468**
Beliar **Vol. 3: 468,** 476
belos **Vol. 3: 959, 966**
bēma **Vol. 2:** 362, **369**
Vol. 3: 322
bēma podos **Vol. 2: 369**
bēryllos **Vol. 3: 396 f.**
bēssa **Vol. 2:** 197
Bēthleem **Vol. 1: 169**
bia **Vol. 2:** 601
Vol. 3: 574, **711,** 925
biaios **Vol. 3: 711,** 987
biastēs **Vol. 3:** 603, **711 f.,** 718
biazō **Vol. 2:** 383
Vol. 3: 603, **711**
biazomai **Vol. 3: 712,** 718
biblion **Vol. 1: 243 f.,** 248
Vol. 3: 1120
biblos **Vol. 1:** 65, 181, **242–244,** 248
Vol. 2: 189
Vol. 3: 490, 656
biē **Vol. 3:** 353
bioō **Vol. 2: 474 f.**
bios **Vol. 1:** 460, 640
Vol. 2: 474 f., 476–478, **845 f.**
Vol. 3: 32, 839, 935
biōtikos **Vol. 1:** 278
Vol. 2: 474 f.
blaisos **Vol. 2:** 414
blapsis **Vol. 3:** 340
blaptō **Vol. 3:** 340
blasphēmeō **Vol. 1:** 413
Vol. 2: 143
Vol. 3: 340–342, 344, 346, 347, 364, 471, 473, 696
blasphēmia **Vol. 3: 341 f., 344 f.**
blasphēmos **Vol. 3:** 27, **341 f., 345**
blastanō **Vol. 3: 865**
blepō **Vol. 1:** 602, 713
Vol. 2: 142, 243, 488, 756, 914
Vol. 3: 126, **511 f., 515, 517,** 520
Boanērges **Vol. 2:** 652
boaō **Vol. 1: 410–412**
Vol. 2: 855
Vol. 3: 53, 55, 118
boē **Vol. 1: 410 f.**
Vol. 2: 855
boēthos **Vol. 2:** 576
Vol. 3: 178, 210
bōmos **Vol. 3: 418, 431**
borboros **Vol. 3:** 679
boskō **Vol. 2:** 210, 411
botanē **Vol. 2: 210 f.**
boulē **Vol. 1:** 292, 693
Vol. 2: 149, 819
Vol. 3: 1015–1018, 1149
boulēma **Vol. 3: 1015, 1017 f.**
bouleuomai **Vol. 1:** 430, 537
Vol. 3: 1157
boulomai **Vol. 1:** 533 f., 569
Vol. 3: 1015–1018, 1019–1021, 1023
bous **Vol. 1:** 115
brabeion **Vol. 1:** 470, 644 f., **647–649**
brabeuō **Vol. 1: 648,** 652
brabeus **Vol. 1:** 648
brachys **Vol. 2:** 502, 643
brechō **Vol. 3: 1000 f.**
brephos **Vol. 1:** 160, 280 f., **283 f.**
briaros **Vol. 3:** 27
brithō **Vol. 3:** 27
brochē **Vol. 3: 1000 f.**
brōma **Vol. 2:** 264, **268 f., 277**
brōmata **Vol. 3:** 766
brontē **Vol. 3: 1000, 1002**
brōsimos **Vol. 2:** 268
brōsis **Vol. 2: 268 f.,** 831
Vol. 3: 1179
brychō **Vol. 2:** 416 f., **421, 424**
brygmos **Vol. 2: 421**
byblos **Vol. 1:** 243

chair- **Vol. 3: 817**
chaire **Vol. 2: 356,** 358
chairein **Vol. 2: 356, 358,** 777, 781
chairete **Vol. 2: 356,** 358
chairō **Vol. 1:** 206, 246 f., 739
Vol. 2: 352–355, **356–359,** 420, 436
chalaza **Vol. 3: 1000, 1004**
chalepos **Vol. 1: 419 f.**
chalkēdōn **Vol. 3: 396 f.**
chalkeus **Vol. 2: 96**
chalkion **Vol. 2: 96**
chalkolibanon **Vol. 2:** 97
chalkos **Vol. 2: 96**
char- **Vol. 3:** 817
chara **Vol. 1:** 400, 459 f., 731, 741
Vol. 2: 115, 355, **356–359,** 388, 420, 423, 431, 433
Vol. 3: 1180
charagma **Vol. 1:** 114
Vol. 2: 573–575
charaktēr **Vol. 1:** 712
Vol. 2: 284, **288–290, 292**
charassō **Vol. 2:** 288, **573–575**
Vol. 3: 951
charax **Vol. 3: 951 f.**
charis **Vol. 1:** 52, 112, 247, 300, 571, 601, 739
Vol. 2: 115–124, 131, 356, 360, 543, 546, 614, 780
Vol. 3: 252, 717, 746, 817, 854, 889, 1151, 1179
charisamenos **Vol. 2:** 116
charisma **Vol. 1:** 52, 300
Vol. 2: 39, 42, 79, **115, 118–124,** 172, 499
Vol. 3: 81, **702 f., 706 f.,** 927, 1091, 1167
charitēs **Vol. 2:** 115
charitoō **Vol. 2: 115 f., 118 f., 122**
charizomai **Vol. 1:** 703
Vol. 2: 115 f., 118 f., 122
Vol. 3: 72, 210
charma **Vol. 2:** 115
cheilos **Vol. 2:** 740
cheir **Vol. 1:** 475, 478
Vol. 2: 144, 146, **148–151,** 153, 367, 710
Vol. 3: 102, 475, 696, 716 f., 763, 1148, 1174, 1182
cheires **Vol. 2:** 148 f.
cheirographon **Vol. 3:** 1199
cheiropoiētos **Vol. 3:** 185, 793, 888
cheirothesia **Vol. 2:** 153
cheirotoneō **Vol. 1:** 471, **478**
cheirotonia **Vol. 2:** 153
cheō **Vol. 1:** 520
Vol. 2: 853
chēra **Vol. 3:** 228, 549, 1055, 1058, 1065, **1073–1076**
chēreia **Vol. 3:** 1074
chernētis **Vol. 3:** 875
chēros **Vol. 3:** 1073
cheroub **Vol. 1: 279**
cheroubeim, cheroubein **Vol. 1: 279**
cheroubim, cheroubin **Vol. 1: 279**
chiliades **Vol. 2: 698 f.**
chiliarchos **Vol. 1:** 666
Vol. 2: 489, **699**
chilias **Vol. 2:** 389, 690, **697–700, 703,** 734, 795, 809, 887, 901, 931
Vol. 3: 179, 277, 305, 417, 470 f., 500
chilioi **Vol. 1:** 52
Vol. 2: 697. 699 f., 703 f.
chiōn **Vol. 3: 1000, 1004**
chliaros **Vol. 1: 317–319**
chliarotēs **Vol. 1:** 318
chliō **Vol. 1:** 318

chloē **Vol. 2:** 27
chlōros **Vol. 1:** 205
Chobar **Vol. 3:** 986
choikos **Vol. 1: 520**
choiros **Vol. 1:** 117
cholē **Vol. 2: 27 f.**
cholos **Vol. 1:** 107
chōlos **Vol. 2: 415**
chōra **Vol. 1:** 741
Vol. 3: 1008
Chōrēb **Vol. 3:** 1013
chōreō **Vol. 1:** 728, **741 f.**
chōria **Vol. 2:** 807
chōrion **Vol. 1:** 93
Vol. 2: 845
chōris **Vol. 2:** 446
chōrizō **Vol. 3:** 172 f., 188 f., **534 f.,** 537, 539, 1064, 1070, 1072, 1164, 1195
chōros **Vol. 1:** 728, 741
chortasma **Vol. 1: 743 f.**
chortazō **Vol. 1:** 728, **743 f.**
Vol. 2: 211
chortos **Vol. 1: 743 f.**
Vol. 2: 210 f.
Vol. 3: 523
chous **Vol. 1: 520**
Chouthaios **Vol. 3:** 450, 456
chraomai **Vol. 3:** 599, 835
chrē **Vol. 2:** 845
Vol. 3: 324, **956–958**
chreia **Vol. 3: 956–958**
chrēma **Vol. 1:** 138, 465
Vol. 2: 829, 844, **845,** 852
Vol. 3: 324, 403, 604
chrēmata **Vol. 3: 324**
chrēmatismos **Vol. 3: 324 f.**
chrēmatizō **Vol. 3: 324 f.**
chrēsmos **Vol. 3:** 324
chrēsteuomai **Vol. 2: 105**
chrēstologia **Vol. 1:** 212
chrēston **Vol. 2:** 105
chrēstos **Vol. 2:** 98, 103, **105 f.,** 281, 335, 343, 659, 714
Vol. 3: 882
chrēstotēs **Vol. 2: 105–107,** 766, 770 f.
Vol. 3: 227
chrēzō **Vol. 3: 956–958**
chrima **Vol. 1:** 121
chriō **Vol. 1:** 53, **119–123**
Vol. 2: 334 f., 347, 711
Vol. 3: 499, 1060
chrisis **Vol. 1:** 121
chrisma **Vol. 1: 119, 121–123**
Vol. 2: 435
Vol. 3: 764
Christianos **Vol. 1:** 123, 199, 590
Vol. 2: 333, **343**
Vol. 3: 325
Christos **Vol. 1:** 53, 63, 122–125, 181, 214, 237, 242, 278, 299, 302, 321, 399, 414, 476, 592, 639, 647, 708, 718, 720, 739
Vol. 2: 94, **334 f., 338–340,** 343, 348, 374, 379, 401, 403, 454, 495, 515, 517, 519, 545 f., 558, 619, 671, 775, 808, 812, 835, 885
Vol. 3: 52–56, 73, 89, 129, 147, 170, 243, 257, 276, 299, 462, 504, 509, 572, 592, 596, 614, 638, 650, 652, 658, 666, 675, 724, 764 f., 770, 1033, 1060, 1172, 1182, 1190, 1192 f., 1199, 1205, 1207, 1209, 1212–1215
chronizō **Vol. 3: 839, 843**
chronos **Vol. 1:** 326, 734, 738
Vol. 3: 148, 826 f., 833–835, **839–844**
chronotribeō **Vol. 3: 839 f., 843**
chrysion **Vol. 2: 95,** 683
Vol. 3: 396
chrysolithos **Vol. 3: 396 f.**
chrysoō **Vol. 2: 95**
chrysoprasos **Vol. 3: 396 f.**
chrysos **Vol. 2: 95**
chrysous **Vol. 2: 95,** 574
Vol. 3: 814
chthōn **Vol. 1:** 263

dai- **Vol. 2:** 788
daimōn **Vol. 1:** 102, 168, **449–454**
Vol. 2: 85, 498
Vol. 3: 473, 727
daimonion **Vol. 1: 450–452,** 636 f.
Vol. 2: 284, 520, 691
Vol. 3: 468, 473, 475
daimonizomai **Vol. 1: 450, 453**
daiomai **Vol. 1:** 450
daktylios **Vol. 3:** 497
daktylos **Vol. 2: 148, 150,** 153
dalancha **Vol. 3:** 982
damalis **Vol. 1:** 115
daneistēs **Vol. 2:** 667
Dauid **Vol. 1:** 181, **425**
Vol. 2: 374
Vol. 3: 245, 607, 648, 658, 671, 1073, 1188
dea Roma **Vol. 3:** 217
dechomai **Vol. 1:** 534
Vol. 2: 146, 244, 817
Vol. 3: 744–746, 751, 808
deēsis **Vol. 2:** 855, **860 f.**
Vol. 3: 1174
dei **Vol. 2:** 139, **662–669,** 808, 878, 912
Vol. 3: 39, 504, 624, 723, 957
deidō **Vol. 1:** 453
Vol. 2: 85
deigma **Vol. 3: 570**
deigmatizō **Vol. 2:** 291
Vol. 3: 570
deiknymi **Vol. 3: 569,** 571
deilia **Vol. 1:** 622
deiliaō **Vol. 1:** 622
deinon **Vol. 3:** 561
deinos **Vol. 1:** 348
deipneō **Vol. 2: 520 f., 536**
deipnon **Vol. 2:** 273, 518, **520, 522, 536**
Vol. 3: 411, 669 f., 750
deisidaimōn **Vol. 1: 450, 453**
Vol. 2: 85
deisidaimonesterous **Vol. 2:** 85
deisidaimonia **Vol. 1: 450, 453**
Vol. 2: 85
dek- **Vol. 2: 238,** 245
Vol. 3: 759, 808
deka **Vol. 1:** 54
Vol. 2: 692, 699
Vol. 3: 851
dekatē **Vol. 2: 692–694**
Vol. 3: 851, 1174
dekatoō **Vol. 2: 692–694**
Vol. 3: 851
dekatos **Vol. 2: 692**
Vol. 3: 851
dekteos **Vol. 3:** 744
dekton **Vol. 3: 745**
dektos **Vol. 3: 744–746**
dēloō **Vol. 3:** 309, 311 f., **316 f.,** 323
dēlos **Vol. 3:** 309, **316**
delphys **Vol. 1:** 254
dēmiourgeō **Vol. 1:** 378, 387
Vol. 3: 1156
dēmiourgos **Vol. 1:** 279, 383, **387,** 389, 513, 521
dēmos **Vol. 1:** 292, 690
Vol. 2: 788 f., 798
Vol. 3: 871, 1205
dēmosia **Vol. 2: 790**
dēmosiōnēs **Vol. 3:** 757
dēmosios **Vol. 2: 788, 790**
dendron **Vol. 3: 865 f., 868**
deō **Vol. 1: 171 f.**
Vol. 2: 732–734
Vol. 3: 188, 537
deomai **Vol. 2:** 855, 857, 859, **860 f., 874, 885**
deon estin **Vol. 2: 664 f.**
derkomai **Vol. 1:** 507
derma **Vol. 3:** 178
derō **Vol. 1: 161–163**
desm- **Vol. 3:** 591
desmē **Vol. 3: 591**
desmeuō **Vol. 3: 591**
desmios **Vol. 3:** 589, **591 f.,** 599
desmophylax **Vol. 3: 591**
desmos **Vol. 3:** 180, 589, **591 f.,** 599
desmōtērion **Vol. 3: 591,** 679
desmotēs **Vol. 3: 591**
despotēs **Vol. 1:** 345

Vol. 2: 508–510
Vol. 3: 876, 1162
deuro **Vol. 3:** 280
deute **Vol. 1:** 493
deuteronomion **Vol. 1:** 54
deuteros **Vol. 1:** 54 f., 666
Vol. 3: 814
dexia **Vol. 2: 146**
Vol. 3: 588, 749
dexiai **Vol. 2:** 146
dexios **Vol. 2: 146 f.**, 152, 188, 194, 614
Vol. 3: 1178
dhala **Vol. 3:** 983
di' ainigmatōn **Vol. 2: 756**
di' hēmōn **Vol. 1:** 570
dia **Vol. 1:** 123, 187, 197, 503, 558, 570, 601, 704, 736
Vol. 2: 27, 120 f., 243, 245, 356, 436, 517, 573, 580, 621, 654, 756, 767, 769, 774, 781
Vol. 3: 53, 72, 152, 163, 166, 171 f., 185, 204, 391, 468, 489, 491, 611, 675, 839, 1033, 1083, **1171–1174, 1176–1178, 1181–1184, 1186, 1189–1191, 1193, 1197 f., 1201, 1210 f.**, 1214
dia charagmatōn **Vol. 2: 573**
dia cheiros tinos **Vol. 2:** 149
dia eidous **Vol. 1:** 704
dia phthonon **Vol. 1:** 558
dia pisteōs **Vol. 1:** 601
Vol. 3: 163, 166, 204, 373
diaballō **Vol. 3: 468**, 476
diabolos **Vol. 1:** 168, 449 f.
Vol. 2: 381, 458
Vol. 3: 468–473, 474, 476, 628, 804, 1178
diachōrizesthai **Vol. 3:** 534
diadēma **Vol. 1: 405**
diadeō **Vol. 1:** 405
diairesis **Vol. 3:** 932
diakoneō **Vol. 2:** 427, 823, 847
Vol. 3: 171, 195, **544–548**, 553, 593, 596, 598, 625, 724, 1065 f.
diakonia **Vol. 2:** 299
Vol. 3: 168, **544–548**, 854, 1112
diakonos **Vol. 1:** 192, 198, 667
Vol. 2: 826
Vol. 3: 195, **544–546, 548 f.**, 553, 596, 1065
diakrinō **Vol. 1: 503–505**
diakrisis **Vol. 1: 503 f.**
dialegomai **Vol. 3: 820 f.**, 826, 1083
dialeipō **Vol. 3: 247 f., 251**
dialektos **Vol. 3:** 1079
diallassō **Vol. 1:** 569
Vol. 3: 166
diallassomai **Vol. 3: 166 f., 173**
dialogismos **Vol. 1:** 350, 566
Vol. 3: 820 f., 826
dialogizomai **Vol. 1:** 589
Vol. 3: 820, 826
dialyō **Vol. 2: 33 f.**
diamartyreō **Vol. 3: 1042, 1044**
diamartyromai **Vol. 3: 1038 f., 1041, 1044**
diamerismos **Vol. 3:** 978
diangellō **Vol. 3: 44–47**
dianoēma **Vol. 3: 122 f., 125, 128**
dianoia **Vol. 1:** 671, 673
Vol. 2: 177, 181, 403, 493
Vol. 3: 122–125, 127 f.
dianoichthēti **Vol. 2: 729**
dianoigō **Vol. 1:** 581, 667
Vol. 2: 726, 729
dianyktereuō **Vol. 1:** 420
diaphtheirō **Vol. 1:** 463, **467 f., 470**
diaphthora **Vol. 1: 467 f., 470**
Vol. 3: 262
diapragmateuomai **Vol. 3:** 1158
diarrhēgnymi **Vol. 3:** 592
diaseiō **Vol. 3: 556–558**
diaskorpizō **Vol. 2: 33 f.**
diasōzō **Vol. 3:** 157, **205, 211 f.**, 860, 1177
diaspeirō **Vol. 1:** 55, 685
Vol. 2: 33 f.
diaspora **Vol. 1:** 55, 683, **685 f.**, 691 f.
Vol. 2: 33–35
diastellō **Vol. 1:** 335
diatagma **Vol. 1:** 330
diatassō **Vol. 3:** 854
diatēreō **Vol. 3:** 717
diathēkē **Vol. 1:** 226, **365 f., 368 f., 371 f., 374, 376**, 659, 666, 682
Vol. 2: 132, 183, 329, 524, 670 f.
Vol. 3: 72, 224, 484, 784, 815
diatithemai **Vol. 1:** 365, 368 f.
diatithēmi **Vol. 1:** 365, 376
Vol. 2: 385
Vol. 3: 871
diaugazō **Vol. 2: 289**
diazonnymi **Vol. 3: 120**
dichostasia **Vol. 1:** 535
didachē **Vol. 1:** 55, 62
Vol. 2: 36 f., 671
Vol. 3: 60 f., 63, 768–771, 907
didaktikos **Vol. 3: 759, 765**
didaktos **Vol. 3: 759, 764**
didask– **Vol. 3:** 766
didaskalia **Vol. 2:** 121, 170, 766
Vol. 3: 228, 765, **768–771**
didaskalos **Vol. 1:** 484
Vol. 2: 36, 510, 595
Vol. 3: 115, 480, 568, 764, **765–768**, 779, 781
didaskō **Vol. 1:** 191, 568, 573
Vol. 2: 36, 113, 165
Vol. 3: 44, 54, 56 f., 181, 228, 509, **759–765**, 769, 774, 821
didaskōn **Vol. 1:** 197
Vol. 3: 766
didōmi **Vol. 1:** 331, 363, 454
Vol. 2: 39–41, 44, 274, 299, 489
Vol. 3: 168, 173 f., 195, 197, 420, 611, 683, 737, 748, 1180
didrachmon **Vol. 3: 752 f.**
didymos **Vol. 1:** 394
diēgeomai **Vol. 1: 573, 575 f.**
diēgēsis **Vol. 1: 573–576**
Vol. 2: 113
Vol. 3: 773
diemai **Vol. 2:** 805
dierchomai **Vol. 1: 320 f.**
diermēneia **Vol. 1: 579**
diermēneuō **Vol. 1: 579–581**
diermēneuomai **Vol. 1:** 581
diermēneutēs **Vol. 1: 579, 581**
diexhodos **Vol. 3: 940**
dihaireō **Vol. 1: 533–535**
dihairesis **Vol. 1: 533–535**
dikaia lambanein **Vol. 3:** 353
dikaiokrisia **Vol. 3:** 315
dikaiōma **Vol. 1:** 332 f., 677, 738
Vol. 3: 352, 354, 361–363, 365, 371 f., 760
dikaion **Vol. 3: 353**
dikaioō **Vol. 1:** 701
Vol. 2: 122, 370
Vol. 3: 161, 168, **352, 354 f., 358, 360–363, 365, 369 f., 372,** 375
dikaios **Vol. 2:** 91, 93, 144, 236 f., 497, 620, 658 f.
Vol. 3: 352–355, 358, 360–363, 365–370, 374 f., 573, 575, 732, 924, 1177
dikaiōs **Vol. 2:** 94
Vol. 3: 352 f., 361, 363, 370
dikaiōsis **Vol. 1:** 701
Vol. 3: 352, 354, 363, 371 f., 1184
dikaiosynē **Vol. 1:** 112, 501, 639, 701, 723
Vol. 2: 78, 245, 387 f., 497, 543, 546, 595, 884
Vol. 3: 72, 92 f., 161, 166, 168, 170, 184, **352–354, 358, 360–365, 369–372**, 374–377, 436, 573, 575, 825 f., 925, 966, 1149, 1155, 1177, 1187 f.
dikastikos **Vol. 3:** 354

dikē **Vol. 1:** 558, 645, 700
Vol. 3: 32, **92 f.**, **96**, 100, 267, 353, 375 f., 573, 583
dio **Vol. 2:** 186, 664
dio legei **Vol. 2:** 186
diōgmos **Vol. 2: 805 f.**, 808
Vol. 3: 27
diōkō **Vol. 1:** 553, 558, 649
Vol. 2: 805 f.
Vol. 3: 942
diōkōn **Vol. 1:** 558
diōktēs **Vol. 3:** 27
diorthōsis **Vol. 3: 351**, 831
diorysso **Vol. 2:** 831
Dios **Vol. 3:** 1002
diotrephēs **Vol. 2:** 372
diplous **Vol. 3:** 572
dipsaō **Vol. 2: 264–268, 277**
dipsos **Vol. 2: 265**
dipsychos **Vol. 1:** 505
Vol. 3: 572, **686 f.**
dischilioi **Vol. 2: 699**
dissos **Vol. 3:** 1083
distazō **Vol. 1:** 504
distomos **Vol. 2:** 686
dizēmai **Vol. 3:** 530
dochē **Vol. 3: 744 f.**
dōdeka **Vol. 1:** 131, 489
Vol. 2: 694, 700, **703**
Vol. 3: 404
dōdekaphylon **Vol. 2:** 695
dogma **Vol. 1: 330 f.**, 336, 342, 533
Vol. 2: 135, 442, 447, 453
Vol. 3: 773, 822, 877
dogmatizō **Vol. 1: 330**
Vol. 2: 453
dok– **Vol. 2: 238**, 245
dokaō **Vol. 3:** 808
dokei **Vol. 3: 821 f.**
dokeō **Vol. 1:** 55, 330
Vol. 2: 44, 52, 393
Vol. 3: 387, 808, **821 f.**, 826, 877
dokimasia **Vol. 3: 808**
dokimasis **Vol. 3: 808**
dokimazō **Vol. 3: 808–810**
dokimē **Vol. 3: 808 f.**
dokimion **Vol. 3: 808 f.**
dokimos **Vol. 3: 808**, 810
dokountes **Vol. 3: 822**
doloō **Vol. 3:** 886
dōma **Vol. 2:** 40–42
domos **Vol. 2:** 509
dōrea **Vol. 2: 40–42**, 122
Vol. 3: 364
dōrean **Vol. 2: 40 f.**, 120
dōrēma **Vol. 2: 40–42**
dōreomai **Vol. 2: 40 f.**
dōron **Vol. 2: 39–43**, 120
Vol. 3: 38, 1203
dosis **Vol. 2:** 40 f., 131
dotēs **Vol. 2:** 43
doulagōgō **Vol. 1:** 647
douleia **Vol. 1:** 707
Vol. 3: 590, **592 f.**, **595–598**
douleuō **Vol. 2:** 817
Vol. 3: 545, 550, **592–595, 598**
doulos **Vol. 1:** 256, 283, 647, 650, 706, 709, 718, 720
Vol. 2: 254 f., 508–511, 573
Vol. 3: 548, 589–591, **592–597**, 599, 608–611, 613, 758, 854, 1162
dounai **Vol. 1:** 331
Vol. 3: 683
doxa **Vol. 1:** 261, 327, 483, 546, 587, 594, 599, 696, 732, 735, 740
Vol. 2: 44–52, 119, 146, 162, 190, 204, 213, 242, 289 f., 336, 377, 393, 482, 485, 543, 546, 563, 605, 612, 724, 781, 839
Vol. 3: 214, 257, 262, 281, 283 f., 316, 344, 514, 516 f., 554, 717, 723, 817, 821, 848, 925, 927, 1176, 1187, 1189
doxasthēnai **Vol. 2:** 546
Vol. 3: 848
doxazō **Vol. 1:** 483
Vol. 2: 44 f., 203, **874**
doxazomai **Vol. 2:** 47, 546
drakōn **Vol. 1: 507 f.**, 510 f.
Vol. 3: 470
drama **Vol. 2:** 644
draō **Vol. 2:** 644
drepanon **Vol. 3:** 527
dromos **Vol. 3: 945, 947**
dyna– **Vol. 2:** 601
dynamai **Vol. 2: 601, 603 f., 615**
Vol. 3: 152, 186 f., 491, 1033
dynameis **Vol. 2:** 148, 608 f.
Vol. 3: 927
dynamenos **Vol. 2:** 450
dynamis **Vol. 1:** 104, 167, 337, 398, 400
Vol. 2: 69 f., 177, 388, 561, **601–606**, 607–609, 615 f., 654
Vol. 3: 276, 278, 281, 299, 371, 457, 711, 714, 717, 736, 927, 993, 995, 1026
dynamoō **Vol. 2: 601, 603**
dynastēs **Vol. 2:** 70, **601**
dynateō **Vol. 2: 601, 603**
dynaton **Vol. 2:** 498
dynatos **Vol. 2: 601**, 606
Vol. 3: 995
dynō **Vol. 1: 314**
dyo **Vol. 3:** 1040
dyō **Vol. 1:** 312 f., **314**, 317, 470
Vol. 2: 686, 688, 697
dyomai **Vol. 1:** 314
dysexēgētos **Vol. 3:** 124
dysnoētos **Vol. 3: 122, 124, 129**
dysparaklētos **Vol. 1:** 89
dyssebēs **Vol. 3:** 353

ē agnoeite **Vol. 2:** 406
ean **Vol. 1:** 210, 591
Vol. 2: 588
Vol. 3: 181, 227, 243, 420, 446, 535
ēchē **Vol. 3:** 112
ēcheō **Vol. 3: 112,** 114
echō **Vol. 1:** 137, 337, 560, 600, **635–638,** 640, 739
Vol. 2: 62, 78, 115, 121, 145, 242, 435, 587, 594, 622, 643, 735, 846
Vol. 3: 129, 216, 822, 998, 1212
ēchōn **Vol. 3:** 112
ēchos **Vol. 3: 112**
echthos **Vol. 1:** 553
echthra **Vol. 1: 553–555**
Vol. 3: 172
echthros **Vol. 1: 553 f.**, 557.
Vol. 2: 742
Vol. 3: 469
ēdē **Vol. 2:** 62
Vol. 3: 869
edō **Vol. 1:** 611
egeirō **Vol. 1:** 445
Vol. 2: 136, 252, 925
Vol. 3: 185, 259, 268, 276, **279 f.**, 307, 715
egeneto **Vol. 1:** 384
Vol. 2: 351, 398
Vol. 3: 313, 351
egersis **Vol. 3: 279 f.**
egō **Vol. 1:** 418, 542, 588, 590, 607
Vol. 2: 278–283, 289, 498, 663
Vol. 3: 127, 136, 185, 195, 204, 505, 591, 742, 773, 1022, 1172, 1213
egō de legō hymin
Vol. 2: 281
egō eimi **Vol. 2:** 79, **278–283,** 715, 741
Vol. 3: 204, 343, 510, 591, 1022
egrēgora **Vol. 2:** 136
ei **Vol. 1:** 592
Vol. 2: 270, 671
Vol. 3: 187, 228, 257, 278 f., 1018
ei kai **Vol. 3:** 596
ei mē **Vol. 1:** 130, 399, 575
Vol. 2: 100
Vol. 3: 1195
ei pōs **Vol. 3:** 278 f.,
eidenai **Vol. 2:** 391
Vol. 3: 1064, 1078

eidō **Vol. 1:** 703
eidōleion **Vol. 2: 284**
eidōlion **Vol. 2: 284**
eidōlolatrēs **Vol. 2: 284 f.**
eidōlolatria **Vol. 1:** 138, 500
Vol. 2: 284–286
eidōlon **Vol. 1:** 138
Vol. 2: 284, 287, **292,** 471
Vol. 3: 207, 678 f., 891
eidōlothyton **Vol. 2: 284 f.**
Vol. 3: 417, 432
eidon **Vol. 3: 511, 513, 515**
eidos **Vol. 1: 703 f.,** 705, 708, 714
Vol. 2: 393
Vol. 3: 513, 554, 1183
eiē **Vol. 3:** 160
eike **Vol. 2:** 286
eikō **Vol. 2:** 256
eikōn **Vol. 1:** 95, 114, 371, 707
Vol. 2: 158, 284, **286–288,** 289 f., **292 f.,** 501–503, 743
Vol. 3: 554 f., 904 f., 1158
eikos **Vol. 2:** 256
eikosi **Vol. 2:** 699
eimi **Vol. 1:** 414
Vol. 2: 57, 79, **278–283,** 290, 724
Vol. 3: 195, 204, 343, 510, 591, 1022
einai **Vol. 1:** 179, 181, 271, 592
Vol. 2: 234, 351, 390, 500, 503 f., 658, 665 f., 683
Vol. 3: 72, 112, 149, 152, 157, 173, 218, 239, 354, 387, 391, 445, 489, 555, 564, 660, 727, 822, 834, 967, 1026, 1162, 1172, 1175, 1177, 1181, 1185, 1193 f., 1204–1207
einai syn Christō **Vol. 3: 1172, 1205, 1207**
eiōthos **Vol. 2:** 437
eipein **Vol. 2:** 236
eipon **Vol. 1:** 341
Vol. 3: 490, 510
eirēnē **Vol. 1:** 213
Vol. 2: 357, 388, 593, **776–783**
Vol. 3: 171, 966, 1181, 1191
eirēneuō **Vol. 2: 776, 780**
Vol. 3: 447
eirēnikē **Vol. 3:** 422
eirēnikos **Vol. 3: 776, 780, 782**
eirēnopoieō **Vol. 2: 776, 782**
eirēnopoios **Vol. 2: 776, 780, 782**
eirgasmenos **Vol. 1:** 348
eirōn **Vol. 2: 430**
eirōtaō **Vol. 2:** 879
eis **Vol. 1:** 107, 227, 245, 305, 320, 325, 358, 502, 547, 591 f., 599, 601, 647, 659, 730, 740–742
Vol. 2: 35, 60–62, 64, 115, 131, 162, 209, 241, 268, 320, 367, 387, 403, 420, 533, 542, 655, 657, 661, 735, 769, 771, 773–775, 809, 835, 839, 882, 900
Vol. 3: 52, 55, 99, 161, 171, 199, 218, 239, 242–245, 278, 313, 371, 388, 400, 432, 448, 505, 511, 519, 563, 572, 603, 711 f., 718, 737, 769, 803, 828–830, 839, 841, 845 f., 935, 1033, 1043, 1045, **1171–1178, 1182–1191, 1201, 1204, 1208–1215**
eis andra teleion **Vol. 2:** 162
eis bebaiōsin **Vol. 1:** 659
eis cheiras **Vol. 2:** 149
eis Christon (Iēsoun) **Vol. 3: 1209, 1213**
eis doxan **Vol. 3: 1189**
eis geneas kai geneas **Vol. 2:** 35
eis pistin **Vol. 1:** 601
Vol. 3: 1189
eis telos **Vol. 2:** 60–62, 64, 773
eis to onoma **Vol. 3: 1209–1211**
eisakouō **Vol. 2:** 91, **172 f., 175, 177**
Vol. 3: 1181
eisdechomai **Vol. 3: 744 f.**
eiselthein **Vol. 2:** 387
eiserchomai **Vol. 1: 320 f.,** 647
Vol. 2: 385, 387
eishodos **Vol. 3: 935–937, 940 f.**
eiskaleō **Vol. 1:** 273
eispherō **Vol. 3:** 803
eita **Vol. 2:** 735
eite **Vol. 2:** 789
ek **Vol. 1:** 179, 289, 291, 301, 310, 320, 377, 445, 534, 601, 669
Vol. 2: 55, 120, 172, 175, 179, 193, 244, 464, 599, 657, 789, 846
Vol. 3: 40, 180, 200, 278, 299, 364, 367 f., 373, 685, 713, 793, 829 f., 839, 922, 1073, 1148, **1171–1174, 1176–1178, 1180–1183, 1185, 1188–1190, 1198, 1201–1203,** 1214
ek merous **Vol. 2: 303 f.**
ek pisteōs **Vol. 1:** 601
Vol. 3: 364, 367 f., 373, 1177, **1188–1190**
ek tou patros **Vol. 3: 1203**
ekballō **Vol. 1:** 449, **453,** 739
Vol. 3: 473
ekcheō **Vol. 2: 523–525, 853–855**
ekchynnō **Vol. 2: 853 f.**
ekchynō **Vol. 2:** 854
ekchysis **Vol. 2:** 854
ekdechomai **Vol. 2: 244 f.**
Vol. 3: 745
ekdēmeō **Vol. 2: 788–790**
ekdēmos **Vol. 2:** 788
ekdiēgeomai **Vol. 1:** 575
ekdikazō **Vol. 3: 92**
ekdikeō **Vol. 3: 92 f., 96 f.,** 100
ekdikēsis **Vol. 3: 92 f., 97,** 136, 836
ekdikos **Vol. 3: 92, 97**
ekdiōkō **Vol. 2: 805 f.**
ekdochē **Vol. 2: 244**
ekdotos **Vol. 1:** 693
ekdyō **Vol. 1: 313 f.**
ekdyomai **Vol. 1:** 315
ekei **Vol. 2:** 421
ekeinos **Vol. 1:** 522, 575
Vol. 2: 122, 826
Vol. 3: 836, 846, 850
ekkaleō **Vol. 1:** 291
Vol. 3: 51
ekkathairō **Vol. 3: 102,** 154, 167
ekklaō **Vol. 3:** 869
ekklēsia **Vol. 1:** 10, 56, 271 f., **291–293, 295–304, 306 f.,** 490, 519, 535, 643
Vol. 2: 30, 83, 328, 349, **731,** 734, 796, 805
Vol. 3: 49, 335, 384, 387, 521, 567 f., 670, 675, 1141, 1194, 1201
ekklēsiazō **Vol. 1:** 292
ekkoptō **Vol. 3:** 869
eklampō **Vol. 2: 484–486**
eklegō **Vol. 1:** 537
eklegomai **Vol. 1:** 273, 533 f., **536–542,** 598
Vol. 2: 237
Vol. 3: 253, 636, 641
ekleipō **Vol. 3: 248**
eklektos **Vol. 1:** 97, 305, **536–541,** 598
Vol. 2: 237
Vol. 3: 388, 641, 1117
eklelegmenos **Vol. 1:** 541
eklogē **Vol. 1: 536 f., 539 f.**
Vol. 2: 120
Vol. 3: 251 f.
eklyō **Vol. 3: 177 f., 189**
ekmyktērizō **Vol. 3:** 341
eknēphō **Vol. 1: 514 f.**
ekniptō **Vol. 1:** 153
ekpeirazō **Vol. 3: 798 f., 802,** 809
ekphainō **Vol. 3:** 311
ekpheugō **Vol. 1:** 558
ekpiptō **Vol. 1: 608**
ekplēroō **Vol. 1:** 734
Vol. 3: 71
ekplēssō **Vol. 1:** 527, **529 f.**
ekplēssomai **Vol. 1:** 530
Vol. 2: 623
ekpneō **Vol. 3: 689, 708**

ekporeuomai **Vol. 3:** 1181, 1202 f.
ekptyō **Vol. 2:** 559
ekpyrōsis **Vol. 1:** 178, 184, 654
Vol. 2: 836
ekrhizoō **Vol. 3: 865 f., 869**
ekrybēn **Vol. 2:** 214
ekstasis **Vol. 1: 527 f.,** 530
Vol. 2: 625
Vol. 3: 315
ekteinō **Vol. 2:** 150
ektenōs **Vol. 2:** 868
ekthambeō **Vol. 2: 621, 623 f.**
ekthambos **Vol. 2: 621, 623**
ekthaumazō **Vol. 2: 621, 623**
ektinaktron **Vol. 3:** 560
ektinassō **Vol. 3: 560**
ektitrōskō **Vol. 1:** 182
ektrapē **Vol. 3: 903**
ektrechō **Vol. 2:** 588
ektrephō **Vol. 3:** 779
ektrepō **Vol. 3: 902 f.**
ektrepomai **Vol. 3: 903**
ektrōma **Vol. 1:** 176, **182 f.,** 188
Vol. 2: 57
Vol. 3: 284, 314
ekzēteō **Vol. 3: 530–532**
ekzētēsis **Vol. 3: 532**
elachistos **Vol. 2: 427–429**
Vol. 3: 181
elachistoteros **Vol. 2: 428 f.**
elaia **Vol. 2: 710 f.**
Vol. 3: 868, 870
elaion **Vol. 1:** 119
Vol. 2: 710–713
Vol. 3: 869. 921 f., 1162
elaiōn **Vol. 2: 710 f.**
elassōn **Vol. 2: 427 f.**
eleaō **Vol. 2: 594**
eleeinos **Vol. 2: 594, 597**
eleeinoteros **Vol. 2: 597**
eleēmōn **Vol. 2: 594–596**
Vol. 3: 162
eleēmosynas poieō **Vol. 2: 597**
eleēmosynē **Vol. 2: 594–597**
eleeō **Vol. 2:** 543 f., **594 f.,** 597 f.
eleēson **Vol. 2: 594**
elegmos **Vol. 2: 140 f.**
ēleimmenos **Vol. 2:** 335
ēlektron **Vol. 2:** 97
elenchō **Vol. 1:** 89, 349
Vol. 2: 137, **140–142, 145,** 768
Vol. 3: 573, 892
elenchōn **Vol. 1:** 373
elenchos **Vol. 1:** 713
Vol. 2: 140–142
elenxis **Vol. 2: 140, 142**
eleōn **Vol. 1:** 197
eleos **Vol. 1:** 112
Vol. 2: 117 f., 123, 449, 543 f., 546, **593–597,** 598 f., **600**
Vol. 3: 241, 889, 1201
elephantiasis **Vol. 2: 464**
elephas **Vol. 2: 464**
eleusis **Vol. 1: 320**
eleutheria **Vol. 1: 715–719,** 721
Vol. 2: 449, 735 f.
Vol. 3: 561, 597, 1151, 1193
eleutheroō **Vol. 1: 715, 717**
eleutheros **Vol. 1: 715–718**
ēli ēli lema sabachtani **Vol. 2:** 82
elleipsis **Vol. 1:** 56
ellogeō **Vol. 3:** 587
elōi elōi lama sabachthani **Vol. 2:** 82
elpis **Vol. 1:** 180, 589, 730
Vol. 2: 238–246, 545, 736, 774
Vol. 3: 214, 1151
elpizō **Vol. 1:** 589, 596, 714
Vol. 2: 142, **238–246**
elpizomena **Vol. 2: 238**
elthe **Vol. 1:** 320, 738
ēlthon **Vol. 1:** 569
emballō **Vol. 1:** 477
emblepō **Vol. 3: 519 f.**
embrimaomai **Vol. 3:** 710
emeō **Vol. 1:** 318
Emmanouēl **Vol. 1:** 186
Vol. 2: 86, 627. 654, 799
Vol. 3: 664, 1072 f.
emmenō **Vol. 3: 223, 226**
emon **Vol. 2: 846**
emos **Vol. 1:** 738
empaigmonē **Vol. 3:** 341
empaizō **Vol. 2:** 436
Vol. 3: 340 f.
empeiria **Vol. 1:** 56
empeirikos **Vol. 1:** 56
emperipateō **Vol. 3: 943–945**
emphanēs **Vol. 2: 488 f.**
emphanizō **Vol. 2: 488 f.**
Vol. 3: 314, 316, 320
emphasis **Vol. 1:** 711
emphysaō **Vol. 2:** 787
emphytos **Vol. 3: 865, 868**
empimplēmi **Vol. 1: 733, 735**
empneō **Vol. 3: 689**
emporeuomai **Vol. 1: 268**
emprosthen **Vol. 2:** 818
Vol. 3: 242, 1173, 1175, **1205**
empsychos **Vol. 2:** 476
en **Vol. 1:** 92, 94, 138, 162, 227 f., 275, 299, 304, 334, 336, 351, 390, 394, 469, 569, 571, 590, 592, 679, 685, 704, 706, 708, 712, 730, 732, 737 f., 742
Vol. 2: 115, 146, 170, 220, 241 f., 289, 354, 356, 358–360, 368, 388, 399, 403, 420, 436, 445, 503 f., 517, 519, 524, 545–547, 563, 574, 586, 604, 615, 619, 621, 643, 655, 657, 671, 675, 680, 683, 708, 715, 726, 735 f., 740, 746, 756, 765, 767 f., 773 f., 781, 789, 816, 819, 878, 883, 900, 912, 925
Vol. 3: 31, 53, 82, 102, 112, 121, 166, 168, 170–172, 180 f., 185, 195, 224 f., 227, 242, 257, 268, 299, 315, 320, 322, 354, 391, 400, 403, 445, 447, 456, 464, 491, 504, 521, 554, 671, 675, 685, 695, 713, 737, 765, 793, 836, 839, 845–847, 850, 876, 884 f., 891 f., 909, 914, 933, 939, 944, 946, 966, 1033, 1045, 1079, 1150, **1171–1178, 1182 f., 1185 f., 1188, 1190–1194, 1198, 1200 f., 1204, 1207–1210, 1212–1214**
en ainigmati **Vol. 2:** 756
en alētheia **Vol. 3: 1191**
en aphtharsia **Vol. 1:** 469
en apokryphō **Vol. 2:** 215
en archē **Vol. 3: 1204**
en Christō **Vol. 1:** 299
Vol. 2: 545, 671
Vol. 3: 1171, 1190–1193, 1207
en Christō Iēsou **Vol. 2:** 619
en dexia **Vol. 2:** 146
en eidei **Vol. 1:** 704
en hēlikia **Vol. 1:** 92
en heni sōmati **Vol. 3: 1191**
en hō **Vol. 3: 1175, 1212**
en hymin **Vol. 3:** 504, **1192**
en kryptō **Vol. 3:** 320
en kyriō **Vol. 1:** 571
Vol. 2: 359 f., 619
Vol. 3: 1191
en merei **Vol. 2: 304**
en panti **Vol. 1:** 94
en pneumati **Vol. 2:** 242
Vol. 3: 695, 1177, **1190–1192**
en prosōpō **Vol. 2:** 399
en sarki **Vol. 1:** 592
Vol. 2: 242, 816
Vol. 3: 322, **1200**
en tō Iēsou **Vol. 3: 1191**
en tō kryptō **Vol. 2:** 214, 216, 218
en tō onomati **Vol. 3: 1210**
en tō phanerō **Vol. 2:** 218
enankalizomai **Vol. 1:** 239
enanthrōpeō **Vol. 2:** 661
enanti **Vol. 2:** 735
Vol. 3: 239
enantion **Vol. 2:** 876
endeixis **Vol. 1:** 573
endēmeō **Vol. 2: 788–790**

Vol. 3: 1205
endoxazō **Vol. 2: 44**
endoxazomai **Vol. 2:** 47
endoxos **Vol. 2: 44, 47**
Vol. 3: 318
endyma gamou **Vol. 2: 579**
endynameō **Vol. 2:** 604
endynamoō **Vol. 2: 601**
endyō **Vol. 1: 314 f.**
Vol. 2: 925
enechō **Vol. 2: 142,** 145
enedra **Vol. 1:** 710
enekrypsen **Vol. 2:** 216
enepō **Vol. 2:** 643
energeia **Vol. 3:** 403, **1147, 1151**
energēma **Vol. 3: 1147, 1151**
energeō **Vol. 3:** 719, 1021, **1147, 1151 f.,** 1182
energēs **Vol. 3: 1147, 1151**
energos **Vol. 3: 1147**
energoumenē **Vol. 2:** 861
enestēkos **Vol. 3:** 831
eneulogeō **Vol. 1: 206, 212**
eneulogeomai **Vol. 1:** 206
engastrimythos **Vol. 2: 554**
engizō **Vol. 2: 53–55,** 382, 387, 901, 932
Vol. 3: 55
engraphē **Vol. 3: 482**
engraphō **Vol. 3: 482 f., 486, 490**
engyaō **Vol. 1:** 372
engyos **Vol. 1: 372 f.,** 375 f.
Vol. 2: 40
engys **Vol. 2: 52–54,** 65, 382
Vol. 3: 1172 f.
enhorkizō **Vol. 3: 737 f.**
enhybrizō **Vol. 3: 27 f.**
eniautos **Vol. 3:** 826, **841**
eniautous treis kai mēnas hex **Vol. 2: 688,** 700
enischyō **Vol. 3:** 713
enkainizō **Vol. 2: 670, 673,** 675
Vol. 3: 366
enkakeō **Vol. 1: 561, 563**
enkaleō **Vol. 1: 84**
enkauchaomai **Vol. 1: 227 f.**
enkentris **Vol. 3: 865**
enkentrisis **Vol. 3: 865**
enkentrizō **Vol. 3: 865, 867, 869**
enklēma **Vol. 1: 84**
Vol. 3: 923
enkopē **Vol. 2: 220 f.,** 418
enkopēn didonai tini **Vol. 2:** 220
enkoptō **Vol. 2: 220 f.,** 222, 418
enkrateia **Vol. 1: 494–496,** 502 f.
Vol. 2: 99
Vol. 3: 102, 214
enkratēs **Vol. 1: 494–496**
enkrateuomai **Vol. 1: 494–496,** 647
enkryptō **Vol. 2:** 216
ennoia **Vol. 3: 122 f., 125. 128,** 457
ennomos **Vol. 1:** 578
Vol. 2: 437 f., **446,** 454
Vol. 3: 521
Enōch **Vol. 3:** 264
enochleō **Vol. 3:** 997
enochō **Vol. 2:** 142
enochos **Vol. 2:** 137, 139, **142 f.**
Vol. 3: 573
enoikeō **Vol. 2: 247, 251,** 324
enōpion **Vol. 2:** 876
Vol. 3: 242, 267, 712, 1044
enōtizō **Vol. 2: 172**
enōtizomai **Vol. 2:** 175
entaphiasmos **Vol. 1: 263–265**
entaphiastēs **Vol. 1:** 264
entaphiazō **Vol. 1: 263–265**
entellomai **Vol. 1: 331 f., 335, 337 f.,** 341 f.
entetalmenon **Vol. 1:** 331
enteuxis **Vol. 2: 860 f.**
enthousiasmos **Vol. 2:** 233
enthymeomai **Vol. 1: 105 f.**
enthymēsis **Vol. 1: 105 f.**
Vol. 3: 128
entimos **Vol. 2: 48 f.**
Vol. 3: 388
entolē **Vol. 1: 330–337,** 341 f., 430
Vol. 2: 133, 177, 426 f., 441, 443, 445, 451, 664, 673, 778
Vol. 3: 127, 173, 181, 239, 455, 584, 774
entos **Vol. 2:** 383, 390
entynchanō **Vol. 2:** 424, **882**
Vol. 3: 130, 199, 325, 417, 432, 550, 702, 1080, 1119
enypion **Vol. 1:** 511 f.
enypniazomai **Vol. 2:** 586
eoika **Vol. 2:** 286
ep- **Vol. 1:** 645
Vol. 3: 563
ep' alētheias **Vol. 3: 883 f.**
epaeidōn epaidēn **Vol. 2: 554**
epagōnizomai **Vol. 1: 644**
epaineō **Vol. 3: 816 f.**
epainos **Vol. 2: 874**
Vol. 3: 668, **816 f.**
epaischynomai **Vol. 3: 562–564**
epakoloutheō **Vol. 1: 480 f.**
epakouō **Vol. 2: 172 f., 175, 178**
epakroaomai **Vol. 2: 172, 175**
epanapauō **Vol. 3: 258**
epanapauomai **Vol. 3: 254 f.**
epangeilamenos **Vol. 3: 69**
epangelia **Vol. 1:** 271, 372, 557
Vol. 2: 111, 122
Vol. 3: 68–72, 143
epangellō **Vol. 3:** 74
epangellomai **Vol. 3: 68, 70**
epangelma **Vol. 3: 68, 71**
epanorthoō **Vol. 3: 351**
epanorthōsis **Vol. 3: 351 f.**
eparatos **Vol. 1: 416 f.**
epeimi **Vol. 1:** 251
epeisan **Vol. 1:** 589
epēkoos **Vol. 2:** 173
epekteinomai **Vol. 1:** 649
epelpizō **Vol. 1:** 589
ependyomai **Vol. 1: 313 f., 316**
Vol. 3: 1195
eperchomai **Vol. 1: 320, 322**
eperōtaō **Vol. 2:** 856, **879 f.**
eperōtēma **Vol. 2: 879–881**
eperōtōn tous nekrous **Vol. 2: 554**
eph' hō **Vol. 3: 1171, 1194,** 1215
eph' hymas **Vol. 3:** 257
ephapax **Vol. 2: 716–718, 725**
Vol. 3: 434, 723
ephphatha **Vol. 2: 560, 729,** 932
ephybrizō **Vol. 3:** 27
epi **Vol. 1:** 98, 107, 188, 227, 251, 276, 393, 506, 591 f.
Vol. 2: 56, 58, 241, 243 f., 356 f., 504, 654 f., 769, 772, 835, 876
Vol. 3: 27, 40, 153, 178 257 f., 392, 432, 540, 712, 737, 750, 763, 839, 883 f., 908, 990, 1085, **1171–1177, 1181, 1193–1196, 1201, 1210, 1212–1215**
epi- **Vol. 3:** 231
epi ti **Vol. 3:** 935
epi to auto **Vol. 3: 1171, 1194,** 1214
epi tō onomati **Vol. 3: 1210**
epibareō **Vol. 1:** 261
epiboulos **Vol. 3:** 468
epieikeia **Vol. 2: 256–259,** 264
epieikēs **Vol. 2: 256–259**
epigeios **Vol. 1: 517 f.**
Vol. 2: 619
epiginōskō **Vol. 2: 392, 397–399,** 405
Vol. 3: 771, 808, 810
epignōsis **Vol. 2: 392, 397, 400 f., 403, 405,** 408
epigraphē **Vol. 1:** 66
Vol. 3: 489
epigraphō **Vol. 3: 489 f.**
epigrapsō **Vol. 3:** 490
epihorkeō **Vol. 3: 737 f.**
epihorkos **Vol. 3: 737 f.**
epikaleō **Vol. 1:** 271 f., 345
Vol. 2: 27, **874**
epikaleomai **Vol. 1: 270–273, 276**
Vol. 3: 232
epikataraomai **Vol. 1:** 416
epikataratos **Vol. 1: 416 f.**
epiklēsis **Vol. 2:** 556

epilambanō **Vol. 3: 747, 749 f.**
epilambanomai **Vol. 3: 747**
epilampō **Vol. 3:** 867
epilegō **Vol. 1:** 537
epilyō **Vol. 1: 576–578**
epilyomai **Vol. 1:** 577
epilysis **Vol. 1: 576–578**
epimartyreō **Vol. 3: 1042**
epimartyromai **Vol. 3: 1041**
epimeleisthai **Vol. 3:** 678
epimenō **Vol. 3: 223, 227 f.**
epinoia **Vol. 1:** 711
epios **Vol. 1:** 282
epiousa **Vol. 1:** 251
epiousios **Vol. 1:** 143, 249, **251,** 253
Vol. 2: 268, 868, 871, 895
epiphainō **Vol. 2:** 122
Vol. 3: 317–319
epiphaneia **Vol. 1:** 504, 658
Vol. 2: 518, 900 f.
Vol. 3: 220, 310, 316, **317–319,** 505
epiphanēs **Vol. 3: 317–319**
epipherō **Vol. 3:** 344
epiphōneō **Vol. 1: 408–410**
epipnoia **Vol. 3:** 690
epipotheō **Vol. 1:** 456–458
Vol. 3: 1195
epipothēsis **Vol. 1:** 458
epipothia **Vol. 1:** 458
episeiō **Vol. 3: 556–558**
episkēnoō **Vol. 3: 814**
episkepsis **Vol. 1:** 189
episkeptomai **Vol. 1: 188–191,** 200
episkiazō **Vol. 3: 553, 555**
episkopē **Vol. 1: 188–190, 192**
Vol. 3: 836, 847
episkopeō **Vol. 1: 188–190**
episkopos **Vol. 1:** 110, **188–191,** 198 f., 333
Vol. 2: 777
Vol. 3: 134, 568, 1065
epispasmos **Vol. 1:** 309
epistamai **Vol. 3:** 122
epistatēs **Vol. 2:** 514, 595
Vol. 3: 115, 767, 781
epistellō **Vol. 1: 246 f., 249**
epistēmē **Vol. 1:** 671
Vol. 2: 493
epistērizō **Vol. 3:** 87
epistolē **Vol. 1:** 242, **246–248**
Vol. 2: 781
Vol. 3: 490, 499
epistrephō **Vol. 1: 353–355,** 357, 359
Vol. 3: 233, 823, 1212
epistrophē **Vol. 1: 354 f.**
episynagō **Vol. 2:** 31, **33**
episynagōgē **Vol. 2:** 31, **33**
episystasis **Vol. 1:** 292
epitassō **Vol. 1:** 341
epiteleisthai **Vol. 3:** 725
epithema **Vol. 3:** 164, 424
epithesis **Vol. 2:** 149 f., 153
epithesis tōn cheirōn **Vol. 2: 149–151,** 153
epithymeō **Vol. 1:** 106, **456 f.**
Vol. 3: 1199
epithymia **Vol. 1:** 106, **456–458,** 460 f., 645
Vol. 2: 458, 588
Vol. 3: 32, 678, 802
epitimaō **Vol. 1: 572 f.**
Vol. 3: 344
epitimia **Vol. 1: 572**
epitithēmi **Vol. 2:** 146, 151
Vol. 3: 243, 857
epitithēmi tas cheiras **Vol. 2:** 146, **150 f.**
epithesis **Vol. 3:** 1182
epitropos **Vol. 1:** 349
Vol. 2: 254
epizēteō **Vol. 1:** 460
Vol. 3: 530 f.
epoikodomeō **Vol. 2:** 249, **251, 253**
eponomazō **Vol. 2: 648, 652, 655**
epōnymos **Vol. 2:** 651
epoptēs **Vol. 1:** 189
epopteuō **Vol. 1:** 189
Vol. 3: 512, 515
erō **Vol. 3:** 1119
epos **Vol. 3:** 1081, 1086
epourania **Vol. 2:** 195 f.
epouranioi **Vol. 2: 188**
epouranion **Vol. 3:** 215
epouranios **Vol. 2: 188, 191 f., 194, 196,** 329, 387
eprepen **Vol. 2: 668 f.**
era **Vol. 3:** 1004
eranos **Vol. 1:** 291
eraō **Vol. 2: 538–540, 542**
Vol. 3: 845
eraunaō **Vol. 3:** 527, **532 f.**
erchomai **Vol. 1:** 179, **319–322,** 327, 358, 438, 569, 738
Vol. 2: 184, 379, 530 f., 664, 758, 839, 912
Vol. 3: 181, 195, 843, 941, 998, 1173, 1181, 1212
erchomenos **Vol. 2:** 379
erēm- **Vol. 3:** 1007
erēmia **Vol. 3: 1004, 1007**
erēmoō **Vol. 3: 1004–1008**
erēmos **Vol. 3: 1004, 1007,** 1014
erēmos topos **Vol. 3: 1004, 1007**
erēmōsis **Vol. 1:** 74 f.
Vol. 2: 912
Vol. 3: 1004–1008
erēmousthai **Vol. 3: 1007 f.**
ereō **Vol. 3:** 532
ereunaō **Vol. 2:** 856
ergasia **Vol. 3:** 173, **1147, 1149 f.**
ergates **Vol. 3: 1147, 1149 f.**
ergazomai **Vol. 1:** 266 f.
Vol. 2: 434
Vol. 3: 793, **1147, 1149 f. 1156–1158**
ergon **Vol. 1:** 197, 228 f., 271, 446, 535, 566, 603, 723
Vol. 2: 104, 120, 449
Vol. 3: 123, 548, 551, 719, 876, **1147–1152,** 1154, 1158 f., 1176, 1178
eriphion **Vol. 1:** 114
eriphos **Vol. 1:** 114
eris **Vol. 1:** 106, 535, 558
Vol. 2: 587
Vol. 3: 544
eritheia **Vol. 1:** 106, 535
erō **Vol. 2:** 734
erōs **Vol. 2:** 103, 123, 493, **538–540, 542,** 551
Vol. 3: 877
erōtaō **Vol. 2: 855–857, 879 f., 885**
erxai **Vol. 3:** 719
eschata **Vol. 1:** 165
Vol. 2: 245
eschaton **Vol. 1:** 56, 211
Vol. 2: 55, 402 904, 909
Vol. 3: 286
eschatos **Vol. 1:** 179, 517, 665–667
Vol. 2: 52 f., **55–59,** 65, 241, 402, 772
Vol. 3: 218, 836, 838, 848 f., 1190
eschatōs **Vol. 2: 55**
ēse **Vol. 3:** 673
esō **Vol. 2:** 566
Vol. 3: 127, 718
esomena **Vol. 2:** 665
esoptron **Vol. 2:** 756
esōteron **Vol. 3: 794**
esōteros **Vol. 3: 794**
estērigmenai **Vol. 3:** 878
esthēs **Vol. 1:** 312
esthiō **Vol. 1:** 253, 743 f.
Vol. 2: 264, **271,** 275, **277,** 521, 523
Vol. 3: 793
ethē **Vol. 3:** 583
ethelō **Vol. 3:** 1015 f., 1018
ethnē **Vol. 2: 788, 790 f., 793–796, 799 f.**
Vol. 3: 38, 73, 454, 567
ethnikoi **Vol. 2: 788**
ethnikos **Vol. 2: 790, 795**
Vol. 3: 580, 757
ethnikōs **Vol. 2: 790, 795**
ethnos **Vol. 1:** 541
Vol. 2: 37, 124, 127, 378, 788, **790 f., 793–796,** 798–801, **805,** 839
Vol. 3: 38, 73, 313, 454, 567, 940, 1191, 1197

ethos **Vol. 2: 436–438,** 450, **455,** 657, 662, 790
ēthos **Vol. 1:** 56
Vol. 2: 436–438
eti **Vol. 3:** 253
etymos **Vol. 1:** 56
eu **Vol. 1:** 206
Vol. 2: 92, 817
Vol. 3: 48, 719, 817, 1002, 1156 f.
euangelia **Vol. 2:** 108, 113
euangelia thyein **Vol. 2:** 108
euangelion **Vol. 1:** 310, 397
Vol. 2: 107–114
Vol. 3: 38, 45, 52, 54, 61, 68 f., 71, 217, 746, 959, 966
euangelistēs **Vol. 2: 107, 114**
Vol. 3: 768
euangelizō **Vol. 2: 107, 110**
Vol. 3: 54, 57
euangelizomai **Vol. 2: 107–114,** 443, 782
Vol. 3: 46–48, 54, 57, 61, 67 f., 71, 764, 774, 1191
euangelizomenos **Vol. 2:** 109
euangelos **Vol. 2:** 107
euaresteō **Vol. 2: 814–817**
Vol. 3: 264
euarestos **Vol. 2: 814–816**
Vol. 3: 930 f., 1021
eucharisteō **Vol. 1:** 206, 213
Vol. 2: 855, 868, **874**
Vol. 3: 675, **817–820**
eucharistia **Vol. 1:** 206, 213, 730
Vol. 2: 874
Vol. 3: 817–819, 820
eucharistos **Vol. 2: 874**
Vol. 3: 817
euchē **Vol. 2: 861, 867**
euchomai **Vol. 1:** 227
Vol. 2: 861 f., 867, 873
Vol. 3: 572
euchos **Vol. 2:** 52
euchrēston **Vol. 2:** 434
eudaimonia **Vol. 2:** 60, 419
Vol. 3: 138, 926
eudia **Vol. 3: 1000, 1002**
eudokeō **Vol. 1:** 534
Vol. 2: 383, 780 f., 817 f., 820
Vol. 3: 219
eudokēsis **Vol. 2:** 817
eudokia **Vol. 1:** 558
Vol. 2: 358, 566, **817–820**
eudokos **Vol. 2:** 817
eudokoumenē zōē **Vol. 2:** 817
euergesia **Vol. 3: 1152**
euergeteō **Vol. 2:** 99
Vol. 3: 1147, 1152
euergetēs **Vol. 1:** 519
Vol. 2: 372
Vol. 3: 1147, 1152
euēthēs **Vol. 2:** 643
euēthia **Vol. 1:** 206
eugenēs **Vol. 1: 187 f.**
euharmostia **Vol. 1:** 206
euhilateuō **Vol. 3:** 152
euhodoō **Vol. 3: 943**
eukaireō **Vol. 3: 833, 837**
eukairia **Vol. 3: 833, 837**
eukairos **Vol. 3: 833, 837**
eukairōs **Vol. 3: 833, 837 f.**
eulabeia **Vol. 2: 90 f.**
Vol. 3: 561, 1181
eulabeomai **Vol. 1:** 622
Vol. 2: 90 f.
Vol. 3: 823, 1181
eulabēs **Vol. 2: 90 f.,** 95
eulabētheis **Vol. 2:** 91
eulogēmenos **Vol. 1:** 206, 213
eulogeō **Vol. 1: 206 f., 212 f.,** 217
eulogeomai **Vol. 2: 874**
eulogētos **Vol. 1: 206 f., 210, 212 f.**
eulogia **Vol. 1: 206, 212–214,** 216, 416
Vol. 3: 70, 233, 752, 819, 854
eunē **Vol. 1:** 560
euneō **Vol. 3:** 173
eunomia **Vol. 3:** 27
eunouchizō **Vol. 1: 559 f.**
eunouchos **Vol. 1: 559–561**
-euō **Vol. 3:** 775
euōdia **Vol. 3:** 432, **599–601**
euōnymos **Vol. 2: 148**
euphrainō **Vol. 2:** 352, **354–357, 361,** 436
euphrosynē **Vol. 2: 354 f.,** 419
euprosdektos **Vol. 3: 744, 746,** 838
eupsycheō **Vol. 3: 687**
eurhythmia **Vol. 1:** 206
euschēmosynē **Vol. 1:** 206
eusebeia **Vol. 1:** 228, 595, 622, 708
Vol. 2: 91–95, 99
Vol. 3: 505, 561, 574, 770
eusebeō **Vol. 2: 91–93**
eusebēs **Vol. 2:** 91–94, 596, 659
eusebōs **Vol. 2:** 93 f., 480
eusplanchnos **Vol. 2: 599 f.**
eutheōs **Vol. 2:** 37
Vol. 3: 833 f., 837
euthymia **Vol. 2:** 60
euthys **Vol. 3: 833 f., 837,** 1169
ex **Vol. 2:** 436, 722, 756
ex ainigmatōn **Vol. 2: 756**
ex anastasis **Vol. 3:** 299
ex haireseōs **Vol. 1:** 534
ex henos **Vol. 2: 722**
exagorazō **Vol. 1: 267 f.**
exaiteomai **Vol. 2: 855 f., 858**
exakoloutheō **Vol. 1: 480 f.**
Vol. 3: 1033
exaleiphō **Vol. 1: 471**
exanastasis **Vol. 3: 259, 278**
exangellō **Vol. 3: 44–46**
exanhistēmi **Vol. 3: 259,** 307
exapataō **Vol. 2: 457–459**
exapostellō **Vol. 1: 126–128,** 136
exartizō **Vol. 3: 349–351**
exēgēma **Vol. 1:** 573
exēgēmatikos **Vol. 1:** 573
exēgeomai **Vol. 1:** 57, **573–576**
Vol. 2: 555
exēgēsis **Vol. 1:** 57, **573 f., 576,** 580
exēgētēs **Vol. 1: 573–575,** 584
Vol. 2: 555
exeimi **Vol. 2: 606**
exekklēsiazomai **Vol. 1:** 292
exeleutheros **Vol. 3:** 598
exeraunō **Vol. 3: 532 f.**
exerchomai **Vol. 1:** 179, **320 f.**
Vol. 2: 663
Vol. 3: 1180, 1202
exērtismenos **Vol. 3:** 350
exesti **Vol. 2:** 253, **606, 611**
exhilasis **Vol. 3: 150 f., 153**
exhilaskomai **Vol. 3:** 104, 146, **148–155, 160,** 167
exhilasma **Vol. 3:** 174, 192
exhilasmos **Vol. 3: 150–153**
exhistēmi **Vol. 1: 527 f.,** 729
Vol. 3: 1109
exhodos **Vol. 3: 935–937, 940**
exhomologeō **Vol. 1: 344–346**
exhomologeomai **Vol. 1:** 344
Vol. 2: 874
Vol. 3: 675, 1208
exhomologēsis **Vol. 1:** 344
exhorkistēs **Vol. 3: 473, 476, 737 f.**
exhorkizō **Vol. 3: 473, 476, 737 f.**
exhorkoō **Vol. 3:** 473
exhypnizō **Vol. 1:** 442
existamai **Vol. 1:** 526 f.
existanō **Vol. 1:** 527
exō **Vol. 2:** 566, 672
Vol. 3: 280, 1172
exodos **Vol. 1:** 57
Vol. 3: 863
exolethreuō **Vol. 1: 465**
exolethreuomai **Vol. 1:** 465
exoudeneō **Vol. 1: 74**
exousia **Vol. 1:** 104 f., 166 f., 228, 301, 564, 638
Vol. 2: 161, 191, 213, 221, 561, 601, **606–611,** 614, **615 f.,** 671
Vol. 3: 97, 482, 549, 617, 645, 711, 755
exousiai **Vol. 2: 608 f.,** 616
exousiazō **Vol. 2:** 606, 611
exoutheneō **Vol. 1: 74,** 455

Gabriēl **Vol. 1: 103**

Gaios **Vol. 2:** 683
gala **Vol. 1:** 282
Vol. 2: 268 f., 277
Vol. 3: 1118
galēnē **Vol. 2:** 776
Galilaia **Vol. 3:** 456
gam- **Vol. 2:** 575
gameō **Vol. 2:** 564, **575 f., 581,** 583–585, **588 f.**
Vol. 3: 191, 263, 356, 539, 845, 1055, 1057, 1072
gamiskō **Vol. 2: 575, 581**
gamizō **Vol. 2: 575, 581, 588**
gamizōn **Vol. 2:** 588
gamos **Vol. 1:** 498, 560, 625
Vol. 2: 575 f., 579 f., 584, 589
gar **Vol. 1:** 351, 569
Vol. 2: 106, 661, 766, 768, 835
Vol. 3: 55, 174, 178, 195, 214, 375, 487, 549, 767, 773, 963, 1026, 1033, 1152
gazophylakion **Vol. 3:** 791, **795 f.**
gē **Vol. 1: 517 f.,** 684
Vol. 2: 55, 57, 104, 188, 205, 207, 209
Vol. 3: 178, 182, 218, 445, 448
gegrammenon **Vol. 3: 483, 488 f.**
gegraptai **Vol. 3:** 329, **483, 487 f.**
gehenna **Vol. 1:** 231, 623
Vol. 2: 143, 205, 207, **208–210**
Vol. 3: 110, 446
gelaō **Vol. 2: 429, 432 f., 436**
gelōs **Vol. 2: 429–431, 433**
gem- **Vol. 2:** 575
gemistos **Vol. 1: 742**
gemizō **Vol. 1: 742 f.**
gemō **Vol. 1:** 728, **742 f.**
genea **Vol. 1:** 176, 187
Vol. 2: 35–39, 382, 584, 910, 912
Vol. 3: 828
genealogeō **Vol. 2: 35**
genealogeomai **Vol. 2:** 35 f.
genealogia **Vol. 2: 35**
genēma **Vol. 3:** 922
genesis **Vol. 1:** 176, 181 f., 184
Vol. 2: 658
Vol. 3: 647, 656, 679
genna **Vol. 1:** 176
gennaō **Vol. 1: 176–179,** 181, 185–188
Vol. 2: 75 f., 188, 505, 575, 661, 725
Vol. 3: 642, 654 f., 661, 1200
gennaomai **Vol. 3:** 1202
gennēma **Vol. 2:** 505
gennēthēnai **Vol. 1:** 179 f.
genoito **Vol. 1:** 98
Vol. 2: 119
genomenon **Vol. 3:** 1113
genos **Vol. 1:** 305, 539, 541, 684
Vol. 2: 35, 75, 232, 349
Vol. 3: 40, 454–456, 1202
gēraskō **Vol. 2:** 716
gerōn **Vol. 2:** 674
gerousia **Vol. 1:** 194–196, 199 f., 363
gēs **Vol. 1:** 186
Gethsēmani **Vol. 2: 710**
geuma **Vol. 1:** 459
geuomai **Vol. 2:** 264, **269, 277**
geus **Vol. 2:** 269
gignomai **Vol. 1:** 181
Vol. 3: 152 f., 1202
gignōskō **Vol. 1:** 245
Vol. 3: 1148
ginomai **Vol. 1:** 176, **181,** 184, 188, 370, 384, 536, 578, 590, 708
Vol. 2: 35, 351, 392, 398, 489, 504, 665, 671, 707, 818, 912
Vol. 3: 143, 149, 168, 170, 181 f., 312 f., 351, 661, 1022, 1073, 1107, 1113, 1175
ginōskō **Vol. 1:** 233, 245, 432, 484, 692, 716, 724
Vol. 2: 158, 202, 221, **390–408,** 448, 460, 490, 586, 757
Vol. 3: 125, 168, 170, 205 f., 310, 316, 630, 639, 679, 720, 835, 1031, 1199
gleukos **Vol. 3:** 922
glōchin **Vol. 3:** 1078
glōssa **Vol. 1:** 143, 530
Vol. 2: 126, 505, 785 f.
Vol. 3: 75, 180, 346, 505, 576, 770, 1078 f., 1143, 1176
glōssokomeion **Vol. 1:** 143
glōssokomon **Vol. 1: 142 f.**
glōtta **Vol. 3:** 1078
glykeia **Vol. 2:** 239
glykys **Vol. 2:** 239
Vol. 3: 449
gnēsios **Vol. 3:** 1164
gno- **Vol. 2:** 392
gnōmē **Vol. 1:** 107
Vol. 2: 392, **397 f.,** 757
gnōrimos **Vol. 1:** 484
gnōrizō **Vol. 3:** 44, 310, **314**
gnōsis **Vol. 1:** 58, 73, 422, 513, 708
Vol. 2: 219, 391, **392–406, 408,** 477, 480, 539, 545, 646, 655, 677, 685
Vol. 3: 206, 310, 640, 647, 885, 932, 936, 996, 1201
gnōstos **Vol. 2: 392, 397**
Vol. 3: 88
gnōthi seauton **Vol. 2:** 392
Vol. 3: 103
goaō **Vol. 2:** 558
goēs **Vol. 2: 552, 558, 561**
Gōg **Vol. 3: 959**
gonata **Vol. 2: 859**
gōnia **Vol. 2:** 129, 159
Vol. 3: 382, 387, **388 f.,** 391, 393, 398
gony **Vol. 2: 859**
gonypeteō **Vol. 1:** 610
Vol. 2: 855 f., 859
gramma **Vol. 1:** 431
Vol. 2: 233, 641, 675, 715
Vol. 3: 477, **482 f., 486, 492 f., 495,** 1183
grammata **Vol. 3: 483, 487, 491**
grammateus **Vol. 1:** 199
Vol. 2: 714, 834
Vol. 3: 184, **477–480, 482**
graph- **Vol. 3:** 483
graphai **Vol. 3: 490 f.**
graphē **Vol. 1:** 246, 558, 580, 736
Vol. 2: 774
Vol. 3: 71, 186 f., 311, 327, **482 f., 486 f., 489–492,** 690, 708, 763, 1200
graphō **Vol. 1:** 736
Vol. 3: 329, **482 f., 488–492,** 496, 1141, 1196 f.
grapsō **Vol. 3:** 490
graptos **Vol. 3:** 490
graus **Vol. 2:** 645
grēgoreō **Vol. 2: 136,** 563, 914
gymnasia **Vol. 1: 312 f.**
gymnazō **Vol. 1:** 312 f.
gymnikos **Vol. 1:** 645
gymnos **Vol. 1: 312–314,** 315–317
gymnotēs **Vol. 1: 312–314,** 316
gynaikarion **Vol. 3: 1055, 1058**
gynaikeion **Vol. 3: 1058**
gynaikeios **Vol. 3: 1055**
gynaikōnitis **Vol. 3:** 1058
gynē **Vol. 2:** 562–564, 585
Vol. 3: 188, 875, 913, **1055, 1058,** 1069, 1073, 1076, 1183
gynē engastrimythos **Vol. 2: 554**
gypsos **Vol. 2:** 574
gys **Vol. 2:** 269

ha- **Vol. 2:** 716
Vol. 3: 572
hadēs **Vol. 1:** 264, 433, 463
Vol. 2: 85, 188, 191, **205–210**
Vol. 3: 262, 267, 388, 858, 947, 984
Hagar **Vol. 1: 80**
Vol. 2: 329, 755
hagia **Vol. 2:** 230
Vol. 3: 794

hagiasma **Vol. 2: 224**
hagiasmos **Vol. 2: 224**
hagiastērion **Vol. 2: 224**
hagiazō **Vol. 1:** 669
Vol. 2: 224, 229, 231 f.
Vol. 3: 38, 152
hagiographa **Vol. 1:** 58
hagioi **Vol. 2:** 229, 302
hagiomai **Vol. 2:** 224
Vol. 3: 100
hagios **Vol. 1:** 105, 272, 275, 300, 305
Vol. 2: 93, **223 f.,** 227, 229, 231 f., 237, 388, 547, 549, 653, 669, 673, 683, 826, 839, 868
Vol. 3: 38, 101, 104 f., 107, 487, 491, 695, 774, 794, 814, 925, 1047, 1176–1178, 1210 f.
hagiōsynē **Vol. 2: 224**
Vol. 3: 299, 1188 f.
hagiotēs **Vol. 2: 224,** 230
hagizō **Vol. 2:** 224
hagneia **Vol. 3: 100 f.**
hagnismos **Vol. 3: 100 f.**
hagnizō **Vol. 3: 100 f.**
hagnos **Vol. 1:** 495
Vol. 3: 100–102
hagnōs **Vol. 3:** 101
hagnotēs **Vol. 3: 100 f.**
haima **Vol. 1:** 93, **220–223,** 226, 376, 647, 685, 699
Vol. 2: 477, **524 f., 532, 535 f.,** 854
Vol. 3: 158, 166, 180, 1175
haimatekchysia **Vol. 1:** 222
Vol. 2: 536, 853 f.
Vol. 3: 158
haireō **Vol. 1:** 533
haireomai **Vol. 1: 533,** 537, 542
Vol. 3: 252
hairesis **Vol. 1: 533–535**
Vol. 3: 941
hairetikos **Vol. 1: 533–535**
hairetizō **Vol. 1: 533 f.,** 537
hairetos **Vol. 1:** 533
hala **Vol. 3:** 444
halas **Vol. 3: 443–446, 448 f.**
halia **Vol. 1:** 291
haliskomai **Vol. 3:** 590
halizō **Vol. 3: 443–445, 447**
hallēlouia **Vol. 1: 99 f.**
Vol. 2: 862
Vol. 3: 669
hallomai **Vol. 3:** 459
halōn **Vol. 3:** 527
halōsis **Vol. 1:** 469
hals **Vol. 3: 443 f., 446,** 1155
halykos **Vol. 3: 443 f., 449**
hama **Vol. 2:** 500
Vol. 3: 908, 1173
hamart- **Vol. 3:** 577
hamartanō **Vol. 2:** 406
Vol. 3: 103, **577, 579,** 587, 1194
hamartēma **Vol. 2:** 767
Vol. 3: 577, 579
hamartētikos **Vol. 3: 576**
hamartia **Vol. 1:** 86, 125, 160, 430, 446, 461, 562 f., 682, 699, 701, 703, 733, 741
Vol. 2: 93 f., 120, 411, 457, 460, 504, 533, 566, 668, 717
Vol. 3: 52, 55, 152, 161 f., 168, 170 f., 180, 243, 375, 419 f., 434, 549, **573, 575–577, 579–582, 584,** 587, 596 f., 717, 811, 1178, 1197, 1203
hamartinoos **Vol. 3: 576**
hamartōlos **Vol. 2:** 94
Vol. 3: 161, **577, 579 f.,** 757, 995, 998
hapas **Vol. 1: 94**
Vol. 2: 770
hapax **Vol. 1:** 667
Vol. 2: 716–719, 720, 723, **725**
Vol. 3: 723
haphē **Vol. 1:** 241
haplōs **Vol. 3:** 572
haplotēs **Vol. 3: 571 f.**
haplous **Vol. 2:** 487, 744
Vol. 3: 571 f.
haptō **Vol. 1:** 241
Vol. 3: 859 f.
haptomai **Vol. 3: 859 f.**
Har Magedōn **Vol. 3: 962**
harma **Vol. 3:** 353
Harmaged(d)ōn **Vol. 3: 959**
harmonia **Vol. 2:** 683
harmos **Vol. 1:** 241
harmozō **Vol. 1:** 241
harpagē **Vol. 2:** 847
Vol. 3: 601, 604
harpagmos **Vol. 1:** 552
Vol. 2: 500
Vol. 3: 601, 603–605
harpax **Vol. 3: 601, 604**
harpazō **Vol. 3: 601–603,** 605, 712
Hasidioi **Vol. 2: 810**
hatheudō **Vol. 2:** 927
hautē (fem. of → *houtos)*
hazomai **Vol. 2:** 224
Vol. 3: 100
heautoṣ **Vol. 1:** 547, 592, 706, 729
Vol. 2: 259, 262, 618, 725, 815 f., 833, 883
Vol. 3: 168, 197, 353, 611, 925, 1064, 1078, 1156, 1176, 1193
hebdomēkonta **Vol. 2: 696**
Hebraios **Vol. 2: 304 f.**
Vol. 3: 465
Hebraïs **Vol. 2: 304,** 309
Hebraïsti **Vol. 2:** 309
heddomēkonta **Vol. 2:** 691
hēdeōs **Vol. 2:** 766
hēdonē **Vol. 1:** 231, 233, 456, **458–461,** 671
Vol. 2: 419
hēdos **Vol. 1:** 458
hedra **Vol. 1:** 363, 661
hedraiōma **Vol. 1:** 658, **660–662**
hedraios **Vol. 1:** 658, **660–663**
hēdyosmon **Vol. 2: 210 f.**
hēdys **Vol. 1:** 458
Vol. 2: 211, 475
hēgemōn **Vol. 1: 270**
Vol. 2: 377
Vol. 3: 939
hēgemonia **Vol. 2:** 377
hēgemonikon **Vol. 1:** 450
Vol. 2: 157, 182
Vol. 3: 679, 681, 684
hēgeomai **Vol. 1:** 584
Vol. 2: 500, 835
Vol. 3: 28
heilkōmenos **Vol. 2:** 466
heima **Vol. 1:** 316
heis **Vol. 1:** 94, 232, 576, 602, 664, 669, 678, 682
Vol. 2: 100, 309, 349, 477, 517, 563 f., 566, 589, 618, **716,** 717, **719 f., 722,** 724 f., 932
Vol. 3: 172, 181, 231, 253, 403, 622, 675, 685, 767, 866, 909, 1175, 1187, 1191, 1194, 1197, 1210
hekastos **Vol. 1:** 94, 576
Vol. 3: 403
hekatontarchēs **Vol. 3: 958, 964**
hekatonarchos **Vol. 3: 958, 964**
hēkō **Vol. 1: 320 f.,** 327
Hēlias **Vol. 1: 543**
Vol. 3: 863 f.
hēlikia **Vol. 1: 92 f.,** 277
Vol. 2: 588
Vol. 3: 350, 403
hēlios **Vol. 2:** 289, 486
Vol. 3: 730–733, 734
Hellas **Vol. 2: 124, 126**
Hellēn **Vol. 1:** 59, 686
Vol. 2: 124, 126 f.
Hellēnes **Vol. 2: 126 f.**
Hellēnikos **Vol. 2: 124, 126**
Hellēnis **Vol. 2: 124, 126**
Hellēnistēs **Vol. 2: 124, 126**
Hellēnisti **Vol. 2: 124, 126**
Hellēnizein **Vol. 2:** 126
hēmera **Vol. 1:** 204, 251, 267, 320, 402, 421, 477, 738
Vol. 2: 56, 58, 363, 518, 693, 783, **887, 889, 895,** 899 f., 926, **931**
Vol. 3: 185, 208, 315, 318, 320, 351, 826, 835, 841 f.,

hēmera (*cont'd*) 845, 924, 940, 1001, 1181, 1190, 1201
hēmera kai hēmera **Vol. 2: 895**
hēmeteron **Vol. 2: 846**
hēmeteros **Vol. 2:** 502
Vol. 3: 1196
hen (neuter of → *heis*)
heneka **Vol. 3:** 161, 1083
heneken **Vol. 2:** 387
hennymi **Vol. 1:** 316
henotēs **Vol. 2: 719, 721**
Vol. 3: 675
heōrakōs **Vol. 3:** 517
heortazō **Vol. 1: 624, 631, 634**
heortē **Vol. 1:** 291, **624, 626, 628, 632,** 635
Vol. 3: 232, 813
heōs **Vol. 1:** 184, 517
Vol. 2: 55, 57, 61, 901, 912
Vol. 3: 181 f., 218, 409, 683, 828, 834
heōsphoros **Vol. 2: 495**
Vol. 3: 468, 734
hepta **Vol. 2: 690,** 702 f., 893, 931
Vol. 3: 88, 179 f., 500, 706, 715
heptakis **Vol. 2: 690**
hermēneia **Vol. 1:** 59, **579–582, 584**
hermēneuō **Vol. 1:** 59, **579–581, 584**
Vol. 2: 729
Vol. 3: 898
hermēneuomai **Vol. 1:** 581
hermēneus **Vol. 1:** 579 f.
hermēneutēs **Vol. 1: 579 f., 582**
hermēneutikos **Vol. 1:** 579
Hērōdeios **Vol. 3:** 441
Hērōdianos **Vol. 2:** 343
Vol. 3: 441
Hērōdos **Vol. 3:** 441
hēsychazō **Vol. 3: 111 f.**
hēsychia **Vol. 3: 111 f.**
hēsychios **Vol. 3: 111 f.**
hetaerae **Vol. 1:** 497 f.
hetairos **Vol. 1:** 254, **259 f.,** 484
Vol. 2: 548
Vol. 3: 49
hetera **Vol. 2: 739**
heterodidaskaleō **Vol. 3: 766, 768**
heteroglōssos **Vol. 2: 739–741**
Vol. 3: 1078 f.
heteroi **Vol. 2: 739**
heteros **Vol. 1:** 666, 708
Vol. 2: 380, **739 f., 742,** 785 f.
Vol. 3: 1080
heterōs **Vol. 1: 739, 741**
heterozygeō **Vol. 2: 739, 741**
Vol. 3: 1160, 1164
heterozygos **Vol. 3: 1160**
hetoim- **Vol. 3:** 966
hetoima **Vol. 1:** 475
hetoimasia **Vol. 3: 116–118,** 966
hetoimassō **Vol. 3:** 117
hetoimazō **Vol. 1:** 363
Vol. 2: 382
Vol. 3: 116 f., 119
hetoimos **Vol. 3: 116,** 122
hēttēma **Vol. 3:** 573
hēttō **Vol. 3:** 1083
Heua **Vol. 1: 87**
Vol. 2: 649
Vol. 3: 585, 1063
heurēka **Vol. 3:** 528
heuriskō **Vol. 1:** 709
Vol. 2: 724
Vol. 3: 199, 264, **527–530,** 533
hex **Vol. 2:** 688, 700
hexis **Vol. 2:** 657
Vol. 3: 562, 926
hiēmi **Vol. 1:** 697
hiera **Vol. 2: 233–235**
Vol. 3: 487, 491, 785
hiera grammata **Vol. 3: 487, 491**
hierachēs **Vol. 2: 234**
hieraomai **Vol. 2: 233**
hierapolos **Vol. 2: 234**
hierateia **Vol. 2: 232–235**
Vol. 3: 32, 36
hierateuma **Vol. 1:** 305
Vol. 2: 232–235, 380
Vol. 3: 32, 43
hierateuō **Vol. 2: 232–234**
Vol. 3: 32, 37
hieratikos **Vol. 2: 233 f.**
hiereia **Vol. 2:** 234
hiereuō **Vol. 2: 234**
hiereus **Vol. 2: 232–236**
Vol. 3: 32 f., 35, 37, 40, 347, 582
hierodoulos **Vol. 2:** 234
Vol. 3: 415
hierogrammateus **Vol. 3:** 480
hierōma **Vol. 2:** 234
hieron **Vol. 2: 232–235**
Vol. 3: 690, 781, 784, **785, 793,** 795 f., 798, 807, 812, 941, 1058
hieroprepēs **Vol. 1:** 645
Vol. 2: 232 f., 235
hieroprepestatos **Vol. 2: 235**
hieros **Vol. 1:** 243, 498, 560, 625
Vol. 2: 223 f., **232–238,** 324, 572, 576, 584, 644
Vol. 3: 32, 43, 478, 772, 781, 785, 1085
hieros gamos **Vol. 2: 576, 584**
Hierosolyma **Vol. 2: 324–326**
Hierosolymitēs **Vol. 2: 324 f.**
hierosyleō **Vol. 2: 232–235**
hierosylos **Vol. 2: 235**
hierōsynē **Vol. 2: 232–234**
Vol. 3: 32, 36, 41
hierothyta **Vol. 2: 233**
hierothyton **Vol. 2: 285**
hierothytos **Vol. 2: 232–235**
hierourgeō **Vol. 2: 232–235**
Vol. 3: 32, 38, 44, 552
hierourgia **Vol. 2:** 234
hierourgōn **Vol. 2: 235**
hikanō **Vol. 3:** 728
hikanoō **Vol. 3: 728 f.**
hikanos **Vol. 3:** 726, **728 f.,** 839
hikanotēs **Vol. 1:** 248
Vol. 3: 728 f.
hikesios **Vol. 1:** 687
hiketeia **Vol. 2:** 859
hiketēria **Vol. 2: 860 f., 885**
hilaos **Vol. 3:** 148
hilaros **Vol. 2:** 239
Vol. 3: 148
hilarōs **Vol. 2:** 735
hilaskomai **Vol. 1:** 89, 437, 694, 697, 699
Vol. 2: 614
Vol. 3: 146, **148 f., 151–155, 160–162,** 167, 169, 190, 192 f., 195 f., 199, 364, 419, 423, 425, 431, 435, 579, 611, 720, 788, 812, 815
hilasmos **Vol. 1:** 89
Vol. 3: 148–151, 156, 162 f.
hilastērion **Vol. 1:** 398
Vol. 2: 614, 766
Vol. 3: 148–150, 153, 156 f., 163–165, 170, 175, 431, 435, 812, 815
hilastērios **Vol. 3:** 149
hilasthēnai **Vol. 3:** 149
hilasthēti **Vol. 3:** 149, 161
hilēmi **Vol. 3:** 148
hileō poiein **Vol. 3:** 148 f.
hileos **Vol. 3:** 148
hileōs **Vol. 2:** 123
Vol. 3: 148 f., 152 f., 157, 160, 192
himation **Vol. 1:** 312, **316 f.**
Vol. 2: 714
hina **Vol. 1:** 181, 647, 736
Vol. 2: 661, 753, 760, 826
Vol. 3: 53, 71, 168, 170, 186, 241, 312, 489, 643, 771, 1184, 1186, 1191, 1212
hina mē **Vol. 2:** 709
hina plērōthē **Vol. 2:** 753
Vol. 3: 71, 489
hippikos **Vol. 1:** 645
hippos **Vol. 1:** 118
hiron **Vol. 2:** 224
Vol. 3: 117, 785
histēmi **Vol. 1:** 51, 471, 474, 606
Vol. 2: 563
Vol. 3: 259, 892

historeō **Vol. 3:** 398
hodēgeō **Vol. 3: 935–937, 942**
hodēgos **Vol. 1:** 220
Vol. 3: 935–937, 939, 942
hodoio **Vol. 3:** 1155
hodoiporeō **Vol. 3: 941**
hodos **Vol. 2:** 458–460, 481
Vol. 3: 352, 584, **935–937, 939–941,** 943, 946 f., 1006
hoios **Vol. 2:** 912
Vol. 3: 391
holokarpōma **Vol. 3:** 421
holokarpōsis **Vol. 3:** 421
holokautōma **Vol. 3: 417, 421, 430, 434**
holokautōsis **Vol. 3: 421**
holos **Vol. 1:** 94, 231, 377
Vol. 2: 659
Vol. 3: 456
holōs **Vol. 3:** 740
homichlē **Vol. 3: 1000, 1003**
homo- **Vol. 3:** 908
homoia **Vol. 2: 503**
homoiōma **Vol. 2:** 284, **500–504**
Vol. 3: 904
homoioō **Vol. 2: 500–505**
homoiopathēs **Vol. 2: 500–503**
homoios **Vol. 2: 497,** 498, **500–503,** 516
Vol. 3: 123, 404, 904
homoiōs **Vol. 2: 500, 502, 508**
homoiōsis **Vol. 2: 500–502, 505,** 743
homoiotēs **Vol. 2: 500–502, 505**
homoiousthai **Vol. 2:** 498
homologeō **Vol. 1: 344–348,** 454
Vol. 3: 54, 232 f., 774
homologia **Vol. 1: 344, 346 f.**
homonoia **Vol. 2:** 776
Vol. 3: 217
homoousios **Vol. 2: 497, 505–508,** 516
homos **Vol. 1:** 344
Vol. 2: 500, 719
homothymadon **Vol. 3: 908 f.**
hoplizō **Vol. 3: 959, 964**
hoplon **Vol. 3: 959, 963 f.**
hopōs **Vol. 1:** 736
hōra **Vol. 2:** 758, 927
Vol. 3: 826, 833, 835, 841, **845–849,** 850
hōraios **Vol. 3: 845, 847**
horama **Vol. 3:** 310, **511–513, 515, 517,** 862
horaō **Vol. 1:** 695
Vol. 2: 134, 173, 176, 180, 555, 768
Vol. 3: 281, 284 f., 509, **511–513, 515 f.,** 521, 1046, 1206
horasis **Vol. 3: 512, 515**
horatos **Vol. 3: 511 f., 515**
hōrē **Vol. 3:** 845
horion **Vol. 1:** 472
hōrismenos **Vol. 1:** 473
horisthentos **Vol. 2:** 203
horizō **Vol. 1:** 471, **472 f.,** 478, 533, 693, 695
Vol. 2: 203
Vol. 3: 299 f., 504
horkia **Vol. 1:** 594
horkios **Vol. 3:** 738
horkizō **Vol. 3:** 473, **737, 739 f.,** 1073
horkōmosia **Vol. 3: 737 f., 742**
horkos **Vol. 3:** 583, **737–740,** 743
hormē **Vol. 1:** 710
horōn **Vol. 3:** 513
horōntes tou asteras **Vol. 2: 555**
horos **Vol. 1:** 472
hōs **Vol. 1:** 197, 285, 287, 446, 710
Vol. 2: 116, 290, 411, 420, 437, 502, 578, 699, 768, 778
Vol. 3: 152, 170, 195, 210, 354, 622, 1202
hōs kecharismenoi **Vol. 2:** 116
hōs mē **Vol. 1:** 278
Vol. 2: 581
hosa echeis **Vol. 2: 846**
hosakis **Vol. 3:** 243
hōsanna **Vol. 1: 100**
Vol. 3: 509
hosia **Vol. 2:** 237
hosiē **Vol. 2: 236**
hosios **Vol. 2:** 93, 223, 232, **236–238**
hosiotēs **Vol. 2: 236 f.**
hosos **Vol. 2:** 429
Vol. 3: 1162
hōsper **Vol. 1:** 176
Vol. 2: 234, 498, 502
Vol. 3: 195, 564, 876
hōsperei **Vol. 1:** 182
hostē **Vol. 2:** 671
hote **Vol. 1:** 738
Vol. 2: 758, 766
Vol. 3: 843
hoti **Vol. 1:** 348, 591, 599
Vol. 2: 213, 356, 826, 901
Vol. 3: 181, 186, 241, 257, 264, 316, 510, 892, 1039, 1194, 1211, 1213
houtos **Vol. 1:** 522, 524–526, 569, 708, 712
Vol. 2: 58, 155, 524, 545, 609, 654, 773, 799, 910, 912
Vol. 3: 71, 178, 181, 185, 240 f., 243, 245, 400, 464, 469 f., 673, 763, 829 f., 838, 1120, 1141, 1184, 1194
hyakinthos **Vol. 3: 396 f.**
hyalinos **Vol. 3:** 984
hybris **Vol. 2:** 259
Vol. 3: 27, 29 f., 32, 561
hybristēs **Vol. 3: 27–29, 31**
hybristikos **Vol. 3:** 27
hybrizō **Vol. 3: 27–29**
hydata **Vol. 3: 987–990**
hydōr **Vol. 1:** 179 f.
Vol. 2: 140, 274
Vol. 3: 449, 982 f., 987, **998–990,** 992, 1177 f., 1180, 1210
hydōr tou elegmou **Vol. 2:** 140
hyetos **Vol. 3: 1000, 1003**
hygiaine **Vol. 2:** 169
hygiaino **Vol. 2:** 164, **169–171,** 766
Vol. 3: 267, 770, 887
hygiēs **Vol. 2:** 164, **169–171**
Vol. 3: 428, 1022
hygros **Vol. 1:** 390
hyios **Vol. 1:** 181, 256, 280 f., 284, **286–290,** 487, 523, 595, 615, 619, 667 f.
Vol. 2: 81, 194, 216, 324, 337, 374, 376, 380, 385, 387, 502 f., 514, 565, 585, 607, 630, 656, 725, 900, 912
Vol. 3: 147, 195, 299, 530, 597, 607, 609, 611–613, 617, 620, 630, 634 f., 639, 641, 648, 651, 658, 665 f., 751, 831, 1085, 1144, 1202
hyios Dauid **Vol. 3:** 607, **648,** 658, 666
hyios tou anthrōpou **Vol. 2:** 194, 216, 337, 376, 380, 385, 387, 502 f., 514, 565, 607, 630, 900, 912
Vol. 3: 147, 195, 530, 607, **613, 617, 620, 630,** 665, 831, 1144
hyios tou theou **Vol. 1:** 281, 615
Vol. 3: 299, 607, 611, **634,** 651, 1085
hyiothesia **Vol. 1:** 282, **286 f., 289**
Vol. 2: 883
Vol. 3: 72, 597, 666, 751
hylē **Vol. 1:** 164, 704 f.
hymnagorēs **Vol. 3: 668**
hymneō **Vol. 3: 668–670,** 673, 675, 817
hymnēsis **Vol. 3: 668 f.**
hymnētos **Vol. 3: 669**
hymnōdeō **Vol. 3: 669**
hymnographos **Vol. 3: 669**
hymnologia **Vol. 3: 668**
hymnos **Vol. 1:** 213
Vol. 2: 874
Vol. 3: 668–670, 672, 674 f., 816
hypakoē **Vol. 1:** 604
Vol. 2: 172, 177, **179**
Vol. 3: 1150 f.
hypakouō **Vol. 2:** 172 f., 177,

hypakouō (*cont'd*) **179**
Vol. 3: 107
hypantaō **Vol. 1: 324 f.**
hypantēsis **Vol. 1: 324 f.**
hyparchōn **Vol. 1:** 706
Vol. 2: 833
hyparchonta **Vol. 2: 845–847**
hyparxis **Vol. 1:** 711
Vol. 2: 829, 844, **845–847**
hypatos **Vol. 1: 270**
hypēkoos **Vol. 2: 179**
hypenantion **Vol. 3:** 1199
hyper **Vol. 1:** 197, 227, 398, 647, 728 f.
Vol. 2: 486, 523 f., 543, 587, 617, 819
Vol. 3: 153, 168, 170, 195, 197, 611, **1171–1174, 1176, 1180, 1193, 1196 f., 1199, 1203, 1207 f.,** 1214
hyper hēmōn **Vol. 2:** 882
Vol. 3: 168, 170, **1196 f.**
hyper hymōn **Vol. 2:** 368, **523 f.**
hyper pantōn **Vol. 3:** 195, 197, 1180, **1197 f.**
hyper pollōn **Vol. 2: 524, 543**
Vol. 3: 611, 1174
hyperakmos **Vol. 2:** 581, **587 f.**
Vol. 3: 538, 1072
hyperaspizō **Vol. 3:** 1196
hyperauxanō **Vol. 2: 128**
hyperbainō **Vol. 1:** 138
Vol. 3: 583 f.
hyperechō **Vol. 2:** 609
hyperekperissōs **Vol. 1: 728**
hyperekperissou **Vol. 1:** 730 f.
hyperēnoreōn **Vol. 3:** 28
hyperentynchanō **Vol. 2: 874, 882**
hyperēphaneia **Vol. 3: 29 f.**
hyperēphaneuomai **Vol. 3: 29**
hyperēphania **Vol. 3: 28–30**
hyperēphanos **Vol. 3: 27–32,** 127
hyperēphanōs **Vol. 3: 30**
hypēreteō **Vol. 3: 544, 547**
hypēretēs **Vol. 3: 544, 546,** 609
hyperhypsoō **Vol. 2: 200 f., 203**
hypernikaō **Vol. 1:** 650 f.
hyperperisseuō **Vol. 1:** 730
Vol. 2: 131
hyperperissōs **Vol. 1: 728 f.**
hyperphroneō **Vol. 2:** 617
hyperpleonazō **Vol. 2: 130 f.**
hyphistamai **Vol. 1:** 710 f.
hyphistēmi **Vol. 1:** 710
hypnoō **Vol. 1:** 442
hypnos **Vol. 1:** 429, **441–443,** 446
hypo **Vol. 1:** 263, 736
Vol. 2: 772
Vol. 3: 489, 1162, **1171–1174, 1181 f., 1193, 1198, 1202, 1208, 1210**
hypo- **Vol. 3:** 231
hypodeigma **Vol. 2:** 284, **290, 293**
Vol. 3: 555, 570, 905
hypogrammos **Vol. 2: 291**
Vol. 3: 724, 905
hypographō **Vol. 2:** 291
Vol. 3: 483
hypokeimenon **Vol. 1:** 711
hypokrinō **Vol. 2: 467 f.,** 813
hypokrinomai **Vol. 2: 468, 474**
hypokrisis **Vol. 2: 468 f.**
hypokritēs **Vol. 2: 468–470**
hypolambanō **Vol. 3: 747, 749**
hypoleimma **Vol. 3: 247 f., 251**
hypoleipō **Vol. 3: 247 f.**
hypoleipomai **Vol. 3: 251**
hypomenō **Vol. 2:** 240, 243–245, **764, 772–774, 776**
Vol. 3: 229
hypomimnēskō **Vol. 3: 230, 240–243**
hypomnēsis **Vol. 3: 230, 241–243, 247**
hypomonē **Vol. 1:** 646
Vol. 2: 243, 245, **772–776,** 782, 809
Vol. 3: 73, 555
hypōpiazō **Vol. 1: 162 f.,** 647
hyposchismos **Vol. 3:** 543
hypostasis **Vol. 1:** 703, **710–714**
Vol. 2: 142, 243, 288–290, 488, 507, 768
hypostolē **Vol. 1:** 713
Vol. 2: 775
hypotagē **Vol. 1:** 347
hypotassomai **Vol. 2:** 180, 664
Vol. 3: 931
hypothesis **Vol. 1:** 61
hypotypōsis **Vol. 3: 903–905**
hyps- **Vol. 3:** 29
hypsēlo- **Vol. 3:** 29
hypsēlophroneō **Vol. 2:** 198
hypsēlos **Vol. 2: 198–200,** 617 f.
Vol. 3: 1009 f.
hypsistos **Vol. 2: 198–200,** 591
hypsōma **Vol. 2: 198, 200**
Vol. 3: 824
hypsoō **Vol. 1:** 288
Vol. 2: 185, 199, **200–204,** 423
Vol. 3: 161, 624, 630 f., 715
hypsos **Vol. 1:** 123
Vol. 2: 197, **198–200,** 204
hys **Vol. 1:** 117
hysterēma **Vol. 1:** 741
Vol. 3: 573, **952 f., 955**
hystereō **Vol. 3: 952–954**
hysterēsis **Vol. 3: 952 f., 955**
hysteron **Vol. 3: 952 f.**
hysteros **Vol. 3: 952 f.,** 958

Ia **Vol. 2: 556**
Iakōb **Vol. 2:** 284, 305, **316–319,** 431, 649
Vol. 3: 203, 987
Iakōbos **Vol. 2: 316–319**
iama **Vol. 2: 166–169**
Iaō **Vol. 2:** 512, **556**
iaomai **Vol. 2:** 151, 164, **166–170,** 634
Vol. 3: 997 f.
iasis **Vol. 2: 166, 168**
Vol. 3: 261
Iasōn **Vol. 2:** 332
iaspis **Vol. 3: 395–398**
iatros **Vol. 2: 166, 168,** 172
ichthydion **Vol. 1: 670**
ichthyophagos **Vol. 1:** 670
ichthys **Vol. 1: 670**
id- **Vol. 3:** 511 f.
ide **Vol. 3:** 521
idea **Vol. 2:** 284, 590
Vol. 3: 224, 513
idein **Vol. 2:** 206, 663
Vol. 3: 513, 519, 1206
idia **Vol. 2: 838–840,** 846
idioi **Vol. 2: 839**
idion einai **Vol. 2: 846**
idios **Vol. 1:** 197, 578 f.
Vol. 2: 273, 456, 725, **839 f.**
Vol. 3: 750, 964
idiōtēs **Vol. 2: 456 f.**
idou **Vol. 2:** 103, 671
Vol. 3: 516, 521
ienai **Vol. 3:** 935
Ierousalēm **Vol. 2: 324–330**
Iēsō **Vol. 3:** 261
Iēsous **Vol. 1:** 181, 235, 278, 399, 445, 476
Vol. 2: 94, **330–332,** 338–340, **344,** 373, 379, 508, 514, 517, 527, 619, 654, 885
Vol. 3: 52, 55 f., 89, 209, 212, 243, 261, 276, 299, 592, 596, 611, 675, 763 f., 770, 1033, 1172, 1191, 1209, 1211, 1213
-ikos **Vol. 3:** 690
Ioda **Vol. 2:** 320
Iōnas **Vol. 2: 350–352**
Iordanēs **Vol. 3: 991,** 992, 1209 f.
ios **Vol. 2: 27–29,** 831
iōta **Vol. 3:** 181 f.
Iouda **Vol. 2: 319 f.**
Vol. 3: 456
Ioudaia **Vol. 1:** 94
Vol. 2: 305, 316, 320
Vol. 3: 456
Ioudaikos **Vol. 2: 310**
Ioudaïkōs **Vol. 2: 304,** 310
Ioudaïos **Vol. 1:** 297, 361
Vol. 2: 304 f., 378, 660, 789
Vol. 3: 450
Ioudaïsmos **Vol. 2: 310**
ioudaïzō **Vol. 2: 310**

Ioudas **Vol. 2: 316, 319 f.**
iris **Vol. 3: 1000, 1002**
isa **Vol. 2: 498,** 500
Isaak **Vol. 1: 81**
Vol. 2: 329, 431, 649
isangelos **Vol. 1: 101, 103**
Vol. 2: 578
Vol. 3: 278
ischyō **Vol. 2:** 170
Vol. 3: 712–714, 718
ischyros **Vol. 2:** 70
Vol. 3: 712–714, 993
ischyroteros **Vol. 3:** 55
ischys **Vol. 1:** 262, 732
Vol. 2: 177, 601 f.
Vol. 3: 711, **712–714,** 717
isēgoreomai **Vol. 2: 498**
isodaimōn **Vol. 2: 498**
isomoiros **Vol. 2: 498**
isonomeō **Vol. 2: 498**
isoō **Vol. 2: 498**
isopolitēs **Vol. 2: 498**
isopsychos **Vol. 2: 497–499**
isos **Vol. 2: 497–500, 502, 505, 508**
Vol. 3: 353
isotēs **Vol. 2: 497–499**
isotheos **Vol. 2: 498**
isotimos **Vol. 2: 497–499**
Israēl **Vol. 1:** 329, 370
Vol. 2: 304, 317, 319, **322,** 378, 799
Vol. 3: 198
Israēlitēs **Vol. 2: 304, 310**
ithys **Vol. 3:** 834

kai **Vol. 1:** 592
Vol. 2: 722
Vol. 3: 492, 979, 1175, 1178
kai egeneto . . .kai **Vol. 1:** 181
kainē ktisis **Vol. 2:** 545
kainizō **Vol. 2: 670**
kainoō **Vol. 2: 670**
kainos **Vol. 1:** 335, 384, 388 f., 666
Vol. 2: 473, 524, 545, 566 **669–676,** 714
Vol. 3: 168
kainotēs **Vol. 2: 670–672,** 675, 715
kaiō **Vol. 2:** 487
kairos **Vol. 1:** 268, 337, 477, 629, 722, 724, 738
Vol. 2: 37, 588, 899, 925
Vol. 3: 148, 686, 750, 826 f., 831, **833–838, 841,** 843 f., 846–849, 754, 1041
Kaisar **Vol. 1: 269,** 345
Vol. 2: 549
Vol. 3: 745
kakia **Vol. 1: 561, 563–565,** 731
Vol. 2: 458
Vol. 3: 577, 886, 936
kako- **Vol. 2:** 419
kakologeō **Vol. 1:** 206 f., 413, 415, 418
kakoō **Vol. 1: 561–563**
kakopatheia **Vol. 3: 724**
kakopatheō **Vol. 3: 719, 722, 725**
kakopoieō **Vol. 1: 561, 563**
kakopoios **Vol. 1: 561, 563**
kakos **Vol. 1:** 107, 125, 138, 228, 513, **561–565,** 567
Vol. 3: 124, 200, 724, 1021, 1148, 1150, 1157, 1179
kakōs **Vol. 3:** 719, 998
kakōsis **Vol. 3:** 847
kakourgos **Vol. 1: 561, 564**
Vol. 3: 379
kala **Vol. 2:** 103
kalamos **Vol. 3:** 404
kaleō **Vol. 1:** 84, **270–273, 275 f.,** 291, 306, 533, 569
Vol. 2: 243, 544, 809
Vol. 3: 51, 54, 398. 767
kaleomai **Vol. 1:** 271, 274
Vol. 3: 181
kallielaios **Vol. 2: 710, 712**
Vol. 3: 869
kalodidaskalos **Vol. 3: 765, 768**
kalon **Vol. 2:** 98,103
kalopoieō **Vol. 2: 102**
kalos **Vol. 1:** 197, 722
Vol. 2: 98–106
Vol. 3: 391, 770, 775, 963, 1021, 1148
kalōs **Vol. 2:** 766
Vol. 3: 1156
kalos kagathos **Vol. 2:** 102 f.
Vol. 3: 775
kaloumenos **Vol. 1:** 271, 273
kalymma **Vol. 2: 212 f.**
Vol. 3: 794 f.
kalyptō **Vol. 1:** 701
Vol. 2: 211 f., 214, 216, 220
Vol. 3: 309 f., 313, 323 f., 795
kamēlos **Vol. 1:** 116
kamptō **Vol. 2:** 859
kananaios **Vol. 3: 1167**
kanōn **Vol. 1:** 51
Vol. 3: 399 f., 403 f., 485, 493
kapēleuō **Vol. 1:** 138
kara **Vol. 2:** 244
karadokeō **Vol. 2: 244**
kardia **Vol. 1:** 169, 230, 350 f., 742
Vol. 2: 40, 177, **180–184,** 207, 262, 566 f.
Vol. 3: 124, 127 f., 229, 572, 679, 710
kardiognōstēs **Vol. 2: 180, 183**
karpōma **Vol. 3:** 421
karpophoreō **Vol. 1: 721 f.**
karpos **Vol. 1: 721–723,** 727
Vol. 2: 104
Vol. 3: 522, 526, 1149
karpōsis **Vol. 2:** 421
kartereō **Vol. 2: 764, 767 f., 776,** 868
kassiterinos **Vol. 3:** 391
kat- **Vol. 1:** 645
Vol. 3: 563
kat' agnoian **Vol. 2: 406**
kat' allēlōn **Vol. 2:** 423
kat' aretēn **Vol. 2:** 477
kat' eklogēn **Vol. 3: 251 f.**
kat' eleon **Vol. 2:** 594
kat' oikon **Vol. 3: 1201**
kat' opsin **Vol. 1:** 680
kata **Vol. 1:** 50, 188, 227 f., 257, 376, 504, 534, 576, 675, 680, 719
Vol. 2: 120, 242, 303 f., 400, 406, 420, 423, 436 f., 476 f., 489, 502, 505, 519, 565, 594, 656 f., 659 f., 671, 723, 766, 774, 882
Vol. 3: 251 f., 299, 365, 400, 403, 456, 491, 516, 585, 595, 737, 770, 926, 944, 1018 f., 1035, 1073, **1172 f., 1188–1190, 1198–1201,** 1214
kata anthrōpon **Vol. 2: 565**
kata anthrōpous **Vol. 2: 565**
Vol. 3: 1200
kata charin **Vol. 2:** 120
kata Christon Iēsoun **Vol. 2:** 619
kata epignōsin **Vol. 2:** 400
kata gnōsin **Vol. 2:** 400
Vol. 3: 1201
kata hairesin **Vol. 1:** 534
kata logon **Vol. 2:** 476 f., 766
kata meros **Vol. 2: 303 f.**
kata monas **Vol. 2: 723 f.**
kata opheilēma **Vol. 2:** 120
kata physin **Vol. 2:** 476 f., 657, 659
Vol. 3: 595, 926
kata pistin **Vol. 3:** 365
kata pneuma **Vol. 1: 675,** 719
Vol. 2: 242, 617
Vol. 3: 299, **1172, 1188 f., 1199 f.**
kata prothesin **Vol. 3: 1201**
kata sarka **Vol. 1:** 188, 228, 257, **675,** 680, 719
Vol. 2: 242, 617
Vol. 3: 1073, **1172, 1188, 1199 f.**
kata tas graphas **Vol. 3: 491, 1200**
kata tēn graphēn **Vol. 3: 491**
kata theon **Vol. 2:** 420, 882
Vol. 3: 1200
kata tychēn **Vol. 3:** 585
katabainō **Vol. 2: 184–186**
Vol. 3: 1176
kataballō **Vol. 1: 376 f.**

katabareō **Vol. 1:** 261
katabolē **Vol. 1: 376–378,** 383, 388, 542
katabrabeuō **Vol. 1: 648**
katachthonios **Vol. 1:** 518
katadendros **Vol. 2:** 285
katadikazō **Vol. 2:** 362, **370**
katadikē **Vol. 2: 370**
katadiōkō **Vol. 2: 805 f.**
katagelaō **Vol. 2: 429, 433**
Vol. 3: 563
kataginōskō **Vol. 2: 362 f., 365**
katagōnizomai **Vol. 1: 644**
kataischynō **Vol. 3: 562–564**
katakalymma **Vol. 2:** 212
katakalyptō **Vol. 2: 212**
katakalyptomai **Vol. 2:** 212
katakauchaomai **Vol. 1: 227 f.**
kataklysmos **Vol. 3:** 982, **991**
katakrima **Vol. 2: 362, 365**
katakrinō **Vol. 2: 362, 365**
katakrisis **Vol. 2: 362, 365**
katakyrieuō **Vol. 2: 510, 519**
katalaleō **Vol. 1:** 413
Vol. 3: 340, **345–347**
katalalia **Vol. 3: 345 f.**
katalalos **Vol. 3: 345 f.**
katalambanō **Vol. 1:** 649
Vol. 3: 747, 749 f.
katalambanomai **Vol. 3: 750**
kataleimma **Vol. 3: 247 f., 251**
kataleipō **Vol. 2:** 724
Vol. 3: 247 f., 251
katallagē **Vol. 1:** 701
Vol. 2: 545
Vol. 3: 166–168, 581, 1112
katallassō **Vol. 1:** 701
Vol. 3: 146, **166–169, 171 f.,** 186, 188, 196, 363, 581, 824, 1192
kataloipoi **Vol. 3: 251**
kataloipos **Vol. 3: 247 f., 251**
katalyma **Vol. 3: 177, 189**
katalyō **Vol. 2:** 252
Vol. 3: 177, 181, 183, 185, 189
katamartyreō **Vol. 3: 1038 f., 1041–1043**
katangeleus **Vol. 3: 44–46**
katangellō **Vol. 2:** 111, 113
Vol. 3: 44–48, 54, 57, 764, 1043
kalanoeō **Vol. 3: 122, 124, 126, 129**
katantaō **Vol. 1: 324 f.,** 327, 649
Vol. 3: 278
katapateō **Vol. 3:** 28, **943 f.**
katapauma **Vol. 3: 255**
katapauō **Vol. 3: 254, 256–258**
katapauomai **Vol. 3: 255**
katapausis **Vol. 3:** 73, **254 f., 257 f.**
katapetasma **Vol. 3: 794,** 798, 814
katapheugō **Vol. 1:** 558
kataphileō **Vol. 2: 547, 549**
kataphroneō **Vol. 1: 461 f.**
kataphronētēs **Vol. 1: 461 f.**
kataphyteuō **Vol. 3: 866**
katapinō **Vol. 2:** 274
katapiptō **Vol. 1: 608**
katara **Vol. 1: 416**
Vol. 3: 1197
kataraomai **Vol. 1:** 207, 413, **416–418**
katargeō **Vol. 1: 73 f.,** 466
katartisis **Vol. 3: 349 f.**
katartismos **Vol. 1:** 302
Vol. 3: 349 f.
katartizō **Vol. 3: 349 f.,** 1187
kataseiō **Vol. 3: 556–558**
kataskēnoō **Vol. 3: 813**
kataskēnōsis **Vol. 3: 813**
kataskeuazō **Vol. 1:** 383
Vol. 3: 116, **118–120**
kataskopos **Vol. 3:** 50
katasphragizō **Vol. 3: 497**
katathema **Vol. 1: 413, 415**
katathematizō **413, 415**
katatomē **Vol. 1: 307, 309**
kataxioō **Vol. 3: 348 f.,** 627
katēcheō **Vol. 3:** 44, **771 f.,** 780
katēchēsis **Vol. 3: 771**
katechō **Vol. 3:** 505, 885
katēchōn **Vol. 3: 771**
katēchoumenos **Vol. 3: 771**
katēgōr **Vol. 1: 82 f.,**
Vol. 3: 470
katēgoreō **Vol. 1: 82 f.**
katēgoria **Vol. 1: 82 f.**
katēgorōn **Vol. 1:** 83
katēgoros **Vol. 1: 82–84**
kateidōlos **Vol. 2: 284 f.**
katenōpion **Vol. 3:** 925
katēphēs **Vol. 3:** 28
katēramenos **Vol. 1:** 416
kateulogeō **Vol. 1:** 212
katexousiazō **Vol. 2: 606 f.**
kath' hēmeran **Vol. 1:** 402
Vol. 2: 895
Vol. 3: 1201
kath' hēmōn **Vol. 3: 1199**
kath' homoiosin **Vol. 2: 505**
kath' homoiotēta **Vol. 2: 505**
kath' hypomonēn **Vol. 2:** 774
kathairō **Vol. 3: 102**
katharismos **Vol. 3: 102**
katharizō **Vol. 3: 102, 104,** 152
katharma **Vol. 1:** 479
katharmos **Vol. 3:** 102
katharoi **Vol. 3:** 108
katharos **Vol. 1:** 351
Vol. 2: 144
Vol. 3: 100 f., 102 f., 105, 108, 167, 924, 997
katharotēs **Vol. 3: 102**
katharsis **Vol. 2:** 477, 594
kathedra **Vol. 3:** 184, **587**
kathēkō **Vol. 3:** 930
kathēmai **Vol. 2:** 612, **615**
Vol. 3: 587–589
kathēmenos **Vol. 3:** 1193
katheudō **Vol. 1:** 429 f., **441–443,** 447
Vol. 2: 927
kathezomai **Vol. 3: 587**
kathistēmi **Vol. 1: 471 f.,** 478, 533
Vol. 3: 363
kathizō **Vol. 3: 587–589**
kathodēgos **Vol. 3: 935 f.,**
katholikos **Vol. 1:** 52
kathoraō **Vol. 3:** 128, **511 f., 515**
kathōs **Vol. 1:** 338
Vol. 2: 669
Vol. 3: 488, 492, 1018
kathōs gegraptai **Vol. 1:** 736
Vol. 3: 488, 492
katischyō **Vol. 3:** 627, **712 f.**
katō **Vol. 1:** 179
Vol. 2: 184, **187,** 209 f., 304
Vol. 3: 1199
katoikeō **Vol. 2: 247, 251**
Vol. 3: 793
katoikētērion **Vol. 2: 247, 249, 251**
katoikizō **247, 251**
katoptrizontes **Vol. 2:** 756
katōteros **Vol. 2:** 205, **209**
kauchaomai **Vol. 1: 227 f.**
Vol. 2: 243, 354, **874**
kauchēma **Vol. 1: 227–229**
Vol. 2: 243
Vol. 3: 1151
kauchēsis **Vol. 1: 227 f.,** 712
kauma **Vol. 1: 652 f.**
kaumatizō **Vol. 1: 652 f.**
kaustēriazō **Vol. 2: 574 f.**
kaustēriazomai **Vol. 2: 575**
kaustērion **Vol. 2:** 574
kautērion **Vol. 2: 574**
kecharitōmenē **Vol. 2:** 119
keimai **Vol. 1:** 441, 471
Vol. 2: 809, 846
keiō **Vol. 1:** 670
keisthai **Vol. 1:** 635
kekalymmenon **Vol. 2:** 214
kekasthai **Vol. 2:** 643
kekatharmenos **Vol. 3:** 103
kekaustēriasmenōn **Vol. 2:** 574
keklēmenos **Vol. 1:** 272
kekrymmenos **Vol. 2:** 217
kel **Vol. 1:** 408
keleuma **Vol. 1:** 408
keleuō **Vol. 1:** 271, **341**
keleusma **Vol. 1: 341 f., 408–410,** 412
keleustēs **Vol. 1:** 408
keleuthos **Vol. 3:** 1155
keleuthros **Vol. 1:** 481

kenodoxia **Vol. 1:** 228, **546**
Vol. 2: 44, 47
kenodoxos **Vol. 1: 546**
Vol. 2: 44, 47
kenoō **Vol. 1: 546 f.,** 706
Vol. 2: 301, 500, 514
Vol. 3: 597
kenos **Vol. 1: 546 f.,** 550 f., 553, 671, 706 f., 709
Vol. 2: 262, 343, 445, 828, 844, 854
Vol. 3: 281, 563, 604, 645
kenōsis 548 f.
kēnsos **Vol. 3: 752–754**
kentron **Vol. 1: 511**
Vol. 3: 267
kentyriōn **Vol. 3: 958, 964**
kephalaion **Vol. 2:** 157, 163
kephalaioō **Vol. 2:** 157
kephalē **Vol. 1:** 238, 301, 665
Vol. 2: 156–163, 579
Vol. 3: 1063, 1066
kephalē gōnias **Vol. 3: 388–390,** 398 f.
kephalis **Vol. 2:** 157
kēphas **Vol. 3: 381, 383 f.,** 398
keraia **Vol. 3:** 181 f.
kerameia **Vol. 3: 910**
kerameikos **Vol. 3: 910**
kerameus **Vol. 3: 910–912**
keramikos **Vol. 3: 910–913**
keramion **Vol. 3: 910 f.**
keramos **910, 912**
kerannymi **Vol. 3: 910 f., 913**
keras **Vol. 2:** 601
Vol. 3: 198, 711, **714 f.**
kerdainō **Vol. 3: 136 f.**
kerdos **Vol. 3:** 134, **136 f.**
kērygma **Vol. 1:** 62, 247, 369, 397
Vol. 2: 36, 248, 398, 401, 647
Vol. 3: 48, 51–53, 60–63, 67 f., 166, 285 f., 328, 401, 629 f., 643–645
kēryssō **Vol. 1:** 397
Vol. 2: 111, 113
Vol. 3: 44, 46 f., **48, 50–52, 54–57,** 170, 285, 767, 774, 1112
kēryx **Vol. 1:** 127
Vol. 2: 682
Vol. 3: 48–53, 67, 170, 767
kēteios **Vol. 1:** 670
kētos **670 f.**
kibōtos **Vol. 3:** 812, 815, 1040, 1042
kindyneuō **Vol. 1: 419**
kindynos **Vol. 1: 419**
kinyra **Vol. 3:** 671
klados **Vol. 3: 865, 867, 869 f.**
klaiō **Vol. 2: 416 f., 424**
klaō **Vol. 2:** 296, **524**
klasis **Vol. 2: 520, 524, 530**
klasis tou artou **Vol. 2: 520, 524,** 530
klasma **Vol. 1:** 729
klauthmos **Vol. 2: 416 f.,** 421
klēdonizomenos **Vol. 2: 554**
kleiō **Vol. 2: 729 f.,** 733
kleis **Vol. 2:** 727, **729 f.,** 897
Vol. 3: 188, 384, 387 f., 652, 717, 763
kleisē ta splanchna **Vol. 2:** 733
klēma **Vol. 3:** 226, **865, 869**
kleos **Vol. 2:** 52
Vol. 3: 1156
kleptēs **Vol. 3: 377 f.,** 381
kleptō **Vol. 3:** 54, **377 f.,** 381
kleptōn **Vol. 3:** 377
klēronomeō **Vol. 1:** 301
Vol. 2: 258, **295–300**
klēronomia **Vol. 2: 295–302**
Vol. 3: 72, 391
klēronomos **Vol. 2: 295–300**
Vol. 3: 72
klēroō **Vol. 1:** 534
Vol. 2: 295 f., 299, 380
klēros **Vol. 1:** 534
Vol. 2: 295–304
Vol. 3: 647
klēsis **Vol. 1: 270 f., 273–275**
Vol. 2: 243, 556
klētos **Vol. 1:** 92, **270–275,** 298, 540
Vol. 2: 544
Vol. 3: 1201
koilia **Vol. 1: 169,** 742
koimaō **Vol. 1:** 441
Vol. 2: 925
koimaomai **Vol. 1:** 429 f., **441–443**
Vol. 2: 925
Vol. 3: 1207
koinē **Vol. 1:** 62
Vol. 2: 657
koinon **Vol. 1:** 639
koinōneō **Vol. 1: 636, 639, 641**
koinōnia **Vol. 1:** 448, 635, **639–644,** 649
Vol. 2: 530, 826
Vol. 3: 104, 278, 547, 572, 702, 724, 854
koinōnikos **Vol. 1: 639 f., 642**
koinōnos **Vol. 1: 639, 642 f.,**
Vol. 2: 520, 661
koinoō **Vol. 1:** 448, **639, 642**
koinos **Vol. 1:** 291 f., 448, **639–642, 644**
Vol. 2: 499
Vol. 3: 28, 104, 1083
koitē **Vol. 2:** 570, **586 f.**
kokkinos **Vol. 1:** 205 f.
kolaphizō **Vol. 1: 161–164**
Vol. 3: 857, 859
kolaphos **Vol. 3:** 857
kolasis **Vol. 1:** 568
Vol. 3: 98 f.
kolazō **Vol. 1:** 568
Vol. 3: 98, 100
kolla **Vol. 2:** 248
kollaō **Vol. 2: 350**
kollaomai **Vol. 2: 348 f.**
kollourion **Vol. 3: 518**
koloboō **Vol. 1:** 542
Vol. 2: 916, 932
kolos **Vol. 2:** 222
kolpoō **Vol. 1:** 240
kolpos **Vol. 1:** 240
Vol. 3: 1174, 1185 f.
kōlyō **Vol. 1:** 149
Vol. 2: 220–223
kōmē **Vol. 2:** 803
komizomai **Vol. 1:** 713
kōmos **Vol. 2:** 587
kondrantēn **Vol. 2: 850**
koniaō **Vol. 1:** 205, 265
konis **Vol. 1:** 520
Vol. 3: 545
kōnōps **Vol. 1:** 116
kopetos **Vol. 2:** 223, **417 f., 424**
kōphos **Vol. 1: 428 f.**
kopiaō **Vol. 1: 262 f.**
Vol. 3: 1162
kopos **Vol. 1:** 260, **262 f.,** 647
kopria **Vol. 1: 480**
Vol. 3: 448
koprion **Vol. 1: 480**
kopron **Vol. 1: 480**
kopros **Vol. 1: 480**
koptō **Vol. 2:** 220, **416–418,** 705
koptomai **Vol. 2: 417**
korakinos **Vol. 3:** 754
korasion **Vol. 1:** 283
Vol. 3: 1071
korban **Vol. 2: 43 f.,** 469, 813
Vol. 3: 423, 763, 1070
korbanas **Vol. 2: 43**
koreō **Vol. 2:** 796
Korinthos **Vol. 1:** 299
kosmeō **Vol. 1: 521, 524, 526**
Vol. 2: 236
kosmikon **Vol. 3:** 814
kosmikos **Vol. 1: 521, 524**
kosmios **Vol. 1: 521, 524**
kosmiōs **Vol. 2:** 476
kosmokratōr **Vol. 2: 514**
Vol. 3: 716–718
kosmos **Vol. 1:** 53, 105, 377, 401, 517, 519, **521–526,** 542, 613, 651
Vol. 2: 200, 280, 411, 420, 452, 476, 494, 511, 548, 559, 567, 609, 840
Vol. 3: 72, 168 f., 217, 445, 469 f., 574, 582, 789, 829, 1035, 1045, 1164, 1188, 1193
kotos **Vol. 1:** 107
kpei **Vol. 1:** 378
kraipalē **Vol. 1:** 514

krat- **Vol. 1:** 494
krataioō **Vol. 3: 716, 718**
krataios **Vol. 3: 716, 718**
krateō **Vol. 1:** 703
Vol. 3: 716 f.
kratistos **Vol. 3: 716–718**
kratos **Vol. 2:** 601, 767
Vol. 3: 711, **716–718**
kraugazō **Vol. 1:** 409
krazō **Vol. 1:** 271 f., **408–410,** 412
Vol. 2: 855, 873
Vol. 3: 114
kreas **Vol. 1: 671 f., 674**
kreissōn **Vol. 3:** 216
kreittō **Vol. 3:** 1083
kreittōn **Vol. 1:** 371, 666
Vol. 2: 847
Vol. 3: 73
kremannymi **Vol. 1: 391, 394**
krima **Vol. 1:** 210
Vol. 2: 362–366
Vol. 3: 96, 648, 760
krinō **Vol. 1:** 60, 503, 648
Vol. 2: 361–365, 370, **371,** 468
krisis **Vol. 1:** 386
Vol. 2: 143, **362, 365 f.,** 371, 680
Vol. 3: 344 f., 582
kritēs **Vol. 2: 362 f., 365**
kritikos **Vol. 2: 362, 365**
krouō **Vol. 2: 855,** 857, **881, 885**
Vol. 3: 529, 532
krybō **Vol. 2:** 214
kryphaios **Vol. 2: 214, 216**
kryphē **Vol. 2:** 214
kryphios **Vol. 2: 214**
krypta **Vol. 2:** 214
kryptō **Vol. 2:** 210 f., **214,** 216 f., 220, 835
Vol. 3: 247, 312, 493
krypton **Vol. 2:** 212
Vol. 3: 320
kryptos **Vol. 2: 214–216**
krystallizō **Vol. 2:** 398
krystallos **Vol. 3: 398**
ktaomai **Vol. 1:** 380
Vol. 2: 773, 845
Vol. 3: 1064 f., 1078
kteinō **Vol. 1:** 429
ktēma **Vol. 2:** 829, 844, **845 f.**
ktēmata **Vol. 2: 845**
ktēnos **Vol. 1:** 114
Vol. 3: 1160
ktēsis **Vol. 1:** 381
kti **Vol. 1:** 378
ktisis **Vol. 1: 376–378, 381, 383–386, 388 f.**
Vol. 2: 243 f., 545, 671 f., 912
Vol. 3: 642
ktisma **Vol. 1: 378, 381–383, 385–387**
ktistēs **Vol. 1: 378, 382 f., 387**
ktizō **Vol. 1:** 178, 376, **378–380, 383 f., 387 f.**
Vol. 2: 912
Vol. 3: 1182
kybernaō **Vol. 1:** 193 f., 198
kybernēsis **Vol. 1: 192–194, 198**
kybernētēs **Vol. 1:** 193 f., 198
kydos **Vol. 2:** 52
kyklos **Vol. 3:** 679
kyllos **Vol. 2: 414 f.**
kyminon **Vol. 2: 210 f.**
kynarion **Vol. 1:** 117
kyōn **Vol. 1:** 117
kyria **Vol. 1:** 539
Vol. 2: 510 f., 518
kyriakē **Vol. 3:** 410, **411 f.,** 413
kyriakē hēmera **Vol. 2: 518,** 934
kyriakon deipnon **Vol. 2: 518, 520, 522**
Vol. 3: 411
kyriakos **Vol. 2: 510, 518**
kyrie **Vol. 2: 509 f.,** 514
kyrieuō **Vol. 1:** 445
Vol. 2: 510, 518
kyrioi **Vol. 2: 510, 512,** 516 f., 595
kyrios **Vol. 1:** 71, 168, 197, 210, 212, 228, 295, 325, 469, 475, 484, 486, 571, 718
Vol. 2: 63 f., 72, 80 f., 155, 186, 191, 194, 203, 213, 247, 332, 338, 359, 373, 386 f., **508–520,** 522, 527, 530, 533, 536, 548, 562, 595, 651 f., 664, 720, 735, 789, 800, 837, 867, 900 f., 932
Vol. 3: 56, 115, 160, 171, 178, 221, 239, 245, 299, 341, 344, 372, 411, 484, 531, 567 f., 595 f., 643, 651, 709, 763, 780, 940, 1151, 1178, 1181, 1191, 1198, 1202, 1205, 1207, 1211
kyriotēs **Vol. 1:** 462
Vol. 2: 510, 518, 614
Vol. 3: 284, 344
kyroō **Vol. 1: 664**
kyros **Vol. 1:** 664
Vol. 2: 510

labete **Vol. 2:** 524
lachainō **Vol. 2:** 210
lachanon **Vol. 2: 210 f.**
laikos **Vol. 2:** 457
lailaps **Vol. 3: 1000, 1003**
lakaō **Vol. 1:** 94
laleō **Vol. 2:** 111, 113
Vol. 3: 54, 574, **1081, 1106, 1109**
laleō tō theō **Vol. 2: 874**
lalia **Vol. 3:** 316
lambanō **Vol. 1:** 336, 343, 363, 475, 536, 587, 709
Vol. 2: 524, 594
Vol. 3: 241, 253, 262, 353, 596, 737, 744–746, **747–751,** 753, 835
lampades **Vol. 2:** 486
lampas **Vol. 2: 484–486,** 487
lampō **Vol. 2: 484–486, 496**
lampros **Vol. 2: 484, 486**
lamprōs **Vol. 2: 484, 486**
lamprotēs **Vol. 2: 484–486**
lanchanō **Vol. 1:** 471, **478**
lanthanō **Vol. 3:** 875, 878
laoi **Vol. 2:** 799
laos **Vol. 1:** 199, 299, 305, 307, 569, 732
Vol. 2: 127, 457, 788, 790 f., 793, **795–801, 805,** 839
Vol. 3: 161, 551, 1197
laos ex ethnōn **Vol. 2:** 805
laskō **Vol. 1:** 94
latreia **Vol. 2:** 285, 885
Vol. 3: 549–551, 1119
latreuō **Vol. 2:** 94, 885
Vol. 3: 432, 544 f., **549 f.,** 553
latron **Vol. 3:** 549
leg- **Vol. 3:** 1081
legō **Vol. 1:** 344, 418, 536
Vol. 2: 173, 180, 186, 281, 356, 379, 645
Vol. 3: 54. 457, 489 f., 505, 822, 995, **1081 f., 1087, 1106 f.,** 1144, 1156 f.
legomenos **Vol. 1:** 310
leia 377
leimma **Vol. 3: 247 f., 251 f.**
leipō **Vol. 3: 247 f., 251, 253**
leipsanon **Vol. 3: 248**
leitourgeō **Vol. 1:** 474
544 f., 549 f., **551–553,** 755
leitourgia **Vol. 3: 551–553,** 913
leitourgikos **Vol. 3: 551 f.**
leitourgos **Vol. 2:** 885
Vol. 3: 38, **551–553,** 755
lēkeō **Vol. 1:** 94
lēmpsis **Vol. 2:** 131
leōn **Vol. 1:** 118
Vol. 2: 411
lēos, leōs **Vol. 2:** 795, 798
Vol. 3: 551
lepra **Vol. 2: 464, 466**
Vol. 3: 997
lepros **Vol. 2: 463 f.,** 466
lepton **Vol. 2: 850**
Vol. 3: 791
lēstēs **Vol. 3: 377–379,** 380 f.
lēthē **Vol. 3:** 231
lēthō **Vol. 3:** 875, 878, 884
Leuei **Vol. 2: 467**
Leueitikos **Vol. 2: 466**
Leui **Vol. 2: 466 f.**

Leuis **Vol. 2: 466**
Leuitēs **Vol. 2: 466**
leuk **Vol. 2:** 487
leukē **Vol. 2:** 464, 675
leukos **Vol. 1:** 203, **204,** 206, 317
Vol. 2: 484
Vol. 3: 40, 143, 347, 349, 360, 362
lexis **Vol. 3:** 1086
lian **Vol. 1:** 729
Vol. 2: 103
liaros **Vol. 1:** 318
libanos **Vol. 2: 293–295**
libanōtos **Vol. 2: 293–295**
libertinos **Vol. 3:** 590, **598**
ligyrion **Vol. 3: 396**
limnē **Vol. 3:** 984 f., **992**
limos **Vol. 2: 264–266**
lithinos **Vol. 3: 390,** 398
lithos **Vol. 1:** 541, 660
Vol. 3: 363, 381 f., 388 f., **390 f., 393 f.,** 396, 398, 855
log- **Vol. 3:** 822
logeia **Vol. 3: 751 f.,** 759, 854
logikos **Vol. 2:** 476, 885
Vol. 3: 1081, 1105, 1118 f.
logion **Vol. 1:** 62, 504
Vol. 2: 57, 630
Vol. 3: 1081, 1106, 1118
logios **Vol. 3: 1081, 1106, 1117**
logismos **Vol. 1:** 350
Vol. 3: 75, 678, **822–824,** 826
logistikos **Vol. 3:** 122
logizesthai eis **Vol. 3: 1171**
logizomai **Vol. 1:** 472
Vol. 2: 458
Vol. 3: 168 f., **822–826,** 1175, 1187 f.
logographos **Vol. 2:** 643
logomacheō **Vol. 3: 1119**
logomachia **Vol. 3: 1119**
logos **Vol. 1:** 54, 56, 63, 107, 138, 337, 344, 397, 459, 468, 513, 546, 571, 579, 592. 636, 654, 659, 671, 736
Vol. 2: 79, 81, 113, 131, 133, 155, 158, 169 f., 175, 456, 476 f., 493, 518, 546, 591, 594, 643 f., 657, 659, 683, 744, 766
Vol. 3: 53, 69, 122, 168 f., 313, 353, 489, 540, 542, 744, 746, 765, 771 f., 868, 876, 886, 941, 1026, 1031, 1036 f., 1044, 1046, 1078, **1081–1087, 1106, 1108–1110, 1112, 1119–1123,** 1143–1145, 1149, 1176, 1195, 1204 f.
loidoreō **Vol. 1:** 413
Vol. 3: 340 f., **346 f.**
loidoria **Vol. 3: 346,** 1179
loidoros **Vol. 3: 346 f.**
loipoi **Vol. 2: 794**
Vol. 3: 253
loipon **Vol. 3: 252**
loipos **Vol. 3: 247 f., 251–253**
louō **Vol. 1:** 143 f., **150–154,** 160, 224, 701
Vol. 3: 180, 989, 1007
loutron **Vol. 1: 150–153**
lychnia **Vol. 2:** 484, **486 f.**
Vol. 3: 814
lychnos **Vol. 2:** 484, **486 f.,** 488, **495 f.**
lydia **Vol. 3:** 855
lykos **Vol. 1:** 118
lyō **Vol. 1:** 152
Vol. 2: 732
Vol. 3: 174, **177, 179–181, 183–189,** 201, 222, 261, 329, 435, 484, 491 f., 537, 544, 763, 795
lypē **Vol. 2:** 360, 419–421, 424
Vol. 3: 725
lypeō **Vol. 1:** 178
Vol. 2: 416, **419 f.**
lypeomai **Vol. 2: 419 f.**
lysis **Vol. 1:** 577, 581
Vol. 3: 177, 188, 537
lythēnai 491
lytra **Vol. 3: 190, 192**
lytron **Vol. 1:** 438
Vol. 2: 425
Vol. 3: 174, 177 f., **189–192, 194–197,** 214, 219, 420, 429, 435, 546, 611, 682, 1179 f., 1196
lytroō **Vol. 3:** 174, **189 f., 192,** 215
lytrōsis **Vol. 1:** 191
Vol. 2: 174, **189 f., 193, 198 f.**
lytrōtēs **Vol. 3:** 178, **189 f., 193, 199**
lytrōtos **Vol. 3: 193**
lytroumenos **Vol. 3: 192**
lytrousthai **Vol. 3: 192 f., 198, 200**

-ma **Vol. 3:** 689
machaira **Vol. 3: 958, 967**
machē **Vol. 1:** 262, 644–646
Vol. 2: 447
Vol. 3: 958 f., 963
machomai **Vol. 1:** 645 f.
Vol. 3: 959, 963, 981
mageia **Vol. 2: 552, 557 f.,** 729, 831, 847
Vol. 3: 180, 270, 324, 457, 474, 735, 844, 860
mageuō **Vol. 2: 552, 557 f.**
Magōg **Vol. 3:** 959
magos **Vol. 2: 552, 557, 561**
mainomai **Vol. 1: 527–530**
Vol. 3: 76, **230**
makar **Vol. 1:** 215
makarios **Vol. 1: 215 f.**
Vol. 2: 543, 659, 825
Vol. 3: 257, 719
makarismos **Vol. 1: 215 f.**
makarizō **Vol. 1: 215 f.**
Makkabaios **Vol. 1:** 63
makran **Vol. 2: 52–54**
makrothen **Vol. 2:** 53
makrothymeō **Vol. 2: 768–772,** 901
makrothymia **Vol. 1:** 646
Vol. 2: 764–771, 774, **776,** 901
makrothymos **Vol. 2: 768 f.**
malakia **Vol. 3: 996 f., 999**
mallon **Vol. 1:** 534, 591, 729
Vol. 2: 504
Vol. 3: 596, 599
mamōnas, mammōnas **Vol. 1:** 138, 277, 684
Vol. 2: 255, 549, 829, 831, **836 f.,** 843–846, **852**
Vol. 3: 576, 595, 812
mania **Vol. 1: 528 f.**
Vol. 2: 471
manna **Vol. 1:** 205, 249, **252 f.**
Vol. 2: 218, 268 f., 628
manteuomai **Vol. 3: 74, 81**
manteuomenos manteian **Vol. 2: 554**
manthanō **Vol. 1: 483–487,** 493
Vol. 3: 765
mantikos **Vol. 3:** 75
mantis **Vol. 2:** 234
Vol. 3: 75 f.
marana tha **Vol. 2: 895**
maranatha **Vol. 1:** 323, 415
Vol. 2: 515, 518, 520, 527, 530 f., **537,** 543, 887, **895–898, 931 f.**
Vol. 3: 245, 316
margaritēs **Vol. 3: 394,** 396, 399
martyr **Vol. 3:** 1038
martyreō **Vol. 1:** 348
Vol. 2: 110
Vol. 3: 46, 53 f., **1038, 1041–1047, 1203**
martyria **Vol. 2:** 110
Vol. 3: 53, 89, 749, **1038–1046,** 1050, 1213
martyrion **Vol. 3:** 198, 811, **1038–1040, 1042–1044**
martyromai **Vol. 3: 1038**
martyros **Vol. 3: 1038**
martys **Vol. 1:** 189
Vol. 3: 53, **1038, 1041–1044, 1046 f.,** 1050 f.
mastigoō **Vol. 1: 161–164**
Vol. 3: 998
mastix **Vol. 1: 161–163**
Vol. 3: 996
mastizō **Vol. 1: 161 f.**

mastos **Vol. 1:** 240
mataiologia **Vol. 1: 550, 552**
mataiologos **Vol. 1: 550, 552**
mataioō **Vol. 1: 549, 551 f.**
mataios **Vol. 1:** 546, **549–552**
Vol. 2: 285, 400
Vol. 2: 200, 281, 554
mataiotēs **Vol. 1: 549–552**
matē **Vol. 1:** 550
matēn **Vol. 1: 549 f., 552**
math- **Vol. 1:** 483
mathēsis **Vol. 2:** 659
mathētēs **Vol. 1:** 167, 303 f., 480 f., **483–487, 489 f.,** 492
Vol. 2: 695
Vol. 3: 509
mathēteuō **Vol. 2:** 714 f.
mathos **Vol. 2:** 419
matia **Vol. 1:** 550
Mattaios **Vol. 2: 715**
mazos **Vol. 1:** 240
mē **Vol. 2:** 220, 222, 459 f., 709
Vol. 3: 152, 168, 170, 181, 188, 377, 534, 539 f., 543, 563, 710, 740, 767, 803, 822, 825, 886, 1119, 1195 f.
mē anakalyptomenon **Vol. 2:** 213
mē eis kenon **Vol. 1:** 547
mē genoito **Vol. 1:** 181
Vol. 3: 505
mē mataion **Vol. 1:** 550
mē ou **Vol. 2:** 220
mē thaumasēs **Vol. 2:** 625
mechri **Vol. 1:** 734
Vol. 3: 64
mēdeis **Vol. 3:** 103, 558
mēden agan **Vol. 2:** 103
mega (neut. of → *megas)*
megal- **Vol. 3:** 29
megalē (fem. of → *megas)*
megaleia **Vol. 2: 424–426**
megaleios **Vol. 2:** 425
megaleiotēs **Vol. 2: 424–426**
megalōsynē **Vol. 1:** 732
Vol. 2: 424–426
megalynō **Vol. 2: 424 f.**
Vol. 3: 400
megas **Vol. 1:** 228, 334
Vol. 2: 177, 356, **424–426,** 428, **429,** 443, 623
Vol. 3: 113 f., 143, 318, 394, 455, 457, 568, 1013
megistanes **Vol. 1:** 666
megistos **Vol. 2:** 425
meizōn **Vol. 1:** 334
Vol. 2: 425–427, 545, 835
melan **Vol. 1:** 203
melas **Vol. 1: 203,** 205 f.
Melchisedek **Vol. 2: 590, 593**
mellō **Vol. 1: 325–327**
Vol. 2: 480
mellōn **Vol. 1: 325–327**
Vol. 3: 198, 829 f., 833
melō **Vol. 1: 276, 278,** 356
melos **Vol. 1: 229, 231,** 235, 241, 445
memnēmai **Vol. 3:** 230
memona **Vol. 3:** 230
memphomai **Vol. 2:** 139, **143–145**
Vol. 3: 932
mempsimoiros **Vol. 2: 143, 145**
mempsis **Vol. 2: 143 f.**
men- **Vol. 1:** 528
Vol. 2: 245
mēn **Vol. 2:** 675, 688, 700
Vol. 3: 152, 826
menein en **Vol. 2: 546**
Vol. 3: 225
mēnis **Vol. 1:** 107
menō **Vol. 1:** 608
Vol. 2: 213, 772, 847
Vol. 3: 223–225, 228–230
menontes **Vol. 3:** 224
menos **Vol. 2:** 233
Vol. 3: 230
mēpote **Vol. 2:** 753
merimna **Vol. 1: 276–278**
merimnaō **Vol. 1: 276–278**
Vol. 3: 1038
meris **Vol. 2:** 298, 306, **303 f.,** 783
merizō **Vol. 3:** 400
mermēros **Vol. 3:** 1038
meros **Vol. 2:** 209, 295, **303 f.**
Vol. 3: 403
mesidios **Vol. 1:** 373
mesitēs **Vol. 1: 372–376**
Vol. 2: 343
Vol. 3: 215
mesiteuō **Vol. 1:** 373–375
mesonyktion **Vol. 1:** 420
Vol. 2: 136
mesos **Vol. 1:** 94, 372 f.
Vol. 2: 615
Vol. 3: 195, 795, 948, 1178
mesotēs **Vol. 3:** 926
mesotoichon **Vol. 3:** 185, **795,** 798, **948 f.**
Mesrain **Vol. 1:** 530
messa **Vol. 1:** 665
Messias **Vol. 2: 334**
Vol. 3: 462
mestos **Vol. 2:** 597
Vol. 3: 102
meta **Vol. 1:** 357, 442, 445
Vol. 2: 233, 359, 423, 445, 604, 680, 699
Vol. 3: 262, 561, 1120, **1172–1174, 1182, 1190, 1201, 1204–1207,** 1214 f.
metabainō **Vol. 2: 184, 186**
metadidōmi **Vol. 2:** 40 f.
metakaleomai **Vol. 1:** 273
metalambanō **Vol. 3: 747, 750**
metalēmpsis **Vol. 3: 747, 750**
metallassō **Vol. 3: 166 f.**
metamelomai **Vol. 1:** 353–355, **356**
metamorphoō **Vol. 3: 861, 864**
metamorphoomai **Vol. 1: 705, 708**
Vol. 2: 673
metanoeō **Vol. 1:** 353–356, **357–359,** 362, 600
Vol. 3: 103
metanoia **Vol. 1:** 111, 160, 355 f., **357 f.,** 362, 422, 702 f., 742
Vol. 2: 183, 770
Vol. 3: 48, 52, 55, 1158
metaphora **Vol. 2:** 743
metaschēmatizō **Vol. 1:** 707, **708–710**
Vol. 3: 864
metathesis **Vol. 3:** 265 f.
metatithēmi **Vol. 1:** 608
Vol. 2: 123
Vol. 3: 264–266, **601 f.**
metechō **Vol. 1: 635 f., 639**
meteōros **Vol. 3:** 29
mētēr **Vol. 1:** 187, 569, 615
Vol. 2: 497
Vol. 3: 1055, 1061, **1068–1070,** 1076
meth' hymōn **Vol. 3: 1204**
methē **Vol. 1: 513–515**
Vol. 2: 587
methermēneuō **Vol. 1:** 579 f.
methermēneuomai **Vol. 1:** 581
methodeia **Vol. 3: 935, 943**
methodeuē **Vol. 3: 936**
methodos **Vol. 3: 935 f., 943**
methyō **Vol. 1: 513 f.,**
methyskō **Vol. 1: 513**
methyskomai **Vol. 1:** 513
methysma **Vol. 1: 513**
methysos **Vol. 1: 513**
metochē **Vol. 1: 635 f.**
metochos **Vol. 1: 635 f., 639**
metoikesia **Vol. 1:** 685
mētra **Vol. 1:** 667
metreō **Vol. 3: 402**
metrētēs **Vol. 3: 403**
metron **Vol. 1:** 605, 711, 740
Vol. 2: 618
Vol. 3: 400, **402–404,** 430, 436, 561
mētropolis **Vol. 3:** 1069
mi **Vol. 1:** 490
mia (fem. of → *heis)*
miainō **Vol. 1: 447–449**
Vol. 3: 925
miasma **Vol. 1: 447 f.**
miasmos **Vol. 1: 447 f.**
Michaēl **Vol. 1: 104**
Vol. 3: 345, 471
mikron **Vol. 2: 429**
mikros **Vol. 2:** 194, 424, **427–429,** 709

Vol. 3: 839
mimēma **Vol. 1:** 491
Vol. 2: 289
Vol. 3: 876
mimeomai **Vol. 1:** 480, 483, **490 f.**, 493
Vol. 3: 60
mimēsis **Vol. 1:** 491
mimētēs **Vol. 1:** 287, **490 f.**
Vol. 3: 60
mimnēskō **Vol. 3: 230, 233, 240–242, 245**
mimnēskomai **Vol. 2:** 533
Vol. 3: 230, 240 f., 247
mimos **Vol. 1:** 490
miseō **Vol. 1:** 553, **555–557**
Vol. 2: 547
miseomai **Vol. 1:** 555
misthapodosia **Vol. 2:** 835
Vol. 3: 138, 141, 143
misthapodotēs **Vol. 3: 138, 141, 143**
misthios **Vol. 3: 138 f.**
misthōma **Vol. 3: 138 f.**
misthoō **Vol. 3: 138 f.**
misthos **Vol. 2:** 193, 499, 813
Vol. 3: 134, 136, **138 f., 141–145**
misthōtēs **Vol. 3: 139**
misthōtos **Vol. 3: 138f.**, 567
mnaomai **Vol. 1:** 264
Vol. 3: 353
mnē– **Vol. 3: 231–233, 246**
mneia **Vol. 3: 230, 238, 242, 246**
mnēma **Vol. 1: 263–265**
Vol. 3: 230, 238, 246
mnēmē **Vol. 3: 230 f., 238, 240**
mnēmeion **Vol. 1: 263–265**
Vol. 3: 238, 246, 268
mnēmōn **Vol. 3:** 230
mnēmoneuō **Vol. 3: 230, 240–243**
Mnēmosynē **Vol. 3:** 231
mnēmosynon **Vol. 3: 230, 233, 236, 238, 242**
mochthos **Vol. 1: 262**
mogilalos **Vol. 1:** 428
moichalidēs **Vol. 2: 584**
moichalis **Vol. 2:** 351, **582**, 584
moichaō **Vol. 2:** 582
moicheia **Vol. 1:** 500
Vol. 2: 582
Vol. 3: 538
moicheuō **Vol. 1:** 494, 498
Vol. 2: 582, 589
Vol. 3: 325, 538, 1167
moichos **Vol. 2: 582**
moira **Vol. 2:** 145, 303, 501, 664
Vol. 3: 729
mōlōps **Vol. 1:** 163 f.
molynō **Vol. 1: 448 f.**
molysmos **Vol. 1: 448 f.**
monastȓion **Vol. 1:** 641
monē **Vol. 3: 224, 229**
monogenēs **Vol. 1:** 668
Vol. 2: 75 f., 81, **723–725**
Vol. 3: 1202
monon **Vol. 2: 723 f.**
monos **Vol. 1:** 216, 664 f., 667
Vol. 2: 75, 394, **716**, 720, **723 f.**
Vol. 3: 314, 1202
mōnos **Vol. 2:** 723
Vol. 3: 186
monōs **Vol. 2:** 723
monōtatos **Vol. 2:** 724
mōrainō **Vol. 3: 1023, 1025**
mōrainomai **Vol. 3:** 447, **1024**
mōreuō **Vol. 3:** 1025
mōria **Vol. 2:** 143, 619, 709
Vol. 3: 53, **1023, 1025 f.**
mōrologia **Vol. 3: 1026**
mōron **Vol. 3: 1026**
mōros **Vol. 1:** 281, 418
Vol. 2: 619 f.
Vol. 3: 126, **1023–1026**, 1036
morphē **Vol. 1:** 50, 204, 355, 703 f., **705–708**, 709, 714
Vol. 2: 203, 290, 500, 673
Vol. 3: 596 f., 604, 645
morphoō **Vol. 1: 705, 708**
morphōsis **Vol. 1: 705, 708**
Vol. 3: 885
moschos **Vol. 1:** 116
mousikos **Vol. 1:** 645
Mōÿsēs **Vol. 2: 635, 638**, 642
Vol. 3: 186, 484
mychos **Vol. 2:** 644
myeō **Vol. 3: 501**, 510
myktērizō **Vol. 3:** 341, 347
mylikos **Vol. 3: 390, 394**
mylinos **Vol. 3: 390, 394**, 1013
mylos **Vol. 3: 390, 394**
myō **Vol. 3:** 501
myron **Vol. 1:** 119, 124
Vol. 2: 294 f., 712
mystērion **Vol. 1:** 64, 370, 539, 578
Vol. 2: 255, 401, 581, 835
Vol. 3: 314, **501–505**, 510 f.
mystēs **Vol. 1:** 184, 327
Vol. 3: 205
mythōdes **Vol. 2:** 643
mythologos **Vol. 2:** 644
mythos **Vol. 2:** 613, **643–645, 647**
Vol. 3: 274, 1033, 1081

naiō **Vol. 3:** 781
naos **Vol. 1:** 234
Vol. 2: 233, 235 f., 250
Vol. 3: 185, **781–785**, 789, 792 f., 796 f.
nauageō **Vol. 1:** 608
Nazaraios **Vol. 1:** 535
Nazarēnos **Vol. 2: 332–334**, 343, 346
Nazaret **Vol. 2:** 333
Nazōraios **Vol. 2: 332–334**, 343, 346
nē Dia **Vol. 3:** 738
nea **Vol. 2:** 675
neanis **Vol. 3:** 1071 f.
neaniskos **Vol. 1:** 192
nekroō **Vol. 1: 443, 445**
nekros **Vol. 1:** 429, 436, **443–446**
Vol. 2: 554
Vol. 3: 268, 278, 299, 303, 1176, 1189, 1207 f.
nekrōsis **Vol. 1: 443, 445**
nektar **Vol. 1:** 513
nekys **Vol. 1:** 443
nēlees **Vol. 2:** 594
nemō **Vol. 2:** 296, 438
neōkoros **Vol. 3: 796**
neomēnia **Vol. 3:** 733
neophytos **Vol. 2: 674**
neos **Vol. 2: 669–671, 674–676**, 714
Vol. 3: 457, 785
neōs **Vol. 3:** 796
neōteros **Vol. 2: 674 f.**
neotēs **Vol. 2: 674 f.**
nēphalios **Vol. 1: 513–515**
nephelē **Vol. 2:** 912
Vol. 3: 1000, 1003
nēphō **Vol. 1: 514 f.**
Vol. 2: 137
nephos **Vol. 3: 1003**
nephros **Vol. 2:** 181
nēpios **Vol. 1:** 92, 238, **280–282**, 290
Vol. 3: 607
nēsteia **Vol. 1: 611 f.**
nēsteuō **Vol. 1: 611–613**
nēstis **Vol. 1: 611–613**
nikaō **Vol. 1:** 648, **650, 652**
nikē **Vol. 1:** 644, **650 f.**
Nikolaitēs **Vol. 2: 676**
Nikolaos **Vol. 2: 676**
nikōn **Vol. 1:** 651
nikos **Vol. 1: 650**
Vol. 3: 267
Nineuē **Vol. 2: 678**
Nineui **Vol. 2: 678**
Nineuitēs **Vol. 2: 678**
Ninos **Vol. 2:** 678
Ninus **Vol. 2:** 678
niptō **Vol. 1:** 143 f., 150–152, **153 f.**, 160, 224 f.
Vol. 2: 144, 150
Nōe **Vol. 2: 681**
noēma **Vol. 1:** 711
Vol. 2: 182
Vol. 3: 122–125, 128, 824, 1082
noeō **Vol. 1:** 693
Vol. 3: 122–129, 132 f.

noētos **Vol. 1:** 523
Vol. 2: 192
Vol. 3: 124
nomē **Vol. 2:** 438
nomeus **Vol. 3:** 564
nomikos **Vol. 2: 438, 443, 447**
Vol. 3: 353, 409, **477, 480**
nomimos **Vol. 2:** 475
Vol. 3: 930
nomimōs **Vol. 1:** 645
Vol. 2: 438, 447
nomizō **Vol. 1:** 595
Vol. 2: 234, 439
Vol. 3: 181
nomodidaskalos **Vol. 2: 438, 447**
Vol. 3: 477, 480, 765, 768
nomophylakōn **Vol. 1:** 193
nomos **Vol. 1:** 54, 94, 228, 245, 282, 334, 336 f., 715, 738
Vol. 2: 120, 131, 436 f., **437–450**, 452, **455**, 519, 540 f., 544, 546, 658 f., 662, 715
Vol. 3: 72, 181, 185 f., 239, 353 f., 480, 493, 573 f., 580, 583 f., 593, 596 f., 885, 1151, 1178, 1188
nomothesia **Vol. 2: 438, 445**
nomotheteō **Vol. 2: 438, 448**
nomothetēs **Vol. 2: 438, 450**
noos **Vol. 3:** 133
noos theoudēs **Vol. 3:** 27
nosēma **Vol. 3: 996, 998**
noseō **Vol. 3: 996–998**
nosos **Vol. 3:** 993 f., **996–999**, 1000, 1119
nossia **Vol. 1:** 174
nothos **Vol. 1: 187 f.**
Vol. 2: 657
notos **Vol. 3: 1000, 1003**
nous **Vol. 1:** 232, 355–357, 443 f., 481, 521, 546, 557, 568, 595, 636, 638, 671, 676, 693, 706, 708, 739
Vol. 2: 182, 212, 439, 476, 493, 564 f., 567, 590 f.
Vol. 3: 122–130, 133, 224, 351, 572, 672, 678, 681, 689, 809, 936, 939, 1198
nous praktikos **Vol. 3:** 123
nous theōrētikos **Vol. 3:** 123
nouthesia **Vol. 1: 568 f.**
noutheteō **Vol. 1:** 329, **567 f.**, 573
nymphē **Vol. 1:** 153
Vol. 2: 549, 579, 581, **584 f.**
Vol. 3: 1071, 1167
nymphios **Vol. 1:** 325
Vol. 2: 549, **584 f.**
nymphōn **Vol. 2: 584 f.**
nyn **Vol. 2:** 282, 329, 416, 480, 543, 912
Vol. 3: 826, 831, **833 f., 837, 841**, 843, 850, 1169
nyn aiōn **Vol. 2:** 543
nyn chronos **Vol. 3: 834**
nyni **Vol. 1:** 282
Vol. 2: 282
Vol. 3: 831, **833 f., 837**, 924
nyx **Vol. 1: 420 f.**, 425
Vol. 2: 134, 368, 490
Vol. 3: 1181

obryzos **Vol. 2:** 574
ochlos **Vol. 1:** 292 f.
Vol. 2: 448, 788 f., 796, 799, **800 f., 805**
ochyrōma **Vol. 3:** 963
ochyros **Vol. 3:** 963
ōdē **Vol. 2: 874**
Vol. 3: 668, 670 f., **672–675**, 676
ōdin **Vol. 3:** 180, **857–859**
ōdinō **Vol. 1:** 178, 180
Vol. 3: 857–859
ōdis **Vol. 3:** 858
odmē **Vol. 3:** 599
ōdos **Vol. 3:** 672
odous **Vol. 2:** 421
odynē **Vol. 1:** 726
Vol. 2: 419
Vol. 3: 229
odyrmos **Vol. 2:** 417
ogdoos autos **Vol. 2: 692**
oida **Vol. 2:** 391 f., 398, 719
Vol. 3: 1064, 1205
oikeia **Vol. 1:** 673
oikeios **Vol. 1:** 673
Vol. 2: 247, 249, **251**, 794
oikeiotaton **Vol. 3:** 1157
oikeō **Vol. 1:** 518
Vol. 2: 247, 250 f.
oikētērion **Vol. 3:** 814
oiketēs **Vol. 2:** 509
Vol. 3: 609
oikia **Vol. 2: 257 f.**, 250
oikodespoteō **Vol. 2: 508, 510**
oikodespotēs **Vol. 2: 508–510**, 714, 790
oikodespotēsis **Vol. 2: 509**
oikodomē **Vol. 1:** 329, 662
Vol. 2: 193, 249, **251–253**, 256
oikodomeō **Vol. 1:** 300, 302
Vol. 2: 129, 249, **251–253**
Vol. 3: 185
oikonomeō **Vol. 2: 253–255**
oikonomia **Vol. 1:** 697, 738
Vol. 2: 253–256, 302, 714, 832, 837
Vol. 3: 468, 504, 1032
oikonomos **Vol. 2: 253–255**
oikos **Vol. 1:** 149, 197, 300, 662, 690
Vol. 2: 129, **247–256**, 873
Vol. 3: 229, 465, 504, 593, 782, 794, 1201
oikoumenē **Vol. 1:** 59, 326, **517–519**, 521, 523, 526
Vol. 3: 217
oikourēma **Vol. 1:** 498
oiktirmōn **Vol. 2: 598**
oiktirmos **Vol. 2:** 116, 543, **593**, 594, 597, **598**, 599 f., 733
oiktirō **Vol. 2: 598, 600**
oiktizō **Vol. 2:** 598
oiktos **Vol. 2:** 593, 598
oiktros **Vol. 2:** 598
oimē **Vol. 2:** 756
oinophlygia **Vol. 1:** 514
Vol. 3: 918, 922
oinopotēs **Vol. 3: 918, 921**
oinos **Vol. 1:** 106
Vol. 3: 918, 922 f.
oitōnizomenos **Vol. 2: 554**
oktō **Vol. 2: 692**
olethreuō **Vol. 1:** 471
olethros **Vol. 1:** 462, 464, **465–467**, 500
Vol. 2: 33, 368
Vol. 3: 97, 214, 471, 477, 535, 537
oligon **Vol. 2:** 429
oligopsychos **Vol. 3: 687**
oligōreō **Vol. 1: 462**
oligos **Vol. 1:** 462, 590
Vol. 2: 427 f.
Vol. 3: 839
ollymi **Vol. 1:** 462 f., 465
olothreuō **Vol. 1: 465**
olothreuōn **Vol. 1:** 465
olothreutēs **Vol. 1: 465**
ombros **Vol. 3: 1000, 1003**
omma **Vol. 2:** 393
Vol. 3: 512
omnymi **Vol. 3:** 737
omnyō **Vol. 3: 737–740**, 743, 792, 840
omosai **Vol. 3:** 740
ōn **Vol. 1:** 64
Vol. 2: 278, 617, 826
Vol. 3: 122, 876, 891, 1075, 1181, 1185 f., 1200, 1202
onaimēn **Vol. 2:** 434
onar **Vol. 1: 511–513**
onarion **Vol. 1:** 117
oneidismos **Vol. 2:** 835
Vol. 3: 340
oneidizō **Vol. 2:** 835
Vol. 3: 257, 340 f.
oneidos **Vol. 3:** 340, 347
ōneomai **Vol. 3:** 144
onēsimos **Vol. 2:** 434
onikos **Vol. 3:** 394
oninēmi **Vol. 2:** 434
onkos **Vol. 1:** 671, 674
onoma **Vol. 1:** 272
Vol. 2: 229, **648, 651 f., 654–656**
Vol. 3: 161, 257, 341, 763, 1119, 1172, 1187, 1196,

1209–1211, 1213
onomazō **Vol. 2: 648, 655**
Vol. 3: 233, 341
onos **Vol. 1:** 117
onta **Vol. 3:** 876, 891
onychion **Vol. 3: 396**
op– **Vol. 3:** 511 f.
opheil– **Vol. 2:** 666
opheilē **Vol. 2: 666, 668**
Vol. 3: 754
opheilēma **Vol. 1:** 701
Vol. 2: 120, **666–668**
opheiletēs **Vol. 2: 666–668**
opheilō **Vol. 2: 662 f., 666–669**
Vol. 3: 152, 573
ōpheleia **Vol. 3:** 137
ōpheleō **Vol. 1:** 463
Vol. 2: 115, 505
ophelon **Vol. 2: 666, 668**
ophis **Vol. 1:** 390, 507, **508 f.**, 511
Vol. 2: 638, 642
Vol. 3: 470
ophthalmos **Vol. 2:** 710, 925
Vol. 3: 32, **511 f., 516**, 1179
ōphthē **Vol. 3:** 281, 284 f.
ōphthēn **Vol. 3: 511 f., 518**
opi **Vol. 1:** 492
opisō **Vol. 1:** 321, 324, 481 f., **492 f.**
Vol. 3: 471, 946
opisthen **Vol. 1: 492 f.**
ops **Vol. 1:** 585
Vol. 2: 564
opsarion **Vol. 1: 670**
opse **Vol. 2:** 136
opsimos **Vol. 3: 1000, 1003**
opsis **Vol. 1:** 680
Vol. 3: 512
opsomai **Vol. 3: 511, 515**
opson **Vol. 3:** 144
opsōnia **Vol. 3: 144 f.**
opsōnion **Vol. 3:** 134, **144 f.**, 379, 964
optanomai **Vol. 3: 516**, 1181
optanomenos **Vol. 3:** 1181
optasia **Vol. 3:** 310, **511 f., 515, 517**
orcheomai **Vol. 2:** 436
oregō **Vol. 1:** 460
oregomai **Vol. 1:** 457, **460 f.**
Vol. 3: 587
oreinos **Vol. 3: 1008**
orexis **Vol. 1: 460 f.**
Vol. 3: 587
orgaō **Vol. 1:** 107
orgē **Vol. 1: 106–108, 110–113**, 464
Vol. 2: 412, 544, 834, 924
Vol. 3: 205, 315, 580, 836, 1166, 1187
orgilos **Vol. 1: 107, 110**
orgizō **Vol. 1: 107**
Vol. 2: 419
orgizomai **Vol. 1:** 110
Oriōn **Vol. 3:** 950
ornis **Vol. 1:** 174
oros **Vol. 2:** 591
Vol. 3: 1009, 1013 f., 1094
orphanos **Vol. 2: 737 f.**
orthon **Vol. 3:** 577
orthopodeō **Vol. 3: 351 f.**
orthos **Vol. 1:** 307, 348, 599
Vol. 2: 475, 659
Vol. 3: 348, **351 f.**, 1084
orthōs **Vol. 3: 351**, 933
orthotomeō **Vol. 1:** 307, 309
Vol. 3: 351 f.
Osiris **Vol. 2:** 274
osmaomai **Vol. 2:** 211
osmē **Vol. 3:** 432, **599–601**
osphys **Vol. 1:** 239
osteon **Vol. 1:** 240
ostraka **Vol. 3: 913**
ostrakeus **Vol. 3: 913**
ostrakinos **Vol. 3:** 912, **913–915**
ostrakizō **Vol. 3: 913**
ostrakon **Vol. 3: 913**
ouai **Vol. 3: 1051–1054**
oudeis **Vol. 1:** 351
Vol. 2: 100, 683
Vol. 3: 353, 521
ouden kōlyei **Vol. 2:** 222
oulē **Vol. 2:** 465
oupō **Vol. 1:** 738
ouranioi **Vol. 2:** 188
ouranios **Vol. 2: 188, 191 f.**, 778
ouranos **Vol. 1:** 304, 517
Vol. 2: 54, 184, **188–196**, 376 f., 381, 502, 555, 714, 735
Vol. 3: 55, 181 f., 391, 543, 941, 1176
ouranos aisthētos **Vol. 2:** 192
ouranos noētos **Vol. 2:** 192
ouranothen **Vol. 2: 188, 193**, 486
ous **Vol. 2:** 175, 180
Vol. 3: 125
ousia **Vol. 1:** 711
Vol. 2: 507, **845 f.**
ousiōdēs **Vol. 3:** 647
oxos **Vol. 2:** 28
oxythymia **Vol. 2:** 769

pachynō **Vol. 2: 153 f., 156**
pachys **Vol. 2:** 153 f.
pagis **Vol. 3:** 802, 1178
pagos **Vol. 2:** 716
paidagōgos **Vol. 1: 370**
Vol. 2: 445
Vol. 3: 580, **775, 778 f.**, 935
paidarion **Vol. 1: 283 f.**
Vol. 2: 428
paideia **Vol. 1:** 462, 568 f., 639
Vol. 2: 140 f., 745
Vol. 3: 311, 688, 745, **775–777, 779**, 998
paideuō **Vol. 1:** 162, 164, 494, 502, 568, 573
Vol. 2: 122, 140–142, 446
Vol. 3: 775–778, 780
paideutēs **Vol. 3: 775, 778**
paidia **Vol. 3:** 1027
paidion **Vol. 1:** 280, **283–285**
Vol. 3: 352
paidiskē **Vol. 1:** 283 f.
pais **Vol. 1:** 96, 273, 280 f., **283 f.**, 286, 290, 538, 552, 597, 707
Vol. 2: 151, 229, 337, 364, 643
Vol. 3: 590, 593, 607–612, 634 f., 637, 640, 664, 721, 775
pais theou **Vol. 1:** 281, 283, 538
Vol. 3: 597, **607, 610–612**, 634 f., 640, 664, 721
paizō **Vol. 2:** 436
Vol. 3: 347
palai **Vol. 1:** 165
Vol. 2: 669 f., 675, **713 f., 716**, 834
palaioō **Vol. 1:** 645
Vol. 2: 671, 675, **713 f., 716**
palaios **Vol. 1:** 192, 339, 401, 666, 671, 682
Vol. 2: 473, 566, 669, 675 f., **713 f., 716**
palaiotēs **Vol. 2:** 671, 675, **713–715**
palin **Vol. 1:** 184
palingenesia **Vol. 1:** 176, 178, 180, **184 f.**, 188, 290, 521
Vol. 2: 566, 625, 673, 836
Vol. 3: 215, 220, 629
pan **Vol. 2:** 734
panēgyris **Vol. 1:** 304
panoplia **Vol. 3: 959, 965**
panourgia **Vol. 1: 412 f.**
panourgos **Vol. 1: 412 f.**
panta **Vol. 1:** 165, 383, 577 f.
panta en pasin **Vol. 3: 1191**
pantelēs **Vol. 3:** 210
pantes **Vol. 1:** 96
pantodapos **Vol. 3:** 197
pantoios **Vol. 3:** 197
pantokratōr **Vol. 2:** 69, 513
Vol. 3: 716–718, 729
pantote **Vol. 1:** 741
Vol. 2: 882
par– **Vol. 2:** 856
para **Vol. 1:** 239, 690, 714
Vol. 2: 172, 175, 243, 291, 450, 502, 618, 659 f., 743, 756, 846
Vol. 3: 178, 228, 835, 869, 939, 1036, **1171–1174, 1181, 1185, 1198, 1201–1205**, 1214
para kairon **Vol. 3:** 835

para kyriō **Vol. 3: 1202**
para patros **Vol. 3: 1202**
para physin **Vol. 2:** 659 f.
Vol. 3: 869
para theō **Vol. 3: 1202**
para theou **Vol. 3: 1203**
parabainō **Vol. 2:** 586
Vol. 3: 583 f., 587
paraballō **Vol. 2:** 743
parabasis **Vol. 1:** 85
Vol. 3: 573 f., **583–585**
parabatēs **Vol. 3: 583 f.**
parabolē **Vol. 1:** 577
Vol. 2: 502, **743 f., 746, 748, 753**, 757 f., 803
Vol. 3: 131, 503, 555, 906, 1014, 1070, 1106
paradeigma **Vol. 2:** 290, 743
Vol. 3: 904, 907
paradeigmatizō **Vol. 2:** 284, **291, 293**
Vol. 3: 570
paradeisos **Vol. 2: 760 f., 764**
Vol. 3: 315, 602
paradidomai **Vol. 2:** 527
paradidōmi **Vol. 2:** 146, 339, **361, 367 f.**, 543, 719, 854
Vol. 3: 55, 61, 171, 611, 643, **772–774**, 1181
paradosis **Vol. 1:** 199, 335, 485
Vol. 2: 367 f.
Vol. 3: 61, 584, 764, **772, 774**
paraineō **Vol. 1:** 65
Vol. 2: 744
paraiteomai **Vol. 2: 855 f., 858**
parakaleō **Vol. 1:** 88 f., 91, 197, 249, 271, 329, 568, **569–571**, 573
Vol. 2: 381
Vol. 3: 54, 87 f., 170, 1042
parakalōn **Vol. 1:** 197
paraklēsis **Vol. 1:** 329, **569–571**
Vol. 2: 121, 766, 774
Vol. 3: 87 f., 751
paraklētōr **Vol. 1:** 89
paraklētos **Vol. 1: 88–92**, 271, 324, 329, 571
Vol. 2: 359, 878, 895
Vol. 3: 162 f., 225, 242, **704**
parakoē **Vol. 2: 172, 175**
Vol. 3: 573, 585
parakoloutheō **Vol. 1: 480 f.**
parakouō **Vol. 2: 172, 175**
paralambanō **Vol. 2:** 839 f.
Vol. 3: 61, 604, **747 f., 751**, 773 f., 1181
paralelymenos **Vol. 3: 999**
paralogizomai **Vol. 2: 457–459**
paralyō **Vol. 3: 999**
paralytikos **Vol. 2: 415**
Vol. 3: 999
paralytos **Vol. 2:** 415
paramenō **Vol. 3: 223, 228**
paramytheomai **Vol. 1: 328 f.**
Vol. 3: 54
paramythia **Vol. 1: 328 f.**
paramythion **Vol. 1: 328 f.**
parangelia **Vol. 1: 340 f.**
parangellō **Vol. 1:** 330, **340–342**
parangelma **Vol. 1:** 339 f.
paranomeō **Vol. 2: 438, 451**
paranomos **Vol. 2:** 586
paranymphios **Vol. 3:** 1072
paraphora **Vol. 2:** 744
parapikrainō **Vol. 1: 202 f.**
parapikrasmos **Vol. 1: 203**
parapiptō **Vol. 1: 608 f.**
Vol. 2: 717
Vol. 3: 573, **585**
paraplēsion **Vol. 3:** 1173
paraptōma **Vol. 1:** 446, 606, 608, 701
Vol. 2: 120, 586
Vol. 3: 168, 573, **585 f.**, 1176, 1184
pararrheō **Vol. 1: 682 f.**
paraskeuazō **Vol. 3:** 116, **118–120**, 410
paraskeuē **Vol. 3: 119 f., 405, 408, 410,** 413
parastēsai **Vol. 3:** 925
paratēreō **Vol. 2: 132 f.**
Vol. 3: 410, 717
paratērēsis **Vol. 2: 132 f.**
parathēkē **Vol. 3:** 61, 770 f.
pardalis **Vol. 1:** 119
paredothē **Vol. 2:** 339
pareimi **Vol. 2: 898 f.**
Vol. 3: 242
pareiserchomai **Vol. 1: 320, 322**
parektos **Vol. 3:** 540, 1195
paremballō **Vol. 3: 959, 965**
parembolē **Vol. 3: 959, 965**
parepidēmeō **Vol. 2:** 790
parepidēmos **Vol. 1:** 305, 683, 689, **690**, 691
Vol. 2: 788–790, 794, 803
parerchomai **Vol. 1: 320, 322**
Vol. 2: 671
Vol. 3: 181
paresis **Vol. 1:** 573, **697 f., 701 f.**
Vol. 2: 767
Vol. 3: 1184
pariēmi **Vol. 1:** 698
paristanō **Vol. 1:** 474, 478
paristēmi **Vol. 1:** 471, **474 f.**, 478, 533
Vol. 3: 925, 1181
paroikeō **Vol. 1: 690 f.**
paroikia **Vol. 1:** 685, **690 f.**
Vol. 3: 844
paroikos **Vol. 1:** 683 f., 686–689, **690 f.**
Vol. 2: 249, 251
paroimia **Vol. 2:** 736, **743**, 745, 756 f., 760
paroinos **Vol. 1:** 514
paromoiazō **Vol. 2: 500–502**
paromoios **Vol. 2: 500 f.**, 503
parōn **Vol. 2: 899**
parorgismos **Vol. 2: 107, 110**
parorgizō **Vol. 1: 107, 110**
parousia **Vol. 1:** 65, 73, 406
Vol. 2: 54, 144, 192, 387, 503, 518, 630, **887**, 894 f., 897, **898–903, 907**, 909, 924–926, **932–934**
Vol. 3: 30, 55, 252, 310, 315, 319, 658, 863
paroxynō **Vol. 1: 107**
paroxynomai **Vol. 1:** 110
paroxysmos **Vol. 1: 107, 110**
parrhēsia **Vol. 1:** 660, 715
Vol. 2: 734 –737, 758
Vol. 3: 74, 143, 1145
parrhēsiazomai **Vol. 2: 734–737**
parthenia **Vol. 3: 1072**
parthenikos **Vol. 3:** 1071
parthenos **Vol. 1:** 186
Vol. 2: 87, 585, 588
Vol. 3: 536, 667, 1055, 1058, **1071 f.**, 1076, 1078
pas **Vol. 1: 94**, 138, 186, 504, 518, 524, 647, 669, 674, 740, 742
Vol. 2: 234, 253, 403, 477, 502, 505, 511, 655, 657, 661, 694, 709, 714, 719, 723, 768, 774, 781, 793, 799, 819, 840, 846, 910
Vol. 3: 148, 171, 181 f., 195, 197, 327, 354, 391, 403, 456, 488, 567, 711, 754, 765, 770, 841, 875, 887, 913, 1153, 1158, 1162, 1176 f., 1180, 1182, 1186, 1190 f., 1194, 1197 f., 1201, 1211 f.
pascha **Vol. 1:** 624 f., **632–635**
Vol. 2: 277, 441, 521, **537**, 716, 783
Vol. 3: 431, 669
paschō **Vol. 1:** 487, 632
Vol. 3: 92, **719–725**, 997
patassō **Vol. 1: 161–164**
pateō **Vol. 3: 943 f.**, 947
patēr **Vol. 1:** 65, 298, 326, 442, **614–619, 621**, 740
Vol. 2: 250, 394, 401, 476, 506 f., 655, 778, 780, 868 f., 871, 878
Vol. 3: 162, 472, 636, 638, 675, 772, 774, 1185 f., 1202 f.
path– **Vol. 3:** 719
pathē **Vol. 3:** 678
pathēma **Vol. 3: 719, 722 f.**
pathētos **Vol. 3: 719, 722, 724**
pathos **Vol. 1:** 108, 674
Vol. 2: 419, 658

Vol. 3: 719 f., 722, 997
patria **Vol. 1: 615 f., 621**
Vol. 2: 655 f.
patrikos **Vol. 3:** 764
patrios **Vol. 3:** 1035
patris **Vol. 1: 615 f.**
Vol. 2: 476
pau **Vol. 1:** 283
Paulos **Vol. 2:** 489
Vol. 3: 592, 1203
pax **Vol. 2:** 716
pedinos **Vol. 3: 1009**
pēganon **Vol. 2: 210 f.**
pēgē **Vol. 3:** 982, **985–987**, 988–990
pēgnymi **Vol. 2:** 716
peinaō **Vol. 2: 264–268**, 274, **277**
peira **Vol. 3: 798 f., 802**, 810
peiraō **Vol. 3: 798 f.**
peiraomai **Vol. 3: 802**
peirasmos **Vol. 1:** 461, 682
Vol. 2: 808
Vol. 3: 587, **798–800, 802 f.**, 809, 811, 1176
peirazō **Vol. 3:** 790, **798 f., 801 f., 808–810**, 1198
peismonē **Vol. 1: 588, 591 f.**
peith- **Vol. 1:** 588
peitharcheō **Vol. 3: 588 f., 593**
peitharchos **Vol. 1:** 588
peithō **Vol. 1:** 228, **588–593**, 605
Vol. 3: 1213
peithomai **Vol. 1:** 328, **587–593**, 598
Vol. 2: 122, 470
peithos **Vol. 1: 588, 592**
Vol. 3: 53
pel- **Vol. 3:** 572
pelas **Vol. 1:** 258
pelazō **Vol. 1:** 258
pēlos **Vol. 3:** 911, **915 f.**
pelta **Vol. 3:** 966
pempō **Vol. 1: 126–128**
Vol. 3: 1203
penēs **Vol. 2:** 257, 264, **820–822, 828**
penia **Vol. 1:** 564
Vol. 2: 820
penichros **Vol. 1:** 564
Vol. 2: 820 f.
penomai **Vol. 1:** 564
pentakischilioi **Vol. 2: 699**
pentateuchos **Vol. 1:** 65
pentē **Vol. 2: 689**, 693, 699
pentēkostē **Vol. 1:** 738
Vol. 2: 783, 788
pentēkostos **Vol. 2:** 783
penth- **Vol. 3:** 719
pentheō **Vol. 2: 416–418**, 420, **421–423**
penthos **Vol. 2: 421–424**
Vol. 3: 720
pepausthai **Vol. 3:** 845
pepeismai **Vol. 1:** 588
Vol. 2: 243
pepoitha **Vol. 1: 587–589, 591 f.**
pepoithenai **Vol. 1:** 228, 596
pepoithēsis **Vol. 1: 588 f., 592**
pepoithōs **Vol. 1:** 598
Vol. 2: 243
pepyrōmena **Vol. 3:** 966
pēra **Vol. 1: 143**
Vol. 2: 825
peras **Vol. 3:** 836
peri **Vol. 1:** 84, 227, 266, 335, 599
Vol. 2: 140, 356, 489, 504, 621
Vol. 3: 153, 162, 171, 419 f., 434, 611, 763, 771, 1045, 1119, **1172–1174, 1176, 1211**, 1214
peri hamartias **Vol. 3: 171**, 419 f., 434, **1203**
peri pollōn **Vol. 3:** 611, 1174
peribolaion **Vol. 3:** 1179
peribolon **Vol. 3:** 679
periechō **Vol. 3:** 491
periekryben **Vol. 2:** 214
perierchomai **Vol. 1: 320, 322**
perierga **Vol. 2: 557**
periergazomai **Vol. 1: 266 f.**
Vol. 2: 434
Vol. 3: 152
periergon **Vol. 2: 557**
periergos **Vol. 1: 266 f.**
Vol. 2: 552
perikathairaō **Vol. 1:** 479
Vol. 2: 102
perikatharma **Vol. 1: 479 f.**
Vol. 2: 57
Vol. 3: 102
perikephalaia **Vol. 3: 959, 966**
perikopē **Vol. 1:** 65
perikoptō **Vol. 1:** 65
perilampō **Vol. 2: 484, 486**
perileipō **Vol. 3: 248**
perileipomai **Vol. 3: 247**
periloipos **Vol. 3: 248**
perimenō 245
Vol. 3: 224, 228
periousiasmos **Vol. 2: 838**
periousios **Vol. 2:** 298, 800, **838–840**
peripateō **Vol. 3: 935,** 942, **943–945,** 947, 1183
peripherō **Vol. 3:** 770
periphora **Vol. 2:** 744
periphroneō **Vol. 1: 461 f.**
peripiptō **Vol. 1: 608**
peripoieō **Vol. 2:** 838
peripoieomai **Vol. 2:** 833, **838 f.**
Vol. 3: 751
peripoiēsis **Vol. 1:** 305
Vol. 2: 829, **838 f.**
peripsaō **Vol. 1:** 479
peripsēma **Vol. 1: 479 f.**
Vol. 2: 57
perisseia **Vol. 1: 728–731**
Vol. 3: 137 f., 400
perisseuma **Vol. 1: 728 f.**
perisseuō **Vol. 1: 728–731,** 735, 744
Vol. 2: 131, 504
Vol. 3: 137, 728
perisseuon **Vol. 1:** 729
perisson **Vol. 1:** 729–731
Vol. 3: 728
perissos **Vol. 1: 728**
Vol. 3: 349
perissōs **Vol. 1: 728, 730**
perissoteron **Vol. 1:** 729–731
perissoteros **Vol. 1: 728**
perissoterōs **Vol. 1: 728, 731**
peristera **Vol. 1:** 175
peritemnō **Vol. 1: 307, 309, 312**
peritomē **Vol. 1: 307, 309 f.**
Vol. 3: 1183, 1189
perizōnnymi **Vol. 3: 120 f.**, 711
pernēmi **Vol. 1:** 497
pēroō **Vol. 2:** 153
pēros **Vol. 2:** 153
pērōsis **Vol. 2:** 153
perysi **Vol. 3:** 1174
petannymi **Vol. 1:** 172
peteinon **Vol. 1: 172**
Vol. 2: 729
peteinos **Vol. 1:** 172
petomai **Vol. 1:** 172
petra **Vol. 2:** 433, 732
Vol. 3: 381–384, 386, 390, 393, 398, 623
petrōdēs **Vol. 3:** 382
petros **Vol. 2:** 433, 652, 732
Vol. 3: 381–383 f., 386, 398
phainō **Vol. 2:** 433, 484, **487 f., 496**
Vol. 3: 310, 312, 317, **320**
phainomai **Vol. 2:** 484, **487 f.**
Vol. 3: 310
-phan- **Vol. 3:** 310
phaneroō **Vol. 2:** 122
Vol. 3: 310, 312, 314, 316, **317, 320–323**
phaneros **Vol. 3:** 312, **317, 320**
phanerōs **Vol. 3: 317, 320**
phanerōsis **Vol. 3: 317,** 323
phantasia **Vol. 3:** 891
phantasma **Vol. 2: 552,** 559
Vol. 3: 317, 324, 513, 876
phantazō **Vol. 3: 317, 324**
phantazomenon **Vol. 3:** 324
phaos **Vol. 2:** 490
Pharisaios **Vol. 1:** 487, 535
Vol. 2: 810, 814
pharmakeia **Vol. 2:** 286, **552, 558**
pharmakeus **Vol. 2: 552, 558**
pharmakon **Vol. 1:** 58
Vol. 2: 552, 558

pharmakos **Vol. 2: 552, 554, 555, 558**
phasma **Vol. 2:** 622
phatis **Vol. 2:** 52
phatos **Vol. 2:** 674
phaulos **Vol. 1: 561, 564**
Vol. 3: 1158
-phē- **Vol. 3: 74 f.**
pheidomenōs **Vol. 1:** 214
phēmi **Vol. 3:** 341
phengos **Vol. 2:** 484
pherō **Vol. 1:** 722
Vol. 3: 1195
pheugō **Vol. 1: 558 f.**
pheugōn **Vol. 1:** 558
phil– **Vol. 2: 547**
Philadelpheia **Vol. 2: 550**
philadelphia **Vol. 1: 254, 257**
Vol. 2: 470, 538, 542, **547, 549 f.**
philadelphos **Vol. 1: 254, 257**
Vol. 2: 549
philagathos **Vol. 2: 549**
philandros **Vol. 2:** 549
philanthrōpia **Vol. 2: 547, 549, 551**
philanthrōpōs **Vol. 2: 550**
philargyria **Vol. 1: 138**
Vol. 2: 550, 845
philargyros **Vol. 2: 550,** 843
philautia **Vol. 1:** 228
philautos **Vol. 2: 550**
philē **Vol. 2: 547 f.**
philēdonas **Vol. 1: 458, 460**
Vol. 2: 550
philēma **Vol. 1:** 206
Vol. 2: 538, 547–549
Philēmon **Vol. 2: 550**
phileō **Vol. 1:** 206
Vol. 2: 86, **538 f., 542 f., 547–551,** 585
Philētos **Vol. 2: 550**
philia **Vol. 1:** 257
Vol. 2: 538, 547 f., 551, 735, 776
Philippēsios **Vol. 2: 550**
Philippoi **Vol. 2: 550**
Philippos **Vol. 2:** 538, **550**
philodēmos **Vol. 2:** 657
Philologos **Vol. 2: 550**
philoneikia **Vol. 2: 550**
philoneikos **Vol. 2: 550**
philonikia **Vol. 2: 550**
philonikos **Vol. 2: 550**
philophrōn **Vol. 2: 550**
philophronōs **Vol. 2: 550**
philoprōteuō **Vol. 2: 550**
philos **Vol. 1:** 259, 665
Vol. 2: 538, **547–551,** 585, 663
Vol. 3: 1034
philosopheō **Vol. 3: 1034 f.**
philosophia **Vol. 1:** 664
Vol. 2: 538, **550**
Vol. 3: 877, 1027, **1034–1036**
philosophos **Vol. 2: 550**
Vol. 3: 1034–1036
philostorgos **Vol. 2: 538 f., 542, 550**
philoteknia **Vol. 2:** 658
philoteknos **Vol. 2: 550**
philotheos **Vol. 1:** 460
Vol. 2: 550
philotimeomai **Vol. 2: 550**
philotimia **Vol. 1:** 137
philoxenia **Vol. 1: 686, 690**
Vol. 2: 538, **547, 550**
philoxenos **Vol. 1: 686, 690**
Vol. 2: 550
phobeō **Vol. 1:** 328, 621, 623 f.
Vol. 2: 596
phobeomai **Vol. 1:** 361, 484, **621–623**
Vol. 2: 91, 94
phoberos **Vol. 1: 621–623**
Vol. 3: 318
phobētheis **Vol. 2:** 91
phobēthron **Vol. 1:** 622
phobētron **Vol. 1:** 622
phobos **Vol. 1: 621 f.**
Vol. 2: 93 f., 396
Vol. 3: 561, 721
phobos theou **Vol. 2:** 93 f.
phoboumenos **Vol. 1:** 359, 361
Vol. 2: 94
phoboumenos ton theon **Vol. 1: 359, 361,** 623
phoinix **Vol. 1:** 648
phoitazō **Vol. 3:** 391
phōnē **Vol. 2:** 426
Vol. 3: 51, 80, **113 f.,** 394, 675, 1078, 1143
phōneō **Vol. 3: 113 f.**
phonos **Vol. 1:** 558
Vol. 2: 674
phoros **Vol. 3: 752, 754**
phortion **Vol. 1: 260 f.,** 335
Vol. 3: 1162
phortizō **Vol. 1: 260,** 262
Vol. 3: 1162
phortos **Vol. 1: 260**
phōs **Vol. 1:** 421–424, 723
Vol. 2: 290, 397, 477, 480, 484–487, **490, 493, 496**
Vol. 3: 312 f., 317, 554, 734
phōsphoros **Vol. 2: 490, 493, 495**
phōstēr **Vol. 2: 490, 493**
phōteinos **Vol. 2: 490, 493**
phōtismos **Vol. 2: 490, 493**
phōtizō **Vol. 2:** 485, **490, 493–495**
Vol. 3: 893
phragellion **Vol. 1: 162**
phragelloō **Vol. 1: 162**
phragmos **Vol. 3:** 185, 949, **950 f.**
phrassō **Vol. 3: 950 f.**
phrattō **Vol. 3:** 950
phrear **Vol. 3:** 986
phren- **Vol. 2:** 616
phrēn **Vol. 1:** 501, 671
Vol. 2: 620, 643
Vol. 3: 1036, 1172
phronēma **Vol. 1:** 680
Vol. 2: 616 f.
phroneō **Vol. 1:** 502
Vol. 2: 259, 616–619, 781
Vol. 3: 124, 441
phronēsis **Vol. 1:** 485
Vol. 2: 616 f., 620
Vol. 3: 354, 898, 1032
phronimos **Vol. 2: 616–620**
Vol. 3: 1025 f.
phronimōs **Vol. 2: 617, 619**
phrontis **Vol. 1:** 276 f.
phrontisteon **Vol. 1:** 377
phrontizō **Vol. 1:** 276 f.
Vol. 3: 823
phroureō **Vol. 2: 134 f.**
phthanō **Vol. 2:** 932
phthartos **Vol. 1:** 468, 470
phtheirō **Vol. 1:** 462, **467–469,** 471
phthoneō **Vol. 1: 557**
phthonos **Vol. 1: 557 f.**
phthora **Vol. 1: 467–470,** 681
Vol. 2: 661
Vol. 3: 281, 995
phy- **Vol. 2:** 656
phyē **Vol. 3:** 866
phygē **Vol. 1: 558 f.**
phylakē **Vol. 2: 134, 136,** 207
phylakizō **Vol. 2:** 136
phylaktērion **Vol. 2:** 136
phylassō **Vol. 2:** 132 f., **134 f.,** 137, 177, 450, 452, 864
phylassomai **Vol. 1:** 332
phylax **Vol. 2:** 136
phylē **Vol. 1:** 518, 684
Vol. 2: 306
Vol. 3: 870 f., 873
phyllon **Vol. 3: 865**
phylon **Vol. 3:** 454
phyō **Vol. 2:** 656
Vol. 3: 870
phyraō **Vol. 3:** 917
phyrama **Vol. 2:** 676
Vol. 3: 917
physeion **Vol. 2:** 657
physika **Vol. 1:** 63
physikos **Vol. 2: 656,** 660 f.
physikōs **Vol. 2:** 661
physioō **Vol. 2:** 422
physis **Vol. 1:** 460, 481, 714
Vol. 2: 394, 439, 476, 648, **656–662**
Vol. 3: 71, 595, 647, 869, 926 f.
phyteia **Vol. 3:** 523, **865, 868**
phyteuma **Vol. 3: 866**
phyteuō **Vol. 3: 865, 868**

pikrainō **Vol. 1: 202**
pikria **Vol. 1:** 106, **202,** 726
pikros **Vol. 1: 201,** 203
Vol. 2: 27
pikrōs **Vol. 1: 201**
pimplēmi **Vol. 1:** 728, **733–739**
pimprēni **Vol. 1:** 94
pinō **Vol. 2:** 264, 269, 272, **274, 277,** 524, 535, 755
Vol. 3: 243, 383, 707, 723
piotēs **Vol. 3:** 870
pipraskō **Vol. 1: 268**
piptō **Vol. 1: 608, 610 f.**
Vol. 2: 835
Vol. 3: 586
pisteuō **Vol. 1:** 324, 354 f., 397, 588, **593 f., 597, 599, 601**
Vol. 2: 243, 837
Vol. 3: 53, 491, 746, 800, 1031, 1172, 1188, 1196, **1211–1213**
pisteuōn **Vol. 1:** 601
Vol. 3: 392, 1212
pistis **Vol. 1:** 50, 289, 351, 446, 504, 587, **593–595, 597–606,** 660, 704, 712 f.
Vol. 2: 94, 117, 133, 142, 170, 175, 239, 242 f., 342, 450, 469, 488, 543, 545 f., 560, 563, 618, 768
Vol. 3: 72, 163, 204, 226, 228, 315, 364–368, 373, 403 f., 505, 581, 584, 774, 878, 882, 885, 966, 1033, 1150 f., 1172, 1176 f., 1182, 1188–1191, **1211–1213**
pistoō **Vol. 1: 594**
pistos **Vol. 1:** 305, 310, **593 f., 598, 602**
Vol. 2: 837
Vol. 3: 162, 765, 1046 f., 1211
pith- **Vol. 1:** 588
pithanologia **Vol. 1: 588 f., 592**
pithanos **Vol. 1:** 588
plan- **Vol. 2:** 457 f.
planaō **Vol. 1:** 608
Vol. 2: 457–461, 469
planaomai **Vol. 2: 457, 459**
Vol. 3: 573
planē **Vol. 2: 457–461**
planēs **Vol. 2: 459**
planētēs **Vol. 2: 457, 459**
planōntes **Vol. 3:** 766
planos **Vol. 2: 457, 459**
plasas **Vol. 3:** 766
plassō **Vol. 1:** 383
plateia **Vol. 2:** 735
platos **Vol. 1: 253**
platynō **Vol. 1: 253 f.**
platys **Vol. 1: 253 f.**
plax **Vol. 3:** 1040
plē- **Vol. 1:** 733
plēgē **Vol. 1: 161–163**
Vol. 3: 857
pleion **Vol. 1:** 729
plēmmeleia **Vol. 3:** 420
plēn **Vol. 1:** 98
pleon **Vol. 1:** 137
Vol. 2: 130, 236
pleonazō **Vol. 2:** 128, **130 f.**
pleonekteō **Vol. 1: 137–139**
Vol. 2: 845
pleonektēs **Vol. 1: 137–139**
Vol. 2: 845
pleonexia **Vol. 1: 137–139,** 214
Vol. 2: 286, **845 f.**
plērēs **Vol. 1:** 546, **733–735, 738 f.,** 744
Vol. 3: 102, 572, 700
plērōma **Vol. 1:** 522, 728, **733–735, 738–740,** 744
Vol. 2: 83, 163
Vol. 3: 252, 350, 827, 843
plēroō **Vol. 1:** 93, 171, 532, 552, 728, **733–738, 740, 741,** 744
Vol. 2: 77, 83, 87, 251, 359, 417, 629, 640, 669, 715, 753, 819
Vol. 3: 53, 71, 82, 172, 181 f., 187, 329, 489, 491, 494, 505, 642, 804, 827, 1073, 1121
plērophoreō **Vol. 1: 733, 735, 737**
plērophoria **Vol. 1: 733, 735**
plēsion **Vol. 1:** 255, 257, **258–260**
Vol. 2: 503, 540, 544, 548, **551**
Vol. 3: 173, 455, 1155
plēsios **Vol. 1:** 254, 257 f.
plēthos **Vol. 1:** 292, 728, **731–733**
Vol. 2: 799
plēthynō **Vol. 1:** 728, **732**
Vol. 2: 128
plousios **Vol. 2:** 820 f., 826, **840–842, 844–846**
plousiōs **Vol. 2: 840, 842**
plouteō **Vol. 2:** 826, **840–842,** 845
ploutizō **Vol. 2: 840–842**
ploutos **Vol. 1:** 138
Vol. 2: 824, 829, 834 f., **840–844,** 845 f., **852**
Vol. 3: 545
plynō **Vol. 1:** 150, 152 f.
pneō **Vol. 3: 689, 707**
pneu- **Vol. 3:** 689
pneuma **Vol. 1:** 66, 90, 232, 234–236, 449, 452, 470, 500 f., 637, 674 f., 719, 739
Vol. 2: 213, 233, 242, 388, 476, 479, 520, 546, 559, 617, 641, 672 f., 675, 691, 715, 784, 824, 878, 899, 919
Vol. 3: 75, 129, 257 f., 299, 471, 473, 475, 493, 495, 597, 672, 678, 680 f., 685, **689 f., 693–695, 700, 706,** 708 f., 711, 831, 967, 1046, 1172, 1177 f., 1183, 1188–1192, 1199 f., 1202 f., 1210
pneuma mantikon **Vol. 3:** 75
pneumatikos **Vol. 1:** 236, 242, 336, 566
Vol. 2: 276, 567, 605
Vol. 3: 281, 283, 303, 308, 435, 504, 647, 674 f., 684, 687, **689 f., 706 f.,** 1037, 1200
pneumatikōs **Vol. 3: 689**
pnigō **Vol. 1:** 220, **226**
pniktos **Vol. 1:** 220, **226**
pnoē **Vol. 3:** 680, **689, 707**
podes kai cheires **Vol. 2:** 149
poiēma **Vol. 3:** 719, **1152–1154**
poieō **Vol. 1:** 363, 377 f., 380, 383, 387, 590, 722
Vol. 2: 100, 221, 597, 664, 709
Vol. 3: 148 f., 168, 170, 242 f., 245, 316, 353, 372, 719, 859, 1021 f., 1083, 1148 f., **1152–1158**
poieomai **Vol. 1:** 536
Vol. 2: 128
poiēsis **Vol. 3: 1152–1155**
poiētēs **Vol. 2:** 655
Vol. 3: 1150, 1153–1155
poiētikos **Vol. 3:** 123
poimainō **Vol. 1:** 408
Vol. 3: 564, 566, 568
poimēn **Vol. 1:** 191 f.
Vol. 2: 104, 412
Vol. 3: 564, 566, 568 f.
poimnē **Vol. 3: 564, 566–568**
poimnion **Vol. 2:** 586
Vol. 3: 564–566
poith- **Vol. 1:** 588
polemeō **Vol. 3: 958 f., 963,** 981
polemikos **Vol. 2:** 776
polemos **Vol. 1:** 644 f., 652
Vol. 3: 958 f., 961–963, 981
pōleō **Vol. 1: 268**
Vol. 2: 846
polis **Vol. 1:** 230, 291, 372, 431, 536, 687, 715
Vol. 2: 92, 236, 320, 324, 439, 477, 788, **801–803, 805,** 840
Vol. 3: 49f., 219, 353, 454, 456 f., 545, 564, 574, 755, 925, 1156, 1173
politarchēs **Vol. 2: 801, 804**
politeia **Vol. 2: 801–804**
politēs **Vol. 1:** 372 f.
Vol. 2: 801–804
politeuma **Vol. 1:** 299

politeuma (cont'd) **Vol. 2: 801–805**
politeuō **Vol. 1:** 373
politeuomai **Vol. 2: 801–804**
politikos **Vol. 2:** 475, 657
pollō mallon **Vol. 2:** 504
polloi **Vol. 1: 94–97,** 576
Vol. 2: 530, **537**
Vol. 3: 195, 197, 229, 275, 363
pōlos **Vol. 1:** 117
polyeleos **Vol. 3:** 889
polypragmoneō **Vol. 3:** 152
polys **Vol. 1:** 94 f.
Vol. 2: 104, 130, 417, 503 f., 524, 543, 840, 846
Vol. 3: 247, 611, 723, 839, 989 f., 1174, 1180, 1201
polysplanchnos **Vol. 2: 598–600, 1201**
polytelēs **Vol. 3:** 388
poma **Vol. 2: 274**
ponеō **Vol. 1:** 262, 564
ponēreuomai **Vol. 1:** 562
ponēria **Vol. 1: 564–566**
Vol. 3: 886
ponēro- **Vol. 2:** 419
ponēros **Vol. 1:** 228, 348, 561–563, **564–567,** 656, 722
Vol. 2: 103, 351, 584, 868
Vol. 3: 124, 204, 469 f., 473, 475, 572, 579, 1148, 1150, 1176
ponos **Vol. 1:** 260, **262,** 271, 459, 564, 647
Vol. 2: 820
ponth- **Vol. 3:** 719
pōpote **Vol. 3:** 521
poreuō **Vol. 1:** 481
poreuomai **Vol. 3:** 937, 943, **945–947**
pornē **Vol. 1: 497 f., 500–502**
Vol. 2: 365
Vol. 3: 1195
porneia **Vol. 1:** 106, 494, **496 f., 499–501,** 503
Vol. 2: 580, 582 f.
Vol. 3: 538, 540 f., 886, 1064, 1195
porneuō **Vol. 1:** 233, 494, **497,** 506
Vol. 2: 575, 579 f., 583, 722
Vol. 3: 538
pornos **Vol. 1: 497**
Vol. 2: 586
pōroō **Vol. 2: 153–155**
pōros **Vol. 2:** 153
pōrōsis **Vol. 2: 153, 156**
porphyra **Vol. 1:** 205
porphyros **Vol. 1:** 205
porrō **Vol. 2:** 53
posis **Vol. 2: 274,** 509
potamophorētos **Vol. 3:** 987, 992
potamos **Vol. 3:** 982, **985, 987,** 989 f., 992
pote **Vol. 3:** 683, 964
potērion **Vol. 2: 274,** 276 f., 524, **536**
potis **Vol. 2:** 509
potizō **Vol. 2: 274 f.**
poton **Vol. 2:** 274
potos **Vol. 2: 274**
pou **Vol. 1:** 283
Vol. 3: 267, 482
pous **Vol. 1:** 239
Vol. 2: 149, 369
pragma **Vol. 1:** 138, 271
Vol. 2: 142
Vol. 3: 772, 876, **1155–1158,** 1195
pragmateia **Vol. 3: 1155, 1158**
pragmateuomai **Vol. 3: 1155, 1158**
praktikos **Vol. 2:** 475
Vol. 3: 123
praktōr **Vol. 3: 1157**
prassō **Vol. 3:** 719, 1148, 1150, **1155–1159**
prattō **Vol. 3:** 353, **1155–1157**
praxis **Vol. 2:** 556
Vol. 3: 719, **1155–1158**
praÿpatheia **Vol. 2:** 256, 264
praÿpathia **Vol. 2: 256**
praÿs **Vol. 2:** 201, **256–264,** 771, 822
Vol. 3: 218, 807, 1032
praÿtēs **Vol. 2: 256–259,** 263, 771
praÿthymos **Vol. 2:** 261
prēgma **Vol. 2:** 674
prēnēs **Vol. 1:** 94
prepei **Vol. 1:** 669
Vol. 2: 668 f.
prepō **Vol. 2: 668 f.**
prepon estin **Vol. 2: 669**
presbeia **Vol. 1: 192 f., 197**
presbeion **Vol. 1:** 193
presbeuō **Vol. 1: 192–194, 197**
Vol. 3: 169 f.
presbeuteros **Vol. 3:** 774, 1065, 1201
presbeutēs **Vol. 1:** 193 f.
Vol. 3: 170
presbys **Vol. 1:** 192, 194, 200
Vol. 3: 50
presbytatos **Vol. 1:** 192
presbyterion **Vol. 1: 192, 194, 197 f., 201**
presbyteron **Vol. 1:** 192
presbyteros **Vol. 1:** 188, 190 f., **192–200,** 485
Vol. 2: 674
Vol. 3: 39, 170, 568
presbytēs **Vol. 1: 192 f., 197,** 536
presbytis **Vol. 1:** 192, 197
prēssō **Vol. 3:** 1155
pro **Vol. 1:** 475, 478, 542, 664, 692 f., 695 f.
Vol. 2: 134, 674
Vol. 3: 747, 750, 829, 844, **1172 f., 1175, 1177,** 1214
pro- **Vol. 3:** 74, 82
proagoreuō **Vol. 3:** 75
proangellō **Vol. 3:** 45
probainō **Vol. 2:** 412
probaton **Vol. 2:** 410, **412–414,** 458
Vol. 3: 567 f.
problēma **Vol. 2:** 745
procheirizō **Vol. 1:** 471, **475 f.,** 478
procheiros **Vol. 1:** 475
procheirotoneō **Vol. 1: 478**
prodokia **Vol. 2: 238 f.,** 241, **244**
prodromos **Vol. 3: 945, 947**
proelpizō **Vol. 2: 238, 241**
proepangellomai **Vol. 3: 68, 70**
proerchomai **Vol. 1: 320, 322**
proginomai **Vol. 2:** 767
proginōskō **Vol. 1:** 471, **692 f.,** 695
prognōsis **Vol. 1:** 542, **692 f.**
prographō **Vol. 3: 482**
prohēgoumenos **Vol. 1:** 666
prohetoimazō **Vol. 3: 116 f.,** 1187
prohistamenos **Vol. 1:** 193, 197
prohistēmi **Vol. 1: 192–194, 197, 201**
prohoraō **Vol. 1:** 471, **695**
Vol. 3: 491, **511 f. 515**
prohorizō **Vol. 1:** 471, 478, 533, 692, **695 f.,** 697
Vol. 2: 79
Vol. 3: 299, 1018
prōi **Vol. 2:** 136
proidein **Vol. 1:** 695
proïdousa **Vol. 3:** 491
proïmos **Vol. 3: 1000, 1003**
prōinos **Vol. 3:** 736
prokatangellō **Vol. 3: 44, 46,** 48
prokatartizō **Vol. 3: 349 f.**
prokeimai **Vol. 1:** 400
Vol. 3: 1180
prokopē **Vol. 2: 128, 130 f.**
prokoptō **Vol. 1:** 92
Vol. 2: 128, 130
prokrima **Vol. 2: 363 f.**
prokyroō **Vol. 1: 664**
prolambanō **Vol. 3: 747, 750**
prolegō **Vol. 3:** 75
promantis **Vol. 3:** 75 f.
promerimnaō **Vol. 1: 276**
pronoeō **Vol. 1:** 471, **692–695,** 697
pronoia **Vol. 1: 692–695**
Vol. 2: 108
propatōr **Vol. 2:** 394
prophēmi **Vol. 3:** 74

prophēteia **Vol. 1:** 736
Vol. 2: 545
Vol. 3: 74 f., 81, 1046, 1182
prophētēs **Vol. 1:** 66
Vol. 2: 915
Vol. 3: 74 f., 81, 90 f., 181, 195, 490 f., 1187, 1198
prophēteuō **Vol. 1:** 527, 529
Vol. 2: 443
Vol. 3: 74–76, 87, 533
prophētikos **Vol. 3: 74 f., 81,** 491
prophētis **Vol. 3: 74 f.**
propheugō **Vol. 1:** 558
prophōneō **Vol. 3:** 75
pros **Vol. 1:** 107, 181, 187, 302, 558, 585, 592, 598
Vol. 2: 115 f., 244, 290, 349, 518, 727, 769, 789, 876, 899
Vol. 3: 162, 265, 353, 712, 737, 747, **1171–1176, 1184–1186, 1204–1206, 1211 f.,** 1214
pros phthonon **Vol. 1:** 558
pros thanaton **Vol. 3: 1206**
pros to paron **Vol. 2: 899**
pros ton theon **Vol. 1:** 592
Vol. 3: 1204, 1211
prosagōgē **Vol. 1:** 592
prosanaplēroō **Vol. 1:** 734, 741
proschysis **Vol. 1:** 223
Vol. 2: 853 f.
prosdechomai **Vol. 2: 238, 244 f.**
Vol. 3: 744 f.
prosdeomai **Vol. 2: 860 f.**
prosdokaō **Vol. 2: 238, 244–246**
prosechō **Vol. 3:** 908
prosēgoria **Vol. 2:** 651
prosēlytos **Vol. 1:** 180, **359–362,** 560, 589, 623, 684, 688 f.
Vol. 2: 86, 90, 93 f., 126, 792
proserchomai **Vol. 1: 320, 322,** 360
proseuchē **Vol. 2:** 530, 860, **861, 863, 867, 875**
proseuchomai **Vol. 2:** 194, 396, 803, **855 f.,** 859 f., **861 f., 867, 873 f.,** 882
Vol. 3: 194, 232, 470, 638 f., 670, 1012, 1022, 1176
proskairos **Vol. 3: 833, 837**
proskaleō **Vol. 1:** 272
proskaleomai **Vol. 1: 270 f., 273–275**
proskartereō **Vol. 2: 767 f.**
proskarterēsis **Vol. 2: 767 f.**
prosklēroō **Vol. 2: 300, 302**
prosklēsis **Vol. 1:** 271
proskollaō **Vol. 2: 350**
proskollaomai **Vol. 2: 348 f.**
proskomma **Vol. 2:** 220, **705–707,** 708
Vol. 3: 363, 382, 996
proskopē **Vol. 2: 705 f.**
proskoptō **Vol. 2: 705 f., 710**
Vol. 3: 996
proskyneō **Vol. 1:** 207, 610
Vol. 2: 855, 859 f., 862, 867, 873, **874–878, 885,** 927
Vol. 3: 219, 460, 551
proskynēsis **Vol. 2:** 859, **876**
proskynētēs **Vol. 2: 875, 878**
proslambanō **Vol. 3:** 262, **747 f., 750 f.**
proslēmpsis **Vol. 3: 747, 751**
prosmenō **Vol. 3: 223, 228**
prosōpolēmpsia **Vol. 1: 585, 587**
prosōpolēmpteō **Vol. 1: 585, 587**
prosōpolēmptēs **Vol. 1: 585, 587**
prosōpon **Vol. 1:** 181, 211, **585–587,** 704, 708
Vol. 2: 399, 622, 625
Vol. 3: 514, 531, 1175
prosphatos **Vol. 2:** 674 f.
prospherō **Vol. 2:** 41
Vol. 3: 925
prosphora **Vol. 2: 40–42**
Vol. 3: 38, **417, 431–434**
prostassō **Vol. 1: 477**
prostithēmi **Vol. 1:** 600
prōta **Vol. 1:** 664, 666
protassō **Vol. 1:** 477
proteron **Vol. 1: 664, 666**
prōteuō **Vol. 1: 664–666**
prothesis **Vol. 1:** 542, 692, 695, **696 f.**
Vol. 2: 120, 819
Vol. 3: 814, 1018, 1201
prothesmia **Vol. 1: 471,** 477
prothymia **Vol. 1:** 188
protithēmi **Vol. 1:** 471, 477, 692, **696 f.**
Vol. 3: 163
prōtokathedria **Vol. 1: 664, 666**
Vol. 3: 587
prōtokathedritēs **Vol. 1: 664, 666**
prōtoklisia **Vol. 1: 664, 666**
Vol. 3: 587
prōton **Vol. 1:** 664, 666
prōtos **Vol. 1:** 165, 334, 377, **664–667,** 668 f.
Vol. 2: 55, 57 f., 657, 671, 720
Vol. 3: 457
prōtostatēs **Vol. 1:** 535
prōtotokos **Vol. 1:** 288, 304, 445, 664–666, **667–669**
Vol. 2: 157, 725, 729
Vol. 3: 38, 416
psallō **Vol. 1:** 344
Vol. 2: 436, **874**
Vol. 3: 670–675
psalmos **Vol. 2: 874**
Vol. 3: 668, **670 f., 674 f.**
psekas **Vol. 3: 1004**
psēphos **Vol. 2:** 674
pseud- **Vol. 2:** 468, 470, 472, 648
pseudadelphos **Vol. 1: 254, 257**
Vol. 2: 472
pseudapostolos **Vol. 2: 472**
pseudēs **Vol. 1:** 66
Vol. 2: 470–473
pseudochristos **Vol. 1: 124 f.**
Vol. 2: 472
pseudodidaskalos **Vol. 1:** 535
Vol. 2: 472
Vol. 3: 766, 768
pseudologos **Vol. 2: 472**
pseudomai **Vol. 1:** 454
Vol. 2: 468 f., **470, 472,** 567
Vol. 3: 877
pseudomartyr **Vol. 3: 1043**
pseudomartyreō **Vol. 2: 470**
Vol. 3: 1038 f., 1041
pseudomartyria **Vol. 2: 472**
Vol. 3: 1038 f.
pseudomartys **Vol. 2: 472**
Vol. 3: 1038 f.
pseudōnymos **Vol. 2: 648, 652, 655**
pseudoprophētēs **Vol. 1:** 125
Vol. 2: 472, 474
Vol. 3: 74, 81
pseudos **Vol. 2:** 468, **470, 472–474,** 724
Vol. 3: 875, 885 f.
pseudōs **Vol. 1:** 66
pseustēs **Vol. 2: 470, 472,** 503
psithyrismos **Vol. 3:** 346
psithyristes **Vol. 3:** 346
psychē **Vol. 1:** 229, 235, 443 f., 450, 465, 671
Vol. 2: 157, 181, 393, 476–478, 564 f., 773, 838 f., 919
Vol. 3: 158, 174, 195, 215, 223, 278, 281, 531, 611, **676 f., 679–688,** 689, 706, 827, 1196
psychikos **Vol. 1:** 236
Vol. 2: 567
Vol. 3: 281, 301, 504, **676, 684, 686 f.**
psychō **Vol. 1:** 317 f.
psychos **Vol. 1:** 317–319
psychron **Vol. 1:** 317
Vol. 2: 274
psychros **Vol. 1: 317 f.**
Vol. 2: 826
ptaiō **Vol. 3:** 573
ptē **Vol. 2:** 821
pterna **Vol. 1:** 241
pternismos **Vol. 1:** 241
pterygas **Vol. 1:** 174
pterygion **Vol. 3:** 790, **796,** 805
pteryx **Vol. 3: 796 f.,** 805

ptēssō **Vol. 2:** 821
ptōcheia **Vol. 2: 821 f., 824, 826**
ptōcheuō **Vol. 2: 821, 824, 826, 828**
ptōchos **Vol. 2:** 110, 257, 264, 453, 820, **821–824, 828,** 834, 843 f., 846, **852**
Vol. 3: 70, 119, 241, 351, 499, 525, 545 f., 548, 553, 572, 727, 752, 810
ptoliethron **Vol. 2:** 802
ptolis **Vol. 2:** 801
ptōma **Vol. 1: 608–610**
ptōsis **Vol. 1: 608 f.**
ptōssō **Vol. 2:** 821
ptōx **Vol. 2:** 821
ptyon **Vol. 3:** 527
pygmē **Vol. 2: 148, 150,** 153
pylē **Vol. 2: 29–31**
pylōn **Vol. 2: 29 f.**
pyr **Vol. 1:** 205, 263, **652–654, 656 f.**
Vol. 2: 485, 746, 836
Vol. 3: 96, 446 f., 695, 1178
pyra **Vol. 1: 653, 656**
pyressō **Vol. 1: 653, 656**
pyretos **Vol. 1:** 377, **653, 656**
pyrinos **Vol. 1: 653, 657**
pyroō **Vol. 1:** 205, **653, 656**
Vol. 3: 966
pyrōsis **Vol. 1: 653 f., 656**
Vol. 3: 110
pyrrazō **Vol. 1: 653, 656**
pyrros **Vol. 1: 205 f., 653, 656 f.**
pythōn **Vol. 2: 552, 558 f.**
Vol. 3: 474

rhabbi **Vol. 2:** 514
Vol. 3: 115 f., 766 f., 780
rhabbouni **Vol. 3:** 115 f., 780
rhabdizō **Vol. 1: 161, 163,** 407
rhabdos **Vol. 1: 161–164, 407 f.**
Vol. 2: 795
Vol. 3: 404, 867
rhabdouchos **Vol. 1:** 407
rhacha **Vol. 1:** 417
rhainō **Vol. 1:** 144, 151, 153, 224
rhaka **Vol. 1:** 413, **417 f.**
Vol. 2: 143
Vol. 3: 1025
rhantismos **Vol. 1: 224 f.**
rhantizō **Vol. 1:** 144, 151 f., 220, **224–226**
rhapisma **Vol. 1: 162**
rhapizō **Vol. 1: 162**
rhē **Vol. 3:** 1119
rhēka **Vol. 1:** 417
rhēma **Vol. 3:** 749, 967, 1078, 1081, 1087, 1106 f., 1113 f., **1119–1122,** 1143–1145
rhēmata **Vol. 3:** 1122
rheō **Vol. 1: 682 f.**
rhēsis **Vol. 2:** 734
Vol. 3: 1119
rhēthen **Vol. 1:** 736
Vol. 3: 489
rhētōr **Vol. 3:** 1119
rhipē **Vol. 2:** 925
rhipizō **Vol. 3: 1000, 1003**
rhiza **Vol. 1:** 138
Vol. 3: 865–868, 870
rhizoō **Vol. 3: 865, 868**
rhizoomai **Vol. 1:** 660
rhomphaia **Vol. 2:** 686
Vol. 3: 959, 967
rhyomai **Vol. 3:** 177, 192, 198, **200–202, 204,** 212, 222, 1176
rhypainō **Vol. 1: 479**
rhypaō **Vol. 1:** 479
rhypareuō **Vol. 1: 479**
rhyparia **Vol. 3: 479**
rhyparos **Vol. 1: 479**
Vol. 3: 102
rhypoō **Vol. 1: 479**
rhypos **Vol. 1: 479**
rhysamenos **Vol. 3:** 192
rhysis **Vol. 1: 682 f.**

sabaōth **Vol. 2:** 69
sabbata **Vol. 3: 405**
sabbatismos **Vol. 3: 411,** 413
sabbaton **Vol. 3:** 186, 258, **405,** 413, 940
Saddouk **Vol. 3:** 439
Saddoukaios **Vol. 1:** 535
Vol. 3: 439, 443
Saleim **Vol. 2:** 592
Salēm **Vol. 2:** 590 f., **592 f.**
saleuō **Vol. 3:** 557, **558,** 561
Salōmōn **Vol. 3: 605,** 1120
salos **Vol. 3: 558–561**
salpinx **Vol. 2:** 925
Vol. 3: 873 f.
salpistēs **Vol. 3: 874**
salpizō **Vol. 3: 873 f.**
Samareia **Vol. 3: 449, 456 f.,** 466
Samareitēs **Vol. 3:** 450
Samareitikon **Vol. 3:** 449
Samareitis **Vol. 3:** 449 f.
Samareus **Vol. 3:** 450
Samaria **Vol. 3:** 449
Samaritēs **Vol. 3: 449 f.,** 454, 463, 466
Samaritis **Vol. 3:** 450
saphēs **Vol. 3:** 477
sappheiros **Vol. 3: 396 f.**
sapros **Vol. 1:** 565, 722
Sarapis **Vol. 2:** 520
sardion **Vol. 3: 396–398**
sardonyx **Vol. 3: 396 f.**
sarkikos **Vol. 1: 671, 764, 677, 682**
Vol. 2: 120
Vol. 3: 963, 1200
sarkinos **Vol. 1:** 236, 337, **671, 674, 682**
Sarra **Vol. 1: 80**
Vol. 2: 329, 431
Vol. 3: 1072
sarx **Vol. 1:** 188, 221 f., 228, 233, 236, 257, 446, 457, 461, 535, 592, 647, **671 f., 674–682,** 719
Vol. 2: 242, 273, 349, 477, 504, 525, 535, 566, 579, 589, 617, 816, 919
Vol. 3: 32, 54, 171, 227, 313, 322 f., 581, 587, 724, 811, 994, 1073, 1115, 1117, 1151, 1158, 1172, 1175 f., 1188, 1195 f., 1199 f.
Satan **Vol. 3: 468**
Satanas **Vol. 1:** 102, 297, 454
Vol. 3: 468–470, 477, 579, 804
sbennymi **Vol. 3: 109–111,** 447
schēma **Vol. 1:** 703, 707, **708 f.,** 714
Vol. 2: 203, 500, 673
Vol. 3: 564, 604, 864
schēsis **Vol. 1:** 271
schisma **Vol. 1:** 535
Vol. 3: 543 f.
schizō **Vol. 3: 543 f.**
schoinisma **Vol. 2:** 298
seb- **Vol. 2:** 91 f.
sebas **Vol. 2:** 92
sebasma **Vol. 2: 91–93**
Sebastē **Vol. 3:** 449
sebastos **Vol. 2:** 93, 234
sebazomai **Vol. 2: 91–93**
sebō **Vol. 2:** 85, 92
sebomai **Vol. 1:** 112, 361, 622, 624, 687
Vol. 2: 85, **90–95,** 232, 439
Vol. 3: 100, 573, 577
sebomenoi ton theon **Vol. 2:** 85
sebomenos **Vol. 1:** 361
Vol. 2: 85, 90, 94
sebomenos ton theon **Vol. 1: 359, 361**
Vol. 2: 85
seiō **Vol. 3: 556 f.,** 561
seismos **Vol. 3: 556 f.,** 561
selēnē **Vol. 3:** 475, **733 f.**
selēniazomai **Vol. 3:** 475, **733 f.**
sēma **Vol. 2:** 626, 629
Vol. 3: 310
sēmainō **Vol. 3:** 310
sēmainomenon **Vol. 3:** 1129
sēmainon **Vol. 3:** 1129
sēmantikos **Vol. 1:** 68
sēmasia **Vol. 2:** 465
sēmeia kai terata **Vol. 2:** 626 f., 629
sēmeion **Vol. 2:** 192, 350, 352, 621, 625, **626 f., 629,** 633 f., 858

Vol. 3: 110, 233, 516, 554, 904, 1108, 1150
sēmeron **Vol. 1:** 251
Vol. 3: 71, 826, **833 f., 837, 841,** 849, 1169
semnos **Vol. 2: 91–93,** 232
Vol. 3: 727
semnōs **Vol. 2:** 93
semnotēs **Vol. 2: 91–93,** 95
sēs **Vol. 1:** 119
Vol. 2: 831
sidēros **Vol. 2: 97,** 795
sidērous **Vol. 2: 97**
Sidōnios **Vol. 3:** 450
Sikimitēs **Vol. 3:** 450
Sikimois **Vol. 3:** 450
Sina **Vol. 3:** 1009, 1011, **1013 f.**
sinapi **Vol. 3:** 523
sindōn **Vol. 3:** 296
siniazō **Vol. 3:** 804
siō **Vol. 3:** 556
Siōn **Vol. 2: 324, 326, 330**
siteutos **Vol. 1:** 116
sitista **Vol. 1:** 116
sitos **Vol. 3:** 523 f., 527
skallō **Vol. 1:** 726
skandalēthron **Vol. 2:** 707
skandalizō **Vol. 2:** 705, **707–710**
Vol. 3: 446, 996
skandalon **Vol. 1:** 535, 608
Vol. 2: 429, 664, 705 f., **707–710**
Vol. 3: 382, 394, 399, 996, 1052
skēnē **Vol. 3:** 465, **811–814,** 1040, 1042
skēnōma **Vol. 2:** 248
Vol. 3: 465, **811, 815**
skēnoō **Vol. 3: 811, 813**
skēnopēgia **Vol. 3: 813**
skēnopoios **Vol. 3: 811 f.**
skēnos **Vol. 3: 811, 814**
skepē **Vol. 3:** 554
skēptō **Vol. 1:** 407
skēptron **Vol. 1:** 405, **407**
skeuazō **Vol. 3:** 119
skeuos **Vol. 1:** 540
Vol. 3: 116, 910, 912–914, 917, 1064 f., 1067, 1076, 1078, 1187
skia **Vol. 2:** 291, 717
Vol. 3: 553–556, 660, 905
skiaō **Vol. 3:** 554
skiazō **Vol. 3:** 554
skiē **Vol. 3:** 553
sklērokardia **Vol. 2: 153, 156, 180, 184**
sklēros **Vol. 2: 153–156**
sklērotēs **Vol. 2: 153, 155**
sklērotrachēlos **Vol. 2: 153, 155**
sklērynō **Vol. 2: 153, 155**
skolops **Vol. 1: 726 f.**
Vol. 2: 762, 809
Vol. 3: 40, 203, 257, 470 f., 714, 728, 802, 814, 857, 995, 998, 1000, 1026
skopeō **Vol. 1:** 188
Vol. 2: 393
skopos **Vol. 1:** 188
Vol. 2: 52, 65
skorpios **Vol. 1: 510**
skorpizō **Vol. 2: 32–34**
skoteinos **Vol. 1: 421–423**
skotia **Vol. 1: 420 f., 423 f.**
skotizō **Vol. 1: 421, 423**
skotoō **Vol. 1: 421, 423**
skotos **Vol. 1:** 301, **420 f., 423, 425**
Vol. 2: 484, 490, 543
Vol. 3: 554, 831, 1151
skybalon **Vol. 1: 480**
Vol. 3: 278
skytotomos **Vol. 3:** 812
smaragdinos **Vol. 3:** 398
smaragdos **Vol. 3: 396 f.**
smyrna **Vol. 2: 294 f.**
smyrnizō **Vol. 2: 295**
societas **Vol. 1:** 643
Solomōn **Vol. 3: 605,** 607
sōma **Vol. 1:** 87, 229, **232–237, 241 f.,** 275, 300–302, 399, 443 f., 446, 501, 647, 671 f., 675 f., 679, 707
Vol. 2: 158, 162, 263, 273, 476, **523–525,** 531 f., 534, **537,** 546, 564, 566 f., 789, 818, 883, 899, 919
Vol. 3: 171 f., 283, 303, 308, 554, 556, 680, 683 f., 1158, 1182, 1187, 1191, 1195
sōmatikos **Vol. 1:** 704
sōmatikōs **Vol. 1:** 740
son **Vol. 2: 846**
sophia **Vol. 1:** 165, 228, 400, 485, 501, 592, 692, 696
Vol. 2: 61, 99, 120, 127, 355, 406, 493, 616, 620
Vol. 3: 53, 68, 76, 129 f., 678, 765, 898, 925, **1026–1028, 1030–1032,** 1033, 1036 f., 1144
sophistēs **Vol. 3: 1034**
sophizō **Vol. 3: 1026, 1028, 1033**
sophos **Vol. 1:** 192
Vol. 2: 555
Vol. 3: 129, **1026–1028, 1032,** 1034, 1037
sōphrōn **Vol. 1:** 494, **501 f.**
sōphroneō **Vol. 1: 501 f.,** 528
Vol. 2: 617
sōphronōs **Vol. 1: 501 f.**
Vol. 2: 94
sōphrosynē **Vol. 1: 494,** 501 f., 529, 550
Vol. 3: 27, 354, 561 f., 925
sōs **Vol. 1:** 501
Vol. 2: 617
sōson **Vol. 1:** 100
sōtēr **Vol. 1:** 519
Vol. 2: 78, 158, 332, 349, 584
Vol. 3: 71, 177, 205, 210, **216–223,** 318, 462, 1022, 1046
sōtēria **Vol. 1:** 68, 168, 397, 454, 464 f.
Vol. 2: 332, 388, 777, 839
Vol. 3: 198, **205–207, 209–216, 218 f.,** 223, 371, 501, 528, 715, 723, 1033
sōtērion **Vol. 3:** 207, 422, 966
sōtērios **Vol. 2:** 122
Vol. 3: 216 f., 221
sōzō **Vol. 1:** 210, 397, 463, 519, 697
Vol. 2: 122, 158, 343, 394, 560, 773, 780, 819
Vol. 3: 177, 201 f., **204–206, 209–219,** 223, 253, 501, 642, 1177
sōzōn **Vol. 3:** 218
speios **Vol. 3:** 380
speirō **Vol. 3: 521 f., 525,** 527, 868
speirōn **Vol. 3:** 868
spēlaion **Vol. 3:** 378, **380 f.,** 793
spendō **Vol. 2: 853–855**
Vol. 3: 432
speos **Vol. 3:** 380
sperma **Vol. 1:** 377 f.
Vol. 2: 104, 586
Vol. 3: 72 f., 251, **521–524,** 527, 684, 1073, 1188
spermatikos **Vol. 3:** 1084 f.
spermologos **Vol. 3: 525**
speudō **Vol. 2:** 245
Vol. 3: 1168
speudontes **Vol. 2:** 245
sphazō **Vol. 2:** 411
sphodra **Vol. 2:** 846
sphragis **Vol. 3:** 73, **497, 499,** 501
sphragizō **Vol. 3: 497, 499,** 1212
sphryon **Vol. 2:** 415
splanchna **Vol. 1:** 258
Vol. 2: 116, 567, **593,** 596, 598, **599 f.,** 733
splanchneuō **Vol. 2:** 599
splanchnizomai **Vol. 2: 599 f.**
splanchnon **Vol. 2: 599 f.**
spondē **Vol. 3:** 423
spora **Vol. 3:** 527, 1201
sporos **Vol. 3: 521, 523**
spoudaios **Vol. 3: 1168 f.**
spoudazō **Vol. 3: 1168 f.**
spoudē **Vol. 1:** 197
Vol. 3: 1166, **1168 f.**
stachys **Vol. 3:** 523

staktē **Vol. 2:** 294
stasis **Vol. 1:** 377
statēr **Vol. 2: 851**
Vol. 3: 752 f., 792
stauroō **Vol. 1: 391, 393 f., 397, 399**
Vol. 3: 1190
stauros **Vol. 1:** 197, 228, 389, **391–399, 403 f.,** 437, 726
Vol. 2: 139, 379
Vol. 3: 172, 641, 1026, 1199
stegō **Vol. 3:** 887
steinos **Vol. 2:** 807
stēkete **Vol. 2:** 563
stellō **Vol. 1:** 126
stemma **Vol. 1: 405**
stenagmos **Vol. 2: 423 f.,** 882–884
stenazō **Vol. 2:** 416, **423 f.,** 883 f.
Vol. 3: 1195
stenochōreō **Vol. 1:** 742
Vol. 2: 807 f.
stenochōria **Vol. 2: 807 f.**
stenos **Vol. 1:** 807
stephanēphoros **Vol. 1:** 648
stephanoō **Vol. 1: 405 f.**
stephanos **Vol. 1: 405 f.**
stephō **Vol. 1:** 405
stereos **Vol. 1:** 660
stergō **Vol. 2:** 538 f., **542**
stērizō **Vol. 1:** 660
Vol. 3: 87
sthenos **Vol. 3:** 715, 993
stichaomai **Vol. 2:** 451
stichos **Vol. 2:** 451
stigma **Vol. 1:** 235
Vol. 2: 572, 574, **575**
stigmata **Vol. 2: 572 f.**
stigmatias **Vol. 2:** 572
stizō **Vol. 2:** 572
stoa **Vol. 1:** 68
stoicheia **Vol. 2:** 73, 200, 446, **451,** 828
Vol. 3: 180, 775, 1035, 1118, 1164
stoicheion **Vol. 1:** 104 f., 282, 331 f., 401
Vol. 2: 73, 436, 451 f., 559
stoicheō **Vol. 2: 451 f., 454**
stoichos **Vol. 2:** 451
stolē **Vol. 1:** 312, 317
stoma **Vol. 2:** 726 f.
Vol. 3: 909
stratēgos **Vol. 1:** 407, 475, 569
Vol. 3: 958, 964
strateia **Vol. 3: 958, 963**
strateuma **Vol. 3:** 877, **958, 964**
strateuō **Vol. 3: 958, 963 f.**
strateuomai **Vol. 1:** 646
Vol. 3: 981
stratia **Vol. 3: 958, 964**
stratiōtēs **Vol. 3: 958, 964**
stratologeō **Vol. 3: 958, 964**
stratopedarchēs **Vol. 3: 958, 964**
stratopedon **Vol. 3: 958, 964**
strephō **Vol. 1:** 285, **354 f.,** 358, 362
Vol. 3: 933, 947
strouthion **Vol. 1:** 173
stygeō **Vol. 2:** 86
stylos **Vol. 3:** 387, **795,** 822
Sychar **Vol. 3:** 457
sykē **Vol. 1:** 417, **723**
Vol. 2: 267, 382, 623, 630, 754, 871, 912, 916
Vol. 3: 174, 249, 532, 793, 865, 868 f., 1012
sykea **Vol. 1:** 723
sylagōgeō **Vol. 2:** 453
Vol. 3: 379
sylaō **Vol. 3: 379**
syleuō **Vol. 3: 379**
syllambanō **Vol. 1:** 187, **343 f.**
syllēbdēn **Vol. 3:** 354
syllegō **Vol. 2:** 31, **33**
syllogismos **Vol. 1:** 664
symbasileuō **Vol. 1:** 643
Vol. 2: 372 f.
symbolon **Vol. 3:** 76
symbouleuō **Vol. 1: 362 f.**
Vol. 3: 129
symboulia **Vol. 1: 362**
symboulion **Vol. 1: 362 f.**
symboulos **Vol. 1: 362 f.**
symmartyreō **Vol. 1:** 350
Vol. 3: 1038 f., 1042
symmetria **Vol. 2:** 102
symmimētēs **Vol. 1: 490 f.**
symmorphizomai **Vol. 1: 705, 707**
symmorphoomai **Vol. 1: 705**
symmorphos **Vol. 1: 705, 707**
sympaschō **Vol. 1:** 643
Vol. 3: 719, 722, 724
sympatheō **Vol. 3: 719, 722, 724**
symphōnia **Vol. 3:** 674
symphytos **Vol. 2:** 504
symplēroō **Vol. 1:** 736–738
sympnigō **Vol. 1: 226**
sympolitēs **Vol. 2:** 794, 804
sympsychos **Vol. 3: 687**
syn **Vol. 1:** 343, 363, 645, 647
Vol. 2: 115, 481
Vol. 3: 1172 f., 1190, 1201, 1205–1207, 1214 f.
syn Christō **Vol. 3: 1172, 1205, 1207,** 1214 f.
synagō **Vol. 1: 291 f., 297, 299, 303**
Vol. 2: 31, **33**
synagōgē **Vol. 1:** 69, 245, 272, **291–293, 295–297, 307,** 589
Vol. 3: 479, 868
synagōnizomai **Vol. 1: 645, 647**
synaichmalōtos **Vol. 3:** 591
synakoloutheō **Vol. 1: 480 f.**
synalizō **Vol. 3: 443, 449**
synantaō **Vol. 1:** 325
synapothnēskō **Vol. 1: 430 f., 435**
synarchias **Vol. 1:** 193
synathleō **Vol. 1:** 645–647
synathroizō 31, **33**
synaulizomai **Vol. 3:** 449
synchairō **Vol. 2:** 431
syndesmos **Vol. 2:** 62
Vol. 3: 590, **591 f.**
syndikos **Vol. 1:** 89
syndoulos **Vol. 1:** 256
Vol. 3: 596
syndoxazō **Vol. 1:** 643
Vol. 2: 44
syndoxazomai **Vol. 2:** 47
-synē **Vol. 3:** 353
synechō **Vol. 2:** 733
synedreuō **Vol. 1:** 363
synedrion **Vol. 1: 363**
Vol. 2: 143
synedros **Vol. 1:** 363
synegeiresthai **Vol. 1:** 643
synēgoros **Vol. 1:** 83, 89
syneidēsis **Vol. 1: 348–351, 353**
Vol. 2: 567, 707
Vol. 3: 365, 995
syneiserchomai **Vol. 1:** 321
synerchomai **Vol. 1: 320, 322**
synergeō **Vol. 3: 1147 f., 1152**
synergos **Vol. 2:** 360
Vol. 3: 548, **1147, 1152**
synesis **Vol. 1:** 348, 485
Vol. 3: 122, 129, **130,** 1026, 1032
synetos **Vol. 2:** 555
syngeneia **Vol. 1:** 194, 669
syngenēs **Vol. 2:** 549
syngraphē **Vol. 1:** 505
synhypokrinomai **Vol. 2: 469**
syniēmi **Vol. 2:** 398
Vol. 3: 124 f., **130, 132 f.,** 1036
synistēmi **Vol. 1:** 166
Vol. 3: 1186
synkakopatheō **Vol. 3: 719, 722**
synkalyptō **Vol. 2:** 210
synkekalymmenon **Vol. 2:** 212
synkerannymi **Vol. 1:** 69
synkleiō **Vol. 3:** 491
synklēronomein **Vol. 1:** 643
synklēronomos **Vol. 2: 295 f.,** 300
Vol. 3: 73
synkoinōneō **Vol. 1: 639, 642, 644**
synkoinōnos **Vol. 1: 639, 642, 644**
synkrinō **Vol. 2: 362,** 364
synodos **Vol. 1:** 292
synoida **Vol. 1: 348, 350 f., 353**
synoikodomeō **Vol. 2: 249, 251, 253**
synopsis **Vol. 1:** 69

synopsizō **Vol. 1:** 69
synstenazō **Vol. 2:** 884
synteleia **Vol. 2: 59–62**
Vol. 3: 836, 847
synteleō **Vol. 2:** 37, **59**
Vol. 3: 178
synthaptō **Vol. 1:** 266, 401
synthēkē **Vol. 1:** 365 f.
syntrechō **Vol. 3:** 947
Syriakē **Vol. 3:** 411
syschēmatizō **Vol. 1: 708 f.**
Vol. 2: 673
sysseismos **Vol. 3:** 266
systauroō **Vol. 1: 391, 394, 397–399, 401**
systauroumai **Vol. 1:** 643
systoicheō **Vol. 2: 451 f.**
systrephō **Vol. 2:** 31, **33**
syzaō **Vol. 1:** 643
syzeugnymi **Vol. 3:** 539, **1160, 1162, 1164**
syzoōpoieō **Vol. 1:** 643
syzygos **Vol. 3: 1160, 1164**

tachinos **Vol. 3:** 847
tachy **Vol. 3:** 173
tachys **Vol. 3:** 1169
tainia **Vol. 1:** 648
talaipōreō **Vol. 2:** 423
Vol. 3: 858 f.
talaipōria **Vol. 3: 858 f.**
talaipōros **Vol. 3: 858 f.**
talitha, koum **Vol. 1:** 581
tapeinōma **Vol. 2:** 198
tapeinoō **Vol. 1:** 569, 731
Vol. 2: 259–264
tapeinophrōn **Vol. 2: 259–264**
tapeinophroneō **Vol. 2: 259**
tapeinophrosynē **Vol. 2: 259–264,** 617
Vol. 3: 928
tapeinos **Vol. 2:** 200, 257, **259–264,** 617 f., 620
tapeinōsis **Vol. 2:** 200, **259–264**
tapeinotēs **Vol. 2:** 259
taphē **Vol. 1: 263 f.**
taphos **Vol. 1: 263–265**
Vol. 2: 727
tarach- **Vol. 3:** 709
tarachē **Vol. 3: 709**
tarachos **Vol. 3: 709 f.**
tarachthēnai **Vol. 3:** 563
tarassō **Vol. 3: 709 f.**
tarassomai **Vol. 3: 710**
tassō **Vol. 1:** 471, **476,** 478, 533
Vol. 3: 1186
tauotēs **Vol. 2:** 506
tauros **Vol. 1:** 116
tauta (neut. pl. of → *houtos)*
taxis **Vol. 1:** 271, 504
Vol. 2: 102
tē emē cheiri **Vol. 2:** 148
technē 271, **279**
Vol. 2: 657
technitēs **Vol. 1: 279,** 387
teichos **Vol. 3: 948**
teinō **Vol. 1:** 478
tekein **Vol. 1:** 667
tekmērion **Vol. 3: 571**
tekna theou **Vol. 3:** 647
teknion **Vol. 1: 285 f.**
teknogoneō **Vol. 1:** 187, 285
teknogonia **Vol. 1:** 187, 285
Vol. 3: 1177
teknon **Vol. 1:** 256, 280, **284–287,** 290 f., 416
Vol. 3: 607, 647
teknoō **Vol. 1:** 176
teknopoieō **Vol. 1:** 285
teknotropheō **Vol. 1:** 187
tēkō **Vol. 3:** 559
tektōn **Vol. 1: 279**
tēlaugēma **Vol. 2:** 465
tēle **Vol. 2:** 713
teleioō **Vol. 2: 59–66**
Vol. 3: 491, 756
teleios **Vol. 1:** 92, 649
Vol. 2: 59–65, 77, 162, 449, 477, 563, 741, 778, 782
Vol. 3: 350, 502, 504, 1021, 1031
teleiōs **Vol. 2:** 63
teleiōsis **Vol. 1:** 668
Vol. 2: 59, 61, 63 f.
teleiotēs **Vol. 2: 59–64**
teleiōtēs **Vol. 2: 59, 61**
Tēlemachos **Vol. 2:** 233
teleō **Vol. 1:** 737
Vol. 2: 59–65
Vol. 3: 752–756
teleutaō **Vol. 1: 429 f.**
Vol. 2: 59
teleutē **Vol. 2: 59**
telōneō **Vol. 3: 756**
telōnēs **Vol. 3: 755, 757,** 759
telōnion **Vol. 3: 755–757, 759**
telos **Vol. 1:** 69, 164, 429, 741
Vol. 2: 52, 58, **59–66,** 157, 445, 713, 715, 741, 904
Vol. 3: 277, 363, 725, **752, 754–756, 759,** 779, 838, 924
temenos **Vol. 2:** 233
Vol. 3: 781 f., 785
temnō **Vol. 1:** 307
Vol. 3: 352
teras **Vol. 2:** 621, 626 f., 629, **633 f.**
teratoskopos **Vol. 2: 554**
tēreō **Vol. 1:** 336 f.
Vol. 2: 132 f., 135, 137
tērēsis **Vol. 2: 132 f.**
tessara zōa **Vol. 2: 689**
tessarakonta, tesserakonta
Vol. 2: 689, 696, 893
Vol. 3: 1181
tessares **Vol. 2: 688, 703**
tetelestai **Vol. 2:** 64
tethnēkōs **Vol. 1:** 444
tetokōs **Vol. 1:** 177
tetradion **Vol. 2: 689**
tetrakischilioi **Vol. 2: 699**
tetrakosioi **Vol. 2: 689**
thalamos **Vol. 3:** 983
thalassa **Vol. 3: 982–985,** 989, 992
thalatta **Vol. 3:** 982
thalattan **Vol. 2:** 726
thambeō **Vol. 2: 621, 623 f.**
thambos **Vol. 2: 621, 623–625,** 633
thanatoō **Vol. 1: 430 f., 435**
thanatos **Vol. 1:** 398, **429–431, 435, 441–443,** 446, 463, 707
Vol. 2: 136, 143, 365, 479, 504, 781, 925, 927
Vol. 3: 145, 157, 171, 180, 267, 554, 581, 723, 858, 984, 1157, 1178, 1194, 1206
thaptō **Vol. 1: 263 f.**
Vol. 3: 292
tharreō **Vol. 1: 327–329**
tharseō **Vol. 1: 327 f.**
thauma **Vol. 1:** 528
Vol. 2: 621–623, 633
thaumasios **Vol. 2: 621–623**
thaumasthēnai **Vol. 2:** 625
thaumastos **Vol. 2: 621–623, 625 f.**
thaumazō **Vol. 1:** 528, 587
Vol. 2: 621–625
thea **Vol. 2:** 477
Vol. 3: 512, 1085
theaomai **Vol. 2:** 621
Vol. 3: 511 f., 516
theatēs **Vol. 3:** 512
theatrizomai **Vol. 3: 521**
theatrizomenos **Vol. 1:** 646
theatron **Vol. 3:** 512, **520 f.**
theia physis **Vol. 3:** 71
theioi anthrōpoi **Vol. 2:** 165
theion **Vol. 2:** 72, 86
Vol. 3: 265, 876
theios **Vol. 1:** 645
Vol. 2: 66, 81, 86, 165, 475, 561, 606, 615, 634, 661
Vol. 3: 49, 71, 564, 635 f., 927
theios anēr **Vol. 3:** 636
theiotata **Vol. 3:** 1083
theiotēs **Vol. 2: 66,** 86
thēkē **Vol. 3:** 867
thēlazōn **Vol. 1:** 281
thelēma **Vol. 2:** 819
Vol. 3: 1016, **1018 f., 1021–1023**
thelēsis **Vol. 3: 1018, 1023**
thelō **Vol. 1:** 534, 569
Vol. 2: 406
Vol. 3: 1015 f., **1018–1023,** 1152, 1195
thēlys **Vol. 2: 569**
Vol. 3: 1058

thematikos **Vol. 1:** 648
themeilia **Vol. 1:** 660
themelioō **Vol. 1:** 383, **660**
Vol. 3: 391
themelios **Vol. 1:** 658, **660–663**
Vol. 2: 129, 249, 706
Vol. 3: 382, 387–390
themethla **Vol. 1:** 660
theo- **Vol. 3:** 491
theoi **Vol. 2:** 498, 674
theologeō **Vol. 1:** 70
theomachos **Vol. 1:** 646
Vol. 3: 963
Theophilos **Vol. 2:** 86
theophorētos **Vol. 3:** 491
theopneustos **Vol. 3:** 327, 401, 491, **689 f.,** 708
theopoieō **Vol. 2:** 661
thēoreō **Vol. 2:** 393, 482
Vol. 3: 511 f., 516
theōrētikos **Vol. 2:** 475, 478
Vol. 3: 123
theōria **Vol. 2:** 60
theos **Vol. 1:** 70, 96, 98, 111 f., 138, 164, 179, 192, 197, 212, 257, 273, 281, 283, 287, 289, 295, 298–300, 303, 305, 336, 359, 361, 374, 484, 523, 538, 552, 569, 579, 592, 597–600, 615, 623, 670, 674, 678, 693, 706 f., 734
Vol. 2: 53, **66–86,** 88, 93 f., 99 f., 121, 127, 183, 229, 231, 247 f., 250, 289, 299, 337, 364, 381 f., 386–388, 393 f., 401 f., 408, 411 f., 420, 424, 472, 498, 500, 503, 511–516, 520, 543, 549, 565, 596, 602, 609, 636, 649, 651, 653, 655, 661, 687, 720, 725, 767, 780, 791, 794, 800, 878, 882, 884, 912, 923, 932
Vol. 3: 38, 54, 71 f., 128 f., 152, 160, 162 f., 168, 170, 172, 202, 205, 211, 217 f., 223, 239, 242, 257 f., 264, 299, 315 f., 318 f., 331, 341, 371 f., 374, 376 f., 391, 400, 431 f., 457, 461, 484, 511, 515, 521, 531, 549, 576, 580, 593, 597, 607, 610–612, 634 f., 640, 647, 651, 664, 670, 738, 746, 749, 794, 824, 832, 848, 867, 886, 925, 959, 965, 967, 1017–1019, 1021, 1026, 1036, 1043 f., 1046, 1085, 1107, 1118, 1150, 1152, 1186–1188, 1193, 1198, 1200, 1202–1205, 1211
theosebeia **Vol. 2:** 85, **91 f.**
Vol. 3: 70
theosebeō **Vol. 2:** 85
theosebēs **Vol. 1:** 361
Vol. 2: 85, **91, 94**
theostygēs **Vol. 2:** 86
Vol. 3: 28
theotēs **Vol. 1:** 740
Vol. 2: 66, 86
theou hyios **Vol. 3: 635**
thēr **Vol. 1:** 113
therapeia **Vol. 2: 164, 171**
therapeuō **Vol. 2: 164–170**
Vol. 3: 57
therapōn **Vol. 2: 164**
Vol. 3: 609 f.
thērion **Vol. 1: 113 f., 119,** 507
Vol. 2: 381, 574, 625, 653, 661, 684, 693, 776, 809, 826
Vol. 3: 256, 342, 471, 500, 715, 856, 1198
therismos **Vol. 2:** 522, **525–527**
theristēs **Vol. 3: 525 f.**
therizō **Vol. 3: 525–527**
thermainō **Vol. 1:** 318
thermē **Vol. 1: 317 f.**
thermos **Vol. 1:** 318 f.
theros **Vol. 3:** 525
thēsaurizō **Vol. 2: 829–831, 834, 836**
thēsaurizōn **Vol. 2: 833**
thēsauros **Vol. 2:** 191, **829–831, 834–836,** 838, 843 f., 846 f., **852**
Vol. 3: 143, 184, 340
thesmos **Vol. 1:** 477
Thessalonikeus **Vol. 1:** 299
thiasos **Vol. 1:** 291
thlaō **Vol. 2:** 807
thlibō **Vol. 2: 807–809**
thlibonta **Vol. 2:** 807
thlipsis **Vol. 1:** 741
Vol. 2: 360, 664, 766, 774, 781, **807–809,** 912
Vol. 3: 956
thnēskō **Vol. 1: 430 f., 435**
thnētos **Vol. 1: 430 f., 435**
Vol. 2: 476
thōrax **Vol. 3: 959, 966**
thorybazō **Vol. 2: 621**
thorybeō **Vol. 2: 621, 623**
thorybos **Vol. 2: 621, 623**
thremma **Vol. 1:** 116
thrēneō **Vol. 2: 416–418, 424**
thrēnos **Vol. 2:** 417, 611
thrēskeia **Vol. 3: 549, 551,** 1074
thrēskō **Vol. 2:** 164
thrēskos **Vol. 3: 549, 551**
thriambeuō **Vol. 1:** 644, **649,** 652
thriambos **Vol. 1:** 649
thrix **Vol. 2:** 197
thronoi **Vol. 2: 612, 614**
thronos **Vol. 2:** 147, 601, **611 f., 614 f.**
Vol. 3: 274, 588, 1193
thygatēr **Vol. 1:** 280
Vol. 2: 325
thym **Vol. 1:** 105
thymiama **Vol. 2: 293 f.**
thymiaō **Vol. 2: 293 f.**
thymiatērion **Vol. 2: 293 f.**
Vol. 3: 814
thymoō **Vol. 2:** 419
thymoomai **Vol. 1: 105 f.**
thymos **Vol. 1: 105 f.,** 107 f., 110 f., 113, 456, 471
Vol. 2: 768 f.
Vol. 3: 586, 676–678, 908, 1166
thyō **Vol. 2:** 108, 293, 689
Vol. 3: 417, 428, 437, 552, 582, 676, 686, 715, 785, 812, 814, 908
thyra **Vol. 2: 29–31,** 280, 734
Vol. 3: 966
thyreos **Vol. 3:** 109, **959, 966**
thysia **Vol. 2:** 41 f.
Vol. 3: 415, **417, 421, 428, 432 f., 434 f.,** 437, 1023
thysiasma **Vol. 3: 421**
thysiastērion **Vol. 3: 417 f., 428, 434 f.,** 437, 1196
ti **Vol. 1:** 326
ti kōlyei **Vol. 2:** 222
tiara **Vol. 1:** 405
tiktō **Vol. 1:** 176, 178, **186 f.,** 280, 285, 668
Vol. 3: 856
timaō **Vol. 2: 48–50**
timē **Vol. 1:** 222
Vol. 2: 44, **47–50, 52**
Vol. 3: 138, 174, 198, 200, 717, 817
timios **Vol. 3:** 391, 396
timiōtatos **Vol. 3:** 398
tis **Vol. 1:** 94, 182, 592, 594, 689
Vol. 2: 115 f., 149, 220, 222, 241, 303, 367, 498, 502, 625, 671, 708, 735, 826, 882
Vol. 3: 174, 353, 445, 719, 822, 946, 1172, 1205, 1209
tithēmi **Vol. 1:** 413, 471, **477 f.,** 568, 660, 696
Vol. 2: 859
Vol. 3: 168, 611, 683, 1046, 1186
titlos **Vol. 1:** 392, 396
toichon **Vol. 3:** 795
toichos **Vol. 3: 948**
toioutos **Vol. 1:** 284
Vol. 2: 503, 912
tokos **Vol. 3:** 1156
tolma **Vol. 1:** 710
tolmaō **Vol. 1: 364 f.**
Vol. 3: 344
tolmēros **Vol. 1: 364 f.**
tolmērotoron **Vol. 1:** 365
tolmētēs **Vol. 1: 364 f.**

topazion **Vol. 3: 396 f.**
topos **Vol. 1:** 538
Vol. 3: 461, 464, 584, 856, 1004, 1007
topos pedinos **Vol. 3: 1009**
tote **Vol. 1:** 282, 666
touto (neut. sing. of → *houtos)*
toxon **Vol. 3:** 1002
trachēlos **Vol. 1:** 241
trachys **Vol. 3:** 709
tragos **Vol. 1:** 114
trapeza **Vol. 2:** 518, **520, 522**
Vol. 3: 814
trapeza daimoniōn **Vol. 2: 520**
trapeza kyriou **Vol. 2:** 518, **522**
trapeza tou theou **Vol. 2: 520**
trechō **Vol. 1:** 648
Vol. 3: 945–947
treis **Vol. 2:** 545, **686–688,** 700, **703,** 763, 893
Vol. 3: 185
tria **Vol. 2: 686**
tria tauta **Vol. 2:** 545
tribō **Vol. 3:** 840
tribolos **Vol. 1: 726**
tris **Vol. 2:** 659, **686, 703**
trischilioi **Vol. 2: 699**
tritos **Vol. 1:** 666
Vol. 2: 63, **687, 703,** 893
trochos **Vol. 1:** 182
trōgō **Vol. 2: 535 f.**
tromos **Vol. 1:** 622
-tron **Vol. 3:** 189
trōō **Vol. 1:** 182
trophos **Vol. 1:** 282
tropos **Vol. 2:** 662, 781
trygaō **Vol. 2:** 31, **33**
tychē **Vol. 2:** 657
tymbos **Vol. 1:** 264
tynchanon **Vol. 3:** 1129
typhlos **Vol. 1: 218, 220**
typikōs **Vol. 2:** 277
Vol. 3: 903
typōma **Vol. 3:** 904
typoō **Vol. 3:** 904
typos **Vol. 1:** 71, 86, 371, 491, 744
Vol. 2: 277, 284, 290, 760
Vol. 3: 61, 555, **903–907,** 1015
typōsis **Vol. 3:** 904
typtō **Vol. 3:** 903
tyrannikos **Vol. 2:** 855
tyrannos **Vol. 2:** 372
Vol. 3: 152
Tyrou hieras kai asylou **Vol. 2: 851**

xenia **Vol. 1:** 690
xenizō **Vol. 1:** 689 f.
xenodocheō **Vol. 1: 686**
Xenophōn **Vol. 1:** 569
xenos **Vol. 1:** 683, **686–689,** 691
Vol. 2: 99, 538, 742, 794, 803
xērainō **Vol. 1: 515**
Vol. 3: 999
xēros **Vol. 1:** 390, **515 f.**
xylon **Vol. 1:** 214, **389 f.,** 394, 404
Vol. 3: 391, **865 f., 868,** 870, 1195 f.

zaō **Vol. 1:** 181, 739
Vol. 2: 94, **476–483,** 658, 882
Vol. 3: 267, 366–368, 926, 1118, 1177
zēleō **Vol. 3: 1167**
zēleuō **Vol. 1:** 318
zēloō **Vol. 2:** 121, 806
Vol. 3: 1166 f.
zēlos **Vol. 1:** 106, 535, 557 f.
Vol. 2: 587
Vol. 3: 1166 f., 1170
zēlōtēs **Vol. 1:** 72
Vol. 3: 1166 f.
zēmia **Vol. 3:** 134, **136 f.**
zēmioomai **Vol. 3:** 136
Zēn **Vol. 1:** 588
zeō **Vol. 1:** 318 f.
zestos **Vol. 1: 317–319**
zēteō **Vol. 1:** 278, 430, 580
Vol. 2: 806, 879
Vol. 3: 188, 527–529, **530–533,** 1026, 1119, 1166
zētēsis **Vol. 3: 530, 532,** 887
zeugnymi **Vol. 3: 1160 f., 1164**
zeugos **Vol. 3: 1160 f., 1164**
Zeus **Vol. 1:** 687
Vol. 3: 1002
zizanion **Vol. 3:** 523
zō **Vol. 2:** 476
zōa **Vol. 1:** 443
Vol. 2: 661
zōē **Vol. 1:** 337, 431, 464, 657
Vol. 2: 387 f., 474, **475–483,** 546, 780, 817, 928
Vol. 3: 99, 216, 309, 313, 353, 517, 832, 987, 1084, 1206, 1212
zōē aiōnios **Vol. 2:** 388, 480, 483, 928
Vol. 3: 99, 517, **832,** 1212
zōnē **Vol. 1:** 142
Vol. 3: 120
zōnnymi **Vol. 3:** 116, **120,** 122
zōogoneō **Vol. 2: 476**
zōon **Vol. 1:** 640
Vol. 2: 476, 658, 689
Vol. 3: 391, 679, 684
zōopoieō **Vol. 1:** 445
Vol. 2: 476, 481
Vol. 3: 72
zōsa **Vol. 1:** 180
zygon **Vol. 3: 1160 f.**
zygos **Vol. 1:** 261
Vol. 2: 106, 119
Vol. 3: 590, 592, **1160–1162**
zymē **Vol. 2: 461–463,** 675
zymoō **Vol. 2: 461 f.**

General Index

(*chief references in* **bold figures**)

Aaron **Vol. 1:** 151, 224, 294, 544, 580
Vol. 2: 228, 312, 314, 466, 592, 636, 777
Vol. 3: 33–36, 77, 80, 155, 159, 164, 239, 418, 424, 445, 508, 588, 650, 654, 827, 853, 878, 1013, 1057
Aaronic blessing **Vol. 1:** 98, 211 f.
Vol. 3: 126, 318
Aaron's rod **Vol. 1:** 408
Vol. 2: 638
Vol. 3: 787
Abaddon **Vol. 3:** 262
Abandon **Vol. 1:** 455, 488, 513, 526, 541, 549, 606, 613, 681, 701, 720
Vol. 2: 123, 155, 307, 396
Vol. 3: 584
Abandoned **Vol. 3:** **1004–1008**
Abandonment **Vol. 1:** 51, 411, 559, 595
Vol. 2: 82 f., 307, 314, 419
Vol. 3: 586, 1073
Abase **Vol. 1:** 731
Vol. 2: 263
Abasement **Vol. 2:** **259–264**
Abba **Vol. 1:** 286, 289, 410, **614 f.,** 623
Vol. 2: 76, 883
Vol. 3: 703
Abdicate **Vol. 2:** 160
Abdomen **Vol. 1:** 169
Abednego **Vol. 2:** 628
Vol. 3: 110
Abel **Vol. 1:** 72, 87, 174, 375, 410, 713
Vol. 3: 82, 143, 421, 425, 430, 434, 436, 616 f., 621, 627, 630, 1014
Abhor **Vol. 1:** 555
Vol. 3: 560
Abib **Vol. 2:** 675
Abide **Vol. 1:** 166, 282, 338, 458, 608, 611, 637 f., 669, 723
Vol. 2: 76, 359, 449, 535, 736
Vol. 3: 225, 255, 921
Abide by **Vol. 3:** **223–229**
Abiding **Vol. 1:** 73, 469, 719
Abihu **Vol. 2:** 638
Ability **Vol. 1:** 248, 278, 481, 676, 681, 731
Vol. 2: 156, 354, 391, 395, 403, **601–616**
Vol. 3: 116, 677, 691, **728–730**, 760, 763, 925, 1026
Abimelech **Vol. 2:** 140, 431
Vol. 3: 394, 739
Abinu malkenu litany **Vol. 1:** 618
Abiram **Vol. 1:** 195
Vol. 2: 638
Able **Vol. 3:** 728–730
Ablutions **Vol. 1:** 144, 149 f., 152 f.
Vol. 3: 30, 982, 989, 1007
Abner **Vol. 1:** 366
Abnormal **Vol. 2:** 568
Abode **Vol. 1:** 523, 661
Vol. 2: 71, 184, 205, 295
Vol. 3: **224–229**
Abolish **Vol. 1:** **73**, 368, 414, 462, 469, 591, 622, 676, 685, 738
Vol. 2: 160, 275, 443
Vol. 3: **177–189**, 323, 434
Abolition **Vol. 1:** 719
Abomination **Vol. 1:** 109, 142, 225, 382, 448, 743
Vol. 2: 200, 284, 296, 555
Vol. 3: 104
Abomination of desolation **Vol. 1:** **74 f.,**, 125, 566
Vol. 2: 65, 373, 809, 912, 916, 931
Vol. 3: 419, 788, 793, 797, 803, 1006, 1008
Abomination of the Gentiles **Vol. 2:** 791
Aborted **Vol. 1:** 182
Abound **Vol. 1:** 683, **728–744**
Vol. 2: 130 f., 144
Above **Vol. 1:** 518, 665
Vol. 2: **184–196**, 200–204, 259, 386
Vol. 3: 767
Abracadabra **Vol. 2:** 560, 729
Abraham **Vol. 1:** 53, 65, 72, **76–80**, 141, 159, 194, 208 f., 214, 227 f., 235, 286, 308 f., 311, 346, 366, 370, 402, 417, 444 f., 452, 477, 504, 531, 538 f., 574, 596 f., 601, 604, 617, 640, 669, 684, 690 f., 693, 706, 713 f.
Vol. 2: 68, 73, 76, 117, 120, 127 f., 140, 168, 180, 216, 243, 245, 297, 301 f., 314, 316–319, 321, 329, 354, 359, 426, 431, 437, 452, 549, 570, 576, 590–593, 596, 627 f., 649, 651, 682, 691, 693 f., 755, 771, 793, 847, 865, 899, 917
Vol. 3: 36, 41, 69, 71–73, 77, 140, 146, 171, 202, 213, 240 f., 263, 281, 359, 363, 366, 369 f., 382, 393, 416, 418, 421, 425, 436, 460, 495, 499, 514, 522–524, 529, 569, 579, 581, 584, 617, 626 f., 639, 642 f., 652 f., 656 f., 659, 701, 735, 739, 786, 800–802, 806, 825 f., 841, 854, 867, 869, 871, 879, 965, 969 f., 1012, 1055, 1072, 1091, 1112, 1135, 1151, 1163, 1179, 1188
Abraham's bosom **Vol. 1:** **78,** 240
Vol. 3: 682
Abraoth **Vol. 3:** 476
Abrasax **Vol. 2:** 683

Abroad **Vol. 1:** 689
Vol. 2: 788
Abrogate **Vol. 1:** 500
Vol. 2: 675
Absalom **Vol. 2:** 649
Absence **Vol. 1:** 598, 724
Vol. 2: 420, 422
Absent **Vol. 1:** 466
Vol. 3: 1205
Absolute **Vol. 1:** 500, 522, 616, 636, 718
Vol. 2: 279, 441, 444
Absolution **Vol. 1:** 639
Vol. 3: 35, 685
Absolutism **Vol. 1:** 543
Absolve **Vol. 1:** 529
Absorb **Vol. 1:** 709
Abstain **Vol. 1:** 261, 494, 541, 611, 690 f., 704,
Vol. 2: 135
Vol. 3: 919
Abstemious **Vol. 1:** 515
Vol. 2: 272
Abstention **Vol. 3:** 380, 934
Abstinence **Vol. 1:** 494–496, 514, 611 f., 625
Vol. 2: 271
Vol. 3: 101 f., 107, 536, 837, 996
Abstract **Vol. 1:** 450, 537, 562, 609
Vol. 2: 240, 242, 746
Abstract thought **Vol. 3:** 234
Abstraction **Vol. 1:** 601, 641
Vol. 3: 353
Abstruse **Vol. 1:** 421
Absurd **Vol. 1:** 637
Abundance **Vol. 1:** 727–732
Vol. 2: 92, 105, 128, 130 f., 842
Vol. 3: 137, 559, 791, 919, 922, 955
Abuse **Vol. 1:** 183, 264, 413, 418, 646
Vol. 2: 123, 155, 310, 412, 772, 835
Vol. 3: 27, 143, 340, **346 f.**, 755, 818
Abusive **Vol. 3:** **346 f.**
Abyss **Vol. 1:** 449, 508
Vol. 2: 126, **205–210**, 459, 727, 734, 826
Vol. 3: 474, 983
Accad **Vol. 1:** 140
Accadian **Vol. 2:** 305
Accede **Vol. 1:** 320, 322
Accent **Vol. 3:** 316
Accept **Vol. 1:** 110, 112, 368, 375, 414, 425, 483 f., 486–488, 556, 568, 578, 590, 629, 666, 695
Vol. 2: 178, 237 f., 245, 309, 311, 377, 794, 817
Vol. 3: 177, 220, 358, 434, 728, **744–746**, 759, 777
Accept as proved **Vol. 3:** **808–810**
Accept into one's society **Vol. 3:** **747–751**
Accept opinion **Vol. 3:** 821
Acceptable **Vol. 1:** 235, 675, 708
Vol. 2: 92, 116, 146, 171, 230, **814–817**, 884 f.
Vol. 3: 358, **744–746**, 1014
Acceptance **Vol. 1:** 534, 588, 593, 603, 655, 701 f.
Vol. 2: 116, 173, 177, 230, 272, 309, 400, 407, 812, 832,
Vol. 3: 142, 505, **744–751**, 1062
Access **Vol. 1:** 223, 324, 390, 485, 592, 603, 611, 638, 742
Vol. 2: 31, 83, 230, 280, 443, 500, 591, 721, 727, 733, 736, 855
Vol. 3: 37, 40–42, 106, 235, 244, 336, 366, 395, 470, 504, 543, 814, **935–943**
Accessible **Vol. 1:** 602
Vol. 2: 342
Accession **Vol. 1:** 177, 626
Vol. 2: 109, 146
Vol. 3: 45, 317
Accident **Vol. 2:** 167, 414 f., 419, 665
Vol. 3: 244, 474, 999
Accidental **Vol. 3:** 585, 997
Acclamation **Vol. 1:** 122, 629, 630
Vol. 2: 424
Vol. 3: 643, 673
Accommodate **Vol. 1:** 548
Vol. 2: **814–817**
Accompaniment **Vol. 3:** 668, 673
Accompany **Vol. 1:** 322, 480 f., 585
Accomplish **Vol. 1:** 696, 733, 737
Vol. 2: 59, 64, 83, 120
Vol. 3: 489, 911, **1147–1158**
Accomplishment **Vol. 1:** 653, 680, 697
Vol. 2: 120
Vol. 3: 68
Accord **Vol. 2:** 304
Vol. 3: 349
Accost **Vol. 2:** 856
Account **Vol. 1:** 56, 378, 386, 573, 577, 588, 725
Vol. 2: 131, 244, 255, 858
Vol. 3: 820, 823, 1081
Accountability **Vol. 1:** 349, 522
Vol. 3: 844, 912
Accountant **Vol. 2:** 254
Accredit **Vol. 3:** 571
Accuracy **Vol. 3:** 65, 875
Accursed **Vol. 1:** 265, 390, 413 f., 416 f.
Vol. 2: 399
Vol. 3: 229
Accusation **Vol. 1:** **82–84**, 281, 373, 402, 577, 594, 609, 612, 631
Vol. 2: 138 f., 178, 252, 434, 450
Vol. 3: 483, 573, 1043
Accuse **Vol. 1:** **82–84**, 349 f., 410, 473
Vol. 2: 137, 140, 193, 236, 378, 380, 451
Vol. 3: 51, 346, **468–473**, 804, 824, **923–928**
Accuser **Vol. 1:** **82–84**, 454, 554, 610
Vol. 2: 191, 313
Vol. 3: 174, 232, 275
Accustom **Vol. 1:** 483 f.
Vol. 2: 235
Vol. 3: 775
Accustomed **Vol. 2:** 436
Achaemenidae **Vol. 3:** 372, 848
Achaia **Vol. 2:** 766, 826
Vol. 3: 119, 416, 499, 976
Achaicus **Vol. 1:** 741
Achan **Vol. 1:** 345
Achieve **Vol. 2:** 62, 327, 394
Vol. 3: 702
Achievement **Vol. 1:** 398, 431 f., 485, 492 f., 502,

Achievement (*cont'd*)
612, 645, 647, 650 f., 676, 697, 722 f.
Vol. 2: 120, 122, 798
Vol. 3: 141 f., 817, 924, 946, **1147–1152**
Achilles **Vol. 2:** 232
Vol. 3: 49, 959
Achsah **Vol. 3:** 557
Acknowledge **Vol. 1:** 265, 489, 549, 587
Vol. 2: 180, 362, 383, 403, 417, 427, 877
Vol. 3: 749, 853
Acknowledgment **Vol. 1:** 415
Vol. 3: 637
Acquaint **Vol. 1:** 692
Acquaintance **Vol. 2:** 392
Acquiesce **Vol. 2:** 769
Acquire **Vol. 1:** 482–484, 635, 639
Vol. 2: 298, 301, **838–840**
Vol. 3: 192, 529
Acquisition **Vol. 1:** 533
Vol. 2: 838–840
Acquit **Vol. 1:** 205, 352, 439, 505, 558, 698
Acquittal **Vol. 2:** 121, 674
Vol. 3: 352–377
Act **Vol. 2:** 74, 108
Vol. 3: 151, 1155–1158
Act of offering **Vol. 3: 417–436**
Act rightly **Vol. 3: 351 f.**
Act unjustly **Vol. 3:** 574
Act violently **Vol. 3:** 377
Action **Vol. 1:** 207, 484, 504 f., 552, 556, 564, 585, 589–591, 600, 603, 639, 679 f., 693, 697, 702, 713 f., 721 f., 741 f.
Vol. 2: 47, 62, 79, 118, 200, 223, 395 f.
Vol. 3: 54, 1021, 1123, **1147–1152**, **1155–1158**
Active **Vol. 1:** 400, 605, 624
Vol. 2: 149, 169, 475, 660, 861
Vol. 3: 1147–1152, 1168
Activity **Vol. 1:** 489, 491, 595, 627, 655, 686, 693, 695–697
Vol. 2: 425
Vol. 3: 1147, 1155
Actor **Vol. 1:** 706, 708
Vol. 2: 468, 748
Vol. 3: 138
Acts, Book of **Vol. 1:** 136, 148, 158, 181, 198, 257, 266, 303, 324, 361, 364, 490, 589, 591, 603
Vol. 2: 130, 147, 252, 315, 333, 359
Vol. 3: 62–65, 86
Acts, apocryphal books of **Vol. 1:** 50 f.,
Vol. 2: 168
Acts of Andrew **Vol. 1:** 51
Acts of John **Vol. 1:** 50
Vol. 2: 219
Acts of Paul **Vol. 1:** 51
Vol. 2: 219, 557
Acts of Peter **Vol. 1:** 51
Vol. 2: 219, 557
Acts of Thomas **Vol. 1:** 51, 646
Vol. 2: 219
Vol. 3: 231
Actual **Vol. 1:** 710 f.
Actuality **Vol. 3:** 1142
Actualization **Vol. 1:** 711, 713
Vol. 3: 238
Adam **Vol. 1:** 53, 71, 77, **84–88**, 96, 179, 182, 327, 390, 433 f., 436, 440, 446, 451, 472, 548, 567, 621, 669, 730
Vol. 2: 45, 57 f., 103, 158, 175, 179, 242, 481, 483, 504, 564, 566, 570 f., 611, 649, 662, 680 f., 691, 721, 723, 761, 763 f., 893, 897, 920
Vol. 3: 35, 186, 264 f., 273, 277, 302, 363, 460, 469, 495, 522, 578 f., 581, 585 f., 613, 617, 623, 632, 656, 659, 661, 663, 684, 687, 906, 1063, 1075, 1158, 1194
Adapa **Vol. 2:** 201
Vol. 3: 617
Adapt **Vol. 1:** 481, 483
Vol. 2: 314
Adaptation **Vol. 2:** 307
Adar **Vol. 3:** 1053
Add **Vol. 1:** 540
Vol. 3: 489
Addict **Vol. 1:** 514
Addiction **Vol. 3:** 996
Address **Vol. 1:** 66, 285 f., 488, 582, 614–617, 620, 622
Vol. 2: 315, 354, 358, 513 f., 651, 856, 860, 867
Vol. 3: 718
Address enthusiastically **Vol. 3:** 1080
Adequacy **Vol. 1:** 576
Adequate **Vol. 1:** 690
Vol. 3: 727 f.
Adherence **Vol. 2:** 270
Adherent **Vol. 1:** 487, 489, 535
Vol. 2: 298
Adiabene **Vol. 2:** 792
Adjuration **Vol. 1:** 97 f.
Adjure **Vol. 3:** 473, **737–743, 1038–1050**
Adjustment **Vol. 1:** 602, 679, 715
Vol. 2: 569
Adjutant **Vol. 3:** 49
Administer **Vol. 1:** 536
Vol. 2: 253–256, 451, 802
Administer **Vol. 3:** 188
Administer oath **Vol. 3:** 473
Administration **Vol. 1:** 192, 738
Vol. 2: 121, 254, 377
Vol. 3: 482, 548, 605, 880, 912
Administrative **Vol. 1:** 198
Administrator **Vol. 1:** 190, 198, 373
Vol. 3: 478
Admiration **Vol. 1:** 99, 435
Vol. 2: 92
Vol. 3: 1166
Admission **Vol. 2:** 449
Vol. 3: 747–751, 754
Admit **Vol. 1:** 680
Vol. 3: 744–746, 747
Admonish **Vol. 3:** 675, 687
Admonition **Vol. 1:** 110, 319, 462, 502, 568 f.
Vol. 2: 262, 360
Adonai **Vol. 2:** 556
Vol. 3: 1116
Adonis **Vol. 1:** 64
Vol. 3: 104, 274 f.

Adonizedek **Vol. 2:** 590
Adopt **Vol. 1:** 483, 632
Vol. 2: 309, 318
Adoption **Vol. 1:** 123, 177–179, **280–291**, 410, 534, 615, 668, 708, 738
Vol. 2: 76, 374, 672, 884
Vol. 3: 637, 751
Adoptionism **Vol. 3:** 300
Adoptionist **Vol. 1:** 473
Vol. 2: 506
Vol. 3: 639
Adoration **Vol. 2:** 855, 859, 868, 876
Vol. 3: 531
Adore **Vol. 2:** 615
Vol. 3: 233
Adorn **Vol. 1:** 469, 520, 524, 684
Vol. 2: 95, 217, 236, 352
Vol. 3: 771
Adornment **Vol. 3:** 562, 1067
Adulation **Vol. 1:** 99
Adult **Vol. 1:** 213, 281 f., 284, 568, 614
Vol. 2: 62, 64, 562, 656
Adulterer **Vol. 2: 582–584**
Vol. 3: 757
Adulteress **Vol. 1:** 650
Vol. 2: 541, **582–584**, 800
Vol. 3: 325, 537, 570, 580, 656
Adulterous **Vol. 2:** 36, 351
Adulterous generation **Vol. 2:** 582, 584, 680
Adultery **Vol. 1:** 51, 97, 235, 240, 349, 390, 495, 498–500, 505–507, 655
Vol. 2: 440, 448, **575–590**, 871
Vol. 3: 104, 182 f., 227, 448, **535–541**, 792, 796, 1062, 1064
Adulthood **Vol. 2:** 59
Advance **Vol. 1:** 320, 322, 473, 692–695
Vol. 2: 128, 130, 238
Vol. 3: 74
Advance payment **Vol. 2:** 40
Advanced **Vol. 2:** 61
Advantage **Vol. 1:** 137–139, 434, 437, 467 f., 539, 728–731
Vol. 2: 115, 519
Vol. 3: 31 f., 134, 136 f., 532, 833
Advent **Vol. 1:** 320, 737
Vol. 2: 382, 887, **898–901**, 904, 931
Vol. 3: 120, 733
Adversary **Vol. 1:** 91, 271, 516, 553, 647
Vol. 2: 202, 368, 618, 877
Vol. 3: 468–473, 784, 1068
Adverse **Vol. 1:** 572
Vol. 2: 364
Adversity **Vol. 1:** 262, 411, 622
Vol. 2: 478, 764
Vol. 3: 672
Advertising **Vol. 3:** 900
Advice **Vol. 1:** 211, 340, 362 f., 568, 591
Vol. 2: 141
Vol. 3: 136
Advise **Vol. 1:** 65, 91, 362 f., 450, 568
Vol. 2: 744
Vol. 3: 677
Adviser **Vol. 1:** 89, 362 f.
Vol. 3: 1029
Advisory **Vol. 1:** 193
Advocate **Vol. 1:** 78, **88–92**, 266, 271, 324, 329, 571 f., 637
Vol. 2: 84, 231, 266, 359, 709, 787, 878, 883, 885, 895
Vol. 3: 47, 93, 162 f., 225, 242, 315, 362, 460, 633, 704, 1046, 1050
Aegina **Vol. 2:** 847
Aegisthus **Vol. 2:** 887
Aelia Capitolina **Vol. 2:** 308
Aelius Aristides **Vol. 1:** 406
Vol. 2: 116, 621
Aeolian **Vol. 2:** 124
Aeon **Vol. 2:** 488
Vol. 3: 826–833
Aeschylus **Vol. 1:** 550
Vol. 3: 852
Aesculapius **Vol. 3:** 261, 915
Aesthetic **Vol. 1:** 459, 536
Vol. 2: 93, 95, 98, 100, 102 f.
Afar **Vol. 2:** 53
Affair **Vol. 3:** 324
Affairs **Vol. 2:** 146
Affect **Vol. 1:** 654, 658
Vol. 2: 366
Affection **Vol. 1:** 177, 254, 742
Vol. 2: 538, 599, 861
Vol. 3: 678
Affection, without natural **Vol. 2: 538–547**
Affectionate **Vol. 2: 538–547**
Affiliation **Vol. 2:** 310
Affinity **Vol. 1:** 482
Affirm **Vol. 1:** 83, 98, 487, 545
Vol. 2: 318
Vol. 3: 742, 1038–1050
Affirmation **Vol. 2:** 149, 297, 313, 317, 340, 343
Vol. 3: 741
Afflatus **Vol. 2:** 233
Afflict **Vol. 1:** 188 f., 467, 612
Vol. 2: 260, 267, **807–809**
Affliction **Vol. 1:** 68, 163, 171, 188, 202, 260–262, 329, 410, 422, 539, 648, 652 f., 687, 725, 727, 731, 741
Vol. 2: 257, 263, 357, 359–361, 414, 416, 423, 663, 700, 766, **805–809**, 865
Vol. 3: 200, 212, 256, 322, 701, **719–725**, 801, 836, 856
Afflictions of Christ **Vol. 2:** 808
Vol. 3: 956
Affluence **Vol. 2:** 320
Affrontery **Vol. 1:** 364
Aflame **Vol. 3:** 225
Afraid **Vol. 1:** 453, 621–623, 646, 688
Vol. 2: 90
After **Vol. 1:** 321, **480–494**
Vol. 2: 55
Vol. 3: 952–956
After-life **Vol. 1:** 204
Vol. 2: 432 f.
Vol. 3: 99, 178, 270, 274 f.
Afternoon **Vol. 1:** 634
Agabus **Vol. 2:** 827
Vol. 3: 86 f., 121, 1183
Agamemnon **Vol. 3:** 851

Agape **Vol. 3:** 547 f.
Agate **Vol. 3:** 396
Age **Vol. 1:** 92 f., 124, 165, 192–194, 277, 280, 282–289, 298, 368, 431, 477, 522, 524, 566, 620, 638, 675, 683, 709, 718
Vol. 2: 35, 58, 62, 75, 129, 170, 254, 353, 359, 398, 428 f., 433, 588, 674, 689 f., 698, 700, **713–716**, 737, 892, 907, 917, 919 f., 928
Vol. 3: 312, 350, 403, 492, 558, 561, 698, 759, **826–833**, 841
Age to come **Vol. 1:** 86, 145, 282, 326 f., 518, 688
Vol. 2: 74, 270, 298, 420, 672, 718, 836, 840, 919 f., 928
Vol. 3: 142, 364, 809
Age of marriage **Vol. 2:** 578, 584, 588
Aged **Vol. 3:** 545
Agent **Vol. 1:** 205, 208, 476 f., 538, 540, 542, 566
Vol. 2: 195, 502, 516, 552, 658, 718
Aggrandizement **Vol. 3:** 703
Aggravate **Vol. 1:** 496
Agitate **Vol. 3:** 556, **709**f.
Agitation **Vol. 1:** 108
Vol. 2: 652
Agitator **Vol. 1:** 396
Agni cult **Vol. 1:** 653
Agony **Vol. 1:** 393, 645 f.
Agree **Vol. 1:** 344, 454
Vol. 2: 897
Agreeable **Vol. 1:** 675
Vol. 2: 116
Vol. 3: 744
Agreement **Vol. 1:** 356, 365, 368, 415, 588, 590, 594, 687
Vol. 2: 146, 236, 317, 328, 436, **500–508**, 584, 660, 879
Vol. 3: 224, 816, 1039, 1083, 1165
Agricultural festivals **Vol. 1:** 625
Agriculture **Vol. 3:** 102, 835
Agrippa (→Herod)
Ahab **Vol. 1:** 195, 640
Vol. 2: 458, 582
Vol. 3: 426, 876, 1057, 1091
Ahabah prayer **Vol. 1:** 618
Vol. 2: 313
Ahasuerus **Vol. 3:** 279, 756, 1057
Ahaz **Vol. 1:** 596, 655
Vol. 2: 86, 628
Vol. 3: 249
Ahaziah **Vol. 3:** 1091
Ahijah **Vol. 1:** 127
Vol. 2: 521
Ahikam **Vol. 3:** 478
Ahithophel **Vol. 1:** 433
Ahriman **Vol. 1:** 563
Vol. 3: 693
Ahura Mazda **Vol. 1:** 563
Ai **Vol. 1:** 394
Aid **Vol. 1:** 261
Vol. 2: 363
Vol. 3: **544–549,** 553, **1147–1152**
Ailing **Vol. 3:** **996–999**
Ailment **Vol. 1:** 119, 515, 727
Aim **Vol. 1:** 270, 470, 488, 541, 604, 644, 676, 695, 697, 720
Vol. 2: 78, 335, 339, 353
Vol. 3: 365
Aimless **Vol. 1:** 546, 550
Aion **Vol. 2:** 158
Vol. 3: 827
Air **Vol. 1:** 164, **449–454**, 708
Vol. 2: 189, 192 f., 232, 452
Vol. 3: 678, 689
Akedah **Vol. 3:** 195
Akeldama **Vol. 1:** 93 f., 224
Vol. 2: 321, 854
Vol. 3: 912
Akiba, Rabbi **Vol. 1:** 67
Vol. 2: 337, 544, 608, 640, 720
Akitu **Vol. 2:** 644
Akkadian **Vol. 1:** 68
Aland, Kurt **Vol. 1:** 149
Alarm **Vol. 1:** 621, 646
Vol. 2: **621–626**
Vol. 3: 50, 239, 709, 1169
Alas **Vol. 3:** **1051–1055**
Alazon **Vol. 3:** 28
Albrektson, B. **Vol. 3:** **333**
Alchemical **Vol. 3:** 310
Alcimus **Vol. 3:** 479
Alcinous **Vol. 2:** 233
Alcohol **Vol. 1:** 625
Vol. 3: 101, 107
Aleppo **Vol. 3:** 446
Alert **Vol. 1:** 513, 515
Vol. 2: 136 f.
Alexander **Vol. 1:** 466
Vol. 3: 471, 558
Alexander Balas **Vol. 2:** 817
Alexander the Great **Vol. 1:** 59, 255, 405
Vol. 2: 33, 95, 124 f., 307, 372 f., 512, 612, 651, 849
Vol. 3: 80, 269, 450, 634, 715
Alexander (high priest) **Vol. 3:** 40
Alexander Janneus (→ Jonathan)
Alexander, Rabbi **Vol. 2:** 462
Alexandra **Vol. 2:** 810
Alexandria **Vol. 1:** 49, 68
Vol. 2: 126, 331 f., 754
Vol. 3: 385, 453, 485, 598, 778, 827, 976
Alexandrian **Vol. 3:** 41
Alexandrians, synagogue of **Vol. 1:** 297
Alexandrines **Vol. 3:** 843
Alien **Vol. 1:** 221, 411, **683–692**
Vol. 2: 297, 540, **739–742**
Vol. 3: 256, 381
Alien speech **Vol. 3:** **1078–1081**
Alienate **Vol. 1:** 684 f.
Vol. 2: 156, 265
Vol. 3: 172
Alienation **Vol. 2:** 94, 170, 663
Alive **Vol. 1:** 359, 401, 445, 474, 509, 653, 722
Vol. 2: 122, 269, 922, 924
Vol. 3: 689
All **Vol. 1:** 94–97, 383, 524, 577, 639, 654, 665, 668 f., 678, 694, 718, 720, 730, 735, 740
Vol. 2: 67, 188, 195, 209, 242, 398, 401, 425,

428, 530, 690, 799
Vol. 3: 195, 197, 275, 906
All in all **Vol. 2:** 74
All-Sovereign **Vol. 2:** 513
All-sufficiency **Vol. 3:** 723
Allay **Vol. 3:** 109
Allegation **Vol. 2:** 139
Allegiance **Vol. 1:** 302, 304, 406, 424, 492
Vol. 2: 311, 377, 380, 382
Vol. 3: 136, 544, 780
Allegorical **Vol. 2:** 56, 125, 277, 280, 329, 446, 685
Vol. 3: 486
Allegorize **Vol. 1:** 577
Vol. 2: 442, 590
Vol. 3: 789
Allegory **Vol. 1:** **49**, 71, 81, 116, 259, 289, 368, 574, 577, 737
Vol. 2: 252, 279, 584 f., **743–760**
Vol. 3: 920
Alleviation **Vol. 1:** 328, 727
Vol. 2: 28
Alliance **Vol. 1:** 141, 594, 718
Vol. 3: 33, 391, 444, 605
Alliteration **Vol. 2:** 831
Allocate **Vol. 1:** 365, 533, 640
Allot **Vol. 2:** 296, 298, 300
Allotment **Vol. 1:** 475, 533
Allow **Vol. 1:** 506 f., 529, 587, 676, 686, 691, 698
Vol. 2: 223, 236, 369, 435
Vol. 3: 188, 475
Allowance **Vol. 3:** 144
Alloy **Vol. 2:** 97
Allurement **Vol. 1:** 457 f., 726
Allusion **Vol. 3:** 489, 494, 612
Ally **Vol. 1:** 531
Almighty **Vol. 1:** 111, 356, 409
Vol. 2: 69 f., 74, 231, 240, 290, 329, 509, 513, 601, 857, 859, 862
Vol. 3: 544, **716–718**, 721, 729
Almond **Vol. 3:** 1096
Almost **Vol. 2:** 428
Alms **Vol. 2:** **594–598**, 820, 823
Vol. 3: 242, 545, 748, 874
Almsgiving **Vol. 2:** 104, 216, 469, 824, 830–832
Vol. 3: 157
Aloes **Vol. 1:** 122, 265
Vol. 2: 295
Alone **Vol. 1:** 492
Vol. 2: 307, **723–725**
Vol. 3: 436, 542
Alongside **Vol. 2:** 743
Aloof **Vol. 1:** 528, 606 f.
Vol. 2: 315
Aloud **Vol. 3:** 75
Alpha and Omega **Vol. 2:** 59, 282
Alphabet **Vol. 2:** 282
Vol. 3: 483 f., 492
Alphaeus **Vol. 2:** 467
Altar **Vol. 1:** 75, 122, 221, 223, 387, 559, 653, 655, 687
Vol. 2: 77, 85, 191, 207, 212, 226, 273, 373, 556, 689
Vol. 3: 34, 94, 104, 151, 154, 157 f., 173, 245, 259, 404, **415–436**, 489, 497, 686, 715, 789, 794, 918, 1006
Altar of burnt offering **Vol. 1:** 633
Vol. 3: 812, 919
Altar of incense **Vol. 1:** 114
Vol. 2: 294
Vol. 3: 418, 424, 436, 787 f., 812, 814 f.
Altar of sacrifice **Vol. 2:** 97
Alter **Vol. 1:** 608, 704
Vol. 2: 437
Vol. 3: 166
Alteration **Vol. 1:** 658
Alves, Rubem **Vol. 3:** 973
Amalekites **Vol. 2:** 637, 639
Vol. 3: 139, 236, 427, 1009
Amanuensis **Vol. 3:** 478
Amarna letters **Vol. 1:** 170, 207
Vol. 2: 324
Amaze **Vol. 1:** 527, 529 f.
Vol. 2: **621–626**
Amazement **Vol. 2:** 359, **621–626**
Amaziah **Vol. 3:** 1092
Ambassador **Vol. 1:** 101, 126, 129, 192–194
Vol. 2: 608
Vol. 3: 49, 168–170, 547
Ambiguity **Vol. 2:** 313
Ambiguity in translation **Vol. 3:** 1177
Ambiguous **Vol. 3:** 352
Ambition **Vol. 1:** 106, 137, 427, 676
Vol. 2: 121, 518
Vol. 3: 112, 821, 888, 1052
Ambrose **Vol. 1:** 315
Ambrosiaster **Vol. 2:** 219
Amen **Vol. 1:** **97–99, 250**
Vol. 2: 456, 837, 862, 878
Vol. 3: 509, 626, 669, 675, 742, 883, 1046, 1106, 1112
Amen-formula **Vol. 3:** 1107
Amethyst **Vol. 3:** 396 f.
Ami, Rabbi **Vol. 1:** 597
Amiable **Vol. 2:** 115
Amillenarianism **Vol. 2:** 389
Amillennialist **Vol. 1:** 53, 508
Vol. 2: **702**
Ammon **Vol. 2:** 395
Vol. 3: 634
Ammonites **Vol. 1:** 426
Vol. 2: 373
Amnesty **Vol. 2:** 168
Amoraim **Vol. 1:** 49, 69
Amorite **Vol. 1:** 734
Vol. 2: 555, 636, 888
Vol. 3: 94, 458
Amorite dynasty **Vol. 3:** 94 f.
Amos **Vol. 1:** 66, 109, 244, 661
Vol. 3: 79, 93, 139, 249, 366, 659, 1089–1092, 1103
Amount **Vol. 1:** 734
Vol. 2: 683
Amphictyony **Vol. 2:** 325, 695
Amphitheatre **Vol. 3:** 571
Amputation **Vol. 2:** 415
Vol. 3: 448

Amulet **Vol. 1:** 451
Vol. 2: 136, 556
Amun **Vol. 1:** 177
'Amwas **Vol. 3:** 453
Anabaptists **Vol. 3:** 108
Anakim **Vol. 3:** 248
Analogical **Vol. 3:** 996
Analogical correspondence **Vol. 3:** 326
Analogy **Vol. 1: 49**, 50, 60, 71, 580
Vol. 2: 110, 501
Vol. 3: 278, 301 f., 570, 912, 1007, 1064, 1132 f., 1138
Analyse **Vol. 1:** 353
Analytical study **Vol. 1:** 580
Ananias **Vol. 1:** 136
Vol. 2: 91, 320
Vol. 3: 912
Ananias (high priest) **Vol. 1:** 205, 476
Vol. 2: 451
Vol. 3: 40, 347, 948 f.
Ananias and Sapphira **Vol. 1:** 466 f., 642
Vol. 2: 473, 846
Vol. 3: 387
Ananus **Vol. 3:** 39
Anarchy **Vol. 1:** 654, 667
Anastasis **Vol. 3:** 261
Anastasius Sinaita **Vol. 1:** 649
Anath **Vol. 2:** 553
Anathema **Vol. 2:** 402, 530, 897
Anatolia **Vol. 3:** 421
Anatolian **Vol. 2:** 97
Anatomy **Vol. 1:** 241
Anaximander **Vol. 2:** 137
Vol. 3: 840
Ancestor **Vol. 1:** 167, 240, 255, 288, 615
Vol. 2: 92, 206, 318, 320, 331, 437
Ancestral **Vol. 1:** 573 f., 616
Ancestry **Vol. 1:** 187, 427
Vol. 2: 36
Vol. 3: 654 f.
Ancestry of Messiah **Vol. 3:** 656
Anchor **Vol. 1:** 372, 658, 660
Vol. 2: 244
Vol. 3: 684, 913
Ancient **Vol. 1:** 164, 641, 657, 720
Ancient of Days **Vol. 1:** 204
Vol. 2: 80, 613, 917
Vol. 3: 614, 621
Ancient paths **Vol. 3:** 938
Andrew **Vol. 3:** 383
Androgynous **Vol. 2:** 570
Vol. 3: 1056
Andronicus **Vol. 1:** 130
Andronicus Rhodius **Vol. 1:** 64
Andros **Vol. 2:** 214
Vol. 3: 760
Angel **Vol. 1:** 54, **101–105**, 127, 166 f., 202, 204, 219, 233, 252, 280, 331, 335, 339, 345, 374, 408–410, 449–452, 464 f., 474, 476, 478, 489 f., 508, 512, 517, 544, 570, 585 f., 622 f., 648, 656 f., 659, 677, 690, 733, 736
Vol. 2: 37, 46, 69, 86, 107, 126, 146 f., 149, 161, 175, 185, 191 f., 194–196, 199, 213, 228 f., 263, 298 f., 302, 332, 365, 381, 426, 434, 452, 459, 486, 488, 492 f., 502, 513 f., 518, 556, 559, 561, 565, 577, 591, 602 f., 608 f., 612–615, 624 f., 651, 655, 681 f., 689, 691, 696, 707, 709, 727, 791, 793, 811, 819, 832, 837, 860, 877, 884, 904, 916, 930
Vol. 3: 35, 40, 45 f., 48, 54, 57, 80, 99, 113, 120, 135, 172, 179, 186 f., 199, 216, 218, 242, 265, 270 f., 278, 313, 316, 322, 342, 344 f., 389, 394, 433, 436, 440, 457, 465, 469 f., 500, 506, 514 f., 517, 527, 546, 551, 557, 579, 621, 630, 632 f., 636 f., 642, 660, 681, 693, 695, 707, 709, 714, 732, 736, 795, 802, 805, 807, 812, 829, 844, 847, 856, 860, 939, 948, 1001, 1003–1005, 1011, 1013 f., 1054, 1060, 1071, 1113, 1121
Angel of Darkness **Vol. 2:** 492, 708
Vol. 3: 469, 801, 842, 939, 944
Angel of death **Vol. 1:** 83, 509
Vol. 3: 468, 471
Angel of destruction **Vol. 3:** 469
Angel of light **Vol. 1:** 710
Vol. 2: 495
Vol. 3: 471, 864
Angel of the waters **Vol. 3:** 990
Angelic **Vol. 1:** 462, 676
Vol. 2: 45 f., 196, 270
Angelology **Vol. 1:** 102
Vol. 3: 457, 704
Angelophany **Vol. 3:** 288
Angels of the Churches **Vol. 1:** 103, 304
Anger **Vol. 1: 105–113**, 202 f., 316, 329, 364, 381, 465, 467, 535, 555, 654, 657, 679, 681, 715, 734
Vol. 2: 28, 58, 70, 76, 139, 180, 224, 256, 261, 272, 275, 366, 419, 421, 484, 544, 550, 599 f., 768 f., 834, 854
Vol. 3: 99, 174, 205, 214, 221, 255, 347, 369, 580, 586, 689, 691, 1051, 1166
Angites **Vol. 3:** 987
Angler **Vol. 1:** 670
Angry **Vol. 1:** 105, 107, 202, 364, 418, 479
Vol. 3: 559
Anguish **Vol. 1:** 411, 422, 526
Vol. 2: 83, 364, 416, 423
Vol. 3: 229, 858
Animal **Vol. 1:** 84 f., 101, **113–119**, 151 f., 173, 175, 178, 186, 218–226, 232, 234, 239–241, 260, 272, 342 f., 371, 393, 419, 443, 468 f., 490, 507, 509, 511, 520, 560, 565, 585, 609 f., 625, 627, 632, 671 f., 674, 699, 721, 725, 743
Vol. 2: 30, 37, 50, 59, 151, 159, 167, 180, 192, 205, 208, 230, 233, 236, 256 f., 268, 274 f., 286, 288, 320, 381, 410–414, 461, 474, 476, 483, 501, 533, 562, 564 f., 569, 572, 577, 586, 599, 625, 631, 649, 653, 659, 661 f., 684, 689, 693, 728, 741, 746, 754, 776, 809, 826, 843
Vol. 3: 27, 41, 95, 103 f., 108, 113, 117, 151, 158 f., 189 f., 192, 200, 212 f., 256, 260, 342, 345, 377, 381, 407, 409, 417, 419–425, 427, 434 f., 444, 471, 476, 497, 500, 532, 560, 565, 568, 604, 713, 715, 739, 791, 797, 856, 858, 860, 923, 925, 965, 986, 990, 1055 f.,

1078, 1160 f., 1164.
Animal worship **Vol. 3:** 104
Animate 522 f.
Vol. 3: 678
Animation **Vol. 1:** 444, 521
Animism **Vol. 1:** 450
Vol. 2: 520
Vol. 3: 424
Ankle **Vol. 1:** 393
Vol. 2: 415
Anna **Vol. 2:** 245
Vol. 3: 81, 198, 790, 872 f., 1059, 1072
Annas **Vol. 3:** 39 f., 381
Annexation **Vol. 2:** 325
Annihilation **Vol. 1:** 109, 413 f., 462 f., 465, 610, 688, 719
Vol. 2: 58, 363, 367
Vol. 3: 248, 590
Annius of Viterbo **Vol. 3:** 655
Anniversary **Vol. 1:** 628
Announce **Vol. 1:** 246, 301, 655
Vol. 2: 107 f., 326, 343, 375
Vol. 3: **44–48**, 52, **68–74**, 316
Announcement **Vol. 1:** 62, 293, 696
Vol. 2: 340, 368, 384
Vol. 3: 44, **48–57**, **68–74**, 1090
Annoy **Vol. 1:** 557
Annual **Vol. 1:** 632
Vol. 2: 211
Annul **Vol. 1:** 370, 416, 578
Vol. 2: 437
Vol. 3: **177–189**
Anodyne **Vol. 2:** 295
Anoint **Vol. 1:** 53, 63, 119–124, 178, 427, 471, 512, 544
Vol. 2: 159, 203 f., 227, 294, **334–343**, 354, 374, 435, 710–713, 791, 812, 835, 875, 899
Vol. 3: 153, 221, 242, 499, 650, 696–698, 703, 750, 764, 1059–1061, 1150
Anointing oil **Vol. 2:** 226, 294
Anonymous 733
Another **Vol. 1:** 684 f.
Vol. 2: 625, 838
Answer **Vol. 1:** 51, 98 f., 272, 332, 339, 345, 409, 411, 480, 583, 727
Vol. 2: 173, 175, 178 f., 244, 296, 446, **468–470**, 856, 864
Vol. 3: **324 f.**, 347, 449, 528, 777, 849
Answerable **Vol. 1:** 222, 365
Vol. 2: 475, 510
Ant **Vol. 1:** 252
Antagonism **Vol. 2:** 826
Vol. 3: 1049
Antagonist **Vol. 2:** 383
Anthology **Vol. 2:** 315
Anthropocentric **Vol. 1:** 383
Vol. 2: 260
Anthropological **Vol. 1:** 233, 382, 401, 523, 672 f., 687, 706
Vol. 2: 64, 94, 253, 919
Anthropology **Vol. 1:** 236, 675
Vol. 2: 397, 919
Anthropomorphism **Vol. 1:** **50**, 63, 66, 239, 472, 585
Vol. 2: 66
Vol. 3: 341, 345, 513, 943, 1167
Anti-Christian **Vol. 1:** 607, 733
Vol. 2: 625
Vol. 3: 36, 856
Anti-docetic **Vol. 2:** 535 f.
Anti-gnostic **Vol. 1:** 603
Vol. 2: 402, 405
Anti-God **Vol. 1:** 124 f.
Vol. 2: 394
Anti-Jewish **Vol. 2:** 309 f., 316
Anti-Judaistic **Vol. 2:** 135
Anti-legal **Vol. 2:** 135
Anti-monarchical **Vol. 2:** 374, 376
Anti-mystical **Vol. 2:** 133
Anti-Semitism **Vol. 1:** 360
Vol. 2: 316
Anti-social **Vol. 2:** 92
Vol. 3: 584
Anti-speculative **Vol. 1:** 603
Antichrist **Vol. 1:** 75, 114, **124–126**, 323, 464, 544, 566
Vol. 2: 58, 192, 205, 435, 447, 460 f., 610, 615, 633, 645, 653, 684, 809, 901, 905, 931
Vol. 3: 319, 471, 476, 505, 706, 716, 803, 872
Anticipate **Vol. 1:** 651, 733, 737
Vol. 2: 367, 380, 394
Vol. 3: 624, **747–751**
Anticipation **Vol. 2:** 87, 238 f., 244 f., 309, 315, 354, 402, 918 f.
Vol. 3: 633, 922
Antidote **Vol. 2:** 271
Antinomian **Vol. 1:** 302, 338, 720
Vol. 2: 394
Antinomianism **Vol. 2:** 447, 677 f., 718
Antioch **Vol. 1:** 133, 303, 361, 462, 473
Vol. 2: 316, 321, 343, 368, 523, 729, 795, 827, 849, 895
Vol. 3: 87, 106, 203, 226, 228, 252, 284, 325, 352, 385
Antioch of Pisidia **Vol. 3:** 65, 180, 228
Antiochus III **Vol. 1:** 196
Vol. 3: 478
Antiochus IV Epiphanes **Vol. 1:** 75, 125, 235, 309, 529
Vol. 2: 125, 372, 628, 688, 849
Vol. 3: 35, 50, 270 f., 318, 419, 452, 460, 498, 788, 1006, 1035
Antiochus VII **Vol. 3:** 147
Antiochus Philopappus **Vol. 1:** 640
Antipas **Vol. 3:** 1047
Antipathy **Vol. 1:** 555
Vol. 2: 332
Antiphon the Sophist
Vol. 3: 1019
Antiquity **Vol. 1:** 164, 531
Vol. 3: 828 f.
Antiseptic **Vol. 3:** 444
Antithesis **Vol. 1:** 335, 600, 705
Vol. 2: 314, 419, 422 f.
Vol. 3: 1107
Antithetical **Vol. 2:** 122
Antithetical argumentation **Vol. 3:** 1082
Antitype **Vol. 1:** 71, 86, 142, 222, 327

Antitype (*cont'd*)
Vol. 2: 835
Vol. 3: 41, 632, **903–906**, 1007
Antonia **Vol. 3:** 788, 977
Antony **Vol. 2:** 849
Anxiety **Vol. 1: 276–278**, 421, 455, 597, 622, 646, 651, 715, 723, 726
Vol. 2: 90, 240, 244, 360, 664, 832 f., 841, 868
Vol. 3: 103, 128, 683, 691, 710, 728
Apartheid **Vol. 3:** 975
Apathy **Vol. 1:** 359
Vol. 3: 821
A-personal **Vol. 2:** 197
Aphorism **Vol. 1:** 555
Vol. 2: 757, 890
Aphrodite **Vol. 2:** 85, 224
Vol. 3: 318
Apiece **Vol. 2:** 158
Apion **Vol. 2:** 310
Apiru **Vol. 1:** 170
Apocalypse **Vol. 1: 50**, 430, 528, 541, 656
Vol. 2: 914
Vol. 3: 85
Apocalypse, Little **Vol. 2:** 903
Apocalypse of Baruch **Vol. 3:** 271
Apocalypse of Elijah **Vol. 2:** 219
Acocalypse of Enoch **Vol. 2:** 219
Apocalypse of Peter **Vol. 2:** 219
Vol. 3: 312
Apocalypses, Apocryphal **Vol. 1:** 50
Apocalyptic **Vol. 1: 50**, 54, 56, 65, 110, 116, 118, 124, 175, 203, 210 f., 216 f., 224, 243 f., 304, 313, 326, 409, 425, 433, 442, 463, 519, 524, 527, 539, 545, 559, 598, 607, 610, 638, 651, 655, 706, 742
Apocalyptic **Vol. 2:** 37, 45, 54, 56, 58, 65, 71 f., 133, 173, 191, 193, 202, 208, 215 f., 219, 237, 252, 276, 279, 329, 364, 366 f., 376 f., 382 – 386, 389, 397, 447, 458 f., 482, 629, 633, 664 f., 674, 684, 688 f., 692, 695 f., 698, 700 f., 703, 762, 835 f., 888, 891 f., 894, 899, 901, 903, 905 f., 911, 913 f., 918, 920 f., 923, 925–927, 930
Vol. 3: 70, 80, 88, 250, 253, 277, 280, 302, 312, 319, 332, 373, 403, 489, 502–504, 522, 526, 559, 576, 610, 613–621, 624, 628–631, 633, 639 f., 644, 658 f., 695, 718, **730–737,** 829–831, 836, 842 f., 847, 851, 862, 888 f., 928, 956, 961 f., 989, 1007, 1011, 1033, 1054, 1109, 1161
Apocalypticism **Vol. 3:** 58
Apocalyptist **Vol. 1: 50**
Vol. 2: 191, 311, 892
Vol. 3: 979
Apocrypha **Vol. 1: 50,** 63, 66–68, 341, 618, 626, 646
Vol. 2: 41, 93, 138, **219**, 324 f., 331
Apocryphal **Vol. 1:** 243
Vol. 2: 204, 218 f.
Vol. 3: 58, 85, 401, 493
Apodictic law **Vol. 3:** 931
Apokatastasis **Vol. 3:** 148
Apollinarianism **Vol. 3:** 1176
Apollo **Vol. 1:** 189, 508, 574 f.
Vol. 2: 85, 166, 224, 558, 756
Vol. 3: 75, 103, 738
Apollonius of Tyana **Vol. 2:** 107, 393
Vol. 3: 259, 261, 635
Apollos **Vol. 1:** 709
Vol. 3: 387, 699, 1117
Apollyon **Vol. 1:** 462
Vol. 2: 126
Apolodorous of Athens **Vol. 3:** 92
Apologetic **Vol. 1:** 338, 383, 736, 737
Vol. 2: 310, 312, 332
Vol. 3: 64, 66, 494
Apologetics **Vol. 1:** 51, 688
Apologia **Vol. 3:** 621
Apologist **Vol. 1:** 51, 63
Vol. 3: 1048
Apology **Vol. 1: 51**
Vol. 2: 357, 856, 858
Apophthegm **Vol. 1:** 269
Vol. 2: 757
Apostasy **Vol. 1: 51**, 108, 124, 141, 281, 309, 347, 357, 390, 397, 469, 499, 512, 606–608, 611, 693, 703
Vol. 2: 37, 270, 288, 291, 449, 487, 573, 576, 581 f., 606, 629, 633, 678, 708, 718 f., 798
Vol. 3: 28, 96, 135 f., 469, 578, 582, 606, 637, 692, 750, 764, 803, 1069, 1104
Apostate **Vol. 1:** 51, 109, 448, 607, 611
Vol. 2: 291, 555, 688, 705, 779, 866 f.
Vol. 3: 343, 601, 883, 961
Apostatize **Vol. 2:** 125
Apostle **Vol. 1:** 71, **126–137**, 172, 174, 183, 191 f., 194, 198–200, 214, 246 f., 256, 274 f., 298, 301, 307, 332, 337, 340, 474–479, 489, 493, 519, 540, 542, 547, 568, 571, 576, 592, 619, 623, 643, 662, 686, 707, 710, 723
Vol. 2: 50, 57, 62, 77, 109, 111–114, 119, 121, 129, 135, 152, 176, 179, 187, 196, 217, 244, 253, 299, 359, 365, 385, 398, 412, 434, 443, 446, 451, 460 f., 472, 517, 550, 573, 597, 603, 611, 620, 655, 695, 718, 729, 732, 734, 736, 740, 765, 768, 787, 789, 799, 873, 877
Vol. 3: 52, 54, 59 f., 63, 65, 67, 84, 88, 128, 212, 241, 252, 296, 313–315, 384, 387, 390, 393 f., 504, 547 f., 553, 568, 571, 724, 729, 746, 767–769, 793, 817, 822, 857, 862, 872, 955, 1044, 1047 f., 1059, 1113, 1122, 1151 f.
Apostles' Creed **Vol. 2:** 210
Apostleship **Vol. 1:** 130–134, 183
Vol. 2: 112, 120 f., 299, 399, 827
Vol. 3: 170, 322, 749
Apostolate **Vol. 1:** 130–135
Vol. 2: 121
Vol. 3: 1020
Apostolic **Vol. 1:** 469, 478, 491, 496, 592, 644, 733, 742
Vol. 2: 75, 121, 252, 255, 263, 329, 403
Vol. 3: 458
Apostolic Council **Vol. 1:** 310
Vol. 2: 328
Vol. 3: 315
Apostolic decree **Vol. 2:** 450 f., 678

Vol. 3: 106, 931
Apostolic Fathers **Vol. 1: 51**, 52, 339, 535
Vol. 2: 123, 219
Apostolic generation **Vol. 1:** 132
Apostolic ministry **Vol. 1:** 419
Apostolic office **Vol. 1:** 247
Apostolic succession **Vol. 1:** 129
Apostolic tradition **Vol. 1:** 70, 200, 247, 302
Apotropaic **Vol. 3:** 982
Apotropaic function **Vol. 3:** 103
Appal **Vol. 1:** 530
Apparent **Vol. 1:** 686
Vol. 2: 420
Apparition **Vol. 2: 552–562**
Vol. 3: 310, **317–324**
Appeal **Vol. 1:** 206, 269–271, 349–351, 487, 492, 569 f., 615, 736
Vol. 2: 155, 162, 281, 312, 364, 860, **879–881**, 882
Vol. 3: 238, 359
Appeal to Caesar **Vol. 1:** 276
Vol. 2: 882
Appear **Vol. 1: 55**, 185, 320, 383, 471, 544, 587, 597, 710, 712, 723
Vol. 2: 82, 318, 328, 386, 447, 484, 518
Vol. 3: 221, 259, 275, 281, 310, **317–324, 821 f.**
Appearance **Vol. 1:** 87, 183 f., 204, 248, 298, 328, 341, 393, 474, 491, 503, 515, 522, 545, 550, 585–588, 597, 607, 622 f., 654, 656, 678, 680, 703–711, 734
Vol. 2: 45, 49, 102 f., 176, 182, 270, 281, 284, **286–289**, 343, 399, **500–508**, 566, 657, 724, 786 f., 909, 918
Vol. 3: 121, 282, 286, 290, 292, 297–299, 301, 310, **317–324**, 513, 516, 558, 571, 649, 686, 734, 813, **861–864**, 875, 877, 889, 914, 994, 1005, 1011, 1034, 1112
Appearing **Vol. 2: 898–901**
Vol. 3: 220
Appease **Vol. 1:** 450
Vol. 2: 164, 166, 860
Vol. 3: 149, 152, 154, 254, 996
Appetite **Vol. 1:** 106, 672
Vol. 2: 460
Vol. 3: 692
Applicable **Vol. 3:** 712
Application **Vol. 1:** 577, 601, 647, 703, 709
Vol. 2: 150, 161
Vol. 3: 184, 480
Appoint **Vol. 1:** 189 f., 275, 293, 331, 369, 427, **471–478**, 533 f., 538, 540, 626 f., 696
Vol. 2: 152, 244, 299, 301, 374, 376, 385, 412, 447
Vol. 3: 569, **570 f.**
Appointed day **Vol. 1:** 706
Appointed time **Vol. 1:** 722, 738
Appointment **Vol. 1:** 664
Vol. 2: 122, 151, 297, 336
Vol. 3: 259, 1040
Apportion **Vol. 1:** 534 f.
Vol. 2: 296 f.
Vol. 3: 402–404
Appreciate **Vol. 2:** 386
Apprehend **Vol. 1: 343 f.**, 425, 523, 692
Vol. 3: 122–130
Apprehension **Vol. 1:** 73, 277
Vol. 2: 172, 390
Vol. 3: 899
Apprentice **Vol. 1:** 484, 486
Vol. 3: 759, 910
Approach **Vol. 1:** 151, 251, 258, 320, 322, 360, 514, 627
Vol. 2: 53 f., 151, 215, 856, **882–885**
Approbation **Vol. 2:** 815 f.
Vol. 3: 744
Appropriate **Vol. 1:** 223 f., 486, 616
Vol. 2: 302, 342, 380, 400, 438, 446, 668 f.
Vol. 3: 348 f., 353, 833
Appropriation **Vol. 1:** 603
Vol. 2: 273
Approval **Vol. 1:** 681, 742
Vol. 2: 308, 815
Vol. 3: 559, **744–746**
Approve **Vol. 1:** 475, 672
Vol. 2: 123, 362, 364, 744, 817
Vol. 3: 798–810, 816
Approved **Vol. 3:** 808
Approximation **Vol. 2:** 686
Apsu **Vol. 2:** 553
Aptitude **Vol. 3:** 349
Apuleius **Vol. 2:** 556
Vol. 3: 861
Aquarius **Vol. 2:** 688
Aqueduct **Vol. 1:** 318
Aquila **Vol. 1:** 89, 279, 379, 539
Vol. 2: 141, 335, 707, 847
Vol. 3: 485, 494, 812, 1065
Aquinas, Thomas **Vol. 1:** 49, 65, 374
Vol. 2: 103
Vol. 3: 244, 1133
Aquit **Vol. 3: 352–377**
Arabia **Vol. 1:** 81
Vol. 2: 95, 293 f., 381, 636
Arabian desert **Vol. 3:** 1008
Arabic **Vol. 1:** 68
Arable **Vol. 1:** 517
Vol. 3: 1006
Arabs **Vol. 1:** 68
Arabs in Palestine **Vol. 2:** 308
Arad **Vol. 3:** 483
Aramaeans **Vol. 1:** 68
Aramaic **Vol. 1: 51**, 63, 68 f., 614 f., 618, 620, 632
Vol. 2: 125, 192, 229, 309, 311, 502, 515, 795, 870, 911
Vol. 3: 112, 483, 485, 613, 622, 628, 914
Aramaism **Vol. 2:** 525 f., 529, 780
Vol. 3: 456
Arâq el-'Emir **Vol. 3:** 451
Aratus **Vol. 1:** 85
Vol. 2: 77, 85
Vol. 3: 331
Araunah **Vol. 3:** 787
Aravacae **Vol. 2:** 291
Arbitrariness **Vol. 1:** 367, 579, 713
Arbitrary **Vol. 3:** 160, 281, 824, 1017, 1019
Arbitrator **Vol. 1:** 373

Arch of Titus **Vol. 3:** 789
Archaeology **Vol. 3:** 327
Archangel **Vol. 1:** 101, 342, 410
Vol. 2: 191, 608, 922, 924 f.
Vol. 3: 113, 622
Archelaus (→Herod)
Archetypal **Vol. 2:** 284, 655
Archetype **Vol. 1:** 491 f., 522
Vol. 2: 103, 160, 191, 460, 546
Vol. 3: 630, 776, 1047
Archimedes **Vol. 3:** 528
Architecture **Vol. 3:** 397
Archon **Vol. 3:** 49
Ardour **Vol. 1:** 652
Arduous **Vol. 2:** 266
Arena **Vol. 3:** 203
Areopagus **Vol. 1:** 473
Vol. 2: 77, 85, 503, 919
Vol. 3: 65, 431, 793, 1036
Ares **Vol. 2:** 85
Vol. 3: 318, 959
Aretas **Vol. 2:** 378, 579
Argue **Vol. 3:** 821
Argument **Vol. 1:** 545, 547, 590, 592, 663, 680
Vol. 2: 140, 223, 312, 427, 434
Vol. 3: 82, 119, **530–532**, **820–826**
Argumentum ad hominem **Vol. 3:** 188
Argus **Vol. 3:** 512
Arian **Vol. 1:** 549
Vol. 2: 81, 497, 506, 725
Vol. 3: 1133
Arian controversy **Vol. 2:** **505–508**
Arianism **Vol. 2:** 76
Arise **Vol. 1:** 181, 679, 681
Vol. 2: 281, 366, 381
Vol. 3: 224
Aristarchus **Vol. 3:** 521
Aristeas **Vol. 1:** 68, 221, 377, 575
Vol. 2: 690, 697, 707
Aristides **Vol. 1:** 51
Vol. 2: 648
Aristobulus **Vol. 3:** 766, 872
Aristocracy **Vol. 1:** 640
Vol. 2: 102, 372
Aristocratic **Vol. 1:** 196, 363 f., 536
Aristogeiton **Vol. 2:** 372
Aristomachus **Vol. 2:** 291
Aristonicus **Vol. 1:** 640
Aristotle **Vol. 1:** 63, 65, 232, 521, 579, 635, 646, 705
Vol. 2: 99, 180, 257, 439, 475, 657, 757, 772
Vol. 3: 123, 354, 570, 678, 776, 841, 875 f., 926 f., 1027, 1034, 1083, 1086, 1169
Arius **Vol. 2:** 505
Ark of the covenant **Vol. 1:** 122, 143, 195, 252, 280, 293 f., 492, 537
Vol. 2: 69, 186, 212, 225 f., 325, 613, 650
Vol. 3: 33, 117, 207, 497, 673, 787, 812, 815, 1004, 1010
Ark of Noah **Vol. 1:** 713
Vol. 3: 120, 211, 248, 310, 683, 851
Ark of testimony **Vol. 3:** 156, 1040
Arm **Vol. 1:** 239, 284, 427, 648, 673, 679
Vol. 2: 239, 864, 877
Vol. 3: 311, 713, **959–967**
Armageddon **Vol. 1:** 114
Vol. 3: **959–967**
Armed **Vol. 1:** 651
Armenia **Vol. 2:** 95
Armies of heaven **Vol. 1:** 118, 205
Armour **Vol. 2:** 137, 431, 868
Vol. 3: 120, 200, 471, 886, **959–967**
Armour of God **Vol. 3:** 749, 965
Armour of light **Vol. 2:** 495, 925
Armourer **Vol. 2:** 97
Arms **Vol. 3:** 119
Arms-bearer **Vol. 1:** 283
Army **Vol. 1:** 254, 293, 295, 505, 521, 536, 685
Vol. 2: 32, 69, 146, 325, 374, 795–801, 845
Vol. 3: 45, 179, 256, 469, 478, 811, 958
Army in battle array **Vol. 3:** **959–967**
Aroma **Vol. 3:** **599–601**
Aromatic **Vol. 2:** 211, 293
Arouse **Vol. 1:** 609
Vol. 2: 418
Arraign **Vol. 3:** 242
Arrange **Vol. 1:** 241, 476 f., 503 f., 521, 692
Vol. 3: 349
Arrange in advance **Vol. 3:** **349–351**
Arrangement **Vol. 1:** 712
Vol. 3: 1147
Array **Vol. 2:** 225
Arrears **Vol. 2:** 667
Vol. 3: 757
Arrest **Vol. 1:** 343, 364, 395, 423, 630, 633, 663
Vol. 2: 368, 429, 448, 451, 486, 526 f., 713, 801
Vol. 3: 38, 592, 716 f., 848
Arrival **Vol. 1:** 320, 324
Vol. 2: 109, 382, 432, 909
Arrive **Vol. 1:** 540, 649
Arrogance **Vol. 1:** 108, 227 f., 364 f., 385, 597
Vol. 2: 201, 259–261, 366, 399, 422, 435, 462
Vol. 3: **27 f.**, 132, 341, 565, 888, 1079
Arrow **Vol. 1:** 656, 698
Vol. 2: 27, 334
Vol. 3: 268, **959–967**, 1079
Art **Vol. 1:** 279, 459, 579, 588, 592
Vol. 2: 683
Vol. 3: 331, 347, 399, 926, 1028
Artemis **Vol. 1:** 189, 560
Vol. 2: 74, 85, 235, 426, 484, 678
Vol. 3: 784, 796, 1068, 1071
Articulation **Vol. 1:** 579 f.
Vol. 2: 390
Vol. 3: 1084
Artificer **Vol. 1:** 387
Artificial **Vol. 3:** 655, 657, 886
Artisan **Vol. 1:** 279, 382, 412
Vol. 3: 551
Artist **Vol. 2:** 574
Arts **Vol. 1:** 490
Vol. 2: 102, 679
Asa **Vol. 3:** 659
Asahel **Vol. 1:** 170
Asaph **Vol. 3:** 659
Asbestos **Vol. 3:** 111
Ascend **Vol. 2:** **184–196**, 377

Vol. 3: 631, 941
Ascended **Vol. 1:** 384, 403
Vol. 3: 244
Ascension **Vol. 1:** 123, 128, 183, 204, 372, 631, 668
Vol. 2: **184, 203 f.,** 692, 713, 718, 787, 918, 920
Vol. 3: 198, 298, 323, 433, 602, 704, 1003, 1060, 1186
Ascent **Vol. 2:** **184**, 209, 646
Vol. 3: 629 f.
Ascetic **Vol. 1:** 250, 284, 313, 489, 496, 613, 641, 645
Vol. 2: 268, 272, 394, 581, 843
Vol. 3: 108, 536, 996, 1007
Asceticism **Vol. 1:** 445, 495 f., 612, 647, 674, 715
Vol. 2: 51, 100, 263, 265, 267, 271 f., 447, 481
Vol. 3: 121, 758
Asclepas of Gaza **Vol. 2:** 506
Asclepieion of Cos **Vol. 2:** 166
Asclepius **Vol. 1:** 594
Vol. 2: 151, 166, 602, 621, 666, 674
Vol. 3: 103, 216, 519, 738, 859
Ascribe **Vol. 2:** 363
Ascription **Vol. 1:** 427
Vol. 2: 80
Ash **Vol. 3:** 989
Ashamed **Vol. 2:** 51
Vol. 3: 135, 352, 367, **562–564**
Ashdod **Vol. 3:** 248
Asher **Vol. 2:** 317
Vol. 3: 872 f.
Asherah **Vol. 1:** 625
Vol. 3: 865
Asherim **Vol. 2:** 226, 284
Ashes **Vol. 1:** 115
Vol. 2: 32, 157, 366, 583
Vol. 3: 557, 589
Ashmedai **Vol. 1:** 451
Ashtaroth **Vol. 3:** 787
Ashur **Vol. 1:** 140
Ashurbanipal **Vol. 2:** 679
Asia Minor **Vol. 1:** 55, 64, 199, 264, 301, 560, 634, 651
Vol. 2: 34, 108, 135, 222, 270, 451, 685, 918, 924
Vol. 3: 118, 185, 203, 217, 416, 598, 757, 795 f., 844, 1035
Asians, Synagogue of the **Vol. 1:** 297
Ask **Vol. 1:** 227, 504, 509, 569–571, 600, 639, 730
Vol. 2: 359, **855–886**
Vol. 3: 348, 531
'Askar **Vol. 3:** 458
Asleep **Vol. 1:** 314
Vol. 2: 419, 900, 917, 922
Vol. 3: 303
Asp **Vol. 2:** 28
Aspect **Vol. 1:** 585, 601
Vol. 2: 287
Aspersion **Vol. 1:** 151
Aspiration **Vol. 1:** 426, 456, 533
Vol. 3: 893
Aspire **Vol. 2:** 550
Vol. 3: 531
Ass **Vol. 1:** 115, 117, 409, 725
Vol. 2: 257, 510
Vol. 3: 557, 560, 1160
Assassin **Vol. 3:** 1167
Assassination **Vol. 1:** 340
Assault **Vol. 1:** 241, 710
Vol. 2: 383
Vol. 3: 94 f.
Assemble **Vol. 1:** 320, 322, 340
Vol. 2: 32 f., 267, 328
Vol. 3: **443–449**
Assembly **Vol. 1:** 56, 69, 199, 291–298, 301–304, 466, 475, 535, 578, 626, 669, 728, 731–733
Vol. 2: 234, 798, 800
Vol. 3: 49, **520 f.**, 1016
Assent **Vol. 1:** 271, 331, 454, 594
Vol. 2: 648
Vol. 3: 369
Assert **Vol. 1:** 83, 541, 596
Vol. 2: 283, 862
Assert claims **Vol. 3:** 531
Asserting on oath **Vol. 3:** **737–743**
Assertive oaths **Vol. 3:** 738
Assessment **Vol. 1:** 680
Vol. 2: 239, 361–363, 374, 417
Asseveration **Vol. 3:** 742
Asset **Vol. 3:** 758
Assign **Vol. 2:** 300, 438 f.
Assist **Vol. 1:** 343 f., 570, 650
Assistance **Vol. 1:** 694
Vol. 2: 266
Assistant **Vol. 3:** 544, 1147–1152
Assmann, Hugo **Vol. 3:** 973
Associate **Vol. 1:** 259, 678, 702
Vol. 2: 263, 349
Association **Vol. 1:** 414, 488, 493, 606, 639
Vol. 2: 342
Vol. 3: 433, 1165
Assume **Vol. 1:** 709 f.
Vol. 2: 165, 430
Vol. 3: **747–751**, 821
Assumption **Vol. 1:** 402, 697
Assumption of Moses **Vol. 1:** 66, 104
Vol. 2: 642
Vol. 3: 345, 471
Assurance **Vol. 1:** 223, 225, 328, 351, 409, 492, 542, 604, 659 f., 663, 703, 713, 733, 735, 740
Vol. 2: 83, 213, 239, 243, 358, 394, 531, 536, 783, 873, 924
Vol. 3: 490, 889
Assure **Vol. 1:** 733
Vol. 2: 374
Assured **Vol. 1:** 719
Assyras **Vol. 2:** 679
Assyria **Vol. 1:** 61, 111, 140 f., 293, 531 f.
Vol. 2: 306, 320, 679 f.
Vol. 3: 179, 202, 341, 590, 867, 1088
Assyrian **Vol. 2:** 166, 189, 285, 306, 320
Vol. 3: 115, 460, 715
Assyrian Law **Vol. 3:** 95

Assyrians **Vol. 1:** 52, 55, 67 f., 531, 670, 673
Vol. 2: 740
Vol. 3: 951
Asleep **Vol. 3:** 252, 280
Astarte **Vol. 3:** 785, 1068 f.
Astarte–Anath **Vol. 1:** 625
Astonishment **Vol. 1:** **526–530**, 729
Vol. 2: **620–626**, 736
Astound **Vol. 1:** 527–529, 729
Vol. 2: **621–626**
Astral **Vol. 1:** 631
Astrologer **Vol. 2:** 558
Vol. 3: 206
Astrological **Vol. 3:** 310
Astrological calculations **Vol. 3:** 844
Astrology **Vol. 1:** 521
Vol. 2: 189, 198, 200, 214, 509, 555
Vol. 3: 397, 735
Astronomical **Vol. 1:** 200
Vol. 2: 37, 191, 690, 694, 916
Astronomy **Vol. 1:** 140
Vol. 2: 743
Vol. 3: 146, 399
Asunder **Vol. 3:** 539
Asylum **Vol. 1:** 687, 691
Vol. 3: 594
At once **Vol. 3:** **833–839**
Athanasius **Vol. 1:** 52, 318
Vol. 2: 505–507, 661
Vol. 3: 53, 401 f.
Atheism **Vol. 1:** 595
Vol. 3: 1096
Atheist **Vol. 2:** 92
Athena **Vol. 3:** 457
Athene **Vol. 1:** 588
Vol. 2: 85, 233, 847–849
Vol. 3: 959, 1071
Athenians **Vol. 1:** 453, 475, 478, 497 f., 689
Vol. 2: 85, 92, 820, 847
Vol. 3: 525, 784, 870, 1055
Athens **Vol. 1:** 68, 189, 267, 291, 475, 478, 497, 529, 573, 611, 640, 687, 732
Vol. 2: 74, 77, 233, 285, 372, 407, 788, 802, 818
Vol. 3: 431, 453, 477, 755, 775, 785, 910, 913, 1015, 1071
Athlete **Vol. 1:** 470, 495 f., 645 f.
Athletics **Vol. 1:** 312 f., 406, 469
Atlas **Vol. 2:** 188
Atom **Vol. 1:** 671
Atomism **Vol. 1:** 640
Atomist **Vol. 3:** 1085
Atone **Vol. 2:** 321, 410 f., 800, 855
Vol. 3: 104, **145–176**, 693
Atonement **Vol. 1:** 57, 152, 172, 220 f., 223 f., 301, 339, 371, 415, 418, 466 f., 698–700
Vol. 2: 72, 294, 407, 525
Vol. 3: 104, **145–176**, 194–197, 236, 364, 372, 419, 423, 428, 579, 724, 812, 941, 989, 999
Atoning **Vol. 2:** 49, 78, 368, 532, 535
Vol. 3: 35, 41 f., 215, 432, 722
Atoning sacrifice **Vol. 3:** 723
Atoning value **Vol. 3:** 194 f.
Atrocity **Vol. 3:** 872
Attachment **Vol. 1:** 486, 493
Vol. 2: 103
Attack **Vol. 1:** 117, 303, 396, 430, 509, 551, 562, 602, 660
Vol. 2: 150, 166, 320, 398
Vol. 3: 121, 748, 799, 859 f.
Attacker **Vol. 1:** 451
Attain **Vol. 1:** 635, 644, 723
Vol. 3: 489, 727, **747–751**
Attainment **Vol. 1:** 734
Vol. 2: 262
Attalus II Philadelphus **Vol. 2:** 550
Attempt **Vol. 1:** 541
Vol. 2: 321
Vol. 3: **798–808**
Attend **Vol. 1:** 691, 693
Vol. 2: 134, 172
Vol. 3: 511
Attendance **Vol. 2:** 164
Attendant **Vol. 1:** 102, 407, 485
Vol. 2: 228
Vol. 3: 32, 49, 609
Attendant circumstances **Vol. 3:** 1182
Attention **Vol. 1:** 457, 591, 731
Vol. 2: 132, 134, 350, 435
Vol. 3: 558
Attentive **Vol. 1:** 458
Vol. 2: 172
Attestation **Vol. 1:** 668
Vol. 3: **1038–1050**
Attic Greek **Vol. 1:** 62
Attis **Vol. 1:** 64, 560
Vol. 3: 501
Attitude **Vol. 1:** 70, 217, 275, 331, 333, 349, 355, 484 f., 492, 496, 510, 553, 571, 583, 589, 591 f., 596, 598, 600, 602 f., 609, 611, 616, 621 f., 627, 629, 635, 639, 641, 680, 686 f., 691, 701, 709 f., 714 f., 725, 737
Vol. 2: 90, 92–94, 99, 147, 170, 177, 179, 239–241, 243, 256, 258–261, 265, 275, 286, 310, 312, 316, 327, 341 f., 353 f., 383, 393 f., 422, 426, 430–432, 435, 437 f., 451, 471, 568, 598, 624, 815 f., 825, 857 f., 864, 878
Vol. 3: 27, 127, 142, 183 f., 251, 314, 346, 351, 407, 424, 427, 493, 691, 727, 945, 1055
Attorney **Vol. 3:** 325
Attract attention **Vol. 3:** 1051
Attraction **Vol. 2:** 115, 308, 350, 538
Vol. 3: 225, 320
Attractive **Vol. 1:** 206, 498
Vol. 2: 116
Attribute **Vol. 1:** 529, 548 f., 616, 740
Vol. 2: 70, 76, 332, 372, 424
Vol. 3: 100, 220, 344, 357, 717
Atom **Vol. 3:** 1125
Auction **Vol. 3:** 755
Auctioneer **Vol. 3:** 50
Audacious **Vol. 1:** 364
Augment **Vol. 2:** 130
Augur **Vol. 2:** 554
August **Vol. 2:** 128, 232
Augustine **Vol. 1:** 59, 116, 299, 315
Vol. 2: 103, 685, 701, 755
Vol. 3: 402

Augustus **Vol. 1:** 59, 269, 330, 519
Vol. 2: 93, 108, 233, 373, 511, 850
Vol. 3: 217, 219, 457, 755 f., 959
Austin, J. L. **Vol. 3:** 895–897, 1125, 1139
Authentication **Vol. 1:** 596, 603, 736
Vol. 2: 351, 398, 626
Vol. 3: 489, 499, 648
Authenticity **Vol. 1:** **51**, 68, 247, 266, 419, 513, 598, 620
Vol. 3: 628
Author **Vol. 1:** 168, 380, 427, 736
Vol. 2: 110–112, 114
Authoritarian **Vol. 1:** 191
Vol. 3: 1064
Authoritative **Vol. 1:** 71, 123, 131 f., 216, 220, 334, 410, 450, 533, 572, 576, 594
Vol. 2: 157, 219, 398, 401, 436, 630, 632, 718, 915
Vol. 3: 48, 59, 440, 481, 492, 696, 1152
Authorities **Vol. 1:** 102, 163, 166, 168 f., 288, 330, 340 f., 363, 392, 590, 593, 649, 717
Vol. 2: 50, 101, 158, 230, 238, 255, 282, 365, 451, 607 f., 885
Vol. 3: 49, 51, 97, 243
Authority **Vol. 1:** 50, 74, 76, 79, 85, 87, 89, 95, 99, 103, 119, 122 f., 127–134, 146, 164–166, 171, 190, 192, 194, 196, 200, 219, 222, 228, 247, 261, 269–271, 281, 301, 303, 335, 337, 341, 349, 363, 365, 385, 392, 402, 407 f., 427, 451, 454, 458, 476, 482, 485–487, 489, 491, 510 f., 528, 534, 548, 564, 572, 574, 578, 588, 590, 596, 614–617, 638, 664, 667, 700, 703 f., 718, 720, 729
Vol. 2: 31, 72 f., 79, 118, 121, 146, 151, 160–162, 174, 177, 179 f., 194, 196, 203 f., 213, 218, 236, 238, 267, 282, 287, 327, 335 f., 362, 365, 375 f., 426, 446, 468, 508, 510–515, 517, 595, **600–616,** 624, 632, 640, 652, 654, 671, 674, 686, 721, 727–730, 787, 795, 797, 880, 917, 921, 930
Vol. 3: 37, 46, 55, 57, 75, 82, 88, 93, 97, 112 f., 115, 120, 128, 139, 188, 311, 313, 322, 329, 340, 342, 344, 384 f., 387, 401, 474, 476, 479, 481, 484, 488, 495, 497–499, 510, 514, 547, 554, 563, 588 f., 617 f., 622 f., 627, 631, 645, 647 f., 700, 711, 741, 754 f., 763, 769, 792, 807, 817, 822, 848, 869, 871, 930, 953, 964, 967, 1022, 1055, 1063, 1066 f., 1103, 1107–1109, 1113, 1122, 1163
Authorization **Vol. 1:** 127, 131–134, 146, 303
Vol. 2: 152, 351, 607
Authorized **Vol. 2:** 176, 362, 365, 654
Vol. 3: 49, 162, 1044
Authorized Version **Vol. 1:** 70
Autobiographical **Vol. 2:** 282
Automatic **Vol. 1:** 541, 678, 694, 740
Vol. 2: 128
Autonomous **Vol. 1:** 424, 439, 494, 565, 595, 605
Vol. 2: 295, 432, 446
Vol. 3: 927 f.
Autonomy **Vol. 1:** 693
Vol. 2: 120, 306, 790
Vol. 3: 1045
Autumn **Vol. 1:** 626
Vol. 3: 269
Avail **Vol. 1:** 602
Vol. 3: 713
Avarice **Vol. 1:** **137–139**, 169, 644
Vol. 2: 550, 845 f., 852
Avenge **Vol. 1:** 222
Vol. 2: 157, 167
Vol. 3: **92–97**, 134
Avenger **Vol. 3:** **92–97**, 159
Avenger of blood **Vol. 3:** 94, 178, 190, 194
Avert **Vol. 3:** 159
Avestas **Vol. 3:** 617
Avoid **Vol. 1:** 272, 423, 432, 485, 514, 558 f., 625, 684, 687, 699
Vol. 2: 260, 268, 290, 358, 447
Vol. 3: 136, 902 f.
Avow **Vol. 1:** 346
Await **Vol. 1:** 504, 544, 738
Vol. 2: 82, 338, 385, 387, 764, 772
Vol. 3: 220
Awake **Vol. 1:** 323, 342, 421, 445, 458
Vol. 2: 137
Vol. 3: 512
Awaken **Vol. 2:** 240
Vol. 3: **259–281**, 861
Awakening **Vol. 3:** **279–281**
Award **Vol. 1:** 648
Aware **Vol. 1:** 483, 513, 549, 569
Vol. 2: 327
Vol. 3: 513
Awareness **Vol. 2:** 80, 432
Vol. 3: 694
Awe **Vol. 1:** **621–624**, 653
Vol. 2: 90, 181, 224, 359
Vol. 3: 100, 561
Awe-inspiring **Vol. 2:** 622
Awkward **Vol. 3:** 1024 f.
Axe-head **Vol. 2:** 97, 628
Axios-acclamation **Vol. 3:** 673
Ayer, A. J. **Vol. 3:** 897, 1135 f.
Azazel **Vol. 1:** 451, 698
Vol. 3: 150, 469, 1005

Baal **Vol. 1:** 209, 497 f., 527, 543, 625
Vol. 2: 85, 190, 224, 234, 265, 297, 432, 582, 699, 724, 797, 848, 863
Vol. 3: 77, 248, 266 f., 325, 426, 436, 617, 1009, 1013, 1057, 1091, 1095
Baal-berith **Vol. 1:** 367
Baal-Melqart **Vol. 2:** 851
Baal-peor **Vol. 2:** 60, 291
Baal-Tars **Vol. 2:** 848
Baal-worship **Vol. 3:** 267
Baalam **Vol. 3:** 311, 468, 1054, 1120
Baalization **Vol. 1:** 499
Bab-ilani **Vol. 1:** 140
Baba Rabba **Vol. 3:** 452
Babbler **Vol. 3:** 525
Babbling **Vol. 3:** 77
Vol. 2: 269 f., 354
Vol. 3: 313

Babel **Vol. 1:** 72, 140, 451, 529
Vol. 2: 117, 649
Vol. 3: 578, 782, 787
Babila **Vol. 1:** 140
Baby **Vol. 1:** 239, 281–283
Vol. 2: 269 f., 354
Vol. 3: 313
Babylon **Vol. 1:** 67, 106, 111, 120, **140–142**, 340, 409 f., 469, 497, 501, 531
Vol. 2: 38, 96, 136, 185, 189, 212, 307, 321, 367, 381, 422 f., 432, 486 f., 495, 541, 582, 625, 644, 649, 653, 691, 696, 795, 844, 916
Vol. 3: 179, 193, 216, 218, 241, 394, 396, 468, 476, 526, 557, 590, 594, 622, 713, 731, 848, 856, 866, 913, 916, 922, 959, 1005, 1008, 1013, 1028, 1054, 1068, 1070, 1074, 1101 f., 1104, 1161
Babylonia **Vol. 1:** 76
Vol. 2: 375, 466
Vol. 3: 1088
Babylonian **Vol. 1:** 124, 126, 141, 219, 308, 379, 497, 508, 531, 616, 625, 717
Vol. 2: 96 f., 166, 174, 201, 239, 266, 285, 287, 305 f., 330, 555, 688, 690
Vol. 3: 51, 94 f., 115, 135, 192, 209, 274, 405, 564, 617, 715, 782, 851, 937, 986, 997
Babylonian creation myth **Vol. 1:** 523
Vol. 2: **200 f.**, 553
Babylonian law **Vol. 3:** 95, 259
Babylonian Talmud (→Talmud, Babylonian)
Babylonians **Vol. 1:** 52, 55
Vol. 2: 679, 681
Vol. 3: 788
Bacchantes **Vol. 1:** 528
Bacchic ceremonies **Vol. 3:** 679
Bacchides **Vol. 3:** 479
Bacchus **Vol. 1:** 64, 528
Vol. 3: 919
Back **Vol. 1:** 233
Backsliding **Vol. 1:** 481
Vol. 3: 692, 1095
Bad **Vol. 1:** 56, 106, 236, 349 f., 357, 419, 422, 456, 459, 469, 504, 557, **561–567**, 610, 657, 680, 721 f., 739
Vol. 2: 363, 395, 419, 476
Vol. 3: 124, 127, 1148
Badness **Vol. 3:** 936
Badge **Vol. 1:** 407
Vol. 3: 120
Bag **Vol. 1:** **142 f.**
Vol. 2: 726, 825
Vol. 3: 120
Baggage train **Vol. 2:** 845
Bailiff **Vol. 3:** 1157
Bait **Vol. 2:** 707 f.
Bake **Vol. 3:** 422
Baker **Vol. 1:** 560
Vol. 3: 446
Balaam **Vol. 1:** 208, 407, 416, 527, 578
Vol. 2: 431, 558, 638, 677 f., 745
Balak **Vol. 1:** 208, 416
Vol. 2: 558, 638
Vol. 3: 311
Balance **Vol. 1:** 118, 203
Vol. 2: 130, 256
Vol. 3: **1160–1165**
Balance arm **Vol. 3:** 399
Baldness **Vol. 2:** 465
Balsam **Vol. 1:** 120
Vol. 3: 758
Balustrade **Vol. 3:** 795
Ban **Vol. 1:** 171, 413–417
Vol. 2: 166, 296, 830
Vol. 3: 139, 471
Band **Vol. 1:** 527
Bandit **Vol. 3:** **377–379**
Banish **Vol. 1:** 476, 558
Vol. 2: 359, 420, 463
Banishment **Vol. 1:** 687
Vol. 2: 318
Vol. 3: 590, 913
Banking **Vol. 1:** 319
Banner **Vol. 1:** 652
Vol. 2: 350, 357
Banquet **Vol. 1:** 210, 274, 460, 689
Vol. 2: 270, 276, 354 f., 358, **520–538**, 711 f., 825
Vol. 3: 744, 951
Banus the Eremite **Vol. 1:** 152
Baptism **Vol. 1:** 77, 122 f., **143–154**, 179 f., 184–186, 224–226, 237, 266, 275, 285, 289–291, 300, 311, 315 f., 346, 351, 358, 360, 400 f., 438, 446, 466, 487, 570, 601–603, 653, 676 f., 701–704, 739
Vol. 2: 40, 63, 75, 130, 144, 150, 152, 176, 185, 193 f., 217 f., 223, 228, 250, 276, 309, 314, 354, 401, 411, 504, 566, 641, 655, 669, 672, 682, 715, 718, 721, 728, 819, 880 f., 885
Vol. 3: 31, 38, 52, 55, 61, 71, 82, 105, 107 f., 113, 120, 170, 204 f., 211, 215, 227, 277, 281, 317, 361, 373, 387, 499, 501, 510, 543, 580 f., 602, 611 f., 639, 641, 647 f., 658–660, 695, 697, 699, 701, 704, 807, 831, 861, 906, 934, 940, 984, 989–992, 1007, 1061, 1070, 1168, 1178, **1208–1210**
Baptism for the dead **Vol. 3:** **1208**
Baptism by fire **Vol. 3:** 447
Baptism, Infant **Vol. 1:** **148 f.**, **154–161**, 284
Vol. 2: 223, 250
Baptismal **Vol. 3:** 278, 772
Baptismal confession **Vol. 3:** 646 f.
Baptismal formula **Vol. 2:** 84
Vol. 3: 1062
Baptismal hymn **Vol. 2:** 270
Baptismal liturgy **Vol. 2:** 533, 785
Baptists (→John the Baptist) **Vol. 2:** 311
Baptize **Vol. 1:** 129, 144, 237, 359, 602, 634, 657
Vol. 2: 127, 231, 359, 519
Vol. 3: 320, 713
Baptizer in Spirit **Vol. 3:** 697
bar Hunnah, Rabbah **Vol. 2:** 730
Bar-Jesus **Vol. 1:** 424
Vol. 2: 557
Bar Kokhba **Vol. 1:** 62, 407
Vol. 2: 308, 313, 316, 337, 495, 558
Vol. 3: 452, 510, 735
Bar Mitzwah **Vol. 1:** 284
Barabbas **Vol. 1:** 409
Vol. 2: 136, 331

Vol. 3: 378
Baraitha **Vol. 1: 51**
Barak **Vol. 3:** 1001, 1057
Barbarian **Vol. 1:** 518
Vol. 2: 124, 127, 657
Barbarianism **Vol. 3:** 353
Barbarity **Vol. 1:** 686
Bare **Vol. 1:** 312 f.
Vol. 2: 854
Baris **Vol. 3:** 82
Barley **Vol. 1:** 118, 249, 648
Vol. 2: 349, 711, 783
Vol. 3: 422
Barn **Vol. 2:** 32, 831
Barnabas **Vol. 1:** 130, 136, 191, 274, 337, 405, 478, 552, 571, 642 f., 739
Vol. 2: 85, 152, 321, 368, 467, 469, 503, 557, 809, 827
Vol. 3: 87, 226, 228, 241, 683, 770, 1113
Barnabas, Epistle of **Vol. 1:** 51 f.
Vol. 2: 316
Barr, James **Vol. 3:** 333, 1123, 1126 f., 1140 f.
Barracks **Vol. 3: 959–967**
Barren **Vol. 1:** 187, 411, 723, 725
Vol. 2: 324
Vol. 3: 444, 475, 1062, 1072
Barricade **Vol. 3:** 951
Barrier **Vol. 1:** 385, 488, 541, 560, 583, 638, 685
Vol. 2: 315, 376, 611
Vol. 3: 106, 795, 949
Barter **Vol. 2:** 822
Barth, Karl **Vol. 3:** 148, 298, 325–328, 371, 663, 1056
Bartimaeus **Vol. 1:** 328
Vol. 3: 115, 507 f.
Baruch **Vol. 1:** 50, 124, 485
Vol. 3: 82, 478, 484
Base **Vol. 1:** 557, 596, 660, 662, 736
Vol. 3: 562–564, 809
Baseless **Vol. 1:** 555
Baseness **Vol. 3:** 125
Bashan **Vol. 3:** 248
Basic **Vol. 1:** 653 f., 662, 711, 717, 738
Vol. 2: 264, 288, 313, 407
Basil of Ancyra **Vol. 2:** 507
Basil the Great **Vol. 2:** 505, 507
Basilides **Vol. 2:** 401
Basilisk **Vol. 1:** 705
Basis **Vol. 1:** 539–541, 546, 601, 605, 620, 637, 640, 659–662, 676, 681, 697, 710, 712, 730
Vol. 2: 243, 313, 352, 360, 365, 448, 583
Vol. 3: 887
Basket **Vol. 2:** 586
Vol. 3: 545, 657
Bat **Vol. 3:** 678
Bath **Vol. 1:** 144, 149–153
Vol. 3: 447, 642
Bath Qol **Vol. 3:** 113 f.
Bathe **Vol. 2:** 334
Bathsheba **Vol. 1:** 349
Vol. 3: 605, 656, 1062, 1069
Battering-rams **Vol. 3:** 951
Battle **Vol. 1:** 103 f., 245, 264, 273, 294, 332, 432 f., 452, 476, 508, 516, 521, 563, 574, 594, 608, 624, 644–646, 654, 656, 741
Vol. 2: 31–33, 56, 69, 154, 244, 274, 334, 357, 362, 367, 385, 435, 602, 674, 698, 796 f., 893, 907
Vol. 3: 119, 200, 207, 874, **958–967**
Battle-cry **Vol. 3:** 51, 353
Battle-line **Vol. 2:** 451
Vol. 3: 959–967
Battle-mace **Vol. 2:** 98
Battle-trained **Vol. 3:** 761
Battlefield **Vol. 1:** 315
Battlement **Vol. 3:** 796
Bay **Vol. 1:** 240
Bay-leaves **Vol. 3:** 75
Bazaars of Annas **Vol. 3:** 381
Be **Vol. 2:** 68
Beacon **Vol. 3:** 1009
Beam **Vol. 1:** 116, 391, 666
Vol. 2: 290, **484–486**
Beans **Vol. 1:** 249
Bear (*animal*) **Vol. 1:** 118 f., 520
Vol. 2: 215, 423
Bear **Vol. 1: 176–188**, 280, 285, 391, 498, 541, 560, 616, 638 f., 645, 667 f., 683, 722, 727, 742 f.
Vol. 2: 343, 668, **765–767**
Vol. 3: 250, 1195
Bear burden **Vol. 3:** 448
Bear children **Vol. 3:** 1055
Bear cross **Vol. 1:** 394, 396, 402 f.
Vol. 2: 314
Bear false witness **Vol. 3: 1038–1050**
Bear fruit **Vol. 1:** 721
Vol. 2: 101, 154, 177, 230, 773, 827
Vol. 3: 173, 921
Bear name **Vol. 3: 324 f.**
Bear sin **Vol. 1:** 96, 234, 266, 390, 398, 525
Vol. 2: 80, 411 f., 854
Vol. 3: 195, 581 f., 1195
Bear testimony **Vol. 3:** 1068
Bear witness **Vol. 1:** 83, 89, 275, 323, 339, 350, 364, 535, 541, 556, 659, 704, 731
Vol. 2: 111, 130, 152, 183, 240, 245, 308, 332, 840, 867, 927
Vol. 3: 54–56, 163, 241, 317, 434, 651, 935, **1038–1050,** 1123
Bearable **Vol. 2: 765–767**
Beard **Vol. 2:** 418
Vol. 3: 950
Bearer **Vol. 1:** 617
Vol. 2: 308
Vol. 3: 314
Bearer of authority **Vol. 2: 606–611**
Bearing **Vol. 1:** 708 f.
Bearing light **Vol. 2: 490–496**
Beast **Vol. 1:** 111, 113, 119, 125 f., 142, 244, 405, 430, 434, 444, 469, 507 f., 520, 523, 545, 667, 728
Vol. 2: 157, 192, 205, 208, 288, 376, 381, 457, 502, 574, 625, 653, 684, 688, 693, 701, 724, 776, 795, 826, 890, 899
Vol. 3: 99, 249, 253, 256, 490, 500, 715, 856, 867, 967, 1047

Beast of prey **Vol. 3:** 601
Beat **Vol. 1: 161–164**, 235, 647
Vol. 2: 95, **705–707**
Vol. 3: 96 f., 99, 725, 903
Beat the breast **Vol. 2:** 416, **417–419**
Beating **Vol. 3: 857**
Beatitudes **Vol. 1:** 215, 217, 290, 744
Vol. 2: 267, 300, 353, 380, 386, 388, 422, 543, 782, 824 f., 843
Vol. 3: 696, 807, 978, 1009
Beautification **Vol. 1:** 119
Beautiful **Vol. 1:** 459
Vol. 2: 60, **98–107**, 201, 271, 329, **484–486**, 806, 815
Vol. 3: 845–849
Beauty **Vol. 1:** 119 f., 227, 229, 277, 380, 382, 411, 521 f., 650, 673, 704
Vol. 2: 60, 100, 103, 115 f., 250, 326, 539
Vol. 3: 128, 398, 730, 734, 1067
Beckon **Vol. 3:** 556
Become **Vol. 1: 176–188**, 285, 481, 548, 667
Become loose **Vol. 3: 177–189**
Become reconciled **Vol. 3: 166–174**
Become weak **Vol. 3: 177–189**
Become weary **Vol. 3: 177–189**
Becoming **Vol. 2:** 256
Bed **Vol. 1:** 408, 560
Vol. 2: 232, **586 f.**
Vol. 3: 399, 1058
Bedouin **Vol. 1:** 81
Beelzeboul **Vol. 3: 468–476**
Beelzebub, Beelzebul **Vol. 1:** 168, 637
Vol. 2: 510, 560, 728
Vol. 3: 83, 344, **468–473**, 507, 1109
Beer-sheba **Vol. 1:** 76
Vol. 3: 426
Befall **Vol. 1:** 325, 608 f., 689
Before **Vol. 1:** 668, 696
Vol. 3: 74
Beforehand **Vol. 1:** 664, 666, 693, 736
Beg **Vol. 1:** 43
Vol. 2: 737, 821 f., **855–886**
Beget **Vol. 1: 176–188**, 285–287, 378, 445, 617, 674
Vol. 2: 75 f., 392, 575, 738
Vol. 3: 521, 647, 681, 865, 1070
Beggar **Vol. 1:** 259, 686
Vol. 2: 386, 820–822
Vol. 3: 589
Beggar-king **Vol. 2:** 258
Beggarly **Vol. 2:** 453
Begin **Vol. 1:** 581, 591, 666, 680
Vol. 3: 723, 818, 832
Begin to fade **Vol. 2: 587–589**
Beginner **Vol. 2:** 61, 64
Beginning **Vol. 1:** 65, 95, **164–169**, 174, 315, 376 f., 383, 482, 521 f., 526, 536, 538, 545, 589, 594, 619, 625, 628, 665 f., 669, 678
Vol. 2: 52, 56, 59, 61, 64 f., 78, 81, 112 f., 128, 138, 156 f., 162, 217, 228, 358, 391, 452, 608 f., 615, 669, 716, 777, 786
Vol. 3: 215, 415, 469, 827, 1028
Beginning and end **Vol. 2:** 64, 289
Begotten **Vol. 1:** 616
Beguiling speech **Vol. 1:** 592
Vol. 2: 459
Behave **Vol. 3: 933–935**
Behave childishly **Vol. 3:** 340
Behaviour **Vol. 1:** 229, 334, 340, 354, 412, 421, 450, 480, 491, 496 f., 505, 526–530, 535, 541, 553, 562 f., 567–569, 591, 593, 596 f., 607, 644, 701, 714, 720
Vol. 2: 65, 101 f., 118, 143, 178, 235, 259, 272, 285, 299, 312, 342, 361, 379, 400, 457, 469, 493, 597, 619, 624, 707, 709
Vol. 3: 54, 76, 79, 101, 104, 110, 136, 138, 149, 343, 347, 349, 353, 355, 373, 527, 562, 586, 691, 762, 771, 926 f., 929, **933–935**, 1020 f., 1023, 1028, 1041, 1084, 1156
Behaviourist schools **Vol. 2:** 568
Behead **Vol. 1:** 393
Behemoth **Vol. 3:** 1006
Behind **Vol. 1:** 481, 492 f.
Vol. 2: 55
Vol. 3: 952–956
Behold **Vol. 2:** 213
Vol. 3: 511–518
Being **Vol. 1:** 64, 87, 491, 547, 550, 571, 576, 587, 643, 703–712, 740
Vol. 2: 67 f., 70, 77–80, 83, 85, 289, 396, 400, 402, 439, 566, 651, 656, 659, 719
Vol. 3: 42, 167, 646 f., 827, 840, 885, 1139
Beit Lahm **Vol. 1:** 170
Bel and the Dragon **Vol. 1:** 50
Vol. 2: 285
Vol. 3: 557
Belial, Beliar **Vol. 1:** 98, 124 f., 288, 296, 423, 452, 554, 563, 587
Vol. 2: 71 f., 298, 304, 314, 472, 542, 779
Vol. 3: 468–473, 801, 939
Belief **Vol. 1:** 69, 76 f., 81, 101 f., 179, 216, 253, 286, 308, 311, 322, 324, 330, 347, 354, 372, 395, 415, 417, 432 f., 437, 439, 446, 451, 476, 483, 505, 524–526, 539, 545, 567, 583, **586–606**, 607, 633, 637, 660, 672, 678, 680, 721, 730
Vol. 2: 75, 80, 82, 124 f., 195, 287, 309, 313 f., 431, 491, 535, 654, 718 f., 929
Vol. 3: 104, 462, 582, 1052
Believe **Vol. 2:** 78 f., 119, 127, 135, 177, 243, 267, 269, 301, 310, 315, 340, 366, 379, 404 f., 429, 453, 494, 642, 709, 715, 824, 868, 874, 929
Vol. 3: 121, 130, 168, 185, 233, 251, 322, 391 f., 394, 685, 821 f., 1046, 1060, **1211–1214**
Believer **Vol. 1:** 92, 96, 112, 123, 146–148, 159, 167, 179, 181, 183, 185, 203, 214, 224 f., 227, 232, 252, 256, 275, 305, 310, 315, 325, 327, 338, 346, 351, 375, 377, 385, 397, 400 f., 412, 424, 440, 464, 469, 473 f., 478, 491 f., 497, 504 f., 507, 526, 534, 551, 559, 571, 578, 595 f., 598, 600–603, 605, 607, 611, 625, 637 f., 644, 651, 659 f., 666, 676, 679, 683, 690 f., 693, 709, 718 f., 723, 730, 733, 740
Vol. 2: 32, 40, 47 f., 71, 74–79, 83, 94, 101 f., 119, 129 f., 136, 157 f., 177 f., 186, 203 f

211, 230 f., 242., f., 251, 253, 266, 271, 283, 295, 300–302, 304, 313, 329, 343, 350, 353 f., 359, 361, 370, 380, 387, 391, 394, 420, 424, 445, 460, 463, 542, 545 f., 587, 604 f., 609–611, 619 f., 653, 664, 671 f., 675, 709, 712, 715, 722, 734, 736, 775, 781, 787, 809, 819, 828, 834, 855, 861, 882, 895, 901, 922–927
Vol. 3: 32, 42, 47, 73, 89, 109, 173, 186, 189, 198, 200, 204, 214, 216, 220, 225, 229, 250, 257 f., 278 f., 292 f., 303, 305, 364–366, 371 f., 383, 398, 402 f., 417, 476, 499 f., 521, 523 f., 535, 549, 581, 588, 604, 648, 701 f., 705, 710, 718, 750, 795, 801 f., 813, 814, 815, 838, 864, 869, 893, 954, 963, 1020 f., 1025, 1052, 1114, 1122, 1149 f., 1152, 1155, 1165
Believing **Vol. 3:** 471
Bellicose **Vol. 1:** 657
Vol. 2: 776
Belly **Vol. 1:** 73, **169**, 212, 671
Vol. 2: 73, 266, 351, 599, 619
Belong **Vol. 1:** 308, 463, 525, 684, 686–688, 715, 718
Vol. 2: 42, 122, **247–251**, 270, 312, 317, 328, 359, 374, 438, 456, 845–847
Vol. 3: 592
Belong to Christ **Vol. 3:** 417
Belongings **Vol. 1:** 381, 414
Beloved **Vol. 1:** 256 f., 287, 568
Vol. 2: 79, 307, 326, 517, **538–547**, 819
Vol. 3: 204, 600, 641, 872
Below **Vol. 2:** 184, **187 f.**, 259
Belshazzar **Vol. 3:** 788, 846, 953, 1160
Belt **Vol. 3:** **120 f.**, 966
ben Dosa, R. Hanina **Vol. 2:** 168
ben Hyrcanus, Eliezer **Vol. 1:** 597
Vol. 2: 696
ben Jose, Rabbi Eliezer **Vol. 1:** 581
ben Kosebah, Simeon **Vol. 2:** 337, 339
ben Yochai, Rabbi Simeon **Vol. 2:** 791
ben Zakkai, R. Johanan **Vol. 1:** 216, 588
Vol. 2: 313, 689
Vol. 3: 682
Bend **Vol. 2:** 260, 370, 414, 856, 876
Benedictine School **Vol. 3:** 232
Benediction **Vol. 1:** 212, 219, 416
Vol. 2: 521 f., 529, 864
Vol. 3: 819
Benedictus **Vol. 3:** 84, 198, 202, 212, 219, 241, 612, 674
Benefaction **Vol. 2:** 666
Benefactor **Vol. 1:** 258, 519
Vol. 2: 108, 372
Vol. 3: 217, 818, **1147–1152**
Beneficence **Vol. 2:** 121
Beneficial **Vol. 2:** 103, 434
Vol. 3: 982, 988
Benefit **Vol. 1:** 115, 384, 467, 475, 479, 536, 581, 624, 694, 709, 722
Vol. 2: 30, 115, 141, 352, 382
Vol. 3: 707, 750 f., 818, **1147–1152**
Benevolence **Vol. 2:** 34, 116 f.
Vol. 3: 689
Benevolent **Vol. 1:** 328, 389
Vol. 2: 100, 256, 550, 552
Vol. 3: 148, 747
Bengel, J. A. **Vol. 3:** 148
Benjamin **Vol. 1:** 52, 61, 544
Vol. 2: 146, 317–319
Vol. 3: 194, 396, 872 f., 953, 1179
Benjaminite **Vol. 2:** 374
Bereave **Vol. 3:** 379
Bereaved **Vol. 1:** 520
Vol. 2: 737
Bereavement **Vol. 1:** 569
Vol. 2: 737 f.
Berechiah **Vol. 3:** 82, 430
Berkeley, Bishop George **Vol. 3:** 56, 899
Bernice **Vol. 1:** 453,
Vol. 2: 160
Beroea **Vol. 1:** 188
Vol. 3: 1063, 1065
Beryl **Vol. 3:** 396
Beseech **Vol. 2:** 860 f.
Besiege **Vol. 1:** 554
Best **Vol. 1:** 666
Vol. 2: 121
Best man **Vol. 2:** 585
Best seat **Vol. 3:** **587–589**
Bestow **Vol. 1:** 208 f., 211, 237, 271, 406, 542, 625, 668, 714, 722, 728, 732, 739
Vol. 2: 122, 266, 277, 342
Vol. 3: 1080
Bestowal **Vol. 2:** 40
Beth-Dagan **Vol. 3:** 453
Bet Se'an **Vol. 3:** 453
Beth-peor **Vol. 3:** 345
Bethany **Vol. 1:** 630
Vol. 2: 104, 418, 528, 549, 801
Vol. 3: 600, 1060 f.
Bethel **Vol. 1:** 52, 140, 511, 531
Vol. 2: 67, 194, 225, 306, 317–319, 711
Vol. 3: 33, 78, 426, 782, 786
Bethesda **Vol. 1:** 637
Vol. 3: 709
Bethlehem **Vol. 1:** **169–171**, 330, 737
Vol. 2: 320, 416, 579
Vol. 3: 158, 191, 567, 652 f., 664, 735, 1008, 1071
Bethsaida **Vol. 1:** 282
Bethshemesh **Vol. 3:** 426
Bethuel **Vol. 3:** 879
Bethzatha **Vol. 3:** 186
Betray **Vol. 1:** 83, 260, 268, 327, 346, 356, 421, 473, 520, 555
Vol. 2: 367 f., 543
Vol. 3: 316, 378, 470, 532, 1156
Betrayal **Vol. 1:** 630
Vol. 2: 321, 339, 368, 526 f., 531, 808
Vol. 3: 804, 912, 1157
Betrothal **Vol. 1:** 128, 506
Vol. 2: 588
Betrothed **Vol. 2:** 563, 798
Vol. 3: 95, 1058
Better **Vol. 1:** 371, 374, 482, 489, 666, 731
Vol. 2: 364, 447 f., 676, 714
Vol. 3: 73, 216

Bewail **Vol. 2:** 416
Beware **Vol. 2:** 135, 462
Bewitch **Vol. 1:** 507
Vol. 2: 552–562
Beyond **Vol. 1:** 604, 687, 721
Vol. 2: 125, 195, 206, 208, 240, 587
Vol. 3: 252
Bezalel **Vol. 2:** 290
Vol. 3: 788
Bias **Vol. 1:** 585, 587
Bible **Vol. 1:** 243
Vol. 2: 309
Vol. 3: 485
Biblical criticism (→Criticism, Biblical)
Biblical exegesis **Vol. 3:** 1140
iblical scholar **Vol. 3: 477–482**
Bigamy **Vol. 1:** 383
Bile **Vol. 2:** 27
Bilhah **Vol. 2:** 317
Vol. 3: 1057
Bilingual **Vol. 2:** 308
Bill **Vol. 3:** 489, 492
Bill of divorce **Vol. 1:** 606
Vol. 2: 307
Vol. 3: 484
Binary **Vol. 3:** 1142
Bind **Vol. 1: 171 f.**, 259, 394, 405, 415, 452, 472, 484, 488, 491, 508, 594, 600, 638, 650 f., 669, 703
Vol. 2: 86, 167, 194, 244, 335, 382, 732, 795, 890, 897
Vol. 3: 97, 120, 388, 394, 472, 537, **591 f.**, 1160–1165
Binding **Vol. 1:** 98 f., 241, 331, 338, 341, 346, 397, 472, 595, 619
Vol. 2: 43, 437–439, 701 f., 811, 813
Vol. 3: 50, 57, 72, 105, 184, 384, 410, 429, 471, 479, 717, 740, 792, 883, 932, 1044, 1052, 1122
Binding and loosing **Vol. 1:** 171, 466
Vol. 2: 731–733
Vol. 3: 179, 188
Biographical **Vol. 3:** 58
Biography **Vol. 2:** 113
Vol. 3: 720
Biological **Vol. 1:** 617
Bird **Vol. 1:** 119, **172–176**, 262, 277, 286, 557, 610, 671 f., 674
Vol. 2: 32 f., 136, 275, 314, 386, 570, 586, 637, 661 f., 729, 746
Vol. 3: 113, 260, 422, 555, 672, 790 f., 797, 867, 1164
Birth **Vol. 1:** 147, 151, 159 f., 172, **176–188**, 191, 207, 256, 280, 286, 295, 303, 309, 330, 343, 361, 458, 508, 521, 560, 617, 619, 643, 653, 668, 697, 708, 710, 721, 737
Vol. 2: 35, 57, 75 f., 86, 126, 188, 270, 305, 309, 318 f., 332, 343, 358, 392, 394, 430, 483, 498, 505, 566 f., 570, 599, 627 f., 660 f., 666, 673, 694, 715, 836
Vol. 3: 103, 215, 219 f., 284, 314, 317, 405, 444, 652, **660–664**, 697, 703 f., 735, 790, 835, 846, 848, **857 f.**, 937, 989, 1058, 1068, 1071 f., 1178
Birth of Jesus **Vol. 1:** 171, 187, 256
Vol. 2: 36, 86 f., 819
Birth narratives **Vol. 1:** 104, 182, 187, 256, 283, 512, 737
Vol. 2: 358, 624
Vol. 3: 324, 657, 674, 735, 790, 931
Birth–pangs **Vol. 1:** 124, 178, 180
Vol. 2: 808, 904
Vol. 3: 1068
Birthday **Vol. 1:** 627
Vol. 2: 786, 887
Vol. 3: 742
Birthright **Vol. 2:** 316, 318, 782
Vol. 3: 869
Bishop **Vol. 1:** 110, 136, **188–201**, 247, 300, 307, 333, 339, 493, 514 f., 646, 666, 690
Vol. 2: 152, 255, 258, 406, 563, 777
Vol. 3: 39, 42, 50, 88, 134, 170, 365, 548, 553, 568, 685, 750, 765, 922, 924, 1065
Bit **Vol. 1:** 118
Bit-lahmi **Vol. 1:** 170
Bite **Vol. 2:** 167, 421
Vol. 3: 748
Bithynia **Vol. 2:** 34
Bitter **Vol. 1: 201–203**
Vol. 2: 27–29, 270, 273, 293, 890
Vol. 3: 444, 737
Bitter herbs **Vol. 1:** 633
Vol. 2: 522, 529
Bitterness **Vol. 1:** 96, 106, 724, 743
Vol. 2: 27, 271
Black **Vol. 1:** 115, **203–206**, 319, 656 f.
Vol. 2: 470, 496
Vol. 3: 40, 143, 347, 349, 360, 362, 396
Black, Max **Vol. 3:** 1127
Blacksmith **Vol. 2:** 98
Blade **Vol. 2:** 97 f.
Blame **Vol. 1:** 247
Vol. 2: 137–145
Blameless **Vol. 2:** 60, 133, 137, 139 f., 143 f., 255, 282, 593, **705–707**
Vol. 3: 101, 171, 228, 361, 435, 529, 534, **923–928**, 933
Blandishments **Vol. 3:** 1143
Blaspheme **Vol. 3: 340–347**
Blasphemer **Vol. 2:** 235
Vol. 3: 27, 1025
Blasphemous **Vol. 3: 341–345**
Blasphemy **Vol. 1:** 79, 126, 270, 294, 317, 327, 394, 396, 466, 637, 700
Vol. 2: 143, 175, 231, 248, 282, 307, 651, 653
Vol. 3: 94, 187, 364, 471 f., 481, 628, 1054
Blazing **Vol. 1:** 653
Blemish **Vol. 1:** 116, 219, 371, 468, 634
Vol. 2: 144, 354, 410 f., 415, 569
Vol. 3: 200, 421 f., 656, **923–928**
Bless **Vol. 1: 206–218**, 416 f.
Vol. 2: 71, 92, 122, 561, 649 f., 874
Vol. 3: 69, 207, 816, 861, 1107
Blessed **Vol. 1:** 100, **206–218**, 288, 321, 412, 556, 649, 690, 729
Vol. 2: 77 f., 80–82, 110, 245, 258, 266, 289, 380, 433, 449, 654, 763, 774, 840, 865 f.
Vol. 3: 41, 98, 257, 313, 360, 580, 645, 1062

Blessedness **Vol. 3:** 839, 969
Blessing **Vol. 1:** 78, 81, 97 f., 122, 149, 184, 191, **206–218**, 237, 240, 247, 250, 276, 280, 284, 286, 288, 300, 308, 332, 367, 369, 380, 408, 413, 416, 431, 463, 498, 531, 585, 603, 617, 633, 683, 713, 731–733, 735
Vol. 2: 116 f., 128, 147 f., 151, 176 f., 196, 237, 242, 275, 300, 317–319, 326, 328, 357, 400, 478 f., 485, 505, 521, 529, 543, 640, 650, 652, 681, 711 f., 776–779, 792, 806, 818, 825 f., 844, 874, 885, 900, 920
Vol. 3: 33, 45, 70, 72, 84, 98, 105, 139 f., 233, 242, 246, 256, 347, 406, 422, 424 f., 449, 523, 697, 731, 733 f., 737, 740, 743, 750, 799, 819, 829, 832, 847, 853 f., 865, 868, 871, 919, 928, 938, 1009, 1012, 1078, 1087, 1125
Blessing of Moses **Vol. 2:** 639
Vol. 3: 872
Blighted **Vol. 1:** 725
Blind **Vol. 1:** **218–220**, 319, 341, 355, 420 f., 424, 429, 473, 513, 525, 572, 610
Vol. 2: 153, 167, 170 f., 214, 216 f., 351, 358, 366, 414, 434, 458, 469 f., 560, 599, 630, 633, 707, 709, 728, 754
Vol. 3: 128, 132, 147, 184, 319, 321, 328, 409, 474, 481, 505, 517, 519, 521, 533, 543, 731 f., 749, 792, 916, 998, 1000, 1020
Blind guide **Vol. 3:** 942
Bliss **Vol. 1:** 216, 240, 563
Vol. 2: 60
Blood **Vol. 1:** 93 f., 96 f., 114–116, 144, 151 f., 174, 186, **220–226**, 230, 237, 254 f., 258, 261, 268, 289, 304, 317, 324, 328, 351, 369, 371, 375, 395, 398, 402, 410, 448, 470, 513 f., 516, 541, 548, 555, 633 f., 638, 643 f., 647, 651, 655, 662, 671, 673, 675–677, 679, 683, 685, 694, 699 f., 702 f., 713, 730
Vol. 2: 122, 142 f., 150, 159, 164, 183, 200, 230, 269, 277, 302, 329, 339, 410–414, 457, 477, 494, 521–536, 542, 552, 560, 568, 571, 606, 625 f., 637, 671, 675, 682, 690, 718, 782, 787, 800, 846, 853–855, 929
Vol. 3: 28, 41, 93, 103, 107, 150 f., 154, 157–160, 163 f., 166, 171 f., 174, 179–181, 198–201, 227, 243–245, 301, 314, 323, 337, 364, 366, 372, 403, 418, 422–425, 428, 432–436, 448, 471, 532, 673, 676, 678, 680 f., 686, 723, 733 f., 758, 788, 794, 812, 815, 861, 919, 941, 965, 984, 989, 1014, 1047, 1059, 1100, 1103
Blood of the covenant **Vol. 2:** 525, 532 f.
Blood-group **Vol. 3:** 871
Blood-guilt **Vol. 2:** 138
Vol. 3: 100, 159
Blood-money **Vol. 1:** 222, 689
Vol. 2: 44
Bloodshed **Vol. 1:** 380, 452, 657, 724
Vol. 3: 579
Bloodthirstiness **Vol. 1:** 205
Blot out **Vol. 1:** 244, 370, 374, 471
Vol. 3: 484
Blow **Vol. 1:** 161 f., 241, 263, 317
Vol. 3: **689–708**, 857, **1000–1004**
Blunt **Vol. 1:** 428
Vol. 2: 295
Boanerges **Vol. 2:** 652
Vol. 3: 1002
Boar **Vol. 3:** 950
Boast **Vol. 1:** 78, 112, **227–229**, 320, 399, 499, 547, 566, 601, 637, 675, 680, 684, 727
Vol. 2: 122, 263, 352, 354, 434 f., 676, 762, 826, 844, 862, 874
Vol. 3: 32, 142, 581, 814, 995, 1031
Boastful **Vol. 1:** 546, 712
Vol. 2: 44, 430
Vol. 3: **28–32**
Boat **Vol. 1:** 559
Vol. 2: 303
Vol. 3: 1003
Boaz **Vol. 2:** 116, 577
Vol. 3: 191, 656, 1041, 1057
Bochim **Vol. 3:** 425
Bodilessness **Vol. 1:** 314 f., 435
Vol. 2: 926
Vol. 3: 179, 231, 681
Bodily **Vol. 1:** 422, 704, 709, 740
Vol. 2: 79, 181 f., 196, 288, 343, 447
Bodily training **Vol. 2:** 429
Body **Vol. 1:** 66, 87, 93, 96, 119 f., 152 f., 169, 182, 209, 225, **229–242**, 250, 266, 275, 277 f., 300, 302, 307, 310, 312–315, 351, 354, 365, 385, 390 f., 393, 399, 401 f., 423, 432, 435 f., 438, 440, 442–445, 459, 463, 466, 470, 473, 477, 480, 487, 495, 497 f., 500 f., 504, 517, 521, 525, 527, 532, 535, 539, 562, 610, 617, 623, 629, 636, 638 f., 643 f., 647 f., 652 f., 671–676, 679, 682, 687, 695, 705, 707, 709, 711, 715, 721 f., 727 f., 732 f., 739, 741
Vol. 2: 40, 50 f., 83, 102, 127, 129, 143 f., 148, 158 f., 162, 171, 179 f., 184, 188, 195, 207 f., 230, 241–243, 245, 249, 253, 256, 263, 265 f., 270, 273, 277, 295, 303 f., 334, 349 f., 360, 369, 384, 391, 394, 402, 414 f., 434, 457, 465, 476–478, 482, 487, 499, 506, 516 f., 521–536, 565–568, 571 f., 606, 619, 642, 659, 709 f., 715, 718, 722 f., 762, 787, 789, 816, 818, 837, 883–885, 919, 924
Vol. 3: 48, 120, 124, 172, 185 f., 189, 219 f., 225, 242–245, 256, 272 f., 275–278, 281, 283, 290, 292 f., 296, 298, 303, 322, 337, 344 f., 366, 378, 403, 417, 425, 430, 432 f., 443, 504, 522, 524, 534–536, 542, 544, 546–548, 554, 556, 563, 572, 577, 602, 677–680, 684 f., 687, 689, 692, 694, 701 f., 706, 712, 717, 720, 724, 750, 785, 791 f., 811, 814 f., 864, 914 f., 1037, 1060, 1064 f., 1067, 1119, 1152, 1158, 1205, 1209
Body of Christ **Vol. 1:** 10, 55, 92, 147 f., 153, 237 f., 301, 327, 398, 400, 467, 501, 541, 662, 723, 740 f.
Vol. 2: 42, 83, 162 f., 169, 273, 277, 350, 534, 536, 566, 646, 715, 722, 885
Vol. 3: 685, 1141
Body of death **Vol. 1:** 236, 436
Vol. 3: 204, 228
Body of Moses **Vol. 1:** 104
Body of sin **Vol. 1:** 73, 236

Body of troops **Vol. 3: 958–967**
Boethus **Vol. 3:** 35
Boethusian **Vol. 3:** 441
Boiling **Vol. 1:** 317
Boils **Vol. 2:** 637
Boldness **Vol. 1:** 328 f., **364 f.**, 435, 490, 592, 710, 715, 739, 743
Vol. 2: 118, 263, 625, **734–737**
Vol. 3: 699
Boman, T. **Vol. 3:** 59, 1126, 1141
Bond **Vol. 1:** 202, 259, 402, 471, 507, 594, 640, 663, 698, 715, 719, 723
Vol. 2: 62, 121
Vol. 3: 591 f.
Bond of the tongue **Vol. 3:** 180
Bondage **Vol. 1:** 275, 282, 284, 335, 385, 412, 470, 531, 552, 623, 707, 715 f., 718, 742
Vol. 2: 28, 74, 101, 121, 158, 182, 884
Vol. 3: 174, 177, 192, 196, 202, 609, 793, 944, 1014, 1070, 1162 f.
Bonds **Vol. 2:** 30
Vol. 3: 179
Bondwoman **Vol. 1:** 531
Bone **Vol. 1:** 205, 240, 337, 629, 652, 671 f., 677
Vol. 2: 153
Vol. 3: 269, 557
Bonino, José Miquez **Vol. 3:** 971 f.
Book **Vol. 1:** 53, **242–249**, 292
Vol. 2: 113 f., 189, 192, 358, 781
Vol. 3: 236, 404, 484, 490, 495, 499, 1094, 1099
Book of the covenant **Vol. 1:** 308, 360
Vol. 2: 441, 639, **822**, 841
Vol. 3: 418, 484, 1103
Book of the law **Vol. 1:** 243
Vol. 2: 369, 440
Vol. 3: 485
Book of life **Vol. 1:** 448, 471
Vol. 2: 312, 795, 866
Vol. 3: 99, 136, 209, 490, 528
Book of Noah **Vol. 3:** 265
Booth **Vol. 3:** 554, **811–815**
Booth of David **Vol. 3:** 650 f.
Booty **Vol. 2:** 32, 41, 296, 497, 844
Vol. 3: 137, 236, 377, 590, **601–605**, 756, 960
Border **Vol. 2:** 60, 303
Born **Vol. 1:** 181, 295, 308, 412, 473, 526, 549, 608, 616, 667, 678, 709, 738
Vol. 2: 228, 288, 353
Vol. 3: 323, 362, 843
Born again **Vol. 1:** 154, 176, 185, 290, 386, 469, 706
Vol. 2: 270, 661, 715
Vol. 3: 215, 225
Born of God **Vol. 3:** 582
Bornhäuser, K. **Vol. 3: 292**
Bornkamm, G. **Vol. 3: 331 f.**
Borrow **Vol. 2:** 254
Bosom **Vol. 1:** 240, 575
Vol. 3: 1185 f.
Bottle **Vol. 1:** 114, 613
Bottomless **Vol. 2:** 197, 205
Bought **Vol. 1:** 308
Boulder **Vol. 3:** 393
Bound **Vol. 1:** 715—718
Vol. 2: 367
Vol. 3: 280
Boundary **Vol. 1:** 472 f., 517, 539
Vol. 2: 60, 131, 312
Vol. 3: 444
Boundary-marks **Vol. 3:** 949
Boundary-stone **Vol. 3:** 391
Boundless **Vol. 1:** 600
Bounds **Vol. 1:** 729
Bounty **Vol. 2:** 735
Bow **Vol. 1:** 118, 587
Vol. 2: 196, 232, 260, 354, 859, 876, 925
Vol. 3: 379, 1079
Bowels **Vol. 1:** 169
Vol. 2: 567, 600, 854
Bowl **Vol. 1:** 106, 449, 653
Vol. 2: 96, 691, 855
Vol. 3: 545, 1004
Box **Vol. 1: 142 f.**
Vol. 2: 586, 726
Boxer **Vol. 1:** 645
Boy **Vol. 1: 280–291**, 428
Vol. 2: 411, 428
Vol. 3: 553, 611, 775
Brackish **Vol. 1:** 201
Vol. 3: 988
Bradley, F. H. **Vol. 3:** 896, 901, 1136
Brag **Vol. 3:** 29
Braggart **Vol. 2:** 435
Vol. 3: 32
Bragging **Vol. 1:** 228
Vol. 2: 862
Brain **Vol. 1:** 230, 679
Vol. 2: 182, 568
Branch **Vol. 1:** 515, 644, 648, 722
Vol. 2: 32, 712 f.
Vol. 3: 226, 416, 567, 649, 811, 813, **865–870**, 921
Branch of David **Vol. 2:** 337, 374
Brand **Vol. 1:** 114,
Vol. 2: 291, **572–575**
Vol. 3: 594
Branding iron **Vol. 2:** 574
Brandish **Vol. 3:** 556
Brandon, S. G. F. **Vol. 3:** 58, 976–979
Brass **Vol. 2:** 96 f.
Brass-founder **Vol. 2:** 97
Brave **Vol. 1:** 364
Bray **Vol. 1:** 409
Brazen **Vol. 2:** 188
Breach **Vol. 1:** 308, 630, 641, 687, 717
Vol. 2: 288
Bread **Vol. 1:** 143, 170, 205, 237, **249–253**, 341, 384, 586, 597, 612 f., 629–631, 633, 642, 670, 729
Vol. 2: 80, 143, 157, 186, 194, 218, 225, 267–269, 271, 273, 277, 279 f., 354, 417, 463, 479, 521–536, 590 f., 628, 632 f., 637, 642, 676, 868, 871 f., 928 f.
Vol. 3: 47, 144, 239, 243–245, 383, 435, 444, 446, 519, 631, 703, 727, 748, 800, 804 f., 819, 893

Bread of affliction **Vol. 2:** 522
Bread of the face **Vol. 3:** 814
Bread of the first fruits **Vol. 3:** 424
Bread of the Presence **Vol. 1:** 586
Vol. 3: 423 f., 436
Bread of setting in order **Vol. 3:** 814
Bread-offering **Vol. 3:** 423
Breadth **Vol. 1:** 253, 254
Break **Vol. 1:** 408, 686
Vol. 2: 231, 296
Vol. 3: 166, 377, 583
Break bread **Vol. 2:** 271, 354, **520–538**, 768
Vol. 3: 908
Break down **Vol. 1:** 541, 676
Vol. 2: 252
Break faith **Vol. 1:** 74
Break in **Vol. 1:** 729
Break the law **Vol. 2: 438–451**
Break loose **Vol. 1:** 639
Break off relations **Vol. 3:** 379
Break one's oath **Vol. 3: 737–743**
Break through **Vol. 1:** 488
Vol. 3: 711
Break up **Vol. 2:** 33
Breakdown **Vol. 2:** 569
Breaking of bread **Vol. 2:** 32
Breast **Vol. 1:** 240, 515
Vol. 2: 416–419
Vol. 3: 1062
Breastplate, breastpiece **Vol. 1:** 205, 657
Vol. 2: 226, **296**, 674, 925
Vol. 3: 236, 396 f., 959
Breastplate of faith **Vol. 3:** 966
Breastplate of judgment **Vol. 3:** 966
Breath **Vol. 1:** 66, 84, 105, 382, 434, 550 f., 729
Vol. 2: 77, 290, 457, 476, 478
Vol. 3: 269, 555, 676, 678 f., **689–708**, 916, 1100
Breathe **Vol. 1:** 317
Vol. 2: 231, 289, 787
Breathe out **Vol. 3: 689–708**
Breathing **Vol. 3:** 689
Breed **Vol. 2:** 742
Brethren **Vol. 1:** 287, 329, 424, 439, 473, 570, 666, 669, 675, 689, 707
Vol. 2: 76, 230, 844
Vol. 3: 98
Brevity **Vol. 1:** 743
Bribe **Vol. 2:** 41
Vol. 3: 139, 149, 192, 290, 425, 747, 880
Bribery **Vol. 1:** 137, 219, 268, 468
Vol. 2: 837
Vol. 3: 35
Brick **Vol. 3:** 1099
Brick-kiln **Vol. 2:** 628
Bride **Vol. 1:** 120, 145, 153, 475, 507
Vol. 2: 307, 329, 349, 412, 541, **575–590**, 798
Vol. 3: 572, 594, 782, 813, 1057, 1068, 1071 f., 1141
Bride chamber **Vol. 2: 584 f.**
Bride of Christ **Vol. 1:** 10, 153, 474
Bridegroom **Vol. 1:** 325, 475, 507, 612
Vol. 2: 358 f., 382 f., 562, **575–590**
Vol. 3: 118, 844, 921
Bridge **Vol. 1:** 640
Vol. 2: 185
Vol. 3: 756
Bridle **Vol. 1:** 627, 735
Brier **Vol. 1:** 726
Vol. 3: 950
Bright **Vol. 1:** 204
Vol. 2: 239, **484–486, 490–496**
Vol. 3: 103
Brightness **Vol. 2:** 61, 290, 484, **490–496**
Brilliance **Vol. 2: 484–486, 490–496**
Brimstone **Vol. 1:** 657
Vol. 3: 992
Bring **Vol. 1:** 471, 666, 731, 741
Vol. 2: 41, 314, 326, 337
Bring about **Vol. 1:** 552
Vol. 2: 129
Vol. 3: 1147–1152
Bring to account **Vol. 2:** 140
Bring back **Vol. 3:** 146
Bring to birth **Vol. 3:** 722
Bring charges **Vol. 3: 468–473**
Bring forth **Vol. 1:** 186 f., 386, 566, 721 f., 739
Vol. 2: 575
Bring in **Vol. 1:** 471
Vol. 2: 443
Bring into light **Vol. 3:** 312
Bring to light **Vol. 1:** 106, 469
Vol. 2: 140, 216, 218, 365, 484, **490–496**
Vol. 3: 323, 840, 892
Bring low **Vol. 2:** 201, 865
Bring to mind **Vol. 1:** 123
Bring to pass **Vol. 1:** 471
Vol. 2: 240
Bring to perfection **Vol. 3:** 1148
Bring to rest **Vol. 3: 254–258**
Bring safely through **Vol. 3: 205–216**
Bring to safety **Vol. 3:** 201
Bring salvation **Vol. 3: 216–221**
Bring together **Vol. 1:** 69, 292, 735
Vol. 2: 31, 716
Vol. 3: 443
Bring to trial **Vol. 2:** 365
Bring up **Vol. 1:** 569
Vol. 2: 95, 201, 738
Vol. 3: 241, **775–780**, 1075
Bringing **Vol. 3:** 417
British in Palestine **Vol. 2:** 308
Brittle **Vol. 2:** 293
Broad **Vol. 1: 253 f.**
Broken **Vol. 1:** 629, 641
Vol. 3: 692
Broken-hearted **Vol. 3:** 359
Bronze **Vol. 1:** 509 f.
Vol. 2: 27, **95–98**
Vol. 3: 392
Bronze altar **Vol. 3:** 787
Bronze laver **Vol. 3:** 787
Brood **Vol. 1:** 174
Brothel **Vol. 2:** 350
Brother **Vol. 1:** 191, 237, **254–260**, 305, 318, 339, 341, 352, 364, 418, 504, 556 f., 572, 637, 664, 666, 669, 672, 675, 691
Vol. 2: 53, 141, 217, 250, 268 f., 311, 318 f.,

Brother (*cont'd*)
368, 404, 450, 472, 499, 503, 521, 538, 540, 542, 544–550, 571, 600, 606, 655, 709, 722, 739, 749, 769 f., 795, 803, 805, 823, 879
Vol. 3: 49, 173 f., 201, 346, 428, 455, 547, 563, 580, 657, 728, 922, 930, 945, 1055, 1062, 1065, 1069, 1074, 1155, 1163
Brother-in-law **Vol. 1:** 254, 499
Brotherhood **Vol. 1:** 254–257, 305, 640
Vol. 2: 185
Brotherly **Vol. 1:** 640 f.
Vol. 2: 116, 328
Brotherly love **Vol. 2: 547–550**
Brown, R. E. **Vol. 3:** 300 f.
Brutality **Vol. 2:** 256
Vol. 3: 27
Brutish **Vol. 3:** 1024 f.
Buddhism **Vol. 3:** 1155
Bugle **Vol. 3:** 962
Bugle-blast **Vol. 3: 873 f.**
Bühler, Karl **Vol. 3:** 1125
Build **Vol. 1:** 300, 302, 329, 378, 390, 395, 458, 600, 660, 662, 684
Vol. 2: 119, 177, 230, **247–256**
Vol. 3: 118–120, 350, 382, 387, 532
Build up **Vol. 1:** 214, 329, 582, 638, 723, 730 f., 740 f.
Vol. 2: 78, 263, 307, 402, 611, 741, 815
Vol. 3: 110, 703, 819
Builder **Vol. 1: 279**, 657
Vol. 2: 622
Vol. 3: 382, 388, 391, 624
Building **Vol. 1:** 300, 305, 377, 389 f., 426, 490, 521, 529, 609, 658, 660–662, 744
Vol. 2: 29, 129, 193, 236, **247–256**, 646, 732
Vol. 3: 189, 388–391, 605 f., 752
Building material **Vol. 2:** 211
Bull **Vol. 1:** 114, 116, 224 f., 677
Vol. 2: 606
Vol. 3: 199, 420, 715
Bultmann, Rudolf **Vol. 1:** 54, 90, 583
Vol. 2: 906 f.
Vol. 3: 53, 57, 60, 84 f., 281 f., 328 f., 372, 618, 899, 1138–1140
Bundle **Vol. 2:** 33
Vol. 3: 591
Burden **Vol. 1:** 241, 250, **260–263**, 271, 277, 335 f., 438, 441, 564, 570, 647, 674, 712,
Vol. 2: 83, 151, 160, 301, 307, 386, 453, 636, 820, 824
Vol. 3: 105, 407, 448, 692, 758, 1095, 1148, **1166–1169**
Burglar **Vol. 2:** 382
Burglary **Vol. 3:** 379
Buri and Eschatology **Vol. 2:** 903
Burial **Vol. 1:** 93, 144, 150, 263 f., 626, 630, 643
Vol. 2: 32, 218, 236, 295, 417 f., 437
Vol. 3: 286, 750, 1047
Burial ground **Vol. 1:** 520, 689
Vol. 2: 206
Burlesque **Vol. 2:** 430
Burn **Vol. 1:** 94, 109, 205, 235, 279, 390, 466, 509, 515, 652–657
Vol. 2: 32, 74, 293, 304
Vol. 3: 159, 255, 421, 434, 536, 1058
Burn incense **Vol. 2: 293 f.**
Burning **Vol. 3:** 96
Burning bush **Vol. 2:** 68, 173, 215, 636
Vol. 3: 179, 199, 1014
Burning coals **Vol. 2:** 157
Burnt-offering **Vol. 1:** 172
Vol. 2: 410
Vol. 3: 239, 417, 447, 787, 873, 1162
Burst **Vol. 1:** 94
Bury **Vol. 1:** 104, 147, 204, **263–266,** 315, 390, 393, 401, 435, 437, 438, 446, 455, 487, 671
Vol. 2: 187, 217, 318, 326 f., 340, 417, 424
Vol. 3: 239, 247
Bush **Vol. 1:** 725
Business **Vol. 1:** 138, 267, 268, 292, 319, 373, 402, 594
Vol. 2: 39, 235, 254, 303
Vol. 3: 75, 324, 482, 823, **1147–1152**
Busy **Vol. 3:** 407, 1168
Busybody **Vol. 1: 266 f.**
Vol. 2: 434, 557
Vol. 3: 112
Butler **Vol. 1:** 560
Button **Vol. 3:** 497
Buy **Vol. 1: 267 f.**, 380
Vol. 2: 240, 273, 286, 847
Vol. 3: 139, 191, 200, 566
Buy back **Vol. 3:** 178, 201
Buzzing **Vol. 3:** 678
By-product **Vol. 1:** 681
Byblos **Vol. 1:** 243
Bystander **Vol. 3:** 583
Byzantine **Vol. 1:** 70
Vol. 3: 674

Caesar **Vol. 1:** 83, 169, **269 f.**, 276, 330 f., 345, 474, 652
Vol. 2: 108, 288, 377, 389, 549, 604, 615, 625, 684, 804, 849–851
Vol. 3: 217, 318, 441, 549, 635, 731, 754, 792, 953, 978 f.
Caesarea **Vol. 1:** 629
Vol. 2: 333, 369, 596, 732
Vol. 3: 40, 453, 1080, 1183
Caesarea Philippi **Vol. 2:** 341
Vol. 3: 294, 509
Caiaphas **Vol. 1:** 397
Vol. 3: 39 f., 381, 826, 1197
Cain **Vol. 1:** 72, 87, 429
Vol. 2: 138, 572, 626, 649, 690, 770
Vol. 3: 421, 425, 434, 1054
Cainites **Vol. 3:** 1054
Cairo **Vol. 1:** 530
Cakes **Vol. 3:** 422
Calah **Vol. 1:** 140
Calamity **Vol. 1:** 239, 423, 451, 565, 727
Vol. 2: 136, 240, 364, 470, 688, 844, 890
Vol. 3: 207, 249, 996
Calamus **Vol. 1:** 121
Calculate **Vol. 2:** 458
Vol. 3: 822, 824
Calculating **Vol. 3:** 142

Calculation **Vol. 2:** 244, 914
Calendar **Vol. 1:** 61, 272, 624–628, 632
Vol. 2: 189, 228, 528
Vol. 3: 412
Calf **Vol. 1:** 116
Vol. 2: 356, 817
Vol. 3: 33, 431
Caliga **Vol. 3:** 966
Caligula **Vol. 1:** 119, 125
Vol. 2: 511, 850
Call **Vol. 1:** 76, 84, 97, 129, 136, 163, 167, 215, 244, 262, **270–276**, 285, 289, 291, 295, 298, 300 f., 303, 311, 319, 322, 329, 340, 342, 344 f., 357–359, 367, 408–410, 422, 446, 480, 482 f., 488 f., 493, 508 f., 532 f., 540, 542, 544, 569, 592, 598 f., 601, 603, 621, 634, 651, 657, 662, 689–691, 695–697, 703, 719, 729 f.
Vol. 2: 62, 68, 83, 101, 114, 119, 154, 160, 173, 185, 188, 194, 215, 225, 230, 243, 259, 262, 267, 272, 285, 291, 302, 317, 351, 356, 358, 374, 394, 400, 403, 405, 413, 418, 422, 527, 530, 544, 566, 636, 641, **648–656**, 712, 721, 778, 794, 796 f., 804, 839, 846, 862, 877
Vol. 3: 51, 53, 55, 76 f., **113 f.**, 171, 215, 221, 225, 231 f., 311, **324 f.,** 360, 371, 400, 424, 428, 431, 435, 528, 532, 542, 563, 628, 638, 641, 644, 647 f., 672, 725, 729, 757–759, 823, 924, 945, 985 f., 1012, 1019, 1059, 1088, 1095, 1098, 1108, 1117
Call to account **Vol. 1:** 332 f.
Vol. 2: 275, 856
Call away **Vol. 1:** 607
Call for **Vol. 1:** 84
Call in **Vol. 1:** 84, 88, 91, 569
Call on **Vol. 1:** 410
Vol. 2: 874
Call out **Vol. 3:** 52
Call together **Vol. 3:** 51
Called **Vol. 1:** 97, 133, 534
Vol. 2: 229 f., 243, 297, 350, 353, 363, 380, 544, 839
Calling **Vol. 3:** 41, 121, 215
Callous **Vol. 3:** 542
Callus **Vol. 2:** 153
Calm **Vol. 3:** 254, 256
Calmness **Vol. 1:** 68, 432
Vol. 2: 776
Vol. 3: 558
Calumny **Vol. 3:** 340
Calvary **Vol. 2:** 232, 911
Vol. 3: 158, 246, 558
Calvin, John **Vol. 1:** 248, 299, 374
Calvinistic tradition **Vol. 2:** 219
Cambyses **Vol. 3:** 428
Camel **Vol. 1:** 116
Vol. 2: 317
Vol. 3: 213, 256
Camp **Vol. 1:** 295
Vol. 2: 298
Vol. 3: 951, **958–967**
Camp commander **Vol. 3: 958–967**
Camp-followers **Vol. 2:** 801
Campaign **Vol. 3: 958–967**
Cana **Vol. 2:** 676
Vol. 3: 317, 321, 403, 922, 1070
Canaan **Vol. 1:** 53, 77, 141, 209, 281, 625, 688
Vol. 2: 69, 99, 258, 265, 318 f., 324, 573, 627, 802
Vol. 3: 135, 150, 201, 421, 425, 564, 740, 811 f., 919, 960, 993
Canaanite **Vol. 1:** 101, 121, 195, 543, 640
Vol. 2: 49, 67, 85, 98, 154, 190, 199, 265, 297 f., 300, 305, 307, 319, 324 f., 353, 434, 441, 541, 553, 576, 583, 590 f., 602, 636
Vol. 3: 94 f., 104, 356, 405, 418, 424, 427, 454, 593, 787, 1010, 1068 f., 1093
Canaanite mythology **Vol. 3:** 617
Canaanite religion **Vol. 3:** 274
Canaanite script **Vol. 3:** 483 f.
Canal **Vol. 3:** 146
Cancel **Vol. 1:** 73 f., 402, 471, 697–699, 701
Vol. 3: 152, 154, 277
Cancelled **Vol. 3:** 510
Candace **Vol. 1:** 560
Vol. 2: 381, 511
Candelabra **Vol. 3:** 424, 736, 788 f.
Candid **Vol. 2:** 470
Cane **Vol. 3:** 399
Cane-grass **Vol. 3:** 559
Cannibalism **Vol. 2:** 520
Canon **Vol. 1:** 50, **51 f.**, 53, 65 f., 70, 134 f., 243 f.
Vol. 2: 219, 406, 442, 452
Vol. 3: 315, **399–402**, 486, 493, 774
Canopy **Vol. 1:** 653
Capability **Vol. 1:** 502, 526, 675, 723
Vol. 2: 601–616, 839
Capable **Vol. 2:** 103, 394
Vol. 3: 349–351
Capable of suffering **Vol. 3:** 719
Capacity **Vol. 1:** 239, 445, 579, 583, 681, 697, 719, 723, 742
Vol. 2: 121, 287, 390, 842
Capernaum **Vol. 1:** 282
Vol. 2: 231, 624, 851
Vol. 3: 348, 753, 757, 759, 856, 964, 1052
Capital **Vol. 1:** 271, 392 f., 395, 403, 721
Vol. 2: 139, 157, 325, 327, 335, 845
Capital offence **Vol. 3:** 593
Capital punishment **Vol. 2:** 365
Vol. 3: 95, 537, 541
Cappadocia **Vol. 2:** 34
Capricious **Vol. 1:** 692
Vol. 3: 1018
Capstone **Vol. 3: 388–390**
Captain **Vol. 2:** 698
Captive **Vol. 1:** 698, 717
Vol. 2: 186, 296, 367, 453
Vol. 3: 51, 379, **589–599**
Captivity **Vol. 1: 52**, 53–55, 57, 61, 67, 354, 685, 701, 717
Vol. 2: 696
Vol. 3: 135, 192, 657, 937
Capture **Vol. 1:** 343, 364, 724
Vol. 2: 308, 325
Vol. 3: 590 f.
Caravan **Vol. 3:** 757

Carcass **Vol. 1:** 230, 232, 610
Vol. 2: 33
Cardinal virtues **Vol. 1:** 501 f.
Vol. 2: 377
Vol. 3: 354, 925
Care **Vol. 1:** 102, 115, 173, 188 f., 191, 199, 203, 239, 250, **276–278**, 335, 464, 498, 523, 587, 612, 616, 620, 642, 676, 689, 692–695, 726
Vol. 2: 43, 76, 117, 123, 137, 149, 164, 211, 227, 234, 275, 303, 358–360, 386, 395, 413, 538, 737 f., 777, 821, 823, 832, 832, 843, 924
Vol. 3: 54, 138, 330, 402, 545, 548 f., 564 f., 677 f., 683, 728, 776, 810, 823, 854, 922, 937, 980, 1043, 1059, 1075, 1162
Care of souls **Vol. 3:** 678
Career **Vol. 1:** 476
Vol. 3: 947
Careful **Vol. 2:** 275
Vol. 3: 875
Careless **Vol. 1:** 563
Cargo **Vol. 1:** 260
Caricature **Vol. 1:** 114
Carmel **Vol. 1:** 209, 527, 543
Vol. 2: 628
Vol. 3: 418, 426, 453, 962, 1009, 1013, 1091
Carnal **Vol. 1:** 236, 315
Vol. 2: 392
Carnality **Vol. 1:** 673
Carnap, Rudolf **Vol. 3:** 897, 1136
Carnelian **Vol. 3:** 396
Carousing **Vol. 1:** 458
Carpenter **Vol. 1:** **279**
Carpet **Vol. 1:** 317
Carry **Vol. 2:** 151, 236
Vol. 3: 250
Carry away **Vol. 1:** 529
Carry off as booty **Vol. 3:** **379**
Carry out **Vol. 1:** 733–735, 742
Vol. 2: 59, 441, 601
Vol. 3: 756
Carrying ring **Vol. 2:** 97
Cartesian view **Vol. 3:** 1135
Carthage **Vol. 1:** 52, 392
Vol. 2: 126, 664
Vol. 3: 385, 402
Cart-wheel **Vol. 3:** 820
Carve **Vol. 1:** 332, 390
Vol. 3: 483
Case **Vol. 1:** 52, 484, 645
Vol. 2: 369, 489
Vol. 3: 92 f., **1119–1123**
Cash **Vol. 2:** 130
Cassiver, E. **Vol. 3:** 1125
Cast **Vol. 2:** 95, 97
Cast ashore **Vol. 1:** 608
Cast die **Vol. 2:** 573
Cast down **Vol. 2:** 225
Vol. 3: 28, 473
Cast lots **Vol. 1:** 70, 478
Vol. 2: **295–303**
Cast off **Vol. 1:** 574
Cast the ostracon **Vol. 3:** 913
Cast out **Vol. 1:** 168, 415, 446, **449–454**, 541, 572, 623, 651
Vol. 2: 34, 75, 165, 379, 382, 559, 631, 921
Vol. 3: 344, 472 f., **474–476**, 696, 713, 734, 998
Castaway **Vol. 1:** 299
Castle **Vol. 3:** 948
Castrate **Vol. 1:** 559–561
Casual **Vol. 1:** 529
Casuistic **Vol. 3:** 741, 1149
Casuistry **Vol. 1:** **52**, 67, 334 f., 485, 700, 730
Vol. 2: 281, 427, 442, 596, 671, 811, 813
Vol. 3: 105, 482, 762, 777, 785, 1052
Cat-fish **Vol. 3:** 754
Catastrophe **Vol. 1:** 108, 224, 450, 596, 610 f., 622, 657
Vol. 2: 54, 56, 189, 225, 238, 313, 382, 384 f., 418, 422 f., 893 f.
Catch **Vol. 1:** 469, 609, 671
Vol. 2: 624, 922
Vol. 3: **747–751**
Catch in the act **Vol. 2:** 363
Catch the eye **Vol. 2:** 350
Catch out **Vol. 3:** 749
Catch sight **Vol. 1:** 694
Catchword **Vol. 1:** 351
Catechesis **Vol. 3:** 30 f., 648
Catechetical **Vol. 2:** 158, 270, 338
Vol. 3: 61, 286, 940
Catechism **Vol. 1:** 599
Catechumen **Vol. 2:** 457
Vol. 3: 772
Catechumenate **Vol. 1:** 158
Category **Vol. 1:** 635, 681, 694
Cathari **Vol. 3:** 108
Cathartic **Vol. 3:** 989
Catholic **Vol. 3:** 62
Catholic Epistles **Vol. 1:** **52**
Cattle **Vol. 1:** 114–116, 209, 743
Vol. 2: 572, 637, 742, 837
Vol. 3: 256, 564
Causal relations **Vol. 3:** 1130
Causality **Vol. 1:** 69
Cause **Vol. 1:** 60, 69, 164, 166, 219, 436, 550, 556, 607, 673, 731
Vol. 2: 41, **137–145**, 154, 166, 265, 357, 364, 370, 707, 768
Vol. 3: 545, 573, 577, 1034, 1183
Cause to ascend **Vol. 3:** 421
Cause to quake **Vol. 3:** **556–558**
Cause of stumbling **Vol. 3:** 1052
Cause to swear **Vol. 3:** **737–743**
Cauterize **Vol. 3:** 448
Caution **Vol. 1:** 663
Vol. 2: 90
Vol. 3: 564
Cavalry **Vol. 1:** 510
Cave **Vol. 1:** 264, 393
Vol. 2: 218, 318
Vol. 3: **380 f.**, 794, 1007, 1011
Cavity **Vol. 1:** 673
Cease **Vol. 1:** 181, 606, 640, 726
Vol. 2: 241, 764
Vol. 3: 247 f., 251, 255, 405
Cedar **Vol. 3:** 866 f.

Celebrate **Vol. 1:** 360, 525, 624–634, 649, 700, 727
Vol. 2: 108, 374
Vol. 3: 232, 388, **417–436**, 668, 672
Celebration **Vol. 2:** 273, 355
Celestial **Vol. 1:** 104
Celibacy **Vol. 1:** 192, 495 f., 560
Vol. 2: 121, 580 f., 588
Vol. 3: 534–536, 538, 541, 934
Cellar **Vol. 2:** 214
Celsus **Vol. 3:** 291, 635
Cemetery **Vol. 1:** 451
Cenchreae **Vol. 3:** 1063, 1065
Censer **Vol. 1:** 649, 655
Vol. 2: 293 f.
Vol. 3: 436
Censorious **Vol. 2:** 130
Censure **Vol. 1:** 461, 572
Vol. 2: 140 f., 144, 335
Census **Vol. 1:** 171, 519
Vol. 2: 569
Vol. 3: 192, 468, 480, 752
Centauros **Vol. 3:** 1000
Centre **Vol. 1:** 681
Vol. 2: 180, 242, 325, 327 f., 615
Centurion **Vol. 1:** 283, 341, 591
Vol. 2: 222, 624
Vol. 3: 106, 211, 242, 348, 361, 508, 856, 958
Cephas **Vol. 3:** 297, 352, **381–388**, 795
Cereal-offering **Vol. 2:** 293, 461, 583, 711
Vol. 3: 236, **422**, 425
Cereals **Vol. 1:** 250
Vol. 2: 211, 693
Vol. 3: 415, 417, 445, 447
Ceremonial **Vol. 1:** 122 f., 295, 373, 629, 641, 649
Vol. 2: 585
Vol. 3: 45, 106, 358
Ceremonial cleanness **Vol. 1:** 155, 448, 685
Ceremonial defilement **Vol. 2:** 463
Ceremonial impurity **Vol. 2:** 415
Ceremonial law (→Law, ceremonial)
Ceremony **Vol. 1:** 152, 155–158, 186, 224 f., 282, 288, 308, 366, 426, 452, 616, 625
Vol. 2: 236, 375
Vol. 3: 159
Cerinthus **Vol. 2:** 677, 701
Certain **Vol. 1:** 97–99, 326, 678, 680, 723
Certainty **Vol. 1:** 339, 591, 638, **658–664**, 697, 713 f.
Vol. 2; 175, 178, 239, 242 f., 245, 307, 340, 391, 857 f., 887
Vol. 3: 319, 646, 771, **874–901**
Certificate **Vol. 1:** 244
Certify **Vol. 3:** 1039
Cessation **Vol. 1:** 551
Vol. 2: 61, 65
Vol. 3: 255
Cessation of prophecy **Vol. 3:** 80
Chaff **Vol. 3:** 526, 804
Chain **Vol. 3:** 170, 589, 829
Chain up **Vol. 3:** 591
Chained **Vol. 1:** 452
Chair **Vol. 1:** 661
Vol. 2: 611
Chairemon **Vol. 2:** 310
Chalcedony **Vol. 2:** 396
Chalcis **Vol. 3:** 40
Chaldean astrology **Vol. 3:** 1035
Chaldeans **Vol. 1:** 140, 267
Vol. 2: 557
Chalice **Vol. 1:** 641
Chalk **Vol. 1:** 265
Challenge **Vol. 1:** 258
Vol. 2: 286, 379, 432
Vol. 3: 252
Champion **Vol. 1:** 104
Chance **Vol. 1:** 687, 694, 725
Vol. 2: 497, 665
Vol. 3: 776, 869
Change **Vol. 1:** 354 f., 416, 470, 475, 477, 527, 596, 599, 608 f., 624, 630, 632, 654, 700, 705, 708
Vol. 2: 183, 214, 288, 317, 320, 328, 922
Vol. 3: 119, 166, 271, 305, 505, 561, 596, **601–605**, 841, 848
Change into another form **Vol. 3: 861–864**
Change guard **Vol. 3:** 873
Change of heart **Vol. 3:** 155, 860
Change of masters **Vol. 3:** 597
Change mind **Vol. 1:** 356–358, 468
Vol. 2: 183
Change position **Vol. 3: 601–605**
Changeable **Vol. 2:** 393
Vol. 3: 224
Changed life **Vol. 1:** 223, 358, 604
Chanin Hanechba, Rabbi **Vol. 1:** 614 f.
Channel **Vol. 1:** 581, 683
Vol. 3: 985
Chaos **Vol. 1:** 113 f., 422, 507 f., 522
Vol. 2: 200, 367, 607, 631
Vol. 3: 207, 807, 983
Character **Vol. 1:** 56, 187 f., 206, 236, 239, 271, 274, 479, 491, 532, 535, 542 f., 561, 565, 601, 603, 642, 644, 651, 678, 693, 704–710, 731, 733
Vol. 2: 75, 141, 256, 288, 304, 309 f., 335, 352, 363 f., 366, 369, 377, 382, 429, 453, 657–659, 767, 774 f., 798, 857
Vol. 3: 50, 56, 106, 153, 156, 162 f., 197, 358, 368, 606, 677, 721, **808–810**, 899, 911, 996, 1012, 1053, 1067
Character-formation **Vol. 2:** 289
Characteristic **Vol 1:** 114, 284, 304, 310, 488 f., 614, 629, 636, 686, 723, 739
Vol. 2: 106, 115, 127, 155, 158, 226, 243, 261, 288 f., 353–355, 376, 430, 435, 458, 470, 602, 657 f., 774, 843, 864
Vol. 3: 31, 49
Characterize **Vol. 1:** 697, 706, 714, 736, 741
Vol. 2: 383, 427, 430 f., 449, 816
Charge **Vol. 1:** 84, 261, 335, 340, 349, 474, 477, 505, 528, 558, 604, 643, 688, 690
Vol. 2: 111, 113, 137–139, 144, 263, 378 f., 451, 773
Vol. 3: 68, 342, 454, 879, **1038–1050**
Charge under oath **Vol. 3:** 737
Charger **Vol. 1:** 117

Chariot **Vol. 1:** 280, 531, 537
Vol. 2: 98, 226, 349, 485, 688 f.
Vol. 3: 266, 557, 560, 605, 1001
Charioteer **Vol. 1:** 558
Vol. 3: 583
Charis **Vol. 2:** 115
Charisma **Vol. 1: 52**
Vol. 2: 633
Vol. 3: 635
Charismatic **Vol. 1: 52**, 192, 198, 208, 570, 601, 739
Vol. 2: 231, 374, 400, 627, 771, 785, 787, 883 f.
Vol. 3: 83 f., 86, 199, 257, 456, 458, 460, 547, 638 f., 698, 701 f., 705, 768, 774, 1018, 1021, 1066, 1118 f.
Charitable acts **Vol. 3:** 545
Charity **Vol. 1:** 259
Vol. 2: 34, 415, 450, **594–598**, 823, 827
Vol. 3: 358, 754, 756, 854, 973 f.
Charlatan **Vol. 3:** 32
Charlemagne **Vol. 3:** 855
Charm **Vol. 2:** 115 f., 136, **552–562**
Charmer **Vol. 2:** 554
Charming **Vol. 3:** 818
Chase **Vol. 1:** 481
Chassidim **Vol. 1:** 67
Chaste **Vol. 1:** 496, 502
Vol. 3: 101
Chasten **Vol. 1:** 373
Vol. 2: 366
Chastening **Vol. 1:** 426
Vol. 3: 779, 998, 1027
Chastise **Vol. 1: 161–164**, 568
Vol. 3: 776–778
Chastisement **Vol. 1:** 407, 639, 734
Vol. 2: 261, 357
Vol. 3: 98, 636
Chastity **Vol. 2:** 132
Vol. 3: 33, **100–102**, 1055, 1071
Chat **Vol. 3: 1081–1119**
Chattels **Vol. 1:** 498
Vol. 2: 844 f.
Vol. 3: 380, 593 f.
Chatter **Vol. 2:** 401
Cheap grace **Vol. 1:** 112
Vol. 2: 106, 123
Cheat **Vol. 1:** 137–139
Vol. 2: 257, **457–461**
Vol. 3: 379
Cheating **Vol. 3:** 377
Chebar **Vol. 3:** 986
Check **Vol. 1:** 352, 495, 722
Vol. 2: 270
Vol. 3: 109
Chedorlaomer **Vol. 2:** 590, 694
Cheek **Vol. 2:** 417
Vol. 3: 979
Cheer **Vol. 1:** 328
Vol. 2; 809
Cheerful **Vol. 2:** 43, 827
Vol. 3: 148, 672
Cheerfulness **Vol. 1:** 513
Vol. 2: 354–356, 419
Chenara **Vol. 3:** 983
Chepre **Vol. 2:** 279
Cherub **Vol. 1:** 101, 279 f., 674
Vol. 2: 476, 612 f., 689, 761
Vol. 3: 156, 163, 256, 794, 812
Chest **Vol. 1:** 142 f.
Vol. 2: 829–836
Vol. 3: 789
Chiasmus **Vol. 3:** 170
Chief **Vol. 1:** 270
Vol. 2: 160, 234
Vol. 3: 415
Chief magistrate **Vol. 3: 958–967**
Chief men **Vol. 1:** 168
Chief priest (→Priest, Chief)
Chief seat **Vol. 1:** 666
Chief Shepherd **Vol. 1:** 305
Vol. 3: 564–568
Chief tax-collector **Vol. 3: 755–759**
Child **Vol. 1:** 92, 177, 240, 256, **280–291**, 360, 378, 407, 423, 508, 523, 568, 595, 614, 617–619, 621, 639, 708
Vol. 2: 76, 86 f., 127, 129, 151, 228, 242, 262, 312, 353, 358, 385, 416, 427, 429, 539, 542, 570 f., 588, 675, 708, 710
Vol. 3: 103, 553, 590, 593, 607, 611, 634, 647 f., 775, 777, 821
Child-bearing **Vol. 1:** 187–378
Child-sacrifice **Vol. 1:** 463
Vol. 2: 208
Childbirth **Vol. 1:** 85, 187, 288, 409 f., 654
Vol. 2: 478
Vol. 3: 103, **857 f.**
Childish **Vol. 1:** 615
Childless **Vol. 1:** 288, 499, 531
Vol. 2: 435, 577, 628, 638
Vol. 3: 340, 1055, 1074
Childlike **Vol. 1:** 616
Vol. 2: 867
Children **Vol. 1:** 149, 155, 160, 212 f., 219, 238, 254, 256, 267, 277, 293, 308, 329, 332, 358, 395, 411, 431, 445, 498, 507, 510, 551, 556, 569, 572, 614–619, 637, 655, 660, 668, 693, 708, 744
Vol. 2: 50, 95, 129, 151, 188, 222, 230, 250, 539, 550, 562, 581, 599, 656, 709, 737, 816, 834
Vol. 3: 594, 746, 779, 861, 928–930, 1056, 1058
Children of Abraham **Vol. 1:** 77, 111
Vol. 2: 794, 798
Children of the curse **Vol. 1:** 416
Children of darkness **Vol. 2:** 602
Vol. 3: 926, 979
Children of the Devil **Vol. 1:** 567
Vol. 3: 372
Children of falsehood **Vol. 2:** 492
Children of God **Vol. 1:** 83, 179, 274, 284, 286, 287 f., 339, 437, 462, 470, 617 f., 620, 649, 651, 717
Vol. 2: 76, 191, 218, 244 f., 610, 798, 929
Vol. 3: 646
Children of hell **Vol. 1:** 361
Children of the Kingdom **Vol. 2:** 417

Children of light **Vol. 1:** 333, 656
Vol. 2: 36, 459, 495, 542, 602
Vol. 3: 126, 926, 944, 979
Children of obedience **Vol. 2:** 179
Children of promise **Vol. 1:** 81, 299, 371
Children of righteousness **Vol. 2:** 492
Children of wisdom **Vol. 1:** 286
Children of wrath **Vol. 2:** 660
Chiliasm **Vol. 1:** 50, **52 f.**, 64
Vol. 2: 64, 136, 207, 389, 701
Chiliast **Vol. 1: 52**
Chirping **Vol. 3:** 678
Chiyya bar Abba, Rabbi **Vol. 2:** 462
Choice **Vol. 1:** 123, 275, 435, 474, 476, 478, 531, **533–543**, 609
Vol. 2: 120, 139, 260, 309, 327, 478, 581, 584, 818 f.
Vol. 3: 260, 598, 918
Choir **Vol. 1:** 665
Vol. 2: 353
Choke **Vol. 1:** 226, 457, 460
Vol. 2: 843
Vol. 3: 474
Chomsky, Noam **Vol. 3:** 1124, 1131, 1134, 1142
Choose **Vol. 1:** 273, 435, 472, 481, 503, **533–543**, 556, 563, 680, 693, 714
Vol. 2: 86, 106, 260, 395
Vol. 3: 313, 344, 786, 1060
Chorazin **Vol. 1:** 282
Vol. 3: 1052
Chorus **Vol. 2:** 233
Chorus-master **Vol. 3:** 760, 766
Chosen **Vol. 1:** 97, 271, 274, 356, 379, 426, 474, 512, 534, 546, 625, 668, 685, 688
Vol. 2: 73, 83, 117, 216, 294, 296, 298 f., 301, 335 f., 378, 380, 517, 542, 673, 790, 792, 795, 798, 819, **838–840,** 844
Vol. 3: 367, 392, 565, 640, 648, 783, 864, 913
Chosen people **Vol. 1:** 99, 485, 618, 636
Vol. 2: 71, 99, 191, 297, 307, 364
Vol. 3: 137
Chosen race **Vol. 2:** 380, 839
Christ **Vol. 1: 53**, 63, 73 f., 80 f., 83, 86, 89 f., 92, 95 f., 99, 103, 110–112, 114–116, 118, 122–126, 129, 131–133, 135 f., 138, 142, 144, 146–150, 152 f., 155, 158 f., 166–169, 171, 175, 178–186, 191, 197, 204 f., 212–215, 221–225, 228 f., 231–235, 237 f., 241, 244–248, 251, 253 f., 256 f., 259, 266, 268, 275 f., 278 f., 282, 285, 287, 289 f., 297–303, 305, 311, 313, 315 f., 319–327, 329, 331, 335–342, 346 f., 351 f., 355, 361, 363, 370–372, 374 f., 378, 382, 384–386, 389 f., 394 f., 397–409, 411, 414, 417, 419, 421, 424 f., 427, 434–441, 445 f., 448 f., 452 f., 455 f., 458, 461 f., 464, 466 f., 469 f., 472–474, 476–479, 483, 486–488, 491–493, 496, 501, 508, 510, 513, 517–519, 525, 528, 535, 539–542, 547–549, 551 f., 554 f., 559, 563 f., 566–568, 570–572, 575 f., 581 f., 586–590, 592 f., 602, 604, 607, 610 f., 615, 619 f., 622 f., 631 f., 637–639, 643 f., 647–651, 656, 659–662, 664, 668 f., 675–677, 679–681, 683–686, 689, 691, 693, 696 f., 701–703, 706–709, 712, 717–720, 723, 727, 730 f., 738–741
Vol. 2: 30–33, 35, 38–40, 42, 46–48, 51, 55, 57–59, 61–65, 73, 75–84, 87, 94, 98, 101 f., 104, 106, 109, 111–114, 119–123, 127, 129 f., 133, 135–140, 147, 149, 152, 156, 159–165, 168–171, 174, 176 f., 179 f., 183, 185–188, 193–196, 198–200, 203 f., 207–210, 213, 217 f., 228–231, 238, 241 f., 244 f., 249, 251–255, 258 f., 262 f., 267–271, 273, 275–277, 281–283, 286–291, 300–304, 313–315, 320 f., 329, **330–348**, 349 f., 353 f., 356–361, 365–369, 374, 378–380, 386–389, 398–403, 407, 411–413, 416 f., 419–422, 434, 437, 443–451, 453, 459–461, 463, 473, 495, 519, 545, 565, 570, 581, 585, 615, 619, 632, 640, 645, 653, 664–666, 671–674, 691, 706, 712, 716, 718, 720–723, 732 f., 762 f., 774, 780 f., 800, 806, 812, 815–819, 826–828, 834 f., 842, 844, 855, 859, 867 f., 873, 875, 877, 882 f., 885, 894 f., 900–903, 905–909, 918 f., 922, 924–928, 930 f.
Vol. 3: 37, 40–42, 48, 50, 52–58, 60–62, 65–67, 71–73, 81–84, 86, 89, 98, 101 f., 107 f., 110, 113 f., 118, 120 f., 127–129, 132, 135–138, 142 f., 147 f., 161–164, 167–172, 177, 195–200, 204, 209, 211–213, 215 f., 219–221, 225–229, 232, 240–246, 251–253, 257 f., 267, 270, 276–279, 281–290, 292, 297–300, 302–305, 312–316, 319–331, 334, 336 f., 346 f., 349, 351 f., 360–365, 367 f., 370–373, 379 f., 383–388, 390, 393, 398, 400, 403, 410, 412, 417, 431–435, 445 f., 449, 462, 471, 475, 481, 490 f., 493, 495, 499 f., 503–506, 509 f., 516–518, 522–524, 529 f., 534–537, 541, 543, 546–549, 552 f., 556, 558, 563, 567–569, 571 f., 576, 580–582, 584–586, 588 f., 591 f., 596–598, 600–604, 606 f., 613 f., 621, 631 f., 636, 643, 647 f., 652 f., 656, 658–664, 670, 672, 674 f., 683, 685 f., 697, 700–706, 714, 716, 718, 722–725, 728 f., 731, 733, 736, 746, 748–752, 763–766, 768–771, 774 f., 779, 790, 793 f., 802, 807, 810, 812–815, 818 f., 824–826, 830–833, 837–839, 843 f., 848, 854, 856, 858, 861–863, 868–870, 873 f., 886, 888, 890, 892 f., 898, 901, 904–906, 908 f., 912 f., 917, 924 f., 928 f., 931 f., 934 f., 944 f., 947, 949 f., 954–956, 963–965, 968, 971, 974–977, 980, 985, 990 f., 995, 998 f., 1003, 1010, 1018–1021, 1023, 1025 f., 1030–1033, 1035, 1043–1050, 1053 f., 1060, 1063–1065, 1067, 1073, 1075, 1079, 1106, 1111–1115, 1118 f., 1122 f., 1131, 1138, 1141, 1143, 1150–1152, 1155, 1162–1165, 1167, 1176–1180, 1182, 1184–1187, 1189–1194, 1196–1203, 1205–1214
Christ, Person of **Vol. 1:** 53, 237, 375, 409, 424, 454 f., 488, 548 f., 578, 581, 610, 680, 729
Vol. 2: 119, 314, 342 f., 354, 383–388, 402, 535, 676, 691, 732, 903, 906, 920
Vol. 3: 48, 56–67, 83, 115 f., 162, 168–170, 185–188, 195–200, 204 f., 212 f., 219–221, 243–247, 276 f., 281–305, 313 f., 321–323,

Christ, Person of (*cont'd*)
393, 503–510, 567 f., 581 f., 607–664, 695–699, 703 f., 723–725, 790 f., 804–807, 889 f., 920 f., 941, 967–981, 1030–1033, 1046, 1106–1117, 1122
Christ, work of **Vol. 1:** 53, 91, 215, 237, 369, 372, 375, 409, 540, 581, 611, 651, 701, 730
Vol. 2: 39, 42, 54, 80, 84, 113, 119, 193, 196, 262, 343, 361, 402, 426, 443 f., 595, 609, 624 f., 630, 732 f., 789, 839, 903, 906
Vol. 3: 40, 42, 57, 120, 131, 138, 162, 168, 171, 177, 191, 204, 220, 395
Christ-event **Vol. 1:** 445
Vol. 2: 314, 316, 907, 930
Christ-hymn **Vol. 1:** 58, 707
Vol. 3: 347
Christendom **Vol. 2:** 328
Christening **Vol. 1:** 707
Christian **Vol. 1:** 81, 88, 123, 129, 132, 138, 141, 144–150, 152, 155–159, 167, 170, 175, 179, 190, 195, 198, 200–202, 204, 215, 219, 222, 228 f., 231, 236 f, 241, 246–248, 256 f., 261, 265 f., 268 f., 275, 281 f., 289, 295, 297–300, 303–305, 314, 316, 319, 325, 331, 336, 339, 346 f., 351–353, 355, 359–361, 364 f., 369–371, 379, 384–387, 397, 403, 406, 410, 415–417, 419, 425, 429, 438–441, 445 f., 453, 458–460, 462, 465 f., 469, 473, 477, 480, 490, 496, 502, 505, 507 f., 510, 513 f., 518 f., 525 f., 534 f., 547, 551 f., 556, 563, 566, 569 f., 572, 578 f., 581, 590, 593, 597, 599, 601 f., 604, 607, 610 f., 613, 619 f., 623 f., 627–632, 634, 637, 641, 644–649, 651 f., 655 f., 659 f., 662, 669, 675, 675, 679 f., 684 f., 689–691, 693 f., 696 f., 701 f., 709, 713, 719 f., 727, 739 f.
Vol. 2: 32–34, 36–38, 42 f., 47, 51 f., 54, 58 f., 64 f., 72–77, 83, 85 f., 92, 94 f., 102 f., 106, 110, 114–116, 120–123, 125 f., 129 f., 133, 137, 139 f., 144, 147, 158, 160 f., 163, 175 f., 179, 188, 193 f., 196, 198, 200, 203, 208f., 211–213, 217 f., 221, 223, 230 f., 235–237, 241–244, 248–253, 258, 264, 275, 268–272, 275, 278 f., 282 f., 285 f., 288, 294, 304, 308, 316, **330–348,** 349, 352, 354, 359, 361, 365, 368, 373, 380, 383 f., 391, 394, 399, 402 f., 405, 407, 410, 413, 415, 418–420, 422, 424, 429 f., 435, 437 f., 445, 450 f., 453, 457, 460, 473, 487, 494, 499, 517, 519, 600, 606, 609, 611, 618, 623, 625, 654, 665 f., 678, 707, 712, 775, 786, 793, 803 f., 806–809, 812, 815 f., 819, 842, 858, 861, 866, 868, 882 f., 893, 895, 897 f., 900, 904, 906, 909 f., 913–915, 917 f., 921, 924, 926 f.
Vol. 3: 27, 30 f., 42, 48, 53, 58–61, 63, 81 f., 84–89, 97, 101 f., 106–108, 112 f., 115, 118 f., 127–130, 136, 142 f., 163–166, 181, 184, 186, 189, 194, 197, 200, 204–206, 213–215, 219 f., 225, 230, 240, 243, 246, 251–253, 256 f., 265, 270, 272, 277, 283, 287, 289, 291, 300 f., 303 f., 309, 312 f., 315 f., 319, 322, 324 f., 327 f., 330, 335 f., 345–347, 349, 352, 362, 364, 368, 370 f., 373, 379 f., 389 f., 393, 400, 403, 408, 410–412, 416, 418, 431–433, 435, 440, 446–449, 453 f., 458, 465, 470 f., 482, 485 f., 489, 491–495, 501, 507, 515, 524, 526, 534–536, 546, 548, 550, 552, 559, 562 f., 568, 572, 576, 579, 581, 583 f., 586, 588 f., 591, 598, 602–604, 610, 612 f., 615, 617, 621, 623, 627, 629 f., 632, 635 f., 639, 645, 647, 652, 656 f., 662, 668, 670, 672, 674 f., 685 f., 697–699, 701, 706 f., 710, 717, 724 f., 728–730, 741, 746, 752 f., 755, 757 f., 765, 768, 770–774, 778, 780, 785, 793, 802, 804, 809 f., 815, 817–819, 830, 832 f., 837, 839, 844, 846, 853–857, 862–864, 869, 871 f., 886–888, 891 f., 894, 896, 903, 905, 913, 921, 923–925, 927–931, 934–936, 940–943, 945, 947, 949, 953, 957, 963 f., 966, 968–976, 999, 1030, 1033, 1036, 1040, 1047–1049, 1063, 1070, 1075, 1080, 1109, 1112, 1115 f., 1118 f., 1121, 1123, 1132 f., 1135, 1137, 1143, 1151, 1155, 1157, 1163–1165, 1167, 1169, 1179, 1187 f., 1190–1192, 1194 f., 1199–1201, 1206–1208, 1213
Christian Platonists **Vol. 2:** 754
Christian prophets **Vol. 3: 84–89**
Christianity **Vol. 3:** 240, 633
Christianity, break with Judaism **Vol. 1:** 634
Christmas **Vol. 1:** 631
Vol. 2: 176, 358, 624
Vol. 3: 1122
Christocentric **Vol. 1: 53**
Christocratic reign **Vol. 3:** 843
Christological **Vol. 1: 53,** 214 f., 239, 281, 337, 411, 435, 438, 440, 599, 621, 737
Vol. 2: 113, 338 f., 343, 354, 380, 386, 403, 749, 809, 827, 834 f., 925
Vol. 3: 39, 83, 167, 172, 200, 224, 568, 576, 607, 627, 640, 767 f., 830, 832, 848, 863, 920
Christology **Vol. 1: 53,** 63, 220, 347, 371, 548 f., 620, 712
Vol. 2: 81 f., 204, 231, 314, 340, 342 f., 387 f., 402, 434, 500
Vol. 3: 40, 42, 65 f., 107, 462, 464, 558, 635, 637, 639, 644, 646, 648, 650 f., 704, 762 f., 1030 f., 1107
Christophany **Vol. 3:** 288
Chromosome **Vol. 3:** 663
Chronicle **Vol. 1:** 243
Chronicler **Vol. 1: 53,** 55, 295
Chronicles **Vol. 1:** 53, 165, 170, 537 f.
Chronological **Vol. 3:** 64
Chronological speculation **Vol. 3:** 653
Chronology **Vol. 1:** 301, 630, 634
Chrysippus **Vol. 1:** 694
Vol. 2: 658
Vol. 3: 679
Chrysolite **Vol. 3:** 396
Chrysoprase **Vol. 3:** 396
Chrysostom **Vol. 2:** 506
Chthonic **Vol. 1:** 498
Church **Vol. 1:** 10, 50–52, 56, 58 f., 61–63, 65 f., 71, 87, 89–92, 95 f., 99, 106, 114, 117, 121, 123, 125 f., 129–135, 138, 146–150, 154, 157, 159 f., 166–168, 172, 175, 178, 183, 185, 187 f., 191 f., 197–200, 214 f., 223 f.,

228, 231 f., 235, 237 f., 242–244, 246–248, 251, 254, 257 f., 261, 263, 267, 271 f., 275 f., 278 f., 285–287, 289, **291–307**, 310 f., 322–325, 328–331, 339–341, 343 f., 346 f., 351, 359, 361, 363–365, 369 f., 372, 384, 390, 393–400, 403, 406, 411, 414 f., 424, 436, 441, 449, 453, 461 f., 466–469, 473–475, 477 f., 490, 496, 500, 506, 508, 510, 519, 525 f., 528 f., 534 f., 539–542, 545, 548, 551, 554, 556, 561, 566, 568–572, 578 f., 582, 589, 591 f., 599–605, 611, 613, 615, 619, 621, 623, 628, 630–632, 634, 638, 640–644, 646, 648, 651, 653, 660, 662, 664, 666 f., 669, 675, 686, 689–691, 697, 702–704, 720, 723, 728, 730–733, 736, 739–741
Vol. 2: 30, 32 f., 37, 42 f., 50 f., 58, 62, 83 f., 95, 106, 110–112, 114, 122, 127, 129, 133, 135, 137, 141 f., 147, 152, 159, 162 f., 165, 169, 171, 174, 178, 186 f., 203, 207, 210, 212 f., 218 f., 221–223, 228, 231, 235, 243, 249 f., 252, 256, 258, 263 f., 270, 272 f., 275, 277, 282, 287, 289, 301–304, 308, 315 f., 328 f., 333, 337–340, 349, 354, 356, 359–361, 365 f., 381, 386 f., 398 f., 402, 404–407, 410–413, 418–421, 438, 443, 446, 448, 450 f., 456 f., 460–462, 473 f., 505, 515–518, 523 f., 526 f., 529–531, 533–536, 542, 545, 547, 550, 563 f., 566, 571, 573, 581 f., 585, 590, 596–598, 604 f., 610 f., 618–620, 632 f., 641 f., 646, 654, 676–678, 684, 691, 695, 699–702, 706 f., 709 f., 712, 718 f., 721–723, 727, 729, 731–734, 741, 748, 763, 766, 768, 774 f., 780 f., 785 f., 792, 794–796, 799 f., 805 f., 808 f., 812, 816, 818, 825–828, 838 f., 842, 844, 846 f., 858 f., 867, 869–871, 873, 875, 882–885, 894–898, 900–903, 905, 914 f., 917 f., 921 f., 927, 930
Vol. 3: 31, 38, 52 f., 57 f., 60, 62 f., 66, 81, 84 f., 87–89, 97, 107, 109 f., 112, 118, 120 f., 127, 129, 131 f., 142, 147 f., 169 f., 173, 182, 188 f., 195, 205, 213 f., 219–221, 227, 241–246, 251–253, 257, 278, 284, 286, 290, 298–300, 315, 319–322, 326, 335, 337, 343, 346, 350, 352, 365, 369, 379, **383–388**, 390, 394 f., 397, 401–404, 408, 432, 440, 446–449, 458, 464, 470, 482, 489 f., 494, 499 f., 503–506, 525, 529, 535 f., 540, 544–549, 553, 568–570, 572, 581, 602, 607, 611–613, 618, 622, 628, 643, 646, 651, 653 f., 659 f., 670, 683, 685, 687, 698, 703, 710, 714, 724, 742, 750, 752–754, 763–765, 767 f., 770, 772–774, 779, 783–785, 793, 802 f., 809 f., 817–819, 825, 831, 838, 854 f., 860, 868, 871, 903, 905, 908 f., 915, 920, 924, 927 f., 930–932, 944, 950, 954, 956, 958, 963, 965, 968, 974, 987, 995, 1020 f., 1032, 1043, 1047, 1053 f., 1061, 1063–1065, 1066–1068, 1074 f., 1079 f., 1106, 1113, 1119, 1141, 1162, 1165, 1167, 1169
Church of England **Vol. 1:** 149
Vol. 2: 219
Church of Scotland **Vol. 1:** 148
Chuza **Vol. 3:** 1059
Cicero **Vol. 1:** 406
Vol. 2: 711
Vol. 3: 757
Cilicia **Vol. 3:** 598
Cilician haircloth **Vol. 3:** 813
Cilicians, synagogue of the **Vol. 1:** 297
Cinnamon **Vol. 1:** 121
Cipher **Vol. 2:** 683 f.
Circle **Vol. 1:** 439
Circular **Vol. 2:** 52
Circularity **Vol. 3:** 1143
Circumcision **Vol. 1:** 50, 61 f., 73, 78 f., 145, 149, 154–160, 235, 283, **307–312**, 336, 340, 360 f., 368, 371, 385, 424, 504, 552, 602, 626, 641, 675 f., 680, 691, 699
Vol. 2: 86, 94, 119, 218, 309, 437, 443, 450 f., 569 f., 573, 625 f., 636, 641, 652, 660, 668, 671, 692, 708, 721, 741, 827f.
Vol. 3: 54, 137, 186 f., 204, 320, 352, 405, 407, 408 f., 431, 452, 493, 498–500, 549, 551, 608, 637, 714, 764, 949, 1010, 1057, 1066, 1071, 1158, 1164
Circumcision party **Vol. 3:** 387
Circumlocution **Vol. 1:** 586
Vol. 2: 381, 602 f., 846
Vol. 3: 342, 489, 510, 562, 622, 684, 741, 748, 816
Circumspection **Vol. 2:** 90 f.
Circumstances **Vol. 1:** 520, 540, 542, 591, 678
Vol. 2: 116, 129, 197, 222, 400
Circus **Vol. 1:** 645
Cisterns **Vol. 3:** 982
Cite **Vol. 1:** 736
Vol. 2: 318
Cities of refuge **Vol. 3:** 35, 94
Citium **Vol. 1:** 68
Citizen **Vol. 1:** 291, 299, 360, 392, 479, 497, 640, 685, 687, 689–691, 715, 732
Vol. 2: 49, 325, 329, 349, 363, 456, 497, 500, 788, 794, **801–804**
Vol. 3: 49, 738, 913
Citizenship **Vol. 2:** 149, 193, **801–804**
City **Vol. 1:** 230, 272, 279, 286, 291, 319, 325–327, 394, 396, 431, 463, 554, 559, 562, 610, 615, 616, 642, 648, 654, 660 f., 663, 682, 688, 690 f., 714, 741
Vol. 2: 29, 125, 132, 134, 217, 233 f., 236, 245, 297, 324–330, 375, 412, 426, **788–805**
Vol. 3: 49, 74, 93, 146, 206, 210, 217, 225, 434 f., 497, 557, 951, 1012
City of David **Vol. 1:** 272
Vol. 2: 324 f.
Vol. 3: 652
City of God **Vol. 2:** 243, 696, 803
Vol. 3: 1008
City wall **Vol. 3:** **948–950**
City-state **Vol. 1:** 287
Vol. 2: 92, 439, 788, **801–804**
Vol. 3: 49, 593, 755
Civic **Vol. 2:** 290
Civic magistrate **Vol. 2:** **801–804**
Civil authorities **Vol. 2:** 101, 369
Civil code **Vol. 1:** 373
Civilization **Vol. 3:** 1068
Civilized **Vol. 3:** 353

Claim **Vol. 1:** 84, 258, 271, 273, 311, 399, 455, 473, 527, 537 f., 543 f., 550, 587, 590, 595 f., 605, 610, 618, 637 f., 719 f., 723
Vol. 2: 111, 118, 139, 159, 165, 202, 241, 256, 276, 282, 287, 298, 307, 309, 334, 337 f., 352, 375, 378–381, 383, 385, 394, 396, 398 f., 401, 426, 434, 443 f., 600, 606, 794
Vol. 3: 144, 202, 348, 361, 508, 629, 635 f., 641, 645, 648, 651, 696, 824, 881, 888, 908, 917, 1045, 1070, 1088, 1155
Clan **Vol. 1:** 194, 196, 294, 534, 615 f., 625, 632
Vol. 2: 35, 247, 317, 582, 789 f.
Vol. 3: 870–87
Clarify **Vol. 2:** 390
Vol. 3: 316
Clarity of mind **Vol. 1:** 514 f.
Class **Vol. 1:** 501
Vol. 2: 102, 284, 298, 303, 311, 437, 826
Vol. 3: 561, 757 f., 929, 1147
Class distinction **Vol. 3:** 589
Class-ethic **Vol. 2:** 103
Classical Greek **Vol. 1:** 62
Classification **Vol. 1:** 533
Classify **Vol. 1:** 534
Claudius Caesar **Vol. 1:** 476
Vol. 2: 827, 847
Vol. 3: 40
Claudius Lysias **Vol. 1:** 340
Vol. 2: 451
Clay **Vol. 1:** 243
Vol. 2: 98
Vol. 3: 392, **910–917**
Clean **Vol. 1:** 62, 172, 265, 349, 351 f., 379, 479, 488
Vol. 2: 144, 225, 237, 261, 275
Vol. 3: 100–108, 355, 1053
Cleanliness **Vol. 1:** 330
Cleanse **Vol. 1:** 115, 119, 122, 144, 146, 148, 150–154, 158, 223–225, 239, 281, 433, 629, 634, 644, 677, 698, 725
Vol. 2: 72, 159, 183, 285, 326, 358, 379, 410, 412, 423, 448, 464, 477, 586, 610, 890
Vol. 3: 30, **102–108**, 152 f., 163, 199 f., 212, 220, 604, 882, 989
Cleansing **Vol. 3:** 695, 1149, 1168
Cleansing of temple **Vol. 3:** 429, 791, 869, 977
Cleansing the hands **Vol. 3:** 106
Cleanthes **Vol. 1:** 232, 616
Vol. 2: 85, 430
Vol. 3: 331
Clear **Vol. 1:** 204, 313, 680
Vol. 3: 309, **316 f.**, 572
Clearchus **Vol. 2:** 757
Cleave to **Vol. 2: 348–350**, 579
Vol. 3: 1069
Cleft **Vol. 2:** 197
Vol. 3: 543
Clement of Alexandria **Vol. 1:** 49
Vol. 2: 506, 754
Clement of Rome **Vol. 1:** 51
Vol. 2: 214, 316, 457
Clement, First Epistle of **Vol. 2:** 264
Vol. 3: 388
Clement, Second Epistle of **Vol. 1:** 51
Cleopas **Vol. 1:** 576
Cleopatra **Vol. 2:** 550
Clergy **Vol. 2:** 457
Clerk **Vol. 3: 477–482**
Clever **Vol. 1:** 412, 509, 551, 692
Vol. 3: 31, 130, 136, 926, 1017
Cliff **Vol. 3:** 381
Climax **Vol. 1:** 647, 669, 725
Climb **Vol. 2:** 184 f.
Climb over **Vol. 1:** 71
Cling **Vol. 1:** 700
Vol. 2: 349
Clique **Vol. 3:** 543 f.
Clopas **Vol. 3:** 1061
Close **Vol. 1:** 620, 678
Vol. 2: 59, 349, 407, **726–734**
Vol. 3: 950 f., 1007
Closed **Vol. 2:** 31
Cloth **Vol. 2:** 205, **312–317**
Vol. 2: 212
Clothe **Vol. 1: 312–317**, 467, 470, 744
Vol. 2: 40, 714 f., 925
Vol. 3: 121, 358, 691, 732
Clothing **Vol. 1:** 114, 116, 204, 207, 234, **312–317**, 318, 395, 449, 468, 470, 479, 563, 625, 630, 636, 672, 706–709
Vol. 2: 264, 295, 465, 823, 831, 833
Vol. 3: 105, 497, 519, 543, 547, 560, 683, 727, 862 f., 1074
Cloud **Vol. 1:** 144, 151, 204, 323, 503, 649, 655
Vol. 2: 154, 190, 194, 212, 376, 380, 493, 905, 912, 916 f., 922, 925
Vol. 3: 114, 267, 509, 554 f., 613 f., 617, 633, 749, 863, **1000–1004**, 1013
Cloud of witnesses **Vol. 3:** 1047
Club **Vol. 1:** 162, 407
Clumsy **Vol. 2:** 146
Cluster **Vol. 1:** 724
Vol. 3: 919
Coals of fire **Vol. 2:** 157
Vol. 3: 97
Coat **Vol. 1:** 478
Cock **Vol. 1:** 173
Vol. 2: 666
Vol. 3: 114, 240, 803, 845
Cock-crow **Vol. 2:** 136
Code **Vol. 2:** 683 f.
Code of Hammurabi **Vol. 2:** 555, 582
Vol. 3: 94
Codex **Vol. 1: 53**, 69
Vol. 3: 478
Coercion **Vol. 3:** 1163
Coercive **Vol. 3:** 711
Coffin **Vol. 1:** 674
Cognition **Vol. 2:** 390, 395
Co-heirs **Vol. 3:** 73
Coherence **Vol. 3:** 689 f., 894
Coherence theory of truth **Vol. 3:** 896
Cohort **Vol. 2:** 32, 93, 699
Coin **Vol. 1:** 463, 592, 643
Vol. 2: 95–97, 287–289, 308–310, 358, 386, 573 f., 630, 651, 728, **847–852**, 898
Vol. 3: 217, 489, 498, **752–755**, 791, 808, 904,

920, 1058
Coin in fish's mouth **Vol. 3: 753**
Coincide **Vol. 1:** 555
Coincidence **Vol. 2:** 342
Coitus **Vol. 2:** 586
Colani and Eschatology **Vol. 2: 903 f.**
Cold **Vol. 1:** 96, **317–319**, 733
Vol. 2: 274, 597, 727, 826, 844, 881
Vol. 3: 260, 321
Collapse **Vol. 1:** 608–610
Vol. 2: 337, 679
Colleague **Vol. 3:** 1147
Collect **Vol. 1:** 508, 536
Vol. 2: 31–33
Vol. 3: 443, 745, **1081–1119**
Collect taxes **Vol. 3:** 747
Collect tithe **Vol. 2: 693 f.**
Vol. 3: 851–855
Collecting box **Vol. 3:** 752, 796
Collection **Vol. 1:** 128, 138, 214, 301, 332, 478, 642, 731
Vol. 2: 121, 400, 818, 826–828, 834, 844
Vol. 3: 70, 119, 351, 369, 499, 546, 548, 553, 572, **751 f.**, 810, 819, 854, 943, 955
College **Vol. 1:** 573
Collegiate **Vol. 1:** 199
Collyrium **Vol. 3:** 518
Colonnade **Vol. 2:** 236
Colony **Vol. 1:** 685
Vol. 2: 801–804
Vol. 3: 964
Colossae **Vol. 1:** 319
Vol. 2: 270, 302, 453, 550
Vol. 3: 379, 930
Colosseum **Vol. 3:** 203
Colossian heresy **Vol. 2:** 559
Colossians **Vol. 1:** 55, 160, 237, 301, 525, 740
Vol. 2: 217, 269, 646, 774, 817
Vol. 3: 775, 1035
Colour **Vol. 1: 203–206**, 224, 447, 656 f.
Vol. 2: 27, 37, 310
Vol. 3: 396 f., 919
Colpe, C. **Vol. 3: 620**
Colt **Vol. 1:** 117
Vol. 3: 179
Column **Vol. 2:** 157
Vol. 3: 795
Combat **Vol. 1:** 644 f., 650
Combustible **Vol. 1:** 653, 656
Combustion **Vol. 1:** 654
Come **Vol. 1:** 174, **319–327**, 438, 545, 609
Vol. 2: 184, 281, 338, 379, 382, 384, 388, 585, 886, **895–898**
Vol. 3: 118, 316, 617, 941
Come of age **Vol. 2:** 65
Come between **Vol. 1:** 373
Come down **Vol. 2:** 379, 928
Come to an end **Vol. 3:** 248
Come forth **Vol. 3:** 592
Come to grief **Vol. 3:** 573
Come to know **Vol. 2: 392–406**
Come to life again **Vol. 3: 259–281**, 529
Come near **Vol. 1:** 586
Vol. 2: 54
Come to pass **Vol. 1:** 737
Vol. 3: 1104
Come short **Vol. 3: 952–956**
Come to terms **Vol. 3:** 192
Come together **Vol. 1:** 97
Vol. 2: 659
Come too late **Vol. 3: 952–956**
Come into view **Vol. 2: 487 f.**
Comedy **Vol. 2: 430 f.**
Comet **Vol. 2:** 558
Comfort **Vol. 1:** 88, 95, 244, **327–329**, 431, 547, 568–571, 639, 681
Vol. 2: 78, 206, 215, 242, 244, 257, 259, 261, 263, 297, 352, 357, 381, 386, 418, 429, 774, 793
Vol. 3: 54, 79, 84, 118, 255 f., 359, 783, 845
Comforter **Vol. 1:** 89, 91
Vol. 2: 307
Coming **Vol. 1:** 65, 111, 124, 175, 269, 358, 411, 438, 474 f., 489, 516, 519, 525, 544 f., 571, 581, 596, 610, 613, 620, 633, 639, 651, 678, 688, 695, 699, 704, 708, 741
Vol. 2: 87, 95, 110 f., 129, 155 f., 170, 194, 196, 218, 229, 240–242, 262, 266 f., 271, 273, 298, 335, 340, 351, 353, 358, 366, 377, 380, 382 f., 385, 387,433, 496, 503, 517 f., 530, 535, 675, 701, 736, 738, 771, 785, 811, 887, 894, **898–901**, 905, 912–914, 916 f., 921 f., 925
Vol. 3: 55, 141, 215, 229, 257, 312, 321, 351, 433, 509, 604 f., 618, 628 f., 634, 672, 703, 707, 863, 1001, 1011, 1033
Coming One **Vol. 1:** 100, 437
Vol. 2: 379, 384
Vol. 3: 367, 378, 462, 695, 1045
Commagene **Vol. 1:** 640
Command **Vol. 1:** 74, 121, 165, 193, 208, 226, 230 f., 255, 260, 271 f., 274, 292–292, 303, 308, 310, 322, **330–343**, 381, 389, 408–410, 415, 453 f., 461, 469, 476, 491, 506, 526, 532, 554–556, 559 f., 572, 604, 617, 622 f., 683, 714, 731, 741
Vol. 2: 43, 75, 77, 109, 123, 133, 135, 137, 154 f., 173, 180, 193, 229, 268, 272, 298, 328, 336, 398, 403 f., 407, 427, 429, 436, 440–442, 444 f., 447, 453, 473, 503, 516, 540–544, 546, 548, 550, 631, 637, 642, 650, 653, 664, 668, 720, 779, 826, 867
Vol. 3: 45, 47 f., 51, 93, 105, 114, 127, 173, 310, 455, 485, 595, 648, 685, 822, 832, 964, 1001
Commander **Vol. 1:** 164, 270
Vol. 2: 189, 363, 511, 699
Vol. 3: 51, 478
Commander-in-chief **Vol. 2:** 374
Commandment (→Decalogue) **Vol. 1:** 61, 67, 86, 95, 166, 196, 215 f., 245, 257–262, 293 f., 316, 331–333, 337–341, 355, 357, 402, 415, 417 f., 422, 430, 433, 437, 451, 455 f., 458, 494, 506, 526, 533, 538, 551, 554, 571, 597, 604, 618 f., 623, 626 f., 632, 638, 676, 689, 691, 730
Vol. 2: 42, 62 f., 68, 93, 106, 132, 135, 141, 144 f., 147, 149, 163, 167, 177, 215, 223,

Commandment (*cont'd*)
288, 297, 306 f., 309, 313, 325, 355, 426 f., 441–443, 446, 449, 451, 458, 489, 492, 499, 542 f., 579 f., 640 f., 652, 660, 698 f., 716, 792, 816, 823, 848, 858, 864, 870–873, 889, 893, 930
Vol. 3: 54, 74, 181, 183 f., 186, 221, 239, 278, **352–377**, 378–380, 420, 455, 484, 487, 490, 542, 545, 550, 572 f., 578, 584 f., 740, 745, 777, 790 f., 800 f., 806, 863, 892, 916, 933, 937 f., 946 f., 949, 1040, 1068–1070, 1087, 1096, 1102, 1107, 1118, 1120 f., 1151, 1153, 1161, 1168
Commemorate **Vol. 1:** 626
Commemoration **Vol. 3:** 407
Commencement **Vol. 2:** 656
Commend **Vol. 1:** 278, 731
Vol. 2: 112, 135, 368, 398, 744
Vol. 3: 403, 431
Commendation **Vol. 1:** 592
Vol. 3: 489
Commentaries of Philo **Vol. 3:** 486
Commentaries of Qumran **Vol. 3:** 487
Commentary **Vol. 2:** 315
Vol. 3: 483
Commerce **Vol. 1:** 670
Vol. 2: 711, 841
Vol. 2: 605 f., 1054
Commercial **Vol. 1:** 268, 344, 484, 721
Vol. 3: 134, 138
Commercialism **Vol. 3:** 791
Commiseration **Vol. 2:** 117
Commission **Vol. 1:** 98, 103, 122 f., 127–136, 195, 213, 246, 263, 271, 274, 294, 298, 300 f., 332, 381, 382, 455, 464, 489, 533, 538, 542, 550, 592, 596, 600, 703
Vol. 2: 83, 146, 152, 154, 169, 173, 176, 212, 217, 255, 269, 302, 307, 328, 358, 426, 435, 469, 608–610, 640, 651, 654, 695, 728
Vol. 3: 49, 53, 55, 57, 83, 128, 142, 284, 314, 427, 453, 456, 569, 629–631, 645 f., 698, 748, 779, 892, 998, 1044, 1053, 1057, 1093–1095, 1098 f., 1103
Commit **Vol. 1:** 730, 733
Vol. 2: 151, 159, 368, 376, 442
Commit injustice **Vol. 3: 573–576**
Commit perjury **Vol. 3:** 737
Commitment **Vol. 1:** 239, 284, 344, 368, 496, 502, 514, 680
Vol. 2: 841
Vol. 3: 336, 425, 436, 793, 1058
Commodity **Vol. 2:** 97, 254
Common **Vol. 1:** 62, 433, 448, 473, 539, 547 f., 583, 624, 639, 642 f., 677, 728
Vol. 2: 272 f., 307, 311, 313, 316, 350, 355 f., 394, 448, 452, 456, 501, 625, 657, 659, 722, 785, 840
Vol. 3: 702 f., 724, 756, 908, 914
Common meal **Vol. 2:** 520
Common sense **Vol. 3:** 898
Commoner **Vol. 2:** 102
Commonwealth **Vol. 2: 801–804**
Vol. 3: 219
Commotion **Vol. 2: 621–626**, 653, 842
Vol. 3: 536, **709 f.**
Communal **Vol. 1:** 448, 484, 533, 633, 639, 641 f., 717, 720
Vol. 2: 247, 316, 355, 438, 846, 869
Vol. 3: 234
Commune **Vol. 3:** 160
Comunicate **Vol. 3:** 760, 898
Communication **Vol. 1:** 511, 574, 578 f., 639, 678, 692
Vol. 2: 559
Vol. 3: 44, 54, 705, 874, 1078
Communion **Vol. 1:** 152, 160, 314, 460, 635, 639, 642
Vol. 2: 40, 161, 245, 273, 286, 288, 359, 518, 781, 905
Vol. 3: 262, 362, 403, 646, 705
Communism **Vol. 1:** 642
Communistic **Vol. 1:** 640
Community **Vol. 1:** 58, 77, 96 f., 128, 133, 144, 159 f., 171, 175, 189–191, 194–197, 211, 214, 219, 224 f., 237, 244, 256–259, 267, 269, 273, 279, 295 f., 298, 300, 302 f., 305, 308, 310, 317, 330, 333, 338, 355, 357, 361, 368, 414, 433, 435, 466, 474, 479, 488, 490, 497, 500, 520, 526, 534–536, 538, 542, 544, 554, 560, 577–579, 582, 598, 607, 613, 624 f., 628 f., 631 f., 634, 640–643, 656, 658, 661 f., 668, 673, 681, 684–687, 690, 693, 700, 715, 720, 732 f.
Vol. 2: 49, 53 f., 56, 73, 83, 92, 121, 123, 129 f., 132, 134, 141, 147, 152, 155, 157 f., 161, 174, 176, 194, 203, 216, 225, 228, 231, 234, 237, 242, 247–253, 255, 257, 261, 298 f., 302, 306–315, 328 f., 339, 354, 363, 384, 427, 429, 438, 441, 459, 463, 511, 516 f., 523, 534, 542, 546, 566, 785, 788, 799, 803, 810, 820, 840, 842, 864, 882 f., 897, 906, 915, 918
Vol. 3: 27, 34 f., 56, 66, 85 f., 88, 95–97, 105 f., 110, 142, 162, 164, 188, 196 f., 256, 268, 285–287, 289, 296, 299, 344, 346, 359, 384, 390, 392, 398, 420 f., 428, 448, 471, 486, 488, 495, 523, 532, 536, 545, 550 f., 553, 566, 568, 571, 574, 576, 593, 595 f., 598, 614 f., 619, 634, 637, 639, 671, 674 f., 695, 700, 702, 707, 720, 745, 758, 775, 783 f., 790, 792, 810, 830, 842, 852, 871, 882 f., 892, 899, 906, 925 f., 928, 934 f., 942, 961, 964, 970, 974, 1018, 1032, 1054, 1059, 1062 f., 1068, 1075, 1080, 1083, 1107, 1109, 1113, 1122 f., 1143, 1155, 1169
Community of hope **Vol. 3:** 970
Community Rule **Vol. 1:** 67
Community theology **Vol. 1: 58**
Companion **Vol. 1:** 254 f., 259, 283, 480, 635, 639, 642 f., 690
Vol. 3: 49, 201, 583
Companionship **Vol. 1:** 643
Company **Vol. 1:** 259, 469, 484, 542, 555, 641, 673, 733
Vol. 2: 355, 386, 790, 800
Comparable **Vol. 1:** 729
Comparative ethics (→Ethics, Comparative)
Comparative theology (→Theology, Compara-

tive)
Compare **Vol. 2: 362–367, 500–508, 743–756**
Vol. 3: 348
Comparison **Vol. 1:** 580, 724
Vol. 2: 128, 287, 351–354, 411, 424, 459, 501, 743–756
Compass **Vol. 2:** 688
Compassion **Vol. 1:** 110, 112 f., 214, 258, 334 f., 486, 569, 679, 699
Vol. 2: 116 f., 121, 123, 364, 418, 543, **593–601**, 667, 733, 738, 779, 801, 825, 857, 866
Vol. 3: 152, 156, 267, 311, **719–725**, 957, 989, 1073
Compassionate **Vol. 2:** 63, 632, 652, 812
Compel **Vol. 1:** 505, 718
Vol. 2: 245, **662–669**
Vol. 3: 951
Compensation **Vol. 2:** 48, 583, 666 f.
Vol. 3: 96, 153, 256, 605, 677
Compete **Vol. 1:** 645–647
Vol. 2: 308, 316
Competence **Vol. 3: 728–730**
Competent **Vol. 2:** 362, 372, 562
Vol. 3: 726, **728–730**
Competition **Vol. 1:** 625
Vol. 3: 775, 799, 1166
Compile **Vol. 1:** 576
Complacency **Vol. 2:** 448
Vol. 3: 369, 603, 692
Complain **Vol. 1:** 574
Vol. 2: 190, 416, 423, 854
Vol. 3: 237
Complaint **Vol. 1:** 598, 652
Vol. 2: 140, 143 f.
Complaint psalm **Vol. 3:** 234 f.
Complete **Vol. 1:** 58, 263, 282, 429, 591, 605, 678, 733 f., 741
Vol. 2: 52–66, 118, 144, 162, 195, 244, 313, 359, 451, 778
Vol. 3: 349–351, 776
Completeness **Vol. 2:** 191, 653, 701, 716
Vol. 3: 723, 872
Completion **Vol. 1:** 627
Vol. 2: 59, 65
Compliment **Vol. 1:** 461
Complutensian Polyglot **Vol. 1:** 70
Comply **Vol. 2:** 132
Vol. 3: 231
Component **Vol. 2:** 452
Compose **Vol. 1:** 676
Composition **Vol. 3:** 65
Compound **Vol. 2:** 293
Comprehend **Vol. 1:** 431, 481, 678
Vol. 2: 392–406
Vol. 3: 124, **130–133**, 512, 747
Comprehension **Vol. 1:** 676
Vol. 2: 392–406
Comprehensive **Vol. 2:** 690
Vol. 3: 894
Compromise **Vol. 2:** 285, 308
Vol. 3: 209, 884
Compulsion **Vol. 1:** 272, 401, 496, 718 f.
Vol. 2: 160, 393, 447, **662–669**, 827
Vol. 3: 108, 589, 854, 1049
Compulsory **Vol. 3:** 551, 593, 775, 934
Comrade **Vol. 1:** 254, 259
Vol. 2: 810
Vol. 3: 583, **1160–1165**
Conceal **Vol. 1:** 50, 577
Vol. 2: 61, 195, **211–220**, 379, 416, 746, 752
Vol. 3: 309 f., 884, 914
Conceit **Vol. 1:** 546
Vol. 3: 380
Conceive **Vol. 1:** 176, 186, **343 f.**, 425
Vol. 2: 86, 176
Vol. 3: 511
Concentration **Vol. 2:** 868
Vol. 3: 911
Concept **Vol. 1:** 612, 711
Conception **Vol. 1:** 152, 186 f., 343, 625, 708
Vol. 2: 87, 229, 587, 599
Vol. 3: 660, 1073
Concepts, Moral (→Moral concepts)
Conceptual **Vol. 1:** 582
Vol. 3: 123
Concern **Vol. 1:** 102, 191 f., 276 f., 646, 595, 731
Vol. 2: 140, 235, 303, 395, 429, 538, 825
Vol. 3: 138, 357, 402, 507, 519, 560, 835, 853, 859, 1053
Concession **Vol. 1:** 310, 496, 506, 709
Conciliate **Vol. 3: 148–166**
Conciliator **Vol. 1:** 373
Conciseness **Vol. 2:** 748
Conclude **Vol. 1:** 330
Conclusion **Vol. 1:** 664
Vol. 2: 32, 59 f., 139, 157
Vol. 3: 1086
Concord **Vol. 2:** 776, 782
Vol. 3: 33
Concordism **Vol. 2:** 889
Concrete **Vol. 2:** 746
Concubinage **Vol. 2:** 578
Concubine **Vol. 1:** 230, 498 f.
Vol. 2: 575
Vol. 3: 1055
Condemn **Vol. 2:** 78, 142, 150, 205, 237 f., 282, **362–367, 370**, 379, 381, 383, 435, 445–447, 736
Vol. 3: 211, 402, 1062, 1151
Condemn to death **Vol. 2:** 57
Condemnation **Vol. 1:** 171, 191, 217, 220, 349, 356, 372, 392, 394–396, 403, 417, 424, 433, 437, 452, 513, 515, 542, 547, 550, 566, 579, 590, 597, 607, 609 f., 613, 633, 648, 655, 675, 688, 722, 730, 738
Vol. 2: 139, 185, 222, 267, 271, 285 f., 361, **362–367, 370**, 443, 445, 449, 584, 709, 723
Vol. 3: 164, 270, 354, 403, 748, 1052
Condemnatory **Vol. 1:** 397
Condescension **Vol. 1:** 426
Vol. 2: 116, 118
Condiment **Vol. 3:** 443 f.
Condition **Vol. 1:** 165, 271, 275, 367, 536, 541, 543, 548, 564, 582, 600, 606, 618, 672, 679, 703, 739
Vol. 2: 147, 163, 230, 235, 308, 325, 343, 359, 366, 415, 421, 445, 500, 548, 568, **656–**

Condition (*cont'd*)
661, 859
Vol. 3: 144, 858, 1156
Conditional **Vol. 3:** 172
Conditioned **Vol. 1:** 71, 526
Conduct **Vol. 1:** 59, 201, 349 f., 352, 418, 472, 482, 487, 491, 550, 571, 594, 597 f., 601, 604, 616, 620, 623 f., 723
Vol. 2: 61, 95, 103, 123, 218, 230, 246, 365, 391, 396, 407, 431, 436, 445, 452, 666, 669, 776, 786, **801–804**, 815 f., 819, 828, 846
Vol. 3: 60, 124, 137, 204, 347, 356–358, 400, 447, 525, 561, 604, 692, 761, 774, **933–947**, 1027 f., 1043, 1052, 1058, 1169
Confederacy **Vol. 2:** 375
Confederate **Vol. 2:** 810
Confederation **Vol. 2:** 373
Confer **Vol. 1:** 208, 650, 675
Vol. 2: 152, 335
Confess **Vol. 1:** 115, 205, 223, 276, **344–348**, 424, 455, 469, 493, 545, 574, 677 f.
Vol. 2: 42, 114, 215, 217, 263, 309, 343, 373, 377, 380, 382 f., 430, 449, 473, 516, 519, 559, 874, 885
Vol. 3: 44, 47, 54, 136, 163, 225, 233, 243, 249, 362, 625, 668, 816, 1050
Confession **Vol. 1:** 51, 142, 149, 153, 158, 227, 244, 272, 290, 309, 332, 336, 340, 344, 347, 349, 380, 382, 384, 396, 404, 435, 437, 491, 519, 597–599, 604, 636, 638, 662, 668 f., 679, 700, 702, 708, 735
Vol. 2: 73, 75, 78, 118, 133, 174, 176, 231, 239, 243 f., 251, 315, 340–342, 404, 514 f., 614, 654, 722, 724 f., 897
Vol. 3: 42, 60 f., 74, 114, 142, 164, 167, 233, 342, 384–386, 401, 474, 490, 505, 509, 563, 578, 611, 630, 639, 643, 646, 651–653, 675, 703, 729, 742, 774, 777, 836 f., 899, 965
Confessional **Vol. 1:** 600, 628
Vol. 2: 338 f.
Confessional formula **Vol. 3:** 299
Confidence **Vol. 1:** 223, 227, 229, 261, 311, 327 f., 364 f., 384, 399, 425, 433, 444, 492, 505, 531, 587 f., 591 f., 658–660, 675, 679–681, 703, 710, 712 f.
Vol. 2: 42, 165, 218, 230, 240, 243 f., 249, 360, 367, 385, 387, **734–737**, 843 f., 863, 866, 868, 873, 900
Vol. 3: 47, 74, 143, 249, 366, 728, 1096
Confidential **Vol. 2:** 395
Vol. 3: 502, 589
Confine **Vol. 1:** 735
Vol. 2: 135, 445, **807–809**
Confirm **Vol. 1:** 97–99, 415, 538, 545, 594, 596 f., 600, 658–664, 667, 708, 734
Vol. 2: 119, 123, 341, 350, 797
Vol. 3: 344, 499, 1104, **1038–1050**
Confiscation **Vol. 3:** 604
Conflagration **Vol. 1:** 463, 521, 656 f.
Conflict **Vol. 1:** 270, 273, 373, 429 f., 452, 487, 561, 563, 592, 600–604, 631, 644–653
Vol. 2: 111, 119, 282 f., 308, 310 f., 313, 401, 781
Vol. 3: 111, 753, **958–967**
Conflicting **Vol. 1:** 505
Conform **Vol. 1:** 708 f.
Vol. 2: 234, 242, 255, 262, 289, 361, 436, 439, 446, **451–453**, 673, 885
Vol. 3: 577, 701
Conforming to the law **Vol. 2:** **438–451**
Conformity **Vol. 1:** 371, 400, 481, 603, 693, 705, 707
Vol. 2: 259, 403, 443
Vol. 3: 1200
Confront **Vol. 2:** 327, 378
Confrontation **Vol. 1:** 499, 502, 505, 524 f., 550, 624, 651
Vol. 2: 396, 437
Vol. 3: 145, 472
Confounded **Vol. 3:** 562, 733
Confuse **Vol. 2:** 416
Confusion **Vol. 1:** 468, 527
Vol. 2: 461
Vol. 3: 556, **709 f.**, 731
Confute **Vol. 1:** 577
Vol. 3: 492
Congenital **Vol. 2:** 414 f.
Congratulate **Vol. 2:** 92
Congregation **Vol. 1:** 96 f., 99, 190, 219, 245, 247, 255, 272, 291, 293 f., 296 f., 300–305, 496, 500 f., 572, 582, 618, 643, 732
Vol. 2: 51, 73 f., 121, 126, 152, 161, 201, 235, 237, 247 f., 250 f., 412, 523, 533, 547, 668, 676, 800, 816, 818
Vol. 3: 88, 159, 670, 675, 746, 868, 905, 930, 1058
Congregation of wickedness **Vol. 2:** 364
Conjecture **Vol. 1:** 326
Vol. 2: 44 f.
Conjugal rights **Vol. 3:** 536, 539
Conjuror **Vol. 2:** 555
Connection **Vol. 2:** 386, 683
Connive **Vol. 2:** 767
Conquer **Vol. 1:** 118, 252, 400, 434, 445, 458, 460, 563 f., 644, 650, 688, 718
Vol. 2: 218, 308, 373, **510–520**, 795
Conqueror **Vol. 1:** 126, 244, 407 f., 413, 651
Vol. 2: 329, 419
Conquest **Vol. 1:** 402, 445 f., 533, 686, 713, 716
Vol. 2: 257
Vol. 3: 256, 1104
Conquest of Canaan **Vol. 1:** **53**, 55, 61, 66, 72
Vol. 2: **297 f.**, 373, 802, 841
Conscience **Vol. 1:** 116, 147, 152, 223, 225, 341, **348–353**, 448 f., 495, 552, 566, 572, 604, 677
Vol. 2: 63, 101 f., 121, 140, 149, 182, 235, 268, 286, 493, 567, 574 f., 611, 659, 706 f., 735, 881
Vol. 3: 35, 41, 107, 127, 133, 322 f., 365 f., 426, 432 f., 550, 725, 755, 759, 824, 874, 889, 903, 927, 941, 989, 995 f., 1042 f.
Conscious **Vol. 1:** 549, 647, 696, 736
Vol. 2: 417
Vol. 3: 513, 1017
Consciousness **Vol. 1:** 348, 351, 353, 485, 491, 497, 527 f., 538 f., 699 f.
Vol. 2: 295, 310, 340, 379, 435
Vol. 3: 125, 127, 514, 677, 681, 899

Conscription **Vol. 1:** 536
Consecrate **Vol. 1:** 210, 224, 239, 294 f., 405, 413–415, 474, 497, 507, 688
Vol. 2: 40, 43, 60, 63, **223–238**, 354, 650, **670–674**, 675, 862
Vol. 3: 160, 415, 892
Consecration **Vol. 2:** 61, 215, **223–238**, 294, 579, 581, 638, 711, 782
Vol. 3: 38, 422 f., 989
Consent **Vol. 1:** 344
Vol. 2: 501, 817
Vol. 3: 1057
Consequence **Vol. 1:** 268, 396, 419, 437, 478, 541, 611, 679, 687, 702, 716–718, 721, 725
Vol. 2: 119, 138 f., 159, 314, 360, 384, 399, 583
Vol. 3: 134, 185, 201, 525, 578 f., 586, 720, 919, 1094
Conservation **Vol. 3:** 820
Conservative **Vol. 3:** 440
Consider **Vol. 2: 362–367**, 458
Vol. 3: 122–130, 230, 232, 511, 519 f., **820–826**
Consider worthy **Vol. 3: 348 f.**
Considerate **Vol. 2: 256–259**, 400
Consideration **Vol. 1:** 105 f., 537, 675, 680, 723
Vol. 2: 286, 386
Vol. 3: 128, **820–826**, 1015
Consign **Vol. 1:** 730
Consistency **Vol. 1:** 725 f.
Consistent **Vol. 2:** 335
Consolation **Vol. 1:** 216 f., 328 f.
Vol. 2: 359, 418, 420
Vol. 3: 88
Consolation of Israel **Vol. 1:** 329, 570
Vol. 2: 245
Vol. 3: 790
Console **Vol. 1:** 88, 328 f., 341, **567–573**
Vol. 2: 418
Vol. 3: 255
Consolidate **Vol. 1:** 604
Consolidation **Vol. 2:** 129
Consort **Vol. 2:** 349
Conspicuous **Vol. 1:** 267
Conspiracy **Vol. 1:** 246
Vol. 2: 521
Constancy **Vol. 1:** 367, 710
Vol. 2: 452, 868
Constant **Vol. 3: 229 f.**
Constantine **Vol. 2:** 506
Constellation **Vol. 1:** 670
Vol. 2: 187, 688
Vol. 3: 146, 312, 396 f., 554, **734–737**, 842 f.
Constitute **Vol. 1:** 710
Vol. 2: 441
Constitution **Vol. 1:** 189, 521, 640, 711
Vol. 2: 657
Vol. 3: 755
Constraint **Vol. 1:** 496, 525, 693
Vol. 2: 360
Vol. 3: 711, 739
Construct **Vol. 3: 118–120**
Construction **Vol. 1:** 521 f., 713
Vol. 2: 683
Consubstantial **Vol. 2: 505**
Vol. 3: 1186
Consul **Vol. 1:** 169, **269 f.**, 407
Consult **Vol. 2:** 367, 856, 879
Consultation **Vol. 1:** 293
Vol. 2: 32
Consume **Vol. 1:** 390
Vol. 2: 268 f., 831
Consuming **Vol. 3:** 982
Consummation **Vol. 1:** 52, 251 f., 506, 508, 655, 668, 692
Vol. 2: 52, 59, 61 f., 65, 147, 178, 271, 329, 383, 532, 575, 585, 692, 789, 877, 918, 920 f., 926
Vol. 3: 71, 73, 256, 702, 733, 842, 844, 847
Consumption **Vol. 1:** 642
Vol. 2: 271
Contact **Vol. 1:** 444, 512, 583
Vol. 2: 225 f., 267, 285
Vol. 3: 103
Contagious magic **Vol. 2:** 553
Contain **Vol. 1:** 636, 741
Vol. 2: 773
Contaminate **Vol. 3:** 759
Contaminated **Vol. 1:** 653
Contamination **Vol. 2:** 223
Vol. 3: 231
Contemn **Vol. 3:** 341
Contemplate **Vol. 3: 122–130**
Contemplation **Vol. 1:** 529
Vol. 2: 60
Vol. 3: 845
Contemplative **Vol. 2:** 475, 478
Vol. 3: 210
Contemporary **Vol. 1:** 334
Vol. 2: 35, 314, 331, 338
Vol. 3: 335
Contempt **Vol. 1:** 74 f., 254, 397, 461, 479, 481, 539, 647, 726
Vol. 2: 124, 270, 284, 310, 334, 428, 449, 718
Vol. 3: 28 f., 426, 556, 593, 809
Contemptuously **Vol. 3:** 943
Contend **Vol. 1:** 645–647, 719
Vol. 2: 305, 718
Vol. 3: 355
Content **Vol. 1:** 546, 600, 681, 704, 727, 741
Vol. 2: 111 f., 143, 243, 777, 817
Vol. 3: 54, 70, 74, 76, 143, **727 f.**, 1083
Contentiousness **Vol. 1:** 106, 641, 646
Vol. 3: 1119
Contentment **Vol. 1:** 433
Vol. 2: 60
Vol. 3: 257, **727 f.**, 955
Contest **Vol. 1:** 454, 469, 645
Vol. 2: 316
Vol. 3: 873, 946
Contestant **Vol. 1:** 646 f.
Context **Vol. 1:** 57, 582, 698, 737
Vol. 3: 153 f., 206, 877, 892, 899, 1140
Continence **Vol. 3:** 536
Contingent proposition **Vol. 3:** 894
Continue **Vol. 1:** 674
Vol. 3: 238

Continue in **Vol. 3:** 223–229
Continuity **Vol. 1:** 299, 736
Vol. 2: 231, 314, 695, 700, 721, 787, 891, 918–920
Vol. 3: 236, 292, 654
Contract **Vol. 1:** 121, 243, 291, 344
Vol. 2: 40, 146, 305, 879
Vol. 3: 353
Contract price **Vol. 3:** **138–144**, 539
Contractor **Vol. 1:** 279
Contradict **Vol. 1:** 601, 630, 659, 693
Vol. 2: 342
Contradiction **Vol. 2:** 281, 401
Vol. 3: 779
Contradictory **Vol. 2:** 214, 229
Contrary **Vol. 1:** 597, 606
Vol. 2: 420, 438, 445
Contrast **Vol. 1:** 609, 629, 631, 643, 666
Vol. 2: 281, 288, 304, 329, 334, 349, 357
Vol. 3: 889
Contravention **Vol. 1:** 447
Contribution **Vol. 1:** 642, 740
Vol. 2: 131, 320, 594, 823, 826 f.
Vol. 3: 153, 415
Contrite **Vol. 2:** 422
Contrition **Vol. 2:** 157
Contrive **Vol. 1:** 599
Vol. 2: 236, 888
Control **Vol. 1:** 208, 260, 273, 365, 429, 436, 450, 452, 458, 494 f., 501 f., 517, 527, 595, 650 f., 654, 671, 692, 697, 715, 720, 733, 738
Vol. 2: 99, 120, 149 f., 159, 182, 191, 262, 287, 296 f., 299, 430, 446, 510, 512, 561, 609, 617, 736
Vol. 3: 122, 177, 234, 474, 689, 693, 917, 1087
Controversy **Vol. 1:** 133, 487, 544, 558, 631
Vol. 2: 362, 402, 405, 426, 446, 448, 451, 580
Vol. 3: 762, 887, 909, 999, 1026, 1086, 1119
Convene **Vol. 2:** 31
Convenient **Vol. 3:** **833–839**
Convention **Vol. 3:** 895, 1123, 1141
Conversation **Vol. 1:** 575, 612
Vol. 2: 861, 867, 869, 873
Vol. 3: 1058, 1083
Conversion **Vol. 1:** 77, 111, 136, 144–146, 149, 158–160, 163, 180, 182 f., 245, 291, 346, 349, **353–362**, 422, 511, 557, 560, 589 f., 623, 685, 688, 691, 702 f.
Vol. 2: 74, 86, 90, 93 f., 126, 181, 183, 240, 250, 266, 270, 314, 405, 407, 413, 453, 568, 584, 596, 716, 749, 785, 792, 825, 828, 877
Vol. 3: 48, 54, 82, 106, 148, 322, 361, 373, 542, 549, 582, 586, 628, 675, 698 f., 705, 751, 765, 775, 955, 1158
Convert **Vol. 1:** 191, 247, 350, 413, 689
Vol. 2: 158, 227, 443 f., 563, 881
Vol. 3: 233, 352, 410, 416, 686, 1052, 1164
Convey **Vol. 3:** 706, 1140
Convey property **Vol. 3:** 806
Conveyance **Vol. 1:** 606
Convict **Vol. 1:** 91, 130, 349
Vol. 2: **137–145**, 158, 447, 768
Vol. 3: 573
Conviction **Vol. 1:** 365, 392, 482, 492, 545, 587, 595, 604, 710, 713, 731, 735
Vol. 2: 140, 152
Vol. 3: 705, 709
Convictor **Vol. 1:** 373
Convince **Vol. 1:** 504, 572, 588–590, 594, 663, 681
Vol. 2: 140
Vol. 3: 362, 1087
Convincer **Vol. 1:** 91
Convivial **Vol. 2:** 356
Conzelmann, H. **Vol. 3:** 86
Cook **Vol. 2:** 254
Co-operate **Vol. 3:** 1147–1152
Co-operation **Vol. 2:** 446
Co-ordinate **Vol. 1:** 523
Vol. 2: 80
Coping **Vol. 2:** 157
Coponius **Vol. 2:** 849
Vol. 3: 452
Copper **Vol. 2:** 96 f.
Vol. 3: 606
Copper-smith **Vol. 2:** 96
Copy **Vol. 1:** 491, 521, 643
Vol. 2: 192, 194, **284**, 287, **290 f.**, 310, 447, 497, **503–508**, 655, 804
Vol. 3: 433, 478, 645, 647, 876, 888, **903–906**
Copyist **Vol. 2:** 309, 715
Coral **Vol. 3:** 498
Corban **Vol. 2:** **39–44**
Vol. 3: 481
Cord **Vol. 3:** 592
Cords of death **Vol. 3:** 858
Cords of Sheol **Vol. 3:** 858
Co-regent **Vol. 2:** 146 f.
Corinth **Vol. 1:** 138, 183, 261, 299, 313, 315, 317, 328 f., 352, 361, 399, 468, 497, 500, 514, 568, 571, 638, 727
Vol. 2: 74, 127, 159, 212 f., 231, 235, 254, 267, 273, 286, 311, 365, 369, 451, 576, 597, 605, 611, 756, 762 f., 809, 849, 851, 895, 898 f., 923
Vol. 3: 84, 127, 170, 203, 225, 297, 305, 346, 369, 379, 432, 534, 541, 548, 561, 714, 742, 802, 831, 905, 955, 994 f., 1021, 1025, 1065 f., 1073, 1080, 1110
Corinthian **Vol. 3:** 412, 499, 544, 570, 707, 932, 1026, 1030 f., 1053
Corinthians **Vol. 1:** 214, 236, 275, 279, 328, 351 f., 356, 365, 397 f., 400, 419, 466, 469, 491, 496, 500, 514, 559, 571, 592, 639, 664, 680 f., 709, 731, 741 f.
Vol. 2: 57, 74, 159 f., 175, 179, 253, 263, 273, 338, 360, 399, 402 f., 420, 422, 519, 530, 676, 727, 756, 765, 826, 834, 880, 884, 922
Vol. 3: 61, 85, 118, 130, 142, 241 f., 380, 431, 576, 727, 752, 773, 954 f., 1151
Corn **Vol. 1:** 115, 204, 498, 625
Vol. 2: 267, 675, 711
Vol. 3: 194, 792
Cornelian **Vol. 3:** 396
Cornelius **Vol. 1:** 148, 361, 504, 576, 690
Vol. 2: 178, 596, 800, 895
Vol. 3: 66, 105 f., 242, 324, 361, 699, 1043

Corner **Vol. 2:** 159, 688 f.
Vol. 3: 388–390
Cornerstone **Vol. 1:** 377, 541, 596, 661 f.
Vol. 2: 129, 249, 253, 313, 622 f., 706
Vol. 3: 84, **381–399**, 504, 809
Coronation **Vol. 1:** 121, 426
Vol. 2: 200
Vol. 3: 873
Corporate **Vol. 1:** 229, 237, 294, 301, 305, 733
Vol. 2: 353, 920
Vol. 3: 373, 523 f.
Corporeality **Vol. 1:** 87, 233, 500
Vol. 3: 680
Corpse **Vol. 1:** 113, 229, 232–234, 393, 429, 443 f., 446, 450, 480, 608, 610, 653–655
Vol. 3: 100, 303, 694, 860, 953, 989
Corpus Hermeticum (→Hermetic Literature)
Correct **Vol. 1:** 163, 707
Vol. 2: 123, 140, 327
Vol. 3: 351 f., 776, **874–901**
Correcting **Vol. 3: 351 f.**
Correction **Vol. 1:** 349, 462, 551, 555, 568 f.
Vol. 2: 140–142
Vol. 3: 745
Correctly **Vol. 3: 351 f.**
Corrector **Vol. 1:** 708
Correlation **Vol. 1:** 60
Correspond **Vol. 1:** 246, 491, 731
Vol. 2: 289, 380, **451–453, 497–500**
Vol. 3: 348, 397, 884 f., 904, 1104, 1200
Correspondence theory of truth **Vol. 3: 894–896**
Corresponding **Vol. 2: 497–500**
Vol. 3: 903–906
Corroboration **Vol. 3:** 326
Corroborative oath **Vol. 3:** 740
Corrupt **Vol. 1:** 96, 350, 402, 464, 467–469, 565, 588, 589, 724
Vol. 2: 183, 326, 461
Vol. 3: 310, 578
Corruptibility **Vol. 1:** 552
Vol. 2: 96
Corrupting **Vol. 3:** 886
Corruption **Vol. 1:** 76, 266, 299, 381, 458, 467 f., 470, 559, 562, 590, 611, 677, 681
Vol. 2: 96, 183, 661, 692, 714
Vol. 3: 140, 271, 281, 444, 449, 525, 651, 685, 939
Cosmetics **Vol. 1:** 119
Vol. 2: 334, 711 f.
Cosmic **Vol. 1: 53**, 102, 167, 186, 224, 237 f., 257, 290, 298, 301–303, 374, 383, 396, 401 f., 423, 432, 498, 521, 523, 549, 562, 610, 637, 707
Vol. 2: 38, 54, 56, 65, 73, 75, 167, 188 f., 196, 200 f., 290, 375, 385, 389, 393 f., 436, 439, 482, 609, 629, 665, 828, 916
Vol. 3: 148, 172, 353, 397, 502, 559, 595 f., 630, 678 f., 718, 722, 847, 1147
Cosmic cycle **Vol. 3:** 146
Cosmic egg **Vol. 2:** 188
Cosmic dualism **Vol. 3:** 802
Cosmic harmony **Vol. 2:** 498
Cosmic sabbath **Vol. 2:** 697
Cosmic signs **Vol. 3:** 372 f.
Cosmic week **Vol. 2:** 697 f., 701
Cosmogony **Vol. 1: 53**
Vol. 2: 189, 394
Cosmological **Vol. 1:** 166, 386, 452, 523, 616, 674
Vol. 2: 71, 190–193, 195, 645, 887
Vol. 3: 630, 645, 719, 789, 865, 984
Cosmological argument **Vol. 3:** 331
Cosmology **Vol. 1: 53**, 69, 491, 521 f., 594, 655
Vol. 2: 187, 394, 397, 677, 763
Vol. 3: 146, 148, 693
Cosmopolitanism **Vol. 1:** 640
Cosmos **Vol. 1:** 94, 164, 167, 184, 232 f., 237, 387, 432, 450, 470, 507, 521–526, 595, 616, 715 f.
Vol. 2: 66, 158, 165, 188, 192, 199, 270, 394, 405, 603
Vol. 3: 831, 994, 1085
Cost **Vol. 1:** 404, 414, 679
Vol. 2: 104, 699
Costas, Orlando E. **Vol. 3:** 973
Costly **Vol. 3:** 398
Council **Vol. 1:** 52, 102, 192, 194, 196, 199, 273, 297, 350, **362–364**, 418, 580, 591, 712
Vol. 2: 32, 368
Vol. 3: 35, 39, 42, 49, 97, 99, 241, 1016
Council of Alexandria **Vol. 2:** 507
Council of Antioch **Vol. 2: 506–508**
Council of Constantinople **Vol. 2: 505–508**
Council of the Five Hundred **Vol. 3:** 1015
Council of Jerusalem (→Jerusalem Council)
Council of Nicaea **Vol. 2:** 316, **505–507**
Council of Trent **Vol. 3:** 244, 371, 401
Counsel **Vol. 1:** 89, 362 f., 425, 451, 552, 569, 625, 684, 696, 738
Vol. 2: 77, 300, 440, 856
Vol. 3: 79, 224, 258, 311, 916, 1016 f.
Counsellor **Vol. 1:** 91, 665
Vol. 3: 230, 242, 704, 1068
Count **Vol. 1:** 480, 536, 540, 546, 556, 675, 723, 732 f.
Vol. 2: 144, 429, 683
Vol. 3: 1081–1119
Countenance **Vol. 1:** 212, 708
Vol. 2: 491
Counter **Vol. 2:** 266
Counteract **Vol. 1:** 693
Counterfeit **Vol. 1:** 187
Vol. 3: 916
Counterpart **Vol. 2:** 291
Countless **Vol. 2:** 700
Country **Vol. 1:** 517, 606, 615, 685, 741
Vol. 2: 92, 349, 788
Countryside **Vol. 1:** 520
Courage **Vol. 1:** 314, 327, **364 f.**, 431, 501, 536, 720, 731
Vol. 2: 180, 244, 736
Vol. 3: 676, 689, 715, 747, 925 f., 1059
Course **Vol. 1:** 492, 524, 608, 610, 667, 694, 730, 741
Vol. 2: 62, 457
Vol. 3: 945–947, 1086
Court **Vol. 1:** 101 f., 267, 271, 315, 321, 344, 347, 349 f., 363 f., 373, 393, 414 f., 478, 554,

Court (*cont'd*)
560, 580, 665
Vol. 2: 116, 137, 142 f., 225, 367 f., 392, 613 f., 841, 922
Vol. 3: 49, 78, 212, 324, 380, 404, 441, 537, 545, 547, 588, 608, 633, 636, 741, 756, 849, 954, 1032, 1048, 1165
Court of the Gentiles **Vol. 2:** 236
Vol. 3: 789, 795, 949
Court of Israel **Vol. 3:** 789
Court of men **Vol. 2:** 236
Court of the women **Vol. 2:** 236
Vol. 3: 789, 796, 1058
Court prophet **Vol. 2:** 306
Courtesan **Vol. 1:** 497
Courtesy **Vol. 2:** 549, 712, 812, 860
Courtly style **Vol. 2:** 79, 428, 818
Vol. 3: 564
Courtyard **Vol. 1:** 632
Cousin **Vol. 1:** 256
Covenant **Vol. 1:** 58 f., 61, 71, 77, 79, 81, 96, 98, 108 f., 123, 149, 154, 159 f., 185, 189, 195, 199, 210, 221–225, 243, 248, 258, 280, 293–296, 308 f., 311, 332 f., 349 f., 354, 357, **365–376**, 382 f., 386, 412, 414, 416, 423, 433, 437, 448, 452, 463, 481, 531, 538, 541 f., 589, 593, 596, 601, 617, 626, 636, 638, 641, 655, 659, 666, 685, 690 f., 702, 717
Vol. 2: 40, 47, 63 f., 73, 75, 77, 105, 117, 122, 132, 134, 139, 145, 155, 176, 183, 213, 228, 230, 237, 275 f., 287, 295, 298, 304, 307, 314, 316, 318, 320, 328 f., 343, 356, 367, 374, 385, 396, 441 f., 444, 447 f., 453, 471, 478 f., 486, 492, 512, 521, 524 f., 532 f., 535 f., 540 f., 569, 576, 581, 591–595, 597, 626, 637, 671, 681, 716 f., 741, 772, 779, 784–786, 794, 797 f., 854, 891, 923
Vol. 3: 28, 42, 70, 72–74, 79, 89, 113, 135 f., 140, 150, 166 f., 172, 190 f., 200, 215, 224, 227, 233, 235, 237, 239, 241, 243, 246, 263 f., 273, 311, 313, 316, 320, 323, 332, 342, 354, 356 f., 363, 365 f., 372 f., 390 f., 397, 407, 411, 415, 422, 425, 433, 435 f., 445, 484, 486, 499, 522–524, 531, 574, 578, 583 f., 590, 592, 626 f., 649 f., 692, 740, 743, 761, 782, 784, 790, 793, 799 f., 803, 805, 811, 815, 824, 828, 836, 870–872, 879, 882, 890, 938, 941, 944 f., 1002 f., 1013 f., 1018, 1030, 1040 f., 1057, 1074, 1087, 1091, 1096, 1102, 1105 f., 1148, 1158
Covenant loyalty **Vol. 3:** 889
Cover **Vol. 1:** 555, 587, 653, 698, 701, 707, 733, 735
Vol. 2: 157, 160–162, **211–214,** 225, 259, 294
Vol. 3: 149, 154, 156, 192, **553–556**
Cover over **Vol. 3:** 150
Cover up **Vol. 3:** 310
Covering **Vol. 3: 794 f.**
Covet **Vol. 1:** 432, 457, 727
Vol. 2: 871
Vol. 3: 142, 1057
Covetous **Vol. 1:** 137 f., 231, 336
Vol. 2: 286
Covetousness **Vol. 2:** 96, 669, 833
Cow **Vol. 1:** 537, 672, 686
Cowardice **Vol. 1:** 365, 559
Vol. 2: 180, 430
Cozbi **Vol. 3:** 159
Crack **Vol. 1:** 94
Craft **Vol. 1:** 279, 654, 743
Vol. 3: 377
Craftsman **Vol. 1: 279**, 383, 387, 419, 735
Vol. 2: 574
Vol. 3: 691, 728, 787
Craftsmanship **Vol. 1:** 723, 735
Crafty **Vol. 1:** 412
Vol. 2: 469, 616
Vol. 3: 935
Crag **Vol. 3:** 381
Cramp **Vol. 2: 807–809**
Cranfield, C. E. B. **Vol. 3: 299 f.**
Crave **Vol. 1:** 456, 671
Vol. 2: 539
Craving **Vol. 3:** 676, 805
Crazed **Vol. 1:** 529
Create **Vol. 1:** 257, 272, 349, 378, 380, 383, 402, 422, 493, 563, 590, 672 f., 678
Vol. 2: 77, 106, 111, 128, 149, 158, 183, 190, 193
Vol. 3: 119, 1058, 1147, 1153
Created **Vol. 1:** 181, 301, 390, 474, 509, 518, 524, 572, 600, 625, 668, 670
Vol. 2: 83, 101, 161, 163, 310, 660, 798
Creation **Vol. 1:** 54, 56, 58, 60, 63, 65 f., 70, 72, 84 f., 87, 95, 99, 101, 116, 165–169, 175, 180, 185, 211, 213, 216, 230, 236, 256, 279, 313, 333, 355, **376–389**, 424, 431, 433, 437, 470, 496, 506, 517 f., 521 f., 524–526, 552, 565, 617, 628, 630, 636, 665, 668–671, 694, 713, 732 f.
Vol. 2: 45, 47–49, 51 f., 58, 64, 72, 78, 83, 99, 128, 149, 160, 189, 194 f., 243–245, 275, 285, 356, 396 f., 405, 420, 441 f., 447, 483, 488, 491, 496, 516, 548, 553, 564, 569, 574, 590, 602, 608, 613, 615, 622, 629, 643, 657–662, 671 f., 690 f., 714, 720 f., 761, 834, 877, 883 f., 889, 912, 927, 931
Vol. 3: 36, 52, 117–120, 128, 148, 180, 182, 199, 204, 207, 210, 250, 256, 293, 319, 330, 349, 372 f., 402, 406, 416 f., 502–504, 515, 460, 616, 642, 647, 656, 674, 681, 683, 689, 707, 725, 730, 734, 831, 833, 837, 843, 845 f., 885, 912, 917, 922, 980, 983, 986, 990, 995, 1029, 1031, 1033, 1055 f., 1063 f., 1087 f., 1100, 1102, 1116 f., 1133, 1143, **1152–1155**, 1157, 1182
Creation of man **Vol. 3:** 915
Creation myth **Vol. 2: 200 f.**, 553
Creation, New **Vol. 1:** 86 f., 153, 185 f., 222, 225, 248, 257, 275, 299, 311, 336, 359, 385, 390, 434, 470, 538, 628, 680
Vol. 2: 48, 78, 83, 307, 399, 482, 545, 661, 670–673, 675, 691 f., 764, 780, 836
Vol. 3: 71, 168, 171, 656, 703, 785, 817, 831, 886, 927
Creation ordinances **Vol. 1:** 333
Vol. 2: 570
Vol. 3: 392

Creative **Vol. 1:** 384, 400, 643, 692
Vol. 2: 128, 425, 488, 920
Creative intuition **Vol. 3:** 898
Creative word **Vol. 3:** 1088, 1100, 1105 f., 1108, 1120
Creator **Vol. 1:** 92, 112, 138, 175, 178, 216, 227, 375, 378–387, 422, 502, 518, 522 f., 552, 616 f., 621, 639, 665, 669–671, 688, 723, 728
Vol. 2: 58 f., 64, 70–72, 74, 92, 94, 158, 160, 164, 175, 187, 226, 375, 472, 478, 480, 485, 491, 512, 514, 633, 649, 655, 658, 672, 724, 799, 839, 877
Vol. 3: 36, 128, 172, 233, 644, 692, 826, 835, 842, 846, 885, 912, 916, 984, 986, 1020, 1032, 1105, 1148 f., 1182, 1202
Creature **Vol. 1:** 138, 222, **376–389**, 439, 471, 521, 674, 679, 723
Vol. 2: 94, 105, 117, 472, 485, 613, 657, 661
Creatureliness **Vol. 1:** 85, 221, 233, 552, 678 f., 700
Vol. 2: 564 f.
Credal form **Vol. 1:** 58, 473, 677
Credentials **Vol. 3:** 354
Credibility **Vol. 1:** 505, 588, 594, 724
Vol. 2: 444, 858
Vol. 3: 290
Credit **Vol. 1:** 594
Vol. 2: 131, 400, 434
Vol. 3: **822–826**
Creditor **Vol. 2:** 667, 858
Creed **Vol. 1:** 147, 379, 473, 620
Vol. 2: 406
Creep **Vol. 2:** 412
Cremation **Vol. 1:** 264
Crenides **Vol. 2:** 550
Creon **Vol. 1:** 550
Cretans **Vol. 3:** 81, 887
Crete **Vol. 2:** 612, 645
Vol. 3: 137, 253, 782
Crime **Vol. 1:** 151, 392, 410, 519
Vol. 2: 139, 142, 521
Vol. 3: 93 f., 574
Criminal **Vol. 1:** 264, 390 f., 402, 417, 466, 479, 564, 649, 655, 669, 698
Vol. 2: 137, 238, 392, 572
Vol. 3: 149, 203, 211, 242, 575
Cripple **Vol. 1:** 507
Vol. 2: **414 f.**
Vol. 3: 520, 710
Crisis **Vol. 1:** 436, 724 f.
Vol. 2: 117, 309, **362–367**, 382 f., 706
Vol. 3: 826
Crispus **Vol. 1:** 160
Criterion **Vol. 2:** 460, 847
Criterion of judgment **Vol. 3:** 399
Critic **Vol. 2:** 362
Critical **Vol. 1:** 583 f., 602
Vol. 2: 159, 401
Critical faculty **Vol. 3:** 124
Criticism **Vol. 1:** 512, 568, 603
Vol. 2: 214
Criticism, Biblical **Vol. 1:** 70, 582
Criticism, Historical **Vol. 1:** 57, **60**, 61, 548
Vol. 2: 340, 389
Vol. 3: 282
Criticism, Literary **Vol. 1:** 51, 57, 60, **62**, 68
Criticism, Redaction (→Redaction Criticism)
Criticism, Scientific **Vol. 1:** 71
Criticism, Textual **Vol. 1:** 57, **69 f.**, 71
Crocodile **Vol. 2:** 485
Vol. 3: 557
Cronus **Vol. 2:** 188
Crooked **Vol. 2:** 36, 370, **414 f.**
Crops **Vol. 1:** 520, 724, 729
Vol. 2: 32, 211, 693, 711
Vol. 3: 525, 756
Cross **Vol. 1:** 54 f., 57, 73 f., 113, 147, 167 f., 191, 198, 214, 223 f., 228, 237, 248, 254, 279, 323, 330, 375, 385, **389–405**, 409, 411, 417, 430, 437, 439, 455, 461, 464, 473, 479, 483, 510, 540, 544, 547–549, 551, 555, 564, 572, 601 f., 615, 638, 647, 649, 651, 669, 680, 685, 702 f., 707, 719, 722, 726 f., 740
Vol. 2: 42, 61, 64, 78, 80, 83, 112, 126 f., 139, 145, 156, 179, 185 f., 199, 204 f., 262 f., 267, 273, 314, 334, 338–340, 343, 354, 361, 367, 378–380, 387 f., 402, 419 f., 426, 433, 435, 443–445, 481, 543, 559, 572 f., 575, 604–606, 610, 620, 671, 708, 710, 722, 766 f., 775, 782 f., 794, 804, 819, 909, 918
Vol. 3: 96 f., 99, 169, 171 f., 174, 183, 186, 204, 211 f., 214, 221, 245, 253, 278, 299, 315, 328, 343, 347, 366, 372, 374, 400, 415, 432, 448, 471, 489, 503 f., 510, 552, 563, 571, 580, 601, 631, 641, 670, 725, 743, 779, 785, 824 f., **865–870**, 871, 883, 922, 949 f., 956, 965, 995, 1017, 1025 f., 1030–1032, 1062, 1108–1110 f., 113, 1154, 1195
Cross over **Vol. 3:** 583
Cross-examine **Vol. 2:** 362
Crossan, J.D. **Vol. 3:** 899
Crouch **Vol. 2:** 260
Crowd **Vol. 1:** 292–295, 322, 409, 411, 482, 646, 679, 728 f., 731 f., 744
Vol. 2: 32 f., 599, 625, **788–805**, **807–809**, 842
Vol. 3: 112 f., 711
Crown **Vol. 1:** 118, 163, 204, **405–408**, 470, 648, 652
Vol. 2: 96, 200, 204, 244, 691, 695, 795
Vol. 3: 182, 483, 748, 750, 809, 1067
Crown of boasting **Vol. 1:** 229
Vol. 2: 901
Crown of glory **Vol. 3:** 323
Crown of life **Vol. 2:** 136, 775
Crown of thorns **Vol. 1:** 726
Crucified **Vol. 1:** 135, 178, 244, 248, 300, 387, 393–396, 439, 455, 466, 473, 564, 629, 633, 643, 727
Vol. 2: 203 f., 242, 267, 273, 282, 291, 340, 367, 388, 400, 412, 420, 715, 718
Vol. 3: 55, 60, 71, 276
Crucifixion **Vol. 1:** 154, 162 f., 168, 290, 298, 304, 390–396, 516, 630
Vol. 2: 32, 150, 204, 295, 299, 327, 368, 379, 526 f.
Vol. 3: 185, 202, 211, 243, 583, 732, 1047, 1059

Crucify **Vol. 2:** 270, 544, 718
Cruel **Vol. 1:** 108, 392 f., 520, 652
Cruelty **Vol. 2:** 98, 680
Vol. 3: 542
Crumb **Vol. 1:** 252
Crusaders in Palestine **Vol. 2:** 308
Crush **Vol. 1:** 261, 610
Vol. 2: 260 f., 807
Cry **Vol. 1:** 342, 360, **408–412**, 464, 610, 615, 623, 724
Vol. 2: 82 f., 175, 178 f., 215, 229, 328, 355, 361, 416–424, 426, 631, 855, 862, 873, 922
Vol. 3: 50, 53, 54, 118, 202, 782
Cry aloud **Vol. 3:** 48
Cry out **Vol. 3:** 114
Cryptic **Vol. 1:** 619
Crystal, D. **Vol. 3:** 394, 396, 398, 1127
Crystal sea **Vol. 2:** 615
Cuff **Vol. 1:** 163
Culinary **Vol. 2:** 211
Cullmann, Oscar **Vol. 1:** 148
Vol. 2: 907 f.
Vol. 3: 333, 618
Culmination **Vol. 1:** 541
Vol. 2: 59, 917
Culpable **Vol. 1:** 364
Vol. 2: 139
Vol. 3: 132, 342, 1025, 1052
Culprit **Vol. 1:** 415
Cult **Vol. 1:** 53, 64, 66, 69, 101 f., 109, 123, 142, 207, 224, 226, 255, 294, 340, 367, 444, 498 f., 514, 529, 560, 587, 595, 599, 625, 649, 653, 655, 687, 698, 708
Vol. 2: 42, 60, 74, 92, 97, 108 f., 164, 185, 190 f., 206, 226, 228, 233, 235, 265, 285 f., 307, 310, 327, 335, 375, 440, 650, 726, 891, 923
Vol. 3: 33, 37, 42, 50, 78 f., 101, 104, 150, 161, 205, 217, 221, 234 f., 237, 239, 317 f., 427, 531, 544, 608, 672 f., **781–797**, 847, 852, 1010, 1105
Cultic **Vol. 1:** 58, 66, 99 f., 122, 150, 210 f., 219 f., 223, 250, 291 f., 296, 304, 307, 310, 322, 351, 367, 390, 401, 403, 438, 447, 468, 479, 495, 497, 499, 538, 586, 607, 650, 687, 699, 716, 742
Vol. 2: 41, 53, 61, 63, 92–95, 134, 164, 185, 223, 225, 227 f., 234, 288, 296 f., 306, 336, 349, 353–355, 410, 461, 511, 520, 525, 778, 887
Vol. 3: 45, 77, 94, 98, 101 f., 105, 118, 149, 154 f., 157, 162, 167, 190, 194, 207 f., 236, 239, 267, 417, 503, 549, 551 f., 556, 653, 668, 738, 782, 925, 982, 1055, 1068, 1148, 1154
Cultic centre **Vol. 2:** 325 f.
Cultic prostitution **Vol. 3:** 1068 f.
Cultic regulations **Vol. 2: 441**
Cultivate **Vol. 1:** 681
Vol. 2: 211, 275, 710
Cultivated **Vol. 2:** 660
Cultivation **Vol. 1:** 416, 520, 726
Cultural **Vol. 1:** 518, 583
Vol. 2: 373
Vol. 3: 1066
Cultural equality **Vol. 2:** 309
Cultural pluralism **Vol. 3:** 1048
Culture **Vol. 1:** 59, 68, 70, 452, 522, 543, 598, 625, 640, 732
Vol. 2: 124–126, 161 f., 287, 308, 311, 462, 582, 640, 645, 680, 820, 841
Vol. 3: 776 f., 851, 1063, 1124, 1147
Cultured **Vol. 3: 1081–1119**
Cumanus **Vol. 3:** 452
Cumber **Vol. 1:** 73
Cummin **Vol. 2: 210 f.**
Cuneiform **Vol. 1:** 68
Cunning **Vol. 1:** 282, **412 f.,** 509
Vol. 2: 616
Vol. 3: 136, 943
Cup **Vol. 1:** 109, 111, 213, 369, 529, 633
Vol. 2: 96, **274–277,** 297, 516, **521–536,** 854
Vol. 3: 242, 245, 604, 670, 1018
Cup of blessing **Vol. 1: 521 f.,** 529, 532
Cup of consolation **Vol. 2:** 417
Cup of fury **Vol. 3:** 242
Cup of salvation **Vol. 3:** 208
Cup of suffering **Vol. 2:** 276
Vol. 3: 723
Cup of wrath **Vol. 3:** 745
Cup-shaped **Vol. 1:** 240
Cupbearer **Vol. 3:** 49
Cure **Vol. 1:** 119, 218, 428
Vol. 2: 164, **166–171**
Vol. 3: 938
Curetes **Vol. 2:** 552
Curiosity **Vol. 3:** 76, 79
Curious **Vol. 1:** 266
Vol. 2: 552–562
Currency **Vol. 2:** 96, 574
Vol. 3: 791, 808
Curse **Vol. 1:** 78, 85, 97 f., 108, 113, 173, 202, 207–210, 214 f., 219, 266, 286, 332, 367, 369, 389 f., **413–418,** 421, 452, 463 f., 509, 547, 554, 673, 719, 724–726, 743
Vol. 2: 143, 157, 166, 245, 257, 267, 402, 445, 478, 504 f., 516, 519, 561, 623, 630, 638, 650, 709, 723, 741, 874, 885, 896
Vol. 3: 72, 76, 84, 95, 98, 226 f., 256, 311, 340, 345, 347, 363, 424, 444, 449, 469, 471, 474, 520, 581, 597, 620, 683, 738–740, 743, 853, 928, 1009, 1025, 1036, 1055, 1069, 1074, 1078, 1087, 1103 f., 1107, 1112, 1125, 1148
Curtain **Vol. 1:** 280, 677
Vol. 2: 212, 673
Vol. 3: 543, **794 f.,** 814
Cushite **Vol. 2:** 638, 684
Custodian **Vol. 1:** 370, 573, 579
Vol. 2: 445
Vol. 3: 580, **775–780,** 935
Custody **Vol. 2:** 132, 134
Vol. 3: 591
Custom **Vol. 1:** 70, 164, 196, 257, 288, 308–310, 314 f., 364, 394, 402, 406, 511, 570, 586, 611, 626 f., 629, 631, 655, 687
Vol. 2: 132 f., 159, 162, 221, 254, 310 f., 317, 331, 335 f., **417, 436–456,** 581, 584, 641, 657,

714, 790, 799
Vol. 3: 409 f., 488, 573, 764, 773, 819, 944, 1059
Customary **Vol. 1:** 709
Customs duties **Vol. 3: 752–759**
Customs house **Vol. 3: 755–759**
Customs officer **Vol. 3:** 756
Cut **Vol. 1:** 309, 368, 527
Vol. 2: 220
Vol. 3: 377, 392
Cut down **Vol. 1:** 725
Vol. 3: 867, 919
Cut off **Vol. 1:** 65, 239, 308, 463, 465, 467, 472, 561, 654
Vol. 2: 314, 385
Vol. 3: 98, 227, 229, 262, 447, 538, 590, 1059
Cut oneself **Vol. 2:** 417
Cut short **Vol. 2:** 222
Cut straight **Vol. 3: 351 f.**
Cutheans **Vol. 3:** 450, 456
Cutting-edge **Vol. 2:** 97
Cybele **Vol. 1:** 142, 560
Cycle **Vol. 1:** 182, 635–630, 654
Vol. 2: 375
Vol. 3: 842 f.
Cycle of births **Vol. 3:** 679
Cyclical history **Vol. 2:** 891
Cyclical pattern **Vol. 3:** 260
Cymbals **Vol. 3:** 76, 112
Cyme **Vol. 2:** 289
Cynics **Vol. 1:** 127, 137, 143, 459, 645
Vol. 2: 735, 841
Vol. 3: 50, 593, 1039
Cypress **Vol. 1:** 389
Vol. 3: 866
Cyprian **Vol. 2:** 869
Vol. 3: 385
Cyprus **Vol. 1:** 68, 167, 497
Vol. 2: 74, 467, 557, 740
Cyrene **Vol. 2:** 740
Vol. 3: 598 f.
Cyrenean synagogue **Vol. 1:** 297
Cyrus **Vol. 1:** 52, 54, 111, 273, 340, 393, 686
Vol. 2: 335 f., 791, 830
Vol. 3: 51, 218, 566, 788, 851, 960

Dagger **Vol. 3:** 966, 978
Dagon **Vol. 1:** 625
Vol. 3: 785–787, 817
Daily **Vol. 1: 249–253,** 261, 278, 624, 630, 702
Vol. 2: 268, 326, 328, 871, 883, 885, 895
Daily offering **Vol. 2:** 294
Dais **Vol. 2:** 369
Damage **Vol. 1:** 182, 563, 678
Vol. 2: 307, 705
Vol. 3: 27, **136–138,** 561
Damage to crops **Vol. 3:** 95
Damages **Vol. 3:** 94, 95 f.
Damaging **Vol. 2:** 309
Damascus **Vol. 1:** 368, 528
Vol. 2: 320, 486, 513, 523, 895
Vol. 3: 114, 284, 288, 453, 520, 731 f., 751, 757, 948, 1110
Damascus Rule **Vol. 1:** 67
Damasus of Rome **Vol. 1:** 71
Vol. 2: 508
Damnation **Vol. 1:** 423, 657
Vol. 2: 362, 365
Vol. 3: 579
Damning **Vol. 1:** 413
Dan **Vol. 1:** 52, 70
Vol. 2: 306, 317, 319, 789
Vol. 3: 33, 426, 782, 872
Dance **Vol. 2:** 436
Vol. 3: 673
Dancing **Vol. 1:** 108, 625 f., 709
Vol. 2: 418
Danger **Vol. 1:** 116, 187, 241, 278, 299, 372, 381, **419 f.,** 430, 440, 455, 482, 484, 489 f., 496, 510, 553, 559, 594, 611 f., 622, 651, 663, 693, 695, 703, 715
Vol. 2: 86, 96, 123, 137, 307, 328, 385, 412, 460, 843 f.
Vol. 3: 177, 184, 200, 205, 216, 475, 681, 685, 748, 802, 805, 833, 908, 983, 1003, 1008, 1058
Dangerous **Vol. 1:** 108, 509, 565, 585
Vol. 3: 103
Daniel **Vol. 1:** 50, 52, 75, 103 f., 340, 345, 512, 672
Vol. 2: 96, 174, 215 f., 373 f., 555, 586, 610, 622, 627 f., 905, 912 f.
Vol. 3: 80, 270, 275, 279, 557, 616, 860, 881, 914, 950 f., 960, 983, 1029
Dare **Vol. 1:** 364
Vol. 2: 432
Daric **Vol. 2:** 848
Darius **Vol. 1:** 393
Vol. 2: 847
Vol. 3: 427
Dark **Vol. 1:** 203, 218, 257, 647
Vol. 2: 193, 199, 351
Dark saying **Vol. 2: 756–758**
Darken **Vol. 1:** 421, 449
Vol. 2: 156, 183, 422
Vol. 3: 731, 733–736
Darkness **Vol. 1:** 102, 110, 204, 276, 301, 333, 338, 355, 359, 379, 382, **420–425,** 450, 452, 462, 483, 490, 519, 522, 525, 556, 563, 609 f., 656, 723
Vol. 2: 53, 71, 185, 190, 206, 212, 215–218, 302, 380, 382, 471, 473, 484 f., 487, 490–496, 514, 543, 548, 586, 604, 608 f., 632, 637, 645, 672, 709, 742, 834, 839, 868, 928
Vol. 3: 47, 204, 260, 262, 270, 344, 435, 469–471, 495, 503, **553–556,** 592, 693, 732, 736, 750, 807, 831, 839, 849, 872, 891, 902, 929, 939, 944, 963, 979, 1149, 1151
Darnel **Vol. 3:** 523
Dart **Vol. 1:** 656, 682
Vol. 3: 959–967
Datames **Vol. 2:** 848
Date **Vol. 1:** 477, 627 f., 630 f., 634, 739
Vol. 2: 894, 901
Vol. 3: 191, 653, 838, 844
Dathan **Vol. 1:** 195
Vol. 2: 638

Daughter **Vol. 1:** 256, 283, 395, 499, 614 f., 655
Vol. 2: 213, 317, 325–327, 548, 575, 581, 588, 677
Vol. 3: 180, 1057 f., 1062, 1074
Daughter of Abraham **Vol. 3:** 180
Daughter of Jerusalem **Vol. 2:** 325
Vol. 3: 1062
Daughter of Judah **Vol. 3:** 1071
Daughter of Zion **Vol. 2:** 327
Daughter-in-law **Vol. 2:** 584
Daughter's inheritance **Vol. 3:** 1057
David **Vol. 1:** 53, 61, 65 f., 100, 108, 117 f., 122, 141, 170, 177, 195, 209, 266, 332, 349, 366, **425–428,** 430, 473, 538, 544
Vol. 2: 35, 79, 98, 113, 116 f., 138, 147, 186, 237 f., 248, 260, 306, 324 f., 329, 335–337, 340, 354, 376, 378, 431, 515, 540, 591, 691, 727, 733, 802, 815, 838, 848
Vol. 3: 73, 77, 117, 121, 158 f., 187, 191, 203, 206, 212, 219, 245, 300, 311, 366 f., 408, 418, 423, 426, 439, 468, 474, 478–480, 494, 522 f., 557, 565 f., 572, 588, 594, 605, 607–609, 611 f., 616, 621, 636 f., 643, **648–662,** 673, 692, 699, 715, 736, 742, 783, 787 f., 794, 797, 812, 815, 836, 872 f., 875 f., 879, 957, 960, 1010, 1017, 1055, 1057, 1104 f., 1188
David *redivivus* **Vol. 1:** 426
Davidic descent **Vol. 3:** 651 f., 662
Davidic dynasty **Vol. 1:** 596
Vol. 2: 306, 325, 374, 612
Vol. 3: 461
Davidic king **Vol. 1:** 100, 210, 405
Vol. 2: 227, 335, 701
Vol. 3: 462, 650
Davidic messiah **Vol. 3:** 566, 650, 657 f.
Davidic sonship **Vol. 3:** 652, 791, 1073
Davidic tradition **Vol. 3:** 639
Dawn **Vol. 1:** 630
Vol. 2: 109, 151, 289, 495
Vol. 3: 267
Day **Vol. 1:** 272, 321, 366, 422 f., 425, 451, 473, 477, 513 f., 612, 619, 627–631, 731, 737
Vol. 2: 232, 245 f., 351, 359, 364, 426, 491, 496, 658, 691, **886–935**
Vol. 3: 74, 410, 628, 633, 730 f., 826, 841, 846 f., 849, 996
Day of atonement **Vol. 1:** 114, 116, 151, 221, 223 f., 351, 612, 626, 628, 700
Vol. 2: 29, 151, 199, 294, 296, 350, 598, 652, 718
Vol. 3: 35, 38 f., 41, 150 f., 156, 161–165, 173, 192, 194, 198 f., 243, 323, 366, 418 f., 428, 433 f., 753, 788, 794, 812, 815, 941, 947, 989
Day of Christ **Vol. 1:** 147, 229, 742
Vol. 2: 47, 130, 360, 707, 894, 922
Vol. 3: 315
Day of conflict **Vol. 1:** 382
Day of favour **Vol. 1:** 382
Day of God **Vol. 2:** 245, 266, 894
Day of judgment **Vol. 1:** 289, 329, 358, 467
Vol. 2: 64, 218, 366 f., 383, 385, 413, 438, 605, 894, 909
Vol. 3: 51, 96, 98, 117, 197, 203, 272, 316, 318 f., 359, 370, 567, 633, 809, 817, 836, 842, 961
Day of the Lord **Vol. 1:** 75, 466 f.
Vol. 2: 37, 140, 517, 700, 887 f., 890 f., 893 f., 901, 916, 924, 926
Vol. 3: 315, 318, 731, 750, 836, 842, 844, 847, 924 f., 1001
Day of massacre **Vol. 2:** 72
Day of opportunity **Vol. 1:** 115, 174
Day of preparation **Vol. 3: 119 f., 405–411,** 472
Day of rest **Vol. 3:** 256, **405–415**
Day of salvation **Vol. 1:** 440, 638
Vol. 2: 242, 353 f., 894
Vol. 3: 214, 838
Day of the Son of man **Vol. 2:** 894
Day of testing **Vol. 1:** 473
Day of tribulation **Vol. 3:** 197
Day of vengeance **Vol. 3:** 93
Day of visitation **Vol. 1:** 190
Day of wrath **Vol. 1:** 110
Vol. 2: 894
Day of Yahweh **Vol. 1:** 190, 423, 655
Vol. 2: 53, 58, 363, 887 f., 890 f., 893
Vol. 3: 381
Day-star **Vol. 2:** 495
Vol. 3: 468, 734
Daybreak **Vol. 2:** 289
Vol. 3: 736
Daylight **Vol. 2:** 490
Days of the Messiah **Vol. 3:** 829
Dayspring **Vol. 1:** 191
Dazzling **Vol. 1:** 708
Deacon **Vol. 1:** 198, 472
Vol. 2: 238, 563, 838
Vol. 3: 544–553, 808, 922, 924, 930, 1066 f.
Dead **Vol. 1:** 79, 103, 120, 125, 147, 166, 186, 204 f., 221, 225, 232–234, 240, 254, 256, 261, 263–265, 290, 312 f., 329, 342, 346, 352, 359, 384 f., 390, 400–402, 410, 421, 429–447, 450–452, 463, 469 f., 475, 484, 499, 523, 544, 569, 591 f., 605, 609 f., 612, 625, 649, 653, 668 f., 676 f., 696
Vol. 2: 29 f., 32, 50, 58, 63, 78 f., 91 f., 113, 122, 178, 190, 204–210, 303, 340, 358, 365 f., 387 f., 403, 417–424, 433, 435, 477–483, 554, 559, 577, 603–606, 612, 625, 630 f., 643, 680, 701 f., 714, 763 f., 796, 830, 865, 893 f., 922, 924, 929
Vol. 3: 56, 104, 113, 149, 204 f., 246, 254, 259 f., 262, 272, 276, 312, 387, 553, 651, 832, 984, 989, 1100
Dead orthodoxy **Vol. 3:** 1151
Dead Sea **Vol. 2:** 319
Vol. 3: 444, 983, 1008
Dead Sea Scrolls (→ Qumran)
Dead works **Vol. 1:** 116, 351, 599
Deadly **Vol. 1:** 645
Deaf **Vol. 1:** 220, **428 f.,** 509
Vol. 2: 170 f., 175, 358, 414, 633, 729
Vol. 3: 180, 475, 519, 860, 1000
Deaf-mute **Vol. 2:** 560, 630
Deal justly **Vol. 3:** 192
Deal out **Vol. 2:** 438

Vol. 3: 402–404
Deal unjustly **Vol. 3: 573–576**
Dealer **Vol. 2:** 236
Dealings **Vol. 1:** 548, 680
Vol. 2: 235, 287, 309 f., 342, 353, 366
Vol. 3: 139
Dear **Vol. 2:** 547
Vol. 3: 677
Death **Vol. 1:** 73, 78, 84–86, 93, 96, 113, 118, 120, 131, 142, 144, 147 f., 150 f., 154, 158, 168, 173, 180 f., 187, 205, 207 f., 221–224, 231–237, 240, 248, 257, 264–266, 288, 301–303, 309 f., 314 f., 321, 323, 326–328, 331, 336, 343, 346, 354, 359, 364–367, 371, 374 f., 380, 387, 389–395, 398–406, 409, 416–424, **429–447,** 455, 458, 463–474, 482 f., 500 f., 505, 507, 511 f., 518, 524, 525, 529, 543, 548 f., 552, 556–559, 563 f., 571, 586, 611, 619, 622 f., 628–630, 634, 638, 643 f., 646, 649–651, 654, 659, 672–677, 681 f., 686, 702, 707–709, 718 f., 722 f., 738, 740
Vol. 2: 28–30, 42, 48 f., 57–59, 61, 78–80, 83, 101 f., 106, 111, 119 f., 123, 126, 131, 133, 136, 138, 142 f., 150, 179, 185 f., 191, 204–210, 212, 217, 222, 224, 229, 232, 234, 239, 242, 245, 262 f., 270 f., 273, 276, 282, 291, 300, 303 f., 318, 327, 333, 338–343, 351, 360, 364 f., 367 f., 370, 380, 382, 398, 403, 411, 416–424, 431, 433 f., 441–443, 445 f., 449 f., 471–474, 478–484, 498, 504 f., 512, 514, 516 f., 519, 522, 525, 527, 532–536, 543, 545 f., 552 f., 555, 564, 568, 570, 577, 581–584, 592, 598, 604, 617, 624, 631 f., 636, 638, 641, 644, 655, 663, 665, 671, 674 f., 680, 687, 691 f., 694, 696, 706, 708, 715–718, 723, 727, 732 f., 736, 738, 761–764, 777, 781 f., 787, 808, 811, 816, 824, 840, 854, 858, 882, 887, 889, 893, 897, 900, 903, 908, 911, 914, 917–920, 924–930
Vol. 3: 35, 38, 42, 55, 59, 62, 66, 74, 82, 94–96, 99, 102 f., 107, 113, 129, 137, 140, 142, 145, 151, 155, 157–160, 162–165, 167–169, 171–174, 178–180, 183, 186, 188 f., 193–196, 198 f., 200–202, 205 f., 210–212, 220, 224, 226, 231, 237, 242, 244 f., 257, 260–262, 266–268, 270, 277, 279–281, 302, 322 f., 341–343, 349, 364, 366, 388, 400, 405, 408, 410, 415, 424 f., 429, 432 f., 436, 444, 465, 471, 473, 487, 489, 493 f., 498, 501, 504, 514, 528–530, 534, 552, 554, 557 f., 563, 566 f., 571, 576, 578–582, 584–586, 590, 594, 596 f., 600–603, 612, 624, 631, 641, 680, 682, 685 f., 692, 694, 697 f., 702, 704 f., 718, 720 f., 723, 748, 750 f., 772, 774, 778 f., 785, 790, 793, 795, 806, 812, 815, 825, 832, 835, 837 f., 840, 844, 846–848, 858, 910, 915, 921, 935–941, 956, 984, 995, 997 f., 1005, 1011, 1017, 1019, 1021, 1030, 1040, 1043 f., 1047, 1049, 1061, 1073, 1079, 1092, 1099, 1101, 1109, 1112, 1117, 1152, 1154
Death-duty **Vol. 3:** 415
Death-penalty **Vol. 3:** 448, 1069
Death-warrant **Vol. 1:** 471
Deathbed **Vol. 1:** 586
Debar **Vol. 2:** 286
Debased **Vol. 1:** 671
Debate **Vol. 1:** 601, 631, 715
Vol. 2: 311, 362, 448
Vol. 3: 530–532, 820, 1082 f.
Debauchery **Vol. 1:** 458, 496, 654
Vol. 3: 918, 947
Debit **Vol. 1:** 471
Deborah **Vol. 2:** 796
Vol. 3: 556, 836, 1001, 1057
Debt **Vol. 1:** 226, 402, 698, 701
Vol. 2: 39, 115, 118, 120, **666–668,** 822, 837
Vol. 3: 96, 172, 191, 594, 758, 943
Debtor **Vol. 1:** 505, 702
Vol. 2: 40, 168, 254, **666–668,** 858, 898
Vol. 3: 189, 758
Decadence **Vol. 3:** 396
Decalogue **Vol. 1:** 54, 336 f., 717
Vol. 2: 68, 173, 278, 284, 441, 444, 637, 639
Vol. 3: 377, 405 f., 418, 484, 488, 787, 1013, 1041, 1102, 1118, 1120 f., 1148
Decapitate **Vol. 1:** 391
Decay **Vol. 1:** 266, 385, 470, 480, 500, 552, 683
Vol. 2: 206, 244, 714, 884
Vol. 3: 292, 302
Deceased **Vol. 1:** 265, 431
Deceit **Vol. 1:** 296, 299, 421, 509, 551
Vol. 2: 437, **457–461**
Vol. 3: 136, 574, 880
Deceitful **Vol. 2: 457–461, 470–474**
Deceitfulness **Vol. 2:** 155, 183, **457–461,** 844
Deceive **Vol. 1:** 85, 124–126, 212, 336, 413, 430, 468, 481, 508, 552, 592, 657
Vol. 2: 457–461, 470–474, 701 f., 795, 914
Vol. 3: 361 f., 468, 573,. 706, 755, 873
Deceiver **Vol. 2: 457–461**
Vol. 3: 475
Decency **Vol. 1:** 501
Vol. 2: 95
Vol. 3: 573
Decent **Vol. 2:** 256
Deception **Vol. 1:** 87, 126, 550, 693
Vol. 2: 317, **457–461,** 555
Vol. 3: 278, 876, 892 f., 936
Deceptive **Vol. 1:** 546, 550, 709, 726
Decide **Vol. 1:** 60, 472, 533, 565, 610, 648, 651, 695
Vol. 2: 314, **362–367**
Decide upon **Vol. 2:** 817
Decimal **Vol. 1:** 692
Decimate **Vol. 2:** 698
Decision **Vol. 1:** 107, 112, 123, 129, 190, 195, 217, 244, 273, 291, 293, 304, 308, 330, 356, 365, 373, 395, 423 f., 457, 476 f., 482, 485, 488, 491, 503, 533 f., 536 f., 540–542, 547, 562, 567, 586, 600 f., 607, 609, 625, 681, 695, 697, 703, 720, 732
Vol. 2: 55, 116, 130, 135, 181, 223, 311, 313, 342, **362–367,** 377 f., 384–386, 391, 567, 727, 736, 873
Vol. 3: 125, 128, 177, 235, 480 f., 582, 691, 745, 821, 834, 838, 849, 938, 944, 1017, 1111, 1117, 1121, 1157

Decisive **Vol. 1:** 482, 488, 597, 739
Vol. 2: 87, 119, 122, 157, 338, 357, 407, 907
Vol. 3: 258, 833
Declaration **Vol. 1:** 402, 702, 738
Vol. 2: 379, 396, 547
Declaratory **Vol. 1:** 596
Declaratory formula **Vol. 3:** 104, 745
Declare **Vol. 1:** 344, 574–576, 604 f., 719, 736
Vol. 2: 380
Vol. 3: 47, 316, 760
Declare openly **Vol. 3:** 1080
Declare useless **Vol. 3: 808–810**
Decline **Vol. 1:** 454
Vol. 2: 855–859
Decompose **Vol. 3:** 293
Decomposition **Vol. 1:** 265
Decoration **Vol. 1:** 495, 522, 524
Vol. 3: 119
Decrease **Vol. 2:** 130
Decree **Vol. 1:** 244, 322, 326, 330, 363, 393, 402, 414, 563, 690, 693, 695 f., 734
Vol. 2: 79, 108, 233, 237, 296, 366, 399, 441, 450, 574, 622
Vol. 3: 51, 311, 325, 354, 484, 503 f., 882
Decry **Vol. 1:** 727
Dedicate **Vol. 1:** 413 f.
Vol. 2: 43, 673
Vol. 3: 194, 406 f.
Dedication **Vol. 1:** 273, 414, 470, 492, 537, 633, 705
Vol. 2: 855, 889
Vol. 3: 157, 207, 366, 415, 552, 873
Dedication of Temple **Vol. 1:** 629
Deduction **Vol. 2:** 391, 396, 402
Vol. 3: 824
Deed **Vol. 1:** 79, 212, 214, 236, 243 f., 254, 271, 457, 482, 546, 556, 568, 572, 679, 713, 719, 722 f.
Vol. 2: 42, 118, 366, 380, 386, 443, 819
Vol. 3: 45, 52, 215, 318, 484, 882 f., 1038, **1147–1158**
Dead of cession **Vol. 1:** 505
Deed of sale **Vol. 3:** 478, 498
Deem **Vol. 1:** 595
Deem worthy **Vol. 3:** 348 f.
Deep **Vol. 1:** 522, 670
Vol. 2: 197 f., 205, 424
Deep things **Vol. 2:** 198, 401
Deep-seated **Vol. 2:** 197
Deepen **Vol. 2:** 405
Defamation **Vol. 3: 341–345**
Defame **Vol. 3: 341–345**
Defamer **Vol. 3: 345 f.**
Default **Vol. 3:** 379
Defeat **Vol. 1:** 433, 438–440, 470, 508, 525, 644, 646, 649 f.
Vol. 2: 147, 211, 320, 367
Vol. 3: 45, 573, 601
Defect **Vol. 1:** 56, 107, 219
Vol. 2: 98, 160, 415
Vol. 3: 925
Defection **Vol. 1:** 606–608
Defective **Vol. 1:** 352, 593
Defence **Vol. 1:** 51, 373, 528, 590, 612, 726
Vol. 2: 75, 138, 148, 307, 319, 398, 450
Vol. 3: 97, 118, 950
Defence force **Vol. 2:** 306
Defenceless **Vol. 1:** 416
Vol. 2: 257, 411–413, 615, 710
Vol. 3: 557
Defend **Vol. 2:** 865
Vol. 3: 93, 824
Defendant **Vol. 1:** 558
Defender **Vol. 1:** 89
Defending Counsel **Vol. 1:** 83, 89
Defer **Vol. 2:** 779
Deference **Vol. 2:** 94
Vol. 3: 112
Deferential **Vol. 1:** 609
Defiance **Vol. 2:** 360
Vol. 3: 475
Deficiency **Vol. 3: 952–956**
Defile **Vol. 1:** 96, 205, 265, 384, 390, 393, **447–449,** 468, 499, 639, 642, 671
Vol. 2: 126, 224, 230, 285
Vol. 3: 106, 108, 173, 344, 925, 932, 953
Defilement **Vol. 1:** 152, 204, 225, 479 f., 507, 559, 641, 677, 688
Vol. 2: 586 f.
Vol. 3: 153, 428, 440, 469, 793, 869, 914, 1165
Define **Vol. 1:** 710
Definite **Vol. 1:** 693, 734
Definition **Vol. 1:** 331, 501, 506, 681
Vol. 3: 1086
Deformed **Vol. 1:** 287, 479
Vol. 2: 415
Defraud **Vol. 1:** 137 f.
Vol. 3: 379 f.
Degenerate **Vol. 2:** 361
Vol. 3: 95
Degradation **Vol. 2:** 50 f., 299, 772
Vol. 3: 1062
Degrading **Vol. 2:** 162, 661
Degree **Vol. 2:** 304
Dehistorizing **Vol. 1:** 380
Deification **Vol. 1:** 616, 705
Vol. 2: 99, 239, 394, 404, 498, 876, 898
Vol. 3: 634
Deism **Vol. 1: 70,** 71
Vol. 2: 902
Deists **Vol. 3:** 290
Deity **Vol. 1:** 75, 676, 740
Vol. 2: 49, **66,** 81, 86, 92, 99, 166, 271, 284, 287, 303, 318, 342, 352, 378, 396, 430, 584
Vol. 3: 100, 124
Dejection **Vol. 2:** 417, 433
Delay **Vol. 1:** 693, 742
Vol. 2: 220 f., 698, 765, 771 f., 900 f., 912, 921
Vol. 3: 97, 215, 578, **839–845**
Delegate **Vol. 1:** 130, 132, 408
Vol. 2: 376, 607
Delegation **Vol. 1:** 197
Deliberate **Vol. 1:** 372, 473, 502, 722
Vol. 2: 273, 407, 445
Vol. 3: 28, 125, 585
Delight **Vol. 1:** 534

Vol. 2: 60, 115, 282 f., 355, 478, **817–820**
Vol. 3: 407, 648, 1019
Delinquent **Vol. 1:** 561
Deliver **Vol. 1:** 195, 236, 238, 326, 409, 414 f., 436, 459, 466, 547, 558, 566, 599 f., 623, 650, 734
Vol. 2: 78, 82, 146, 150, 353, **361–371,** 387, 394, 418, 442, 447, 479, 681, 817
Vol. 3: 30, 174, **177–221**
Deliver up **Vol. 1:** 693
Vol. 2: 340, 411, 526, 534
Deliverance **Vol. 1:** 68, 70, 99, 141, 315, 345, 438 f., 531 f., 544, 554, 566, 596, 655, 699, 701 f.
Vol. 2: 55, 83, 363, 413, 421, 485, 642, 807, 824, 863, 868, 920
Vol. 3: 135, **177–221,** 357, 425, 470, 724, 911, 960, 1097, 1102, 1111
Deliverer **Vol. 1:** 54, 320
Vol. 2: 329, 363
Delivering **Vol. 3: 216–221**
Delivery **Vol. 3:** 53
Delphi **Vol. 1:** 653
Vol. 2: 392, 558 f.
Vol. 3: 75, 103, 379, 474, 782, 851
Delphic Apollo **Vol. 1:** 574 f.
Vol. 3: 739
Delphic oracle **Vol. 3:** 310
Delta **Vol. 1:** 531
Delude **Vol. 1:** 552
Vol. 2: 457–461
Deluge **Vol. 3: 991**
Delusion **Vol. 1:** 546
Vol. 2: 349, **457–461,** 473
Demand **Vol. 1:** 84, 271, 334, 368, 396, 398, 402, 406, 426, 482, 489, 491 f., 510, 538, 571, 588, 595, 598–600, 602, 616, 626 f., 640, 643, 647, 714, 719, 730, 738
Vol. 2: 75, 77, 102, 123, 132, 135, 147, 184, 224, 244, 262, 281, 285, 301, 394, 396, 399, 427, 445, 469, 812, 833, **855–859**
Vol. 3: 46, 72, 531, 766
Demean **Vol. 1:** 449
Vol. 2: 259
Demented **Vol. 1:** 529
Demeter **Vol. 1:** 215
Vol. 2: 233
Vol. 3: 739
Demetrius **Vol. 1:** 419
Vol. 2: 139
Vol. 3: 784, 1045
Demiurge **Vol. 1:** 387, 521
Democracy **Vol. 1:** 732
Democritus **Vol. 1:** 521
Vol. 2: 233
Vol. 3: 840
Demolish **Vol. 3: 177–189**
Demon **Vol. 1:** 54, 95, 102, 119, 121, 168, 219, 322, 382, 409, 415, 431, 446, **449–454,** 508 f., 529 f., 567, 572, 611, 625, 632, 636 f., 643, 651
Vol. 2: 34, 74, 85, 159, 165–167, 189, 196, 205, 208, 210, 225, 228, 251, 273, 284, 286, 379, 382, 426, 452, 518, 556, 561, 600, 610, 615, 630 f., 648 f., 691, 702, 877, 921
Vol. 3: 108, 149, 344, 444, 462, 468, 470–473, 476, 586, 643, 657, 693 f., 696, 713, 725, 738, 770, 806, 810, 856, 910, 939, 982, 984, 1004–1006, 1059, 1061, 1109
Demon-possessed **Vol. 1:** 79, 453
Vol. 2: 595
Demon-possessed land **Vol. 3:** 463
Demon-possession **Vol. 2:** 165, 631
Demoniac **Vol. 1:** 117, 340, 420, 427, 572, 576
Vol. 2: 231, 623
Vol. 3: 592, 714
Demonic **Vol. 1:** 114, 139, 151, 408, 414, 449, 452, 500, 510 f., 522, 527, 611, 613, 644, 650 f.
Vol. 2: 73 f., 136, 179, 195, 270, 284–286, 485
Vol. 3: 97, 102 f., 180, 310, 343, 433, 592, 690, 831, 983–987, 989 f., 998, 1008
Demonstrate **Vol. 2:** 404
Vol. 3: 569–571, 759
Demonstration **Vol. 1:** 411, 613, 628
Vol. 2: 165, 315, 352, 398, 416, 422, 427, 461
Vol. 3: 570 f.
Demosthenes **Vol. 1:** 498
Vol. 3: 679
Demythologization **Vol. 1: 54,** 57, 59, 380, 523, 583
Vol. 2: 189, 202, **645 f., 906 f.**
Vol. 3: 328, 1048
Den **Vol. 2:** 586, 628
Vol. 3: 378, **380 f.,** 430
Denarius **Vol. 1:** 118
Vol. 2: 288, 850 f.
Vol. 3: 920, 979
Denck, Hans **Vol. 3:** 148
Denial **Vol. 2:** 265, 291, 394, 924
Vol. 3: 208, 212, 240, 903
Denizen **Vol. 1:** 510
Denounce **Vol. 1:** 641
Vol. 2: 311, 380
Denunciation **Vol. 1:** 410
Vol. 2: 312
Deny **Vol. 1:** 74, 126, 202, 268, 346 f., 421, 427, 433, **454–456,** 469, 482, 489 f., 493, 525, 535, 552, 562, 608, 611, 644, 657, 678, 691, 708, 718, 730
Vol. 2: 135, 161, 222, 229, 296, 361, 398, 444, 459, 471, 473, 707, 775
Vol. 3: 200, 281, 343, 625, 646, 683, 1025, 1050
Depart **Vol. 1:** 181, 209, 320, 442, 558 f., 606 f., 611, 634
Vol. 2: 312, 421, 924
Vol. 3: 121, **534–543,** 580
Departed **Vol. 2:** 559
Departure **Vol. 1:** 607, 676
Vol. 2: 317, 420, 777
Vol. 3: 863, **935–943,** 946
Depend on **Vol. 1:** 591, 649, 659
Vol. 2: 120, 446
Dependable **Vol. 1:** 97, 594, 596
Dependence **Vol. 1:** 84, 311, 355, 375, 385 f., 484, 616, 664, 673, 681, 700

Dependence (*cont'd*)
Vol. 2: 116, 162, 416 f., 432, 667, 821 f.
Vol. 3: 342, 498, 552, 589, 595, 677, 869 f.
Dependent **Vol. 1:** 385, 427, 440, 480, 541 f., 612, 730
Vol. 2: 121, 132, 262, 306, 336
Vol. 3: 728, 813
Depersonalize **Vol. 1:** 566, 612
Depict **Vol. 1:** 689 f.
Deplore **Vol. 2:** 594
Depopulate **Vol. 3:** **1004–1008**
Depopulation **Vol. 1:** 109
Vol. 2: 60
Deport **Vol. 1:** 686
Deportation **Vol. 2:** 306, 691
Vol. 3: 249, 590
Depose **Vol. 1:** 315
Vol. 3: 254
Deposit **Vol. 2:** 27, 39, 586
Vol. 3: 61, 73, 255
Depravation **Vol. 3:** 396
Depraved **Vol. 1:** 398, 565
Vol. 3: 361, 579
Depravity **Vol. 1:** 559, 677
Vol. 3: 996
Depreciation **Vol. 1:** 524
Vol. 2: 315
Vol. 3: 1058
Depreciatory **Vol. 2:** 259
Depression **Vol. 1:** 163, 262
Deprivation **Vol. 2:** 267
Deprive **Vol. 1:** 679
Vol. 2: 49, 201, 257, 361
Vol. 3: **379 f.**
Depth **Vol. 1:** 253
Vol. 2: 183, **197–205**, 209, 212, 677
Vol. 3: 504
Dereliction **Vol. 1:** 615
Vol. 3: 211
Derision **Vol. 2:** 358, 432
Vol. 3: 29
Derivation **Vol. 1:** 56 f., 662, 674, 696
Derogatory **Vol. 1:** 732
Vol. 2: 259, 263, 305, 372, 428, 452
Descartes, R. **Vol. 1:** 504
Vol. 3: 899
Descend **Vol. 1:** 675, 704
Vol. 2: **184 f.**, 205, 209, 326, 329, 922
Vol. 3: 630 f., 691
Descendant **Vol. 1:** 81, 285 f., 288, 427, 434, 473
Vol. 2: 247, 297, 369
Vol. 3: 251, 524, 634, 652, 734
Descendants of Abraham **Vol. 1:** **79**, 80, 366
Vol. 2: 120, 301, 314, 452, 570
Descendants of Adam **Vol. 1:** 96
Descendants of David **Vol. 1:** 366
Vol. 2: 337, 378
Descendants of Joseph **Vol. 2:** 636
Descendants of Levi **Vol. 2:** 447, 592, 693
Descendants of Noah **Vol. 1:** 366
Descendants of patriarchs **Vol. 2:** 317
Descent **Vol. 1:** 187, 283, 289, 427, 433, 438, 525, 541, 557, 616, 619, 667, 677, 681, 683
Vol. 2: 35, **185**, 312, 381, 447, 452, 656, 660, 796, 924 f.
Vol. 3: 393, 471, 629, 632, 870
Descent into hell **Vol. 1:** 677
Vol. 2: 303
Descent of Jesus **Vol. 1:** 77, 619
Vol. 2: 79, 113, 320
Describe **Vol. 1:** 57, 573–576, 580
Vol. 2: 385
Description **Vol. 1:** 57, 614
Vol. 2: 343
Descriptive Ethics (→ Ethics, Descriptive)
Desecration **Vol. 1:** 75, 125, 448, 626
Vol. 2: 38, 223
Vol. 3: 452, 173
Desecularization **Vol. 1:** 122
Desert **Vol. 1:** 411, 451, 509, 550, 729, 739
Vol. 2: 265 f., 305, 635
Vol. 3: 189, 508, 534, **1004–1014**
Deserted **Vol. 3:** **1004–1008**
Deserter **Vol. 1:** 606
Vol. 2: 572
Desertion **Vol. 1:** 716
Deserts **Vol. 1:** 722
Deserve **Vol. 1:** 434, 489
Vol. 2: 142, 718
Vol. 3: 144, 349
Deserving **Vol. 3:** 348
Design **Vol. 1:** 556, 670
Vol. 2: 675, 819
Vol. 3: 902
Designation **Vol. 1:** 332, 473, 501, 623, 626, 735
Vol. 2: 79, 333, 648
Designer **Vol. 1:** 279
Vol. 3: 331
Desirable **Vol. 1:** 729
Desire **Vol. 1:** 98, 106, 137, 169, 187, 211, 231, 233, 236, 336, 343, 359, 401, 412, 424, **456–461**, 494 f., 501 f., 509, 528, 530, 533 f., 537, 555, 557, 611, 630, 645 f., 671 f., 676, 678, 680 f., 692, 723 f., 726, 734
Vol. 2: 47, 62, 116, 121, 182 f., 200, 262, 265, 274, 356, 377, 391, 419, 458, 460, 478, **538–547**, 583, 588, 599, 814–816, **817–820**, 843, 856, 874, 925
Vol. 3: 231, 676 f., 680, 702, 799, 866, 934, **1015–1023**
Desist **Vol. 3:** 255
Desolate **Vol. 1:** 174, 411
Vol. 3: **1004–1008**
Desolation **Vol. 1:** 75, 114, 173 f., 411, 610
Vol. 2: 54, 82 f., 299, 738
Vol. 3: 444, **1004–1008**
Desolation, abomination of (→ Abomination of desolation)
Despair **Vol. 1:** 106, 314, 411
Vol. 2: 478
Vol. 3: 560, 565, 691, 1051
Despise **Vol. 1:** 74, 400, 453, 455, **461 f.**, 542, 555
Vol. 2: 221, 258, 310, 363, 435, 440, 838
Vol. 3: 27 f., 215, 777
Despised **Vol. 2:** 48, 50 f.

Vol. 3: 593
Despoil **Vol. 1:** 651
Vol. 3: 379, 859
Despondency **Vol. 1:** 622
Vol. 2: 259
Despot **Vol. 1:** 272
Despotic rule **Vol. 2:** 607
Destination **Vol. 2:** 184 f., 327
Vol. 3: 121, 352
Destined **Vol. 3:** 382, 686, 1018
Destiny **Vol. 1:** 50, 107, 260, 377, 379 f., 431, 434, 436, 450, 464, 477, 489, 534, 595, 677, 692 f., 716
Vol. 2: 52, 70, 138, 209, 288, 308, 383, 412, 430, 481, 510, 709, 782
Vol. 3: 117, 206, 260, 265, 269, 272, 507, 610, 616, 623, 629, 650, 677 f., 686, 835, 940, 1045
Destitute **Vol. 1:** 318
Vol. 2: 254
Vol. 3: 853
Destitution **Vol. 3:** 191, 748
Destroy **Vol. 1:** 104, 110 f., 151, 163, 168, 219, 254, 322, 390, 395, 399, 401, 414, 425, 434, 436, 446, 451, 459, **462–471**, 500, 521, 530, 546, 552, 554 f., 563, 608, 623, 638, 655–657, 661, 672, 698, 701
Vol. 2: 33, 58, 99, 126, 151, 154, 195, 226, 252, 285, 306 f., 328, 363, 368, 373, 378, 435, 460, 715, 798, 831, 893
Vol. 3: 97, 99, 166, **177–189**, 214, 250, 471, 535, 537, 574, 686, 934, 949
Destroyer **Vol. 1:** 101, 379, 462, 465, 467
Vol. 2: 677
Vol. 3: 859, 1091
Destroying angel **Vol. 1:** 101
Destruction **Vol. 1:** 103, 113, 141, 205, 222, 236, 248, 254, 354, 413–415, 425, 431, 452, 462–469, 525, 554, 593, 608, 610–612, 629, 654, 657, 685, 692, 724
Vol. 2: 33, 61, 72, 110, 149, 154, 225, 236, 238, 271, 275, 306, 366, 413, 418, 422, 446, 552, 661, 679, 681 f., 705, 709, 844, 846, 914–916
Vol. 3: 159, 193, 201, 210, 214, 262, 266, 268, 474, 748, 779, 784, 790–792, 795, 804, 820, 853, 866, 869, 938, 940, 992, **1004–1008**, 1058
Destruction of Jerusalem **Vol. 2:** 37 f., 312
Destructive **Vol. 1:** 207, 210, 413, 416, 418, 452, 457, 459, 461, 463, 555, 561, 563
Vol. 2: 27
Vol. 3: 986, 1096
Detach **Vol. 1:** 674, 715
Detachment **Vol. 3:** **958–967**
Detail **Vol. 2:** 385
Detain **Vol. 2:** 221
Detention **Vol. 2:** 132
Determination **Vol. 1:** 240, 648
Vol. 2: 818 f.
Determine **Vol. 1:** 54, 326, 457 f., **471–478**, 533, 540, 542, 571, 648, 695–697, 722, 734 f., 737
Vol. 2: 64, 66, 75, 123, 132, 156, 160, 162, 203, 332, 339, 383 f., 430, 432, 609, 662 f.
Vol. 3: 121, 504, 1073
Determine by lot **Vol. 2:** **295–303**
Determinism **Vol. 1:** **54**
Vol. 3: 577
Deterministic **Vol. 2:** 56, 72
Deterrent **Vol. 1:** 392, 568
Vol. 3: 448
Detest **Vol. 2:** 350
Deucalion **Vol. 2:** 124
Deutero-Isaiah **Vol. 1:** **54**
Vol. 3: 609
Deutero-Pauline **Vol. 1:** 55, 247
Deuteronomic **Vol. 1:** **55**, 332, 426
Deuteronomic reform **Vol. 3:** 1096
Deuteronomic school **Vol. 1:** 53, **55**
Deuteronomist **Vol. 1:** **55**
Vol. 2: 258, 367
Deuteronomistic **Vol. 1:** **55**
Vol. 2: 325, 355, 374
Deuteronomistic circles **Vol. 3:** 1093
Deuteronomy **Vol. 1:** 53, **54f**., 61, 65, 209, 331, 463, 484, 538
Vol. 2: 317, 355, 823
Vol. 3: 139, 249, 406, 805
Devalue **Vol. 1:** 674
Vol. 2: 310, 313, 427
Devastate **Vol. 3:** **1004–1008**
Devastation **Vol. 1:** 109, 380, 734
Vol. 3: 729, 859, **1004–1008**, 1068
Develop **Vol. 1:** 164, 485, 686, 692, 694, 740
Vol. 2: 223, 310, 391, 841
Development **Vol. 2:** 65, 131, 288, 367, 387 f., 923
Vol. 3: 58, 280, 760
Deviant **Vol. 1:** 514
Deviate **Vol. 2:** 363, 457
Vol. 3: 583
Deviation **Vol. 3:** 577, 583, 903
Device **Vol. 2:** 289
Vol. 3: 1027
Devil **Vol. 1:** 73, 104, 110, 118, 166–168, 173, 204, 223, 287, 335, 436, 438, 458, 504, 509, 515, 542, 557, 559, 561, 563, 565–567, 609 f., 651
Vol. 2: 143, 207, 267, 312, 365, 381 f., 403, 472, 602, 608 f., 701, 728, 811, 893
Vol. 3: 99, 174, 321, 362, **468–476**, 499, 523, 718, 796, 807, 831, 892, 944, 962, 1054, 1150, 1155
Devilish **Vol. 1:** 432
Devious **Vol. 2:** 235
Devise **Vol. 1:** 532
Vol. 3: 820
Devise craftily **Vol. 3:** **1026–1034**
Devoid **Vol. 1:** 546
Devote **Vol. 1:** 151, 641 f., 645
Vol. 2: 768
Devoted **Vol. 2:** **232–236**, 262, 399, 838
Vol. 3: 377
Devotion **Vol. 1:** 58, 239, 265, 329, 413, 469, 492, 510
Vol. 2: 136, 236, 270, 538, 547, 572
Vol. 3: 322, 572, 687, 954
Devotion to duty **Vol. 3:** 565 f.

Devour **Vol. 1:** 508, 655 f., 730
Vol. 2: 421
Devout **Vol. 1:** 537, 539, 597, 641, 666, 691, 708
Vol. 2: 53, 85, 90–92, 94, 167, **223–238**, 265, 272, 302, 353, 418, 451, 471, 550, 803
Vol. 3: 361
Dew **Vol. 1:** 177
Vol. 2: 307, 586, 865 f.
Vol. 3: 255, 267–269
Dewey, John **Vol. 3:** 896
Diachronic linguistics **Vol. 3:** 1140
Diachrony **Vol. 3:** 1140, 1142
Diadem **Vol. 1:** 405
Vol. 2: 693
Diadochoi **Vol. 2:** 372
Diagnosis **Vol. 2:** 464
Dialect **Vol. 3:** 1078
Dialectic **Vol. 1:** 533
Vol. 2: 171
Vol. 3: 1086
Dialectical Theology **Vol. 3:** 326, 328
Dialogue **Vol. 2:** 867
Vol. 3: 492, 1083 f., 1086
Diamond **Vol. 3:** 391, 396
Diana **Vol. 2:** 85
Vol. 3: 1071
Dianoetic virtues **Vol. 3:** 926
Diary **Vol. 1:** 243
Diaspora **Vol. 1: 55**, 66, 68, 128, 197, 246, 360, 364, 475, 499, 544, 607, 617 f., 626, 693
Vol. 2: 33 f., 91, 398, 449, 695, 792, 795
Vol. 3: 38, 287, 485, 644, 752, 853, 1040
Dibelius, M. **Vol. 3:** 63, 85
Dichotomy **Vol. 1:** 233
Dictate **Vol. 1:** 247 f., 573
Vol. 3: 329
Dictation **Vol. 3:** 491
Dictator **Vol. 1:** 475
Didache **Vol. 1:** 51, **55**, 370
Vol. 2: 219, 870, 895 f.
Vol. 3: 89, 402, 412, 770, 929
Didactic **Vol. 2:** 628, 743
Die **Vol. 1:** 181, 219, 234, 256, 314, 327, 352, 397, 400 f., 429–447, 460, 466, 505, 520, 525, 585, 610, 625, 629 f., 659, 676 f., 681, 689, 717 f.
Vol. 2: 59, 120, 207, 226, 232, 269, 271, 289, 326, 339, 350, 368, 398 f., 411, 927
Vol. 3: 254, 293, 364, 631, 689, 719, 826
Dietary laws **Vol. 1:** 473
Vol. 2: 211
Vol. 3: 931
Difference **Vol. 1:** 601 f., 631
Vol. 2: 101, 127, 307, 397, 499, 657, 739
Vol. 3: 534
Different **Vol. 1:** 485, 500, 539, 670, 673, 707–709
Vol. 2: 739–742, 794
Vol. 3: 638, 1056
Differentiate **Vol. 1:** 504
Vol. 2: 310
Vol. 3: 353
Difficult **Vol. 1:** 364, 419, 536
Vol. 2: 155, 308, 316
Vol. 3: 177
Difficulty **Vol. 1:** 164, 229, 260, 262, 419 f., 516, 581, 725
Vol. 2: 257, 320, 414, **807–809**
Dig **Vol. 2:** 210
Vol. 3: 434
Digest **Vol. 2:** 269
Dignify **Vol. 3:** 30
Dignity **Vol. 1:** 193, 537, 668
Vol. 2: 49 f., 91, 101, 146, 159 f., 262, 340, 563
Vol. 3: 545, 583, 596, 1059
Digression **Vol. 2:** 458
Dike **Vol. 2:** 729
Vol. 3: 353
Dilepton **Vol. 2:** 850
Diligence **Vol. 2:** 271
Diligent **Vol. 2:** 255
Vol. 3: 953
Dill **Vol. 2: 210 f.**
Dilthey, W. **Vol. 3:** 1138
Dilute **Vol. 3:** 911, 913
Dimension **Vol. 1:** 680
Vol. 2: 103, 197
Diminish **Vol. 2:** 288
Diminutive **Vol. 2:** 410 f.
Dinner **Vol. 2:** 358, **520–538**
Dio Cassius **Vol. 2:** 324, 679, 792
Diodore of Tarsus **Vol. 2:** 505
Diodorus **Vol. 2:** 679
Diodorus Siculus **Vol. 1:** 580
Vol. 2: 116
Diogenes of Apollonia **Vol. 2:** 476
Diogenes Laertius **Vol. 2:** 430
Vol. 3: 727
Diogenian **Vol. 2:** 757
Diognetus, Epistle to **Vol. 1:** 51
Dionsysiac **Vol. 2:** 539
Dionysius of Alexandria **Vol. 2:** 507
Dionysius of Halicarnassus **Vol. 1:** 314, 320, 580
Vol. 2: 116, 476
Dionysius of Syracuse **Vol. 1:** 640
Dionysus **Vol. 1:** 64, 184, 513 f., 528 f., 625, 647, 649
Vol. 2: 430, 674
Vol. 3: 318, 919, 1085
Dioscuri **Vol. 1:** 687
Diotrephes **Vol. 1:** 453
Vol. 3: 241
Dip **Vol. 1:** 144 f.
Vol. 2: 150
Diplomatic **Vol. 3:** 51
Direct **Vol. 1:** 330 f., 340, 483, 486, 509, 597, 693, 696, 718, 737
Vol. 2: 50
Vol. 3: 45, 834
Direction **Vol. 1:** 357, 423, 481, 484, 492, 512
Vol. 2: 236, 271, 377, 406
Vol. 3: 121, 351, 572, 820, 945 f., 1153
Directive **Vol. 1:** 341, 476
Director **Vol. 1:** 279
Dirge **Vol. 2: 416–424**
Vol. 3: 673 f.

Dirt **Vol. 1:** 315, **479 f.**, 520
Vol. 2: 57
Vol. 3: 108, 278, 916
Dirty **Vol. 3:** 102
Disability **Vol. 1:** 727
Vol. 2: 414 f.
Vol. 3: 475, 932
Disadvantage **Vol. 1:** 288
Vol. 3: 134, **136–138**
Disagreement **Vol. 1:** 107, 110, 628, 693
Disappear **Vol. 1:** 675, 699, 718
Vol. 2: 312
Disappearance **Vol. 1:** 607, 654, 671, 683
Disappoint **Vol. 2:** 240
Vol. 3: 209
Disappointed **Vol. 3: 562–564**
Disappointment **Vol. 1:** 202, 585, 594, 724 f.
Vol. 2: 241, 316, 420, 618
Disapproval **Vol. 1:** 572, 681
Disarm **Vol. 1:** 314, 649, 651
Vol. 2: 382
Disaster **Vol. 1:** 450, 462, 565, 608, 725
Vol. 2: 56, 225, 417, 435
Vol. 3: 27, 393, 919, 1089
Disastrous **Vol. 1:** 699
Disbelief **Vol. 1:** 504, 591, 594
Vol. 2: 473, 544
Vol. 3: 313, 911
Disc **Vol. 1:** 523
Vol. 2: 188, 556
Discard **Vol. 1:** 674
Discern **Vol. 1:** 123, 353, 504, 673
Vol. 2: 328
Vol. 3: 173, 358, 517
Discernment **Vol. 3:** 522, 533, 695, 703, 770, 776, 1023, 1027
Discernment of spirits **Vol. 1:** 300, 452
Discerner **Vol. 2:** 365
Discerning **Vol. 2:** 616
Discernment **Vol. 2:** 391, 616
Discharge **Vol. 1:** 74, 577, 683, 697 f.
Vol. 2: 586
Vol. 3: 103, **177–189**
Disciple **Vol. 1:** 136, 148, 153, 166 f., 183, 200, 203 f., 213 f., 239, 251 f., 256, 262, 266, 274, 276, 284–290, 298, 303–307, 321, 323 f., 328, 335, 337 f., 340, 358, 402 f., 415, 417, 419, 430, 439, 443, 453–455, 464, **480–494**, 504, 510, 528, 540, 542, 545, 556, 559, 561, 572, 577 f., 600, 603, 612 f., 615, 617, 619 f., 623, 628, 630, 642, 644, 659, 684, 686, 689, 722, 729, 733, 741 f.
Vol. 2: 31, 34, 38, 57, 63, 76, 84, 87, 104, 106, 112, 136 f., 144, 150, 155, 159, 164 f., 168 f., 176, 178, 180, 183, 193 f., 216 f., 222 f., 229, 232, 250, 255, 262, 267, 272, 276, 281 f., 291, 311, 328, 330 f., 339, 341–343, 350, 358 f., 365, 382 f.,387 f., 401, 403, 405, 411, 413, 417, 420, 427–430, 432, 434, 450, 462, 473, 482, 486 f., 493, 510, 518, 523 f., 528, 532, 535, 544, 550, 597, 610, 614, 619, 632, 642, 652–654, 666, 695, 697, 702, 706, 709, 713–715, 732 f., 736–739, 752, 754, 766, 773, 781, 787, 795, 801, 806, 809, 825, 827, 831 f., 834, 838, 843, 846, 856, 867, 879 f., 902, 904, 909, 911, 916 f., 921, 929 f.
Vol. 3: 56 f., 59, 115, 118, 121, 129, 131 f., 136, 147, 184, 188, 204, 213, 226, 228, 240, 242, 253, 256–258, 276 f., 289, 291, 293, 313 f., 321, 325, 340, 343, 347, 378, 393 f., 409, 429, 445–447, 449, 453, 456, 470 f., 474, 476, 480 f., 503, 506 f., 509, 540, 546, 628, 648, 670, 697, 705, 708, 710, 713, 717, 723, 734, 741, 746, 763, 767, 792, 803 f., 806 f., 821, 848 f., 854, 920, 922, 941, 947, 954, 967, 985, 995, 1003, 1012, 1043 f., 1061, 1079, 1108, 1113, 1164
Discipleship **Vol. 1: 480–494**, 541, 607, 722
Vol. 2: 104, 139, 203, 262, 543 f., 631, 699, 782, 824 f.
Vol. 3: 107, 253, 623, 625, 757, 1053, 1108
Disciplina arcana **Vol. 3:** 461
Disciplinary **Vol. 1:** 392, 414
Discipline **Vol. 1:** 152, 171, 192, 233, 288, 299, 415, 460, 462, **494–503**, 506, 515, 535, 539, 561, 569, 572, 639, 647, 652
Vol. 2: 140 f., 230, 243 f., 266, 350, 367, 391, 459, 575, 579, 582 f., 588, 668, 722, 733, 775, 782, 867 f., 897
Vol. 3: 95, 97, 99, 102, 214 f., 384, 471, 535, 538, 544, 561, 745, 750, **759–780**, 821, 954, 998, 1027, 1064, 1075
Disclaim **Vol. 1:** 592
Vol. 2: 150, 470
Disclose **Vol. 1:** 50, 313
Vol. 2: 212
Vol. 3: 310–316
Disclosure **Vol. 3: 310–324**
Disclosure situation **Vol. 3:** 336
Disconcerted **Vol. 3:** 562
Discontent **Vol. 3:** 556, 805
Discontinuity **Vol. 2:** 919 f.
Vol. 3: 236
Discord **Vol. 1:** 646
Discount **Vol. 1:** 399
Discourage **Vol. 2:** 259, 266
Discouragement **Vol. 3:** 494
Discourse **Vol. 1:** 62, 575, 578
Vol. 3: 1086 f., 1106
Discover **Vol. 2:** 296
Vol. 3: 527–530
Discredit **Vol. 1:** 529
Vol. 2: 340
Discreet **Vol. 2:** 103
Discrepancy **Vol. 2:** 261
Vol. 3: 184, 883
Discretion **Vol. 1:** 555
Vol. 2: 90
Vol. 3: 354, 957
Discrimination **Vol. 1:** 219, 737
Vol. 2: 362, 391
Vol. 3: 395
Discuss **Vol. 3:** 668, **820 f.**
Discussion **Vol. 1:** 338, 488, 506, 552, 595
Vol. 3: 530–532, 1083
Disdain **Vol. 1:** 112, 587
Vol. 3: 27

Disdainful **Vol. 2:** 284
Disease **Vol. 1:** 119, 124, 234, 451, 505, 515, 527, 636
Vol. 2: 138, 164, 170, 349, 414, 421, 463 f., 553
Vol. 3: 104, 178, 189, 473, 748, 858, 860, 910, **993–996** (*also* → Sickness)
Disfavour **Vol. 2:** 261, 267
Disfigure **Vol. 2:** 433, 831
Vol. 3: 562
Disgrace **Vol. 1:** 288, 391–393
Vol. 2: 48 f., 51, 140, 284, 572, 583, 658
Vol. 3: 240, **562–564**, 856
Disgraceful **Vol. 3: 562–564**
Disguise **Vol. 1:** 709 f.
Vol. 3: 864, 948
Dish **Vol. 1:** 633
Vol. 2: 556
Disharmony **Vol. 2:** 781
Dishonesty **Vol. 1:** 137
Vol. 2: 282, 837
Vol. 3: 377, 566
Dishonour **Vol. 1:** 282, 393
Vol. 2: 47–51, 160
Vol. 3: 377, **562–564**
Disillusionment **Vol. 1:** 679, 743
Disinherit **Vol. 2:** 257
Disintegrate **Vol. 1:** 470
Vol. 3: 446
Dislike **Vol. 2:** 705
Dislocation **Vol. 3:** 903
Disloyal **Vol. 2:** 312, 396
Dismay **Vol. 3:** 166
Dismembered **Vol. 1:** 230
Dismiss **Vol. 1:** 505, 701
Vol. 3: 177–189
Disobedience **Vol. 1:** 86, 110, 203, 211, 356 f., 367, 385, 390, 399, 422 f., 433, 463, 465, 472, 509, 555, 588 f., 591, 598, 607, 611, 659, 730
Vol. 2: 144, 172, 175, 179, 272, 400, 407, 459 f., 473, 564 f., 627, 667, 682, 716, 820, 864
Vol. 3: 97, 118, 130, 134 f., 139, 185, 382, 481, 563, 565, 573, 585, 740, 779, 799, 809, 938, 1155
Disobedient **Vol. 1:** 102, 109, 202, 219, 449, 569, 588 f., 593 f.
Vol. 2: 181, 183, 202, 301, 367, 478, 481, 490, 653, 721, 880
Vol. 3: 691, 1008, 1014
Disorder **Vol. 1:** 468
Vol. 2: 458, 621–626, 780
Vol. 3: 148
Disown **Vol. 1:** 454 f., 684
Vol. 2: 383, 641
Vol. 3: 560
Disparage **Vol. 1:** 413, 461
Vol. 3: 346
Disparate **Vol. 1:** 525
Dispatch **Vol. 1:** 698
Dispensation **Vol. 1:** 53, 81, 372, 730
Vol. 2: 40, 115, 365, 443, 641
Dispense **Vol. 1:** 211, 503 f.
Vol. 2: 363, 370
Dispenser of the Spirit **Vol. 3:** 697 f.
Disperse **Vol. 2:** 33 f., 413
Dispersion **Vol. 1: 55**, 141, 361, 394, 671, **683–692**
Vol. 2: 33, 35, 126, 306, 308, 310 f., 316, 324, 326, 331 f., 426, 740
Vol. 3: 65 (*also* → Diaspora)
Display **Vol. 1:** 649, 696 f.
Display in public **Vol. 3:** 571
Displeasure **Vol. 1:** 318, 740
Vol. 2: 149, 419
Disposal **Vol. 1:** 414, 536, 723
Vol. 2: 275, 368
Vol. 3: 268
Dispose **Vol. 1:** 369, 539, 640, 657, 715
Vol. 3: 263
Disposed **Vol. 2:** 259
Disposition **Vol. 1:** 107, 485, 511
Vol. 2: 102, 392, 501, 622, 659
Vol. 3: 111 f., 123, 125, 127, 684, 912
Dispossess **Vol. 2:** 265
Disproof **Vol. 3:** 202
Disproportion **Vol. 1:** 743
Disprove **Vol. 1:** 74
Vol. 2: 340
Disputation **Vol. 3:** 1086
Dispute **Vol. 1:** 104, 285, 294, 373, 453–455, 504, 535, 558, 578, 687
Vol. 2: 140–142, **362–367**, 550, 680
Vol. 3: 281, 346, 532, 820 f., 887, **958–967**, 999, 1119, **1155–1158**
Disqualified **Vol. 3: 808–810**
Disqualify **Vol. 1:** 163, 235, 514
Vol. 2: 415, 424
Disregard **Vol. 1:** 333, 454, 461 f., 607
Vol. 2: 325, 402, 448, 683
Disrepair **Vol. 3:** 788
Disrepute **Vol. 2:** 363
Disrespectful **Vol. 2:** 334, 432
Vol. 3: 1055
Disruption **Vol. 2:** 250
Vol. 3: 468
Dissatisfaction **Vol. 1:** 459
Vol. 3: 1051
Dissection **Vol. 1:** 533
Dissension **Vol. 1:** 535
Vol. 2: 362, 708
Vol. 3: 1119
Dissimulate **Vol. 2: 468–470**
Dissipation **Vol. 1:** 261, 514, 686
Vol. 3: 922
Dissociation **Vol. 2:** 334
Dissolute **Vol. 1:** 496
Vol. 2: 480
Vol. 3: 856
Dissolution **Vol. 1:** 496, 578
Vol. 2: 325, 629
Vol. 3: 832
Dissolve **Vol. 1:** 688, 698, 707
Vol. 2: 33, 452
Vol. 3: 178, 559
Dissuade **Vol. 1:** 450
Vol. 3: 902

Distance **Vol. 1:** 583, 618, 679, 693
Vol. 2: 90, 94, 197, 215, 876
Vol. 3: 595
Distant **Vol. 2:** 53, 713
Distinct **Vol. 3:** 874
Distinction **Vol. 1:** 227, 385, 503, 533, 662, 720
Vol. 2: 80, 302, 308, 355, 399, 403, 425, 457, 660, 683
Vol. 3: 85, 106, 317, 534
Distinctiveness **Vol. 1:** 240
Distinguish **Vol. 1:** 60, **503–505**, 527, 533, 599, 614, 705, 723, 735, 737
Vol. 2: 84, 121, 226, 319, 333, 358, 362, 364, 391, 395, 397 f., 442
Vol. 3: 108, 127, 475, 526, 535, 701, 707
Distort **Vol. 3:** 332
Distraction **Vol. 1:** **526–530**
Distress **Vol. 1:** 106, 111, 260, 262, 345, 409 f., 422, 461, 645
Vol. 2: 63, 82, 215, 229, 265, 353, 357, 360 f., 419, 423 f., 594, **621–626**, 663–665, 715, **807–809**, 855, 863, 890, 904
Vol. 3: 210, 239, 388, 505, 514, 558, 560, 836, **858 f.**, 860, 1011
Distribute **Vol. 1:** 365, 453, 533–535, 641
Vol. 2: 33, 436, 438 f.
Distribution of alms **Vol. 3:** **544–549**, 957
District **Vol. 2:** 303 f., 788
Distrust **Vol. 2:** 167
Disturb **Vol. 1:** 698
Vol. 3: 556, **709 f.**
Disturbance **Vol. 2:** 623, 777
Vol. 3: 112, 558
Disunite **Vol. 1:** 108
Disunity **Vol. 1:** 535
Diversity **Vol. 1:** 602, 654
Vol. 2: 719
Divert **Vol. 1:** 741
Vol. 2: 458
Dives **Vol. 2:** 267, 846
Vol. 3: 240, 856
Divest **Vol. 1:** 549
Divi filius **Vol. 3:** 635
Divide **Vol. 1:** 398, 503 f., 523, 533–535
Vol. 2: 189, 296 f., 362, 788, 810
Vol. 3: 468, 472, **534–544**
Divide asunder **Vol. 3:** 684
Divided monarchy **Vol. 2:** 320
Divided heart **Vol. 3:** 687
Dividing wall **Vol. 3:** 185 f., **795, 948–950**
Divination **Vol. 2:** 296, **552–562**
Vol. 3: 33
Divine **Vol. 2:** **66**, 72, 86, 94, 112, 120, 147, 149, 188, 224, 233, 236, 247, 255, 267, 269, 280, 287 f., 290, 293, 335 f., 351, 355, 357, 362, 365, 372 f., 378, 393, 402–404, 439, 475, 520, 659, 663, 719, 818
Vol. 3: 33, 36, 41, 49, 117, 123, 635, 690
Divine attributes **Vol. 3:** 373
Divine honours **Vol. 3:** 217
Divine man **Vol. 2:** 107, 165, 498, 606
Divine nature **Vol. 1:** 216, 548, 706, 740
Vol. 2: 80, 374
Vol. 3: 71, 372, 832, 927
Divine origin **Vol. 1:** 85
Vol. 2: 394
Divine passive **Vol. 3:** 1047
Divine philosophy **Vol. 3:** 1035
Divine secret **Vol. 1:** 578
Divine statement **Vol. 3:** **324 f.**
Divine warrior **Vol. 3:** 960
Diviner **Vol. 1:** 573, 575, 579
Vol. 2: 234
Vol. 3: 33
Divinity **Vol. 1:** 548 f., 551, 576, 616
Vol. 2: **66**, 81 f., 86, **232–236**, 294, 373, 378
Vol. 3: 663, 678, 965
Divinity of Jesus **Vol. 2:** 36, **80–83**, 504
Divinization **Vol. 1:** 498, 595, 643, 707
Division **Vol. 1:** 503, 533 f., 628, 631
Vol. 2: 62, 306, 311, 315, 319, 708, 736, 794, 799, 887
Vol. 3: 130, **543 f.**, 978
Division of day **Vol. 3:** 847
Division of time **Vol. 3:** 845–847
Divisive **Vol. 1:** 300, 400
Divorce **Vol. 1:** 243 f., 335, 340, 384, 453, 500, 502, **505–507**, 555, 607, 678, 698, 701
Vol. 2: 138, 349 f., 563 f., 570, 588, 715
Vol. 3: 95, 99, 172 f., **177–189**, 487, 498, **534–543**, 544, 660, 980, 1057, 1064, 1069, 1075, 1164, 1195
Dix, Gregory **Vol. 3:** 244, 675
Dizziness **Vol. 1:** 514
Do **Vol. 3:** **1147–1158**
Do business **Vol. 3:** **1155–1158**
Do good **Vol. 2:** 98, 101 f., 326, 429
Vol. 3: 745
Do well **Vol. 1:** 610
Do wrong **Vol. 2:** 137
Vol. 3: **573–576**, 859
Docetic **Vol. 1:** 339
Vol. 2: 314, 402
Docetism **Vol. 1:** **55**, 58, 338
Vol. 2: 504
Vol. 3: 724
Doctor **Vol. 1:** 381
Vol. 2: 59, 164, 167
Vol. 3: 138, 217, 840
Doctrinal opinion **Vol. 2:** 311
Doctrine **Vol. 1:** 62, 70, 238, 247, 279, 282, 330, 341, 346, 544, 636–638, 662, 738–740
Vol. 2: 64, 78, 95, 118 f., 152, 165, 170 f., 191, 219, 270, 273, 311, 358, 361, 367 f., 452, 460, 598, 652, 859
Vol. 3: 51, 53, 61, 765, 769 f., 773 f., 1002
Document **Vol. 1:** 243, 246
Vol. 3: 231, **482–495**, 497, 500, 1038, 1040 f., 1043
Dodd, C. H. **Vol. 1:** 56
Vol. 2: **904–906**
Vol. 3: 59, 62 f., 151
Doer **Vol. 3:** **1153–1155**
Dog **Vol. 1:** 117 f., 444, 744
Vol. 2: 27, 539
Dogma **Vol. 1:** 50, 330, 533, 694
Dogmatics **Vol. 1:** 65, 707
Dogmatism **Vol. 1:** 486

Doing good **Vol. 3: 1153–1155**
Doing the truth **Vol. 3: 891**
Domain **Vol. 1:** 671
Vol. 2: 381
Dome of the Rock **Vol. 3:** 787
Domestic **Vol. 1:** 574
Vol. 2: 254, 410, 412
Vol. 3: 443
Dominant **Vol. 2:** 442
Vol. 3: 712–714
Dominate **Vol. 1:** 407, 424, 436, 457 f., 466
Vol. 2: 182
Domination **Vol. 1:** 670
Vol. 2: 688
Domineer **Vol. 3:** 1066
Dominion **Vol. 1:** 74, 102, 114, 165, 300, 381–383, 454, 462, 522, 524, 526, 610, 651, 701, 734
Vol. 2: 51, 83, 120, 203, 208, 210, 287, 319, 388, **510–520**, 607, 649
Vol. 3: 204, 648 f., 716
Domitian **Vol. 1:** 126
Vol. 2: 378, 511, 514, 678, 684
Vol. 3: 621, 653, 789
Donated **Vol. 3:** 140
Donation **Vol. 2:** 115
Vol. 3: 874
Donatists **Vol. 3:** 108
Donkey **Vol. 1:** 117, 317
Donkey stone **Vol. 3:** 394
Doom **Vol. 1:** 85, 464, 610, 693, 699
Vol. 2: 38, 367, 438
Door **Vol. 1:** 303, 646, 690
Vol. 2: 29–31, 179, 194, 280, 434, 510, 726 f., 729, 881
Vol. 3: 227, 556, 567, 936
Doorkeeper **Vol. 2:** 382, 912
Doorpost **Vol. 1:** 221
Vol. 2: 410
Vol. 3: 484
Doors of knowledge **Vol. 3:** 936
Dooyeweerd, H. **Vol. 3:** 899
Dorak **Vol. 2:** 98
Dorcas **Vol. 2:** 596
Vol. 3: 1065
Dorian **Vol. 1:** 498
Vol. 3: 1055
Doric **Vol. 2:** 124
Vol. 3: 870
Dositheus **Vol. 3:** 463, 635
Double birth **Vol. 1:** 653
Double entendre **Vol. 3: 1177 f.**
Double heart **Vol. 2:** 468
Vol. 3: 883
Double portion **Vol. 2:** 317
Double-minded **Vol. 1:** 505
Vol. 2: 435
Vol. 3: 572, 686 f.
Doubt **Vol. 1:** 76, 323, **503–505**, 596, 609
Vol. 2: 142, 182, 241, 244, 282, 393, 419, 857, 863, 868
Vol. 3: 341, 494, 528, 572, 778, 805, 809, 820, 1096
Dough **Vol. 1:** 249
Vol. 2: 461–463, 675 f.
Vol. 3: 194, 416, 917
Dove **Vol. 1:** 172, 175, 704
Vol. 2: 313
Vol. 3: 516
Dovetail **Vol. 1:** 241
Down payment **Vol. 2:** 39
Vol. 3: 416
Downcast **Vol. 2:** 259 f.
Downfall **Vol. 1:** 462 f., 610
Vol. 2: 320, 432, 890
Vol. 3: 866
Downing, F. G. **Vol. 3: 329 f.**
Downwards **Vol. 2: 187**, 617
Dowry **Vol. 2:** 588
Vol. 3: 1057
Doxology **Vol. 1:** 97–99, 210, 212 f., 620
Vol. 2: 80 f., 122, 290, 724
Vol. 3: 830, 1058
Drachma **Vol. 2:** 851 f.
Vol. 3: 532, **752–755**
Dragon **Vol. 1:** 87, 104, 111, 114, 119, 125, 175, 187, 205, 390, 405, **507–511**, 562, 657
Vol. 2: 29, 570 f., 613, 615, 625, 638, 642, 691, 693, 701
Vol. 3: 216, 253, 470, 474, 476, 603, 714 f., 718, 737, 983 f., 987, 1046, 1068
Drain **Vol. 2:** 854
Drain cup **Vol. 3:** 919
Drama **Vol. 2:** 748
Dramatic **Vol. 2:** 430, 432
Draw **Vol. 1:** 458, 538
Vol. 3: 483
Draw attention **Vol. 1:** 618
Vol. 3: 516
Draw conclusion **Vol. 3:** 822 f.
Draw lots **Vol. 1: 478**
Vol. 3: 49, 260
Draw near **Vol. 2:** 53, 388, 422
Vol. 3: 860
Draw off blood **Vol. 3:** 448
Draw together **Vol. 2:** 113
Draw up **Vol. 1:** 576
Drawn out **Vol. 2:** 265, 636
Dread **Vol. 2:** 90, 224, 420
Dream **Vol. 1:** 393, 395, 420 f., 429, **511–513**, 574, 577, 580, 692
Vol. 2: 92, 96, 185, 240, 307, 317, 319, 362, 433, 457, 468, 488, 555, 561, 586, 616, 898
Vol. 3: 87, 316, 324, 392, 502, 517, 521, 555, 660, 723, 806, 1097
Dregs **Vol. 1:** 710
Dress **Vol. 1: 312–317**
Vol. 2: 275, 303
Vol. 3: 562
Dressing **Vol. 1:** 477
Drift **Vol. 1:** 481, 608, 682 f.
Drink **Vol. 1:** 106, 109, 451, 494, 504, 513, 528, 611 f., 625, 633, 683
Vol. 2: 157, **264–277**, 295, 355, 357, 382, 387, 417, 520, 530, 929
Vol. 3: 243, 245, 276, 359, 556, 706, 859, 988 f.
Drink-offering **Vol. 2: 853–855**

Vol. 3: 208, **423**
Drink toast **Vol. 2:** 356
Drip **Vol. 1:** 683
Drive **Vol. 1:** 494, 496, 590, 645, 675 f., 739
Drive across **Vol. 3:** 799
Drive away **Vol. 1:** 686
Vol. 2: 417, 485, **805–807**
Vol. 3: **558–560**
Drive out **Vol. 1:** 453, 529 f., 608, 726, 740
Vol. 2: 64, 151, 363
Driven by the wind **Vol. 3:** 1002
Drizzle **Vol. 3:** 1004
Drop **Vol. 1:** 608, 698
Vol. 3: 255
Drop off **Vol. 1:** 682
Dropsy **Vol. 3:** 749
Drought **Vol. 1:** 209, 354, 543 f.
Vol. 2: 193, 264, 688
Vol. 3: 79
Drover **Vol. 3:** 268
Drown **Vol. 1:** 226, 508
Vol. 2: 426
Vol. 3: 109, 985, 990
Druids **Vol. 3:** 259
Drunkard **Vol. 1:** 513
Vol. 3: 921
Drunken **Vol. 1:** 261, 420 f., 458, **513–515**, 528 f., 561
Vol. 2: 137, 458, 587, 625, 925
Vol. 3: **918–922**, 1047
Drunkenness **Vol. 3:** 556, 674, 913, **918–922**
Dry **Vol. 1:** 390, 513, 516
Vol. 2: 153, 265
Dry up **Vol. 1:** 515 f., 652
Vol. 3: 109, 867, 999
Dualism **Vol. 1:** **55**, 58, 102, 124, 233, 333, 382, 422, 432, 435, 446, 452, 461, 494, 496, 500, 518, 522, 524 f., 562 f., 656, 674, 734
Vol. 2: 71, 376, 402 f., 405 f., 434, 472, 492 f., 565, 567, 608, 610, 736, 840, 905, 919
Vol. 3: 42, 631, 695, 831, 833, 891, 895, 899, 1029, 1082, 1084
Dualistic **Vol. 3:** 41, 470, 595, 926, 939, 945, 1101
Dualistic redemption **Vol. 2:** 201
Duality **Vol. 3:** 1056
Dubious **Vol. 1:** 352, 539
Due **Vol. 2:** 358
Vol. 3: **134–136**, 353 f., 753, **755–759**
Dull **Vol. 1:** 281, 428
Vol. 2: 28, 183
Dumb **Vol. 1:** 220, **428 f.**
Vol. 2: 171, 410, 729, 863
Vol. 3: 474 f., 750, 1118
Dung **Vol. 1:** 480
Vol. 3: 469, 915
Dupe **Vol. 2:** 458
Duplicity **Vol. 3:** 886, 889
Durable **Vol. 1:** 97, 658
Duration **Vol. 1:** 589 f., 711, 732
Vol. 2: 374, 475, 478, 698
Vol. 3: 827, 830
Durkheim, E. **Vol. 3:** 1125
Dust **Vol. 1:** 239, 254, 433 f., 520, 672, 705
Vol. 2: 261, 349, 478
Vol. 3: 268, 545, 560, 683, 915
Duty **Vol. 1:** 190, 287, 295 f., 302, 358, 386, 490, 505, 569 f., 606, 628, 633, 684, 687 f., 696
Vol. 2: 43, 47, 223, 227, 327, 437, 439, 663, 825
Vol. 3: 49, 104, 608, **755–759**, 765, 810, 908
Dwell **Vol. 1:** 272, 519, 558, 676, 684, 691, 726, 740
Vol. 2: 75, 79, 164, 190, 193, 195, 215, 245, **247–251**, 326, 343, 866
Vol. 3: 228, 254 f., 588, 781, **811–815**
Dwelling **Vol. 1:** 688
Vol. 2: 190, 199, **247–251**, 586, 925
Vol. 3: **224–229**, 225, 784, **811–815**
Dwelling-place **Vol. 3:** **224–229**, 465
Dye **Vol. 1:** 205
Dying **Vol. 1:** 145, 147, 225, 359, 401, 455, 470, 638 f., 648
Vol. 2: 83, 201, 525 f., 532, 644
Vol. 3: 205, 227
Dynamic **Vol. 1:** 602, 681
Vol. 2: 65, 171, 480
Vol. 3: 1091, 1155
Dynamic monotheism **Vol. 2:** 71
Dynamic view of language **Vol. 3:** 1125
Dynasty **Vol. 1:** 596
Vol. 2: 306, 325, 374

E source **Vol. 1:** **56**, 57, 61, 511
E-temen-an-ki **Vol. 1:** 140 f.
Ea **Vol. 3:** 259
Ea-Enki **Vol. 2:** 553
Each **Vol. 1:** 94
Vol. 2: 720
Eager **Vol. 2:** 244, 868
Eagle **Vol. 1:** 116, 173, 175, 262
Vol. 2: 201
Vol. 3: 805, 918, 1054
Ear **Vol. 1:** 230, 234, 261, 689
Vol. 2: 110, 154, 172–176, 178, 267, 414, 726
Vol. 3: 312, 434, 516 f., 594
Earlier **Vol. 1:** 666
Vol. 2: 187, **713–716**
Earliest **Vol. 1:** 668
Early **Vol. 2:** 136
Early Catholicism **Vol. 2:** 918 f.
Early rain **Vol. 3:** **1000–1004**
Earn **Vol. 1:** 78, 329, 437
Vol. 2: 102, 200, 302, 499
Vol. 3: 140, 142, 595
Earnest **Vol. 2:** 39 f., 883
Earnestness **Vol. 1:** 492, 612 f., 730
Vol. 2: 859
Ears of corn **Vol. 3:** 408
Earth **Vol. 1:** 54, 95, 254, 272, 302, 313, 322, 380 f., 383, 387, 402, 443, 449, 466, 469, 498, 508 f., **517–526**, 585, 587, 621, 627, 661, 663, 672, 674, 689–691, 722, 734 f., 743
Vol. 2: 55, 70, 74, 77, 80, 84, 131, 149, 164, 174, 184–190, 192, 194–196, 205, 207, 209 f., 212, 215, 232, 271, 274, 279 f., 282, 299 f., 303 f., 327, 329, 353, 355, 363, 375–

Earth (*cont'd*)
377, 380 f., 396, 399, 402, 411, 452, 494, 564, 571, 619, 626, 650, 655 f., 664, 688, 700, 819, 836, 840, 866, 876, 918–920
Vol. 3: 69, 117, 171, 258, 269, 574, 578, 674, 692, 741, 865, 941, 1054, 1068, 1148, 1176
Earth-bound **Vol. 1:** 422
Earthen vessel **Vol. 1:** 638
Earthenware **Vol. 3: 910–915**
Earthly **Vol. 1:** 401, 520, 547, 587, 638 f., 642 f., 706 f., 709, 720, 728, 738
Vol. 2: 244, 326, 342, 359, 373, 385, 403, 659
Earthly man **Vol. 1:** 85
Earthly nature **Vol. 1:** 168
Earthquake **Vol. 1:** 124, 319, 610
Vol. 2: 426, 700, 911
Vol. 3: 79, 292, 382, 543, **556–558**, 592, 1001, 1091
Ease **Vol. 1:** 724
Vol. 2: 777
Vol. 3: 255
East **Vol. 1:** 164, 205, 665
Vol. 2: 378
Vol. 3: 730
Easter **Vol. 1:** 323, 423, 474, 599, 603, 631, 634, 659
Vol. 2: 176, 203, 341 f., 387, 524, 610 f., 624, 654, 695, 738, 897
Vol. 3: 131, 276, 282, 411, 844
Easter legends **Vol. 3: 282 f.**
Eat **Vol. 1:** 175, 225 f., 250, 308, 341, 350–352, 390, 444, 448, 504, 597, 611 f., 620, 633, 643, 670, 673, 678, 691, 724, 731, 743 f.
Vol. 2: 157, 226, **264–277**, 286, 355, 357, 387, 402, 417, 421, 520, 530, 533, 711, 889, 929
Vol. 3: 158 f., 239, 245, 276, 423, 859
Eat (salt) with **Vol. 3: 443–449**
Eatable **Vol. 2: 268 f.**
Eating **Vol. 2: 268 f.**
Eating meat **Vol. 3:** 106
Ebal **Vol. 1:** 67, 210
Vol. 2: 639
Vol. 3: 451, 788, 1009
Ebeling, G. **Vol. 3:** 898, 1139 f.
Ebionites **Vol. 2:** 36
Vol. 3: 621, 632, 661
Ecclesiastes **Vol. 1:** 59, 211
Vol. 3: 606
Ecclesiastical **Vol. 2:** 536
Vol. 3: 112
Ecclesiasticus (Sirach) **Vol. 1:** 50, 575 f., 580
Vol. 2: 331, 355, 622
Ecclesiology **Vol. 1: 56**
Echo **Vol. 3:** 80, 112 f.
Economic **Vol. 1:** 501, 642, 710
Vol. 2: 259
Economics **Vol. 1:** 643
Economy **Vol. 1:** 738
Vol. 2: 306, 822
Vol. 3: 593
Ecstasy **Vol. 1:** 399, 414, 502, 514, **526–530**
Vol. 2: 103, 477, 539, 621, 764
Vol. 3: 76–79, 84, 89, 126, 129, 283, 315, 476, 690 f., 720, 1000
Ecstatic **Vol. 1:** 582, 598
Vol. 2: 202, 355, 394, 398, 739 f., 785, 883
Vol. 3: 225, 515, 571, 691, 698, 700, 707, 1079
Ecumenical **Vol. 1:** 304, 519
Eden **Vol. 1:** 168, 389, 453
Vol. 2: 482
Vol. 3: 986, 988
Edge **Vol. 2:** 303
Vol. 3: 796 f.
Edict **Vol. 1:** 330 f., 393, 476, 623, 686
Vol. 3: 48, 1015
Edification **Vol. 1:** 50
Vol. 2: 763, 924
Vol. 3: 390, 547, 675, 703, 748, 962, 1080
Edificatory **Vol. 1:** 741
Edifice **Vol. 1:** 658
Edify **Vol. 2:** 253
Vol. 3: 84, 675, 770
Editorial adaptation **Vol. 1:** 57
Edom **Vol. 2:** 38
Vol. 3: 1005
Edomites **Vol. 2:** 373
Vol. 3: 341, 871
Educate **Vol. 1:** 352, 617
Vol. 2: 265
Vol. 3: 759–780
Educated **Vol. 1:** 498
Education **Vol. 1:** 567–569
Vol. 2: 102 f., 140–142, 288, 309, 406, 430, 437, 513, 737
Vol. 3: 75, **759–780**, 880, 996, 1028, 1055
Educational **Vol. 2:** 103, 419, 432, 445
Vol. 3: 721, 1066
Educator **Vol. 1:** 640
Efface **Vol. 2:** 288
Effect **Vol. 1:** 469, 513–515, 546, 550, 601, 610, 652, 733, 738, 742
Vol. 2: 245, 360, 362, 422, 428
Vol. 3: 905, 1147–1152
Effective **Vol. 1:** 311, 515, 540, 547
Vol. 2: 109, 122, 130, 148, 327, 426, 861
Vol. 3: 1147–1152
Efficacious **Vol. 2:** 592, 873
Vol. 3: 1091, 1108
Efficacy **Vol. 1:** 216, 609, 659
Vol. 3: 242
Effort **Vol. 1:** 241, 386, 429, 437, 439, 456, 464, 478, 502, 550 f., 645 f., 649, 660, 675, 681, 716, 718, 723
Vol. 2: 261, 271
Vol. 3: 111, 141, 252, 359, 526, 555, 603, 799, 946, 1150
Effulgence **Vol. 1:** 712
Vol. 2: 284, **289 f.**
Ego **Vol. 2:** 182
Egocentric **Vol. 2:** 242
Egypt **Vol. 1:** 53, 55, 64, 117, 119 f., 162, 173, 177, 193 f., 209 f., 249 f., 264, 270, 281, 290, 293, 380, 393 f., 422, 512, **530–532**, 559, 574, 616, 626, 632 f., 684, 688, 691 f., 716, 737
Vol. 2: 38, 68 f., 95 f., 99, 125, 130, 134, 157, 166, 202, 219, 255, 305, 318 f., 321, 329, 367, 424, 461, 464, 492, 512, 521, 541, 554–

558, 586, 627, 643, 699, 717, 719, 796, 822, 830, 835 f., 849, 863, 889 f., 916
Vol. 3: 35, 135, 143, 159, 190, 192 f., 211, 216, 227, 259, 311, 359, 388, 405 f., 421, 428, 451, 453, 460, 476, 551, 592–594, 605, 642, 731, 788, 811, 846, 857, 870, 918, 937, 940, 960, 970, 984, 1001, 1005, 1007, 1028 f., 1068, 1088, 1103, 1162, 1167, 1179
Egyptian **Vol. 1:** 172, 205, 264, 266, 288, 307, 393, 523, **530–532**, 546, 574, 616, 625, 633, 692 f.
Vol. 2: 97, 157, 166, 201, 234, 279, 305, 318, 374, 489, 848, 876, 891
Vol. 3: 208, 274, 560, 617, 634, 636, 713, 827, 1068, 1085
Egyptian king myth **Vol. 2:** 200 f.
Eichhorn, J.G. **Vol. 3:** 1138
Eight **Vol. 2: 692**
Eighteen Benedictions **Vol. 1:** 444
Vol. 2: 311–313, 803, **864–867**
Vol. 3: 194, 638, 650, 871
Eighth **Vol. 2:** 692, 698
Eighth day **Vol. 1:** 309 f.
Vol. 2: 692
Eisler, Robert **Vol. 3:** 977
Ekron **Vol. 3:** 469
El **Vol. 1:** 616, 625
Vol. 2: 67, 190, 553
Vol. 3: 617
El-berith **Vol. 1:** 367
Elath **Vol. 2:** 97
Elation **Vol. 1:** 163, 727
Elder **Vol. 1:** 83, 92, 121, 136, **188–201**, 285, 288, 293 f., 300, 303, 305, 310, 356, 364, 472, 478, 496, 499, 515, 527, 529, 536, 568
Vol. 2: 50, 152, 319, 356, 363, 519, 521, 563, 615, 638 f., 696, 715, 799, 880
Vol. 3: 33, 39, 77, 88, 95, 185, 191, 241, 478, 480 f., 568, 588, 924, 930, 1065
Eleatic school **Vol. 2:** 719
Eleazar **Vol. 1:** 435, 529
Vol. 2: 792
Vol. 3: 681, 926, 1168
Elect **Vol. 1:** 84, 159, 189, 216, 273, 275, 296, 305, 345, 381, 403, 475 f., 478, 485, **533–543**, 545, 617, 646 f., 655, 673, 697
Vol. 2: 32–34, 45, 56, 73, 118, 156, 194, 228 f., 241, 298, 307, 313 f., 354, 357, 364, 367, 395, 413, 428, 540, 566, 689, 771, 775, 798, 817, 893, 916
Vol. 3: 118, 168, 196, 215, 253, 272, 398, 505, 524, 610, 614–616, 636 f., 641, 748, 783, 874, 1016, 1029, 1117, 1165
Elect of righteousness **Vol. 3:** 359
Election **Vol. 1:** 77, 80 f., 123, 129, 159, 166, 177, 273 f., 288, 298, 300, 305, 378 f., 474, 484 f., **533–543**, 589, 617, 644, 669, 690, 693, 697, 700, 720, 730
Vol. 2: 73, 77, 117 f., 237, 259, 301 f., 307, 311 f., 321, 357 f., 385, 400, 402, 544 f., 604, 609, 661, 709, 797, 818 f., 863, 889
Vol. 3: 135 f., 221, 224, 251 f., 332, 482, 639, 648, 721, 818, 1018, 1031, 1087, 1095, 1102, 1112, 1121
Electrum **Vol. 2:** 97
Elemental powers, spirits **Vol. 1:** 282, 331, 401, 439
Vol. 2: 200, 270, 559, 645
Elemental principle **Vol. 3:** 689
Elemental spirits **Vol. 3:** 775, 994
Elementary **Vol. 1:** 166
Vol. 2: 452
Vol. 3: 216
Elementary propositions **Vol. 3:** 894
Elements **Vol. 1:** 102, 419, 525, 653 f., 664, 707
Vol. 2: 270, **436–456**, 657, 659
Vol. 3: 27, 180, 690, 1035
Elephant **Vol. 1:** 116
Elephantine **Vol. 1:** 207
Vol. 2: 576
Vol. 3: 427, 451, 457, 752
Eleusinian deities **Vol. 2:** 484
Eleusinian mysteries **Vol. 1:** 408
Vol. 2: 643
Vol. 3: 50, 138, 491 f., 593
Eleusis **Vol. 1:** 573
Vol. 3: 501
Elevation **Vol. 1:** 432
Elevated **Vol. 1:** 123
Eleven **Vol. 3:** 340
Elhanan **Vol. 1:** 170
Eli **Vol. 1:** 193
Vol. 2: 116, 856
Vol. 3: 33 f., 155, 426, 451, 655, 740
Eliakim **Vol. 2:** 727, 730, 732 f.
Elias **Vol. 1:** 543, 545
Eliashib **Vol. 3:** 35
Eliezer **Vol. 2:** 637
Vol. 3: 879
Eliezer ben Hyrkanos, Rabbi **Vol. 3:** 1058
Eligible **Vol. 1:** 533
Elihu **Vol. 1:** 511
Elijah **Vol. 1:** 128, 173, 209 f., 273, 323, 328, 481, 485, 527, **543–545**, 593, 640
Vol. 2: 82, 281, 337, 399, 432 f., 443, 488, 503, 559, 582, 627 f., 640, 686, 688, 724, 730, 861, 863, 882, 893, 902
Vol. 3: 78, 80, 83, 89, 119, 121, 211, 248, 252 f., 261 f., 266 f., 293, 325, 361, 418, 426, 436, 454, 480, 495, 507, 558, 579, 602, 621, 650, 658, 707, 721, 747, 812, 863 f., 880, 962, 1002, 1005, 1009, 1013 f., 1062, 1067, 1090 f., 1120
Elijah *redivivus* **Vol. 3:** 121, 147
Elimination **Vol. 1:** 508, 643 f.
Vol. 2: 372
Eliphaz **Vol. 3:** 209, 1041
Elis **Vol. 1:** 189
Elisha **Vol. 1:** 210, 481, 485
Vol. 2: 225, 337, 433, 464, 627 f.
Vol. 3: 77 f., 121, 211, 261, 266 f., 293, 444, 558, 962, 987, 1007, 1089, 1091
Elite **Vol. 1:** 489, 536 f., 539
Elizabeth **Vol. 1:** 187, 739
Vol. 2: 353, 358
Vol. 3: 84, 340, 361, 843, 1009, 1071, 1073
Elkanah **Vol. 3:** 1057
Ellipse **Vol. 1:** 56

Ellipsis **Vol. 1: 56**
Elliptical **Vol. 1: 56**
Eloah **Vol. 2:** 67
Elohim **Vol. 2: 56**
Vol. 2: 67
Elohist **Vol. 1: 56**, 65, 72
Elohistic narrative **Vol. 3:** 484
Elohistic source (→ E source) **Vol. 1: 56**
Eloquence **Vol. 1:** 212
Vol. 2: 873
Vol. 3: 322, **1081–1119**
Elucidate **Vol. 1:** 581
Elymas **Vol. 2:** 557
Elysian fields **Vol. 2:** 761
Elzevir edition **Vol. 1:** 70
Emanate **Vol. 1:** 616, 705
Emanation **Vol. 2:** 67, 290
Vol. 3: 831
Emancipation **Vol. 3:** 1168
Embalm **Vol. 1:** 264, 266
Vol. 2: 293
Embassy **Vol. 1:** 192, 197
Vol. 2: 311
Embellish **Vol. 1:** 265
Embezzlement **Vol. 2:** 471
Vol. 3: 377
Embitter **Vol. 1:** 201 f., 561, 563
Emblem **Vol. 1:** 406–408
Embodiment **Vol. 1:** 501, 545, 705, 708, 712
Vol. 2: 289, 325, 625
Vol. 3: 686, 694, 815, 1205
Emboss **Vol. 2:** 288
Embrace **Vol. 1:** 206 f., 239, 742
Embryo **Vol. 1:** 183, 283, 712
Vol. 3: 997
Emerald **Vol. 3:** 391, 396, 1003
Emergency **Vol. 3:** 408, 410
Emigrate **Vol. 2: 788–790**
Emissary **Vol. 2:** 328
Emission **Vol. 2:** 586
Vol. 3: 104
Emmanuel **Vol. 1:** 581, 737
Vol. 2: 86 f., 654
Vol. 3: 697
Emmaus **Vol. 1:** 576
Vol. 2: 342, 729
Vol. 3: 132, 198, 283, 287, 453, 717
Emotion **Vol. 1:** 106, 230, 239 f., 461, 555, 567, 656
Vol. 2: 70, 180–183, 244, 352, 355, 416–424, 478, 552, 567, 593, 599 f., 765
Vol. 3: 125, 676 f., 680 f., 684, 691, 710, 719, 748, 823
Emotional strain **Vol. 3:** 858
Empathy **Vol. 1:** 583
Empedocles of Agrigentum **Vol. 1:** 594
Vol. 3: 635
Emperor **Vol. 1:** 119, 125, 269 f., 474, 519
Vol. 2: 167, 233 f., 288, 378, 380, 511, 572, 574, 624, 665, 693, 782, 898
Vol. 3: 45, 217, 411, 635, 715, 718, 736, 959, 1168
Emperor-cult **Vol. 2:** 309, 373, 674, 876
Emperor-worship **Vol. 2: 511**
Vol. 3: 959
Emphasis **Vol. 1:** 99, 359, 538, 609, 732
Vol. 2: 112
Emphasize **Vol. 2:** 327
Emphatic **Vol. 1:** 600
Empire **Vol. 1:** 126, 519
Vol. 2: 376, 381, 689, 788, 802, 918
Vol. 3: 555
Empirical **Vol. 1: 56**, 522, 711
Vol. 2: 395
Empiricism **Vol. 1: 56**, 64
Empiricist **Vol. 1: 56**
Vol. 3: 1136
Employ **Vol. 1:** 653
Employer **Vol. 2:** 513
Employment **Vol. 1:** 267
Vol. 3: 758
Empower **Vol. 2:** 146, 165
Emptiness **Vol. 1:** 482, 512
Vol. 2: 432
Vol. 3: 407
Empty **Vol. 1:** 137, 266, 455, **545–553**, 611 f., 623, 706 f., 709, 714
Vol. 2: 150, 203, 242, 262, 264, 285, 343, 400, 445, 471, 500, 620, 683, 828, 844, 854
Vol. 3: 200, 281, 417, 554, 597, 604, 645, 815, 1101
Empty-handed **Vol. 1:** 546 f.
Empty-headed **Vol. 1:** 417 f.
Enable **Vol. 1:** 681
Vol. 2: 357, 359
Vol. 3: 728–730
Enact **Vol. 1:** 369
Vol. 2: 438–451
Enallage **Vol. 3:** 1174
Encaenia **Vol. 3:** 366
Encamp **Vol. 3: 811–815**
Enchanter **Vol. 2:** 555
Enchantment **Vol. 2:** 166
Enclose **Vol. 1:** 54, 240
Enclosure **Vol. 3:** 565, 948
Encompass **Vol. 1:** 405
Encounter **Vol. 1:** 335, 611, 623
Vol. 2: 223, 317, 342, 396, 631
Vol. 3: 56, 310, 336, 493, 694
Encouragement **Vol. 1:** 88, 258, 263, 303, **327–329**, 342, 512 f., 567–570, 600, 679, 722
Vol. 2: 199, 266, 317, 431, 857
Vol. 3: 44, 54, 204, 492, 844, 930, 1043
End **Vol. 1:** 56, 69, 95, 164, 289, 298, 311, 342, 403, 410, 429, 432–434, 463, 470, 492, 513, 515, 521, 544, 550, 581, 589, 597, 610, 619, 642, 651, 654, 666 f., 669, 671, 680–682, 696, 698, 712, 719, 734 f., 737, 739
Vol. 2: 37, **52–66**, 128, 157, 229, 275, 303, 313, 351, 385, 443, 445, 451, 461, 629, 633, 657, 665, 701, 748, 786, 892, 904, 908, 910–912, 914 f., 918, 926
Vol. 3: 42, 254, 659, 725, 756, 759, **796 f.**, 936, 969
End of the age **Vol. 1:** 124, 325
Vol. 2: 37, 218, 282, 326, 329, 844, 900 f., 921
End of time **Vol. 1:** 389, 657

Vol. 2: 48, 300, 354, 376 f., 388, 417, 610
Vol. 3: 504, 621, 701
End of the world **Vol. 1:** 56, 216 f., 496, 519, 630
Vol. 2: 37 f., 52, 54, 61 f., 383 f., 458, 893, 903, 918
Vol. 3: 559, 812, 829, 844
End-time **Vol. 1:** 65, 185, 244, 545, 610, 622, 629, 656, 729, 733, 735
Vol. 2: 34, 54, 56, 250, 266, 306, 308 f., 315, 382, 717, 736, 785, 808, 833, 889, 914 f., 929
Vol. 3: 31, 80, 88, 105, 213, 301, 531, 650, 695 f., 832, 918
Endanger **Vol. 1:** 241, 500, 687
Vol. 2: 370
Endeavour **Vol. 1:** 319, 695, 723
Vol. 2: 617
Vol. 3: 42, **798–808**
Endless **Vol. 2:** 891
Endor **Vol. 2:** 554
Vol. 3: 270
Endorse **Vol. 1:** 99, 679
Endow **Vol. 1:** 207, 654, 739
Endowment **Vol. 1:** 122, 735, 739
Vol. 2: 121, 658
Vol. 3: 69
Ends of the earth **Vol. 2:** 55
Endurable **Vol. 2: 765–767**
Endurance **Vol. 1:** 123, 215, 257, 304, 400, 541, 570, 639, 644, 646, 650, 673, 710, 727
Vol. 2: 98, 123, 245, 291, 301, 696, **764–776**
Vol. 3: 680, 1040
Endure **Vol. 2:** 269, 357, 420, **764–767**, 773
Vol. 3: 224, 347, 490, **719–725**
Endure hard labour **Vol. 3: 858 f.**
Endure hardship **Vol. 3: 719–725**
Enduring **Vol. 1:** 711, 739
Vol. 2: 96, 318
Vol. 3: 558–560
Enemy **Vol. 1:** 125, 187, 208, 210, 215, 239, 248, 252, 257, 259, 264 f., 295, 345, 400, 416 f., 440, 453, 463 f., 477, 487, 508, 541, **553–557**, 567, 572, 610, 622, 649 f., 652, 655, 657, 662, 679, 686, 702, 726
Vol. 2: 58, 61, 71, 105 f., 110, 144, 146 f., 149, 157 f., 187, 206, 211, 215, 220, 245, 256, 263, 266, 268, 363 f., 366, 385 f., 402, 413, 416, 432 f., 438, 486, 499, 543 f., 547, 549, 613, 632, 665, 674, 679, 868
Vol. 3: 49, 93, 96 f., 145, 167, 183, 193, 202, 207, 210, 212, 216, 218, 234, 237, 249, 256, 269, 275, 341, 355 f., 360, 379, 425, 444, 469 f., 559, 562 f., 576, 581, 590, 609, 633, 678, 721, 757, 802, 806, 818, 842, 868, 873, 908 f., 916, 951, 960, 983, 987, 994, 1006, 1017, 1099
Energetic **Vol. 2:** 861
Energy **Vol. 1:** 671
Vol. 2: 148, 658
Vol. 3: 599, 683, 691
Engage **Vol. 1:** 372, 494, 656
Engaged **Vol. 2:** 582, 585
Engagement **Vol. 2:** 584
Engelmann, P. **Vol. 3:** 1136
Engrave **Vol. 1:** 332
Vol. 2: 573
Vol. 3: 483, 488
Enigmatic **Vol. 1:** 203
Enjoy **Vol. 2: 269–271**, 352, 428, 477, 817, 843
Vol. 3: 372, 922
Enjoyment **Vol. 1:** 212, 239 f., 431, 434, 457 f., 494, 529, 687, 689 f., 722, 728
Vol. 2: 264, 273, **352–361**, 458
Vol. 3: 677, 845, 852
Enlarge **Vol. 1:** 253, 732 f.
Enlightener **Vol. 2:** 290
Enlightenment **Vol. 1:** 421–423, 562
Vol. 2: 243, 265, 270, **490–496**, 718
Vol. 3: 932, 1083
Enlist soldiers **Vol. 3: 958–967**
Enmeduranna **Vol. 3:** 264 f.
Enmity **Vol. 1:** 85, 223, 289, 370, 417, 458, 501, 525, **553–557**, 603, 644, 681
Vol. 2: 258, 309, 426, 548, 663
Vol. 3: 168 f., 171, 315, 949
Enoch **Vol. 1:** 50, 66, 85, 124, 316, 545
Vol. 2: 202, 216, 219, 227, 290, 627, 681, 815, 817, 842, 897, 905
Vol. 3: 35, 262, 264–266, 272, 487, 558, 579, 602, 615–617, 621, 627, 682, 747
Enosh **Vol. 1:** 451
Enough **Vol. 1:** 597, 699, 728, 731
Vol. 2: 131, 272
Vol. 3: 726–730
Enquire **Vol. 2:** 140, 286, 362, 364
Vol. 3: 531
Enquiry **Vol. 1:** 607
Vol. 3: 570
Enrage **Vol. 1:** 107
Enraptured **Vol. 3:** 230
Enrich **Vol. 2:** 405, 842
Enrobe **Vol. 1:** 122
Enrol **Vol. 3:** 486, 1014
Enrolment **Vol. 1:** 330, 669
Enslave **Vol. 1:** 138, 364, 399, 401, 437 f., 457 f., 460, 466, 469, 613, 717
Vol. 2: 94, 154, 182 f., 195, 229, 265, 401, 449, 718, 828, 843
Vol. 3: 96
Ensure **Vol. 2:** 364
Entanglement **Vol. 2:** 457
Enter **Vol. 1:** 320, 646, 682, 688
Vol. 2: 223, 244, 295, 385, 387 f., 813
Vol. 3: 691, 910
Enterprise **Vol. 1:** 710, 712
Vol. 2: 254
Entertain **Vol. 1:** 625, 690
Vol. 2: 674
Enthronement **Vol. 1:** 121–123, 177, 668
Vol. 2: 58, 108 f., 201–203, 374–376, 918
Vol. 3: 637, 643, 673, 863
Enthronement festival **Vol. 2:** 375, 613
Enthronement Psalms **Vol. 2:** 336, 375, 613
Enthusiasm **Vol. 1:** 528 f., 594, 598, 600 f., 604, 642, 679
Vol. 2: 160, 171, 241, 386, 429, 785 f., 883
Vol. 3: 58, 199, 932, 1166
Enthusiast **Vol. 1:** 638

Enthusiast (*cont'd*)
Vol. 2: 253, 267, 611, 741
Vol. 3: 690
Entice **Vol. 1:** 458
Vol. 3: 809
Enticement **Vol. 2:** 458, 708, 845
Entirely **Vol. 2:** 63
Entirety **Vol. 1:** 740
Entity **Vol. 1:** 522
Entrails **Vol. 2:** **599 f.**
Vol. 3: 423
Entrance **Vol. 2:** 29–31, 54, 179, 245
Vol. 3: 213, 221, 310, 395, 794, **935–943**, 948
Entranced **Vol. 1:** 528
Entreat **Vol. 2:** **861–864, 867–875**
Entreat favour **Vol. 3:** 149
Entreaty **Vol. 2:** **860 f.**, 862–864, 867–875
Entrenchment **Vol. 3:** 952
Entrust **Vol. 1:** 273, 332, 594, 596, 684, 730
Vol. 2: 113, 255 f., 366, 438, 837
Vol. 3: 686
Entry **Vol. 1:** 317, 325, 629, 724
Vol. 2: 379, 415, 902
Vol. 3: 652, 669, 791
Enûma Eliš **Vol. 2:** 200, 552
Envious **Vol. 1:** 557
Vol. 2: 356
Environment **Vol. 1:** 679, 693, 720
Vol. 2: 307–309, 487
Vol. 3: 935
Envoy **Vol. 1:** 126 f., 130, 193 f., 596
Vol. 3: 50
Envy **Vol. 1:** 397, 509, **557 f.**
Vol. 2: 594
Vol. 3: 149, 532, 707, 1119, 1166
Epaenetus **Vol. 3:** 416
Epaphras **Vol. 2:** 597
Vol. 3: 596
Epaphroditus **Vol. 1:** 130, 741
Vol. 3: 553, 955, 957, 1164
Epexegetical *kai* **Vol. 3:** 241
Ephemeral **Vol. 2:** 358
Ephesians **Vol. 1:** 55, 148, 160, 237, 301, 487
Vol. 2: 85, 217, 302
Vol. 3: 66, 315, 592, 699
Ephesus **Vol. 1:** 199, 263, 303, 419, 560, 568, 578, 654
Vol. 2: 74, 85, 155, 235, 360, 557, 623, 644, 676, 678, 763, 775
Vol. 3: 65, 203, 480, 521, 529, 757, 768, 784, 796, 903, 915, 949, 967, 1080
Ephod **Vol. 2:** 296
Ephphatha **Vol. 3:** 860
Ephraim **Vol. 2:** 306, 318, 541, 649
Vol. 3: 450
Ephrath **Vol. 1:** 170
Ephrathah **Vol. 1:** 170
Ephron **Vol. 3:** 51, 146
Epic literature **Vol. 3:** 1081
Epictetus **Vol. 2:** 140, 259, 776
Vol. 3: 50, 123, 491, 634, 739, 766
Epicureans **Vol. 1:** 246, 555, 672, 676
Vol. 2: 817
Vol. 3: 525, 1034, 1036, 115
Epicurus **Vol. 1:** 469, 671, 673
Vol. 3: 217, 678
Epidaurus **Vol. 1:** 594
Vol. 2: 166
Vol. 3: 103, 520, 915
Epilepsy **Vol. 1:** 163, 727
Vol. 3: 475, 734, 750
Epimenides **Vol. 2:** 77, 85
Vol. 3: 81, 331, 887
Epiphanius **Vol. 2:** 506 f.
Vol. 3: 36
Epiphany **Vol. 2:** 245, 862
Vol. 3: 317, 514, 862
Episcopacy **Vol. 1:** **188–201**
Epistle **Vol. 1:** 246
Epistles, Apocryphal **Vol. 1:** 50 f.
Epistolary style **Vol. 1:** 247
Epitaph **Vol. 1:** 431
Epoch **Vol. 1:** 477
Vol. 3: **826–833**
Eponym **Vol. 2:** 318 f.
Equal **Vol. 2:** 291, 438, **496–508**, 825
Vol. 3: 409
Equal rights **Vol. 1:** 720
Equal status **Vol. 2:** 160 f.
Equality **Vol. 1:** 366, 368, 640–642, 691
Vol. 2: 80, 146, 160, 309, 311, 403, 426, **496–508**, 823
Vol. 3: 604
Equality of the sexes **Vol. 2:** 563
Equate **Vol. 2:** 338, 387
Equestrian order **Vol. 3:** 718, 755
Equilibrium **Vol. 3:** 560
Equip **Vol. 2:** 152, 606
Vol. 3: 118, **349–351, 959–967**
Equipment **Vol. 3:** **349–351**
Equivalent **Vol. 3:** 153, 1179
Era **Vol. 3:** 829
Erase **Vol. 1:** 471
Vol. 2: 312
Vol. 3: 109, 840
Erasmus **Vol. 1:** 70
Erastus **Vol. 2:** 254
Erech **Vol. 1:** 140
Erect **Vol. 2:** 251, 373
Vol. 3: **118–120**, 279
Erigena, John Scotus **Vol. 3:** 148
Erinyes **Vol. 1:** 687
Eros **Vol. 2:** 539, 643
Erotic **Vol. 1:** 631
Vol. 2: 584
Vol. 3: 676
Err **Vol. 1:** 400, 467, 608
Vol. 2: 142
Vol. 3: **585 f.**
Errant **Vol. 1:** 664
Erroneous **Vol. 1:** 708
Vol. 2: 239
Error **Vol. 1:** 355, 438, 546, 680, 700, 733
Vol. 2: 95, 141, 214, **406–408, 457–461**
Vol. 3: 328, 379, **585 f.**, 770
Eryx **Vol. 1:** 497
Esau **Vol. 1:** 81, 214, 556 f., 667
Vol. 2: 116, 316–319, 369, 431, 782, 796, 847

Vol. 3: 869, 1179
Escape **Vol. 1:** 268, 358, 420 f., **558 f.**, 657, 677, 717
Vol. 2: 136, 366 f., 393, 434, 445, 573
Vol. 3: 120, 209, 227, 528, 1053
Eschatological **Vol. 1: 56**, 87, 99, 111, 123 f., 126, 131, 133 f., 147, 170 175 f., 179, 184–186, 204, 215–217, 224 f., 231, 237, 244, 260, 262 f., 269, 278, 289, 296–305, 317, 321, 336, 338, 347, 358, 368, 373, 383, 400, 414, 423, 425, 449, 452, 463, 465 f., 482, 496, 505, 513, 515, 518, 535, 539, 544 f., 551, 554, 566, 578, 601 f., 604, 607, 610, 615, 620, 630, 634, 638, 640 f., 656 f., 661, 668, 701, 709, 728, 735 f.
Vol. 2: 31, 33, 45, 47 f., 50, 56–65, 72, 100, 102, 109, 111, 117, 122, 130 f., 135, 147, 150, 162, 168, 186, 189 f., 192, 194, 200, 203, 205, 208, 228 f., 240–242, 244 f., 252, 261 f., 264, 275 f., 288, 298, 300, 303, 312–315, 325 f., 329, 337, 353–359, 367, 374–377, 382, 384, 386, 399, 402, 411 f., 420, 426, 429, 435, 479, 487, 491 f., 495, 499, 504, 518, 522, 524, 530 f., 534–536, 573, 580, 585, 591, 595, 602, 604, 609–611, 614, 625, 631 f., 640, 665 f., 670, 672, 676, 691, 693, 695 f., 698, 709, 727 f., 733, 754, 767, 773, 779 f., 786, 793, 797, 807–809, 819, 823, 825, 842, 844, 875, 887 f., 890–894, 900–935
Vol. 3: 35–37, 46 f., 74, 79, 82–84, 88, 111 f., 121, 141–143, 147 f., 182, 196 f., 204 f., 207 f., 210, 214 f., 218, 233, 245, 256, 272, 274, 276, 279, 281, 287 f., 292, 297, 301, 318–320, 328, 334, 352, 361, 368, 372 f., 417, 430, 460, 462, 502, 514, 545 f., 556, 558, 560, 615, 618–620, 623–627, 630 f., 637 f., 641, 643, 645, 647, 649, 669, 675, 682, 685 f., 693, 696 f., 699, 701, 703, 705, 710, 725, 731–737, 745, 749, 784, 792, 803, 842–844, 848, 856, 863, 871, 890, 905 f., 922, 924, 934, 953, 961 f., 965, 969, 973, 986–989, 1005 f., 1008, 1010 f., 1041, 1117, 1149, 1158, 1168
Eschatology **Vol. 1:** 50, 53, **56**, 65, 111, 382, 563, 601, 639
Vol. 2: 47 f., 110, 139, 376, **383–385**, 388 f., 447, 517, 749, 764, 785, 824, 886, 890, 892, 894, 899, **901–935**
Vol. 3: 46, 66 f., 80, 86, 146, 277, 305, 332, 453, 603, 648, 658, 830–833, 991
Eschatology, consistent **Vol. 2: 383, 902 f.**
Eschatology, futurist **Vol. 2: 384**, 388, 924, 927–929
Eschatology, realized **Vol. 1: 56**, 111
Vol. 2: 242, **384**, 883, **904–906**, 927 f., 930
Eschatology, thorough-going **Vol. 2: 383**
Vol. 3: 506
Eschaton **Vol. 3:** 642, 733
1 Esdras **Vol. 1:** 50
2 Esdras **Vol. 1:** 124
Vol. 3: 271
3 Esdras **Vol. 3:** 312
Eshnuna **Vol. 3:** 594
Esoteric **Vol. 1:** 577
Vol. 2: 401
Vol. 3: 481, 502
Especial **Vol. 2: 838–840**
Espouse **Vol. 2:** 364
Essence **Vol. 1:** 703, 705, 710–712
Vol. 2: 84, 287 f.
Vol. 3: 513, 1186
Essenes **Vol. 1:** 67, 102, 145, 151, 153, 204, 309, 495, 534, 554, 627, 630, 641 f., 688
Vol. 2: 71, 207, 377, 579, 651, 785, 810 f., 823
Vol. 3: 80, 105, 108, 160, 273, 486 f., 495, 531, 545, 595, 608, 623, 681, 740, 753, 802, 978 f., 989, 1006, 1035
Essential **Vol. 1:** 549, 701, 703–709, 715
Vol. 2: 106, 335, 406, 438
Establish **Vol. 1:** 123, 329, 368, 380, 426, 472, 522, 596, 626, 639, 660, 664, 681, 688, 696
Vol. 2: 69, 183, 489
Vol. 3: 117, 242, 350, 434
Establishment **Vol. 3:** 970
Estate **Vol. 1:** 641
Vol. 2: 254, 303, 317, 823, 844
Esteem **Vol. 1:** 106, 197, 553
Vol. 2: 48, 130, 364, 438
Vol. 3: 317
Esteemed **Vol. 3: 808–810**
Estha **Vol. 3:** 655
Esther **Vol. 1:** 50, 59, 364, 560, 626, 637
Vol. 2: 116, 291, 860
Vol. 3: 960, 962, 1057
Estimate **Vol. 1:** 480
Vol. 2: 365
Estrangement **Vol. 1:** 421, 459, 474, 684 f.
Vol. 2: 468, 742
Vol. 3: 171 f., 227
Etana **Vol. 2:** 201
Etch **Vol. 2:** 573
Eternal **Vol. 1:** 79, 240, 243, 382 f., 386, 406, 408, 442, 452, 464, 544, 563, 596, 611, 619, 657, 665, 694, 697
Vol. 2: 52, 70, 72, 77, 86, 103, 105, 138, 179, 213, 230, 253, 271, 274, 290, 303, 355, 365, 412, 585, 792
Vol. 3: 41, 99, 189, 209, 229, 260, 583, 686, **826–833**, 1034
Eternal death **Vol. 1:** 434
Vol. 3: 685, 833
Eternal destruction **Vol. 1:** 423, 466, 610
Vol. 2: 61
Vol. 3: 96
Eternal fire **Vol. 3:** 96, 99, 470
Eternal habitations **Vol. 2:** 382
Vol. 3: 812
Eternal judgment **Vol. 3:** 99
Eternal life **Vol. 1:** 78 f., 112, 244, 250, 253 f., 337, 406, 423, 434, 439–441, 464, 476, 482, 603, 625, 637 f., 701, 723
Vol. 2: 32, 42, 47, 51, 79, 82 f., 120, 194, 207, 230, 265, 269, 273, 277, 280, 295, 300–304, 388, 403 f., 415, 419, 480–483, 517, 535, 606, 632, 642, 654, 727, 770, 774, 824, 830, 833, 840, 905, 927 f., 930

Eternal life (*cont'd*)
Vol. 3: 47, 71, 73, 99, 114, 142, 145, 216, 302, 321, 368, 517, 525, 533, 631, 647, 681 f., 685 f., 750, 809, 831, **832 f.**, 837, 920, 1046, 1122
Eternal punishment **Vol. 1:** 339
Vol. 3: 98 f., 210
Eternal rejection **Vol. 3:** 99
Eternal sin **Vol. 3:** 99
Eternity **Vol. 1:** 222, 311, 347, 380, 440, 464, 470, 473, 616, 669, 719
Vol. 2: 255, 276, 592, 719, 878, 906, 919
Vol. 3: 686, **826–833**, 841
Eternity-formula **Vol. 3:** 828
Ether **Vol. 1:** 449
Vol. 2: 188
Ethic **Vol. 1:** 489, 494 f., 498
Ethical **Vol. 1:** 333 f., 339, 412, 420, 448, 460, 483, 490, 501, 514, 543, 546, 561 f., 565, 607, 612, 626, 640, 649
Vol. 2: 65, 95, 98, 103, 116, 128, 132, 223, 232, 258 f., 262, 367, 377, 383, 391, 437, 439, 443, 475, 781 f.
Vol. 3: 102 f., 107, 138, 149, 357, 373, 572, 766, 844, 928, 933, 945, 1148, 1166
Ethical values **Vol. 2:** 224
Ethics **Vol. 1:** 52, 54, **56**, 59, 62, 65, 68, 147, 338, 494, 571, 687
Vol. 2: 60, 65, 102, 123, 133, 140, 166, 394, 397, 544, 719, 858
Vol. 3: 54, 75, 103, 107, 215, 351, 561, 582, 849, 1022, 1034
Ethics, comparative **Vol. 1: 56**
Ethics, descriptive **Vol. 1: 56**
Ethics, negative **Vol. 2:** 394
Ethics, normative **Vol. 1: 56**
Ethics, philosophical **Vol. 1: 56,** 68, 494
Ethiopia **Vol. 2:** 294, 367, 381
Vol. 3: 526
Ethiopian **Vol. 1:** 341
Vol. 2: 349, 381
Ethiopian eunuch **Vol. 3:** 65 f., 602, 609
Ethiopic **Vol. 1:** 68
Ethiopic Enoch **Vol. 3:** 265, 272
Ethnic origin **Vol. 2:** 124, 305
Etruscans **Vol. 1:** 68
Vol. 3: 851
Etymology **Vol. 1: 56 f.**, 61
Vol. 3: 206, 878
Euboea **Vol. 2:** 233
Eucharist **Vol. 1:** 154, 702
Vol. 2: 535, 591, 897
Vol. 3: 158, 412, **816–819**
Eucharistic **Vol. 1:** 437
Eucharistic sacrifice **Vol. 3:** 244 f.
Eudaemonism **Vol. 1:** 501
Vol. 3: 1034
Eudaimonia **Vol. 2:** 271
Eulogy **Vol. 3:** 816
Eumenides **Vol. 1:** 421, 588
Eumolpidae **Vol. 1:** 573
Eunice **Vol. 3:** 1070
Eunuch **Vol. 1:** 341, **559–561**
Vol. 2: 381, 385, 580, 710, 728
Vol. 3: 541, 866
Euodia **Vol. 1:** 344
Vol. 3: 1164
Euphemism **Vol. 1:** 429
Vol. 2: 59, 148, 925, 927
Vol. 3: 910, 1053
Euphrates **Vol. 1:** 516, 531
Vol. 2: 555, 754
Vol. 3: 179, 871, 985–987
Europe **Vol. 2:** 222
Eusebius **Vol. 1:** 582
Vol. 2: 505
Eustathius of Antioch **Vol. 2:** 506
Evade **Vol. 1:** 602
Vol. 2: 254
Vol. 3: 835
Evaluation **Vol. 1:** 348, 480, 504, 528, 666, 679 f., 736
Vol. 2: 103, 473, 847, 905
Vol. 3: 402, 824
Evangelism **Vol. 1:** 95, 129, 662
Evangelist **Vol. 1:** 116, 213
Vol. 2: 107–115, 187
Vol. 3: 768, 1067
Evangelize **Vol. 2:** 83, **107–115**
Evans, C. F. **Vol. 3: 299**
Evaporate **Vol. 3:** 109
Evaporation **Vol. 3:** 689
Eve **Vol. 1: 84–88**, 187, 390, 413, 451, 468
Vol. 3: 585, 691
Vol. 3: 215, 579, 585
Evening **Vol. 1:** 629, 632, 634
Vol. 2: 136, 887
Vol. 3: 846
Event **Vol. 1:** 71, 667, 693, 707, 713, 733, 735, 737 f.
Vol. 2: 137
Vol. 3: 53, 65, 1090, **1119–1123**
Ever **Vol. 2:** 60 f.
Everlasting **Vol. 1:** 367, 423
Vol. 2: 357, 374
Everlasting God **Vol. 2:** 67
Everyday **Vol. 1:** 614 f., 703
Vol. 2: 334
Vol. 3: 313
Everyone **Vol. 1:** 94
Evidence **Vol. 1:** 365, 428, 436, 726
Vol. 2: 140, 142, 368, 498
Vol. 3: 1038–1050
Evident **Vol. 2:** 377
Vol. 3: 316, **317–324**
Evil **Vol. 1:** 55, 84 f., 104, 106 f., 118, 124, 138, 152, 163, 167, 169, 201, 205, 212, 223, 228, 231, 240, 265, 268, 322, 348, 351, 354 f., 357, 359, 370, 381, 385, 387, 389, 402, 411, 413, 416, 419 f., 422, 424, 429, 431, 433–435, 449–453, 456 f., 463, 466 f., 473, 509, 522, 529, 556, 558 f., **561–567**, 568, 609, 631, 644, 649, 651, 653, 656, 671, 673 f., 676, 700, 704, 719, 731, 743
Vol. 2: 28, 36, 86, 94, 97–101, 103, 127, 150 f., 157 f., 166, 181 f., 191, 193, 229, 236, 239, 266, 272, 274, 328, 350 f., 358, 366, 369, 387, 391, 396, 406, 419, 446, 458,

462 f., 490, 497, 568, 659, 676, 680, 716, 733, 794, 798, 811, 817, 868, 889 f., 928
Vol. 3: 103, 125, 130, 140, 172, 174, 179, 201, 203 f., 212, 231, 265, 321, 358, 439, 476, 522, 534, 572, 579, 586, 647, 651, 691–693, 695, 718, 720, 725, 734, 807, 810, 865, 868 f., 938, 1021, 1054, 1079, 1148, 1158, 1176
Evil eye **Vol. 1:** 423
Vol. 2: 553
Vol. 3: 520
Evil generation **Vol. 3:** 256
Evil impulse, inclination **Vol. 1:** 83, 231, 336, 459
Vol. 2: 459
Vol. 3: 363, 468 f., 579, 801, 805, 939
Evil one **Vol. 1:** 420, 510, 526, 651
Vol. 2: 135, 376, 709, 868
Vol. 3: 121, 469, 1176
Evil powers **Vol. 2:** 30, 193, 582
Evil speech **Vol. 3:** **345 f.**
Evil spirits **Vol. 2:** 75, 358, 383, 459, 630, 653
Evil spirits and good spirits **Vol. 3:** **694 f.**
Evil thoughts **Vol. 3:** 106
Evil-doers **Vol. 1:** 293, 433, 452, 537, 555, 561, 563, 641
Vol. 2: 101, 237, 893
Vol. 3: 359, 527, 583
Evil-speaking **Vol. 3:** 345
Evolve **Vol. 1:** 694
Exact **Vol. 1:** 712
Exaction **Vol. 1:** 572
Vol. 2: 318, 364
Vol. 3: 756
Exaggerate **Vol. 1:** 528
Vol. 2: 433
Exalt **Vol. 2:** **197–205**, 265, 417, 422 f.
Vol. 3: 393
Exaltation **Vol. 1:** 83, 95, 168, 179, 224, 375, 399, 402, 437 f., 483, 500, 510, 549, 648, 668
Vol. 2: 122, 148, 178, 184, 195, 198–204, 262 f., 343, 603 f., 609 f., 718, 900, 903, 918, 920
Vol. 3: 42, 55, 162, 297, 366, 510, 552, 588, 615 f., 620, 630, 632, 652, 698, 812, 1111
Exalted **Vol. 1:** 133, 135, 168, 214, 244, 248, 269, 300, 305, 338, 375, 387, 403, 482, 491, 532, 540, 565, 603, 643, 656
Vol. 2: 46, 58 f., 64, 84, 93 f., 119, 128, 147, 165, 194, 196, **198–200**, 210, 225, 242, 262, 277, 329, 340, 386, 493, 503, 514, 516–518, 530, 604, 611, 786, 795, 921
Vol. 3: 29, 62, 85, 88, 195, 276, 349, 534, 630, 670, 838
Examination **Vol. 1:** 163, 602
Vol. 2: 341
Vol. 3: 533, 758, 855, 1080
Examine **Vol. 1:** 189, 485, 503, 591
Vol. 2: 140, 183, **362–367**, 393, 856
Vol. 3: 533
Example **Vol. 1:** 71, 156, 214, 239, 276, 299, 311, 400 f., 440, 448, 491 f., 532, 544, 572, 578, 593, 600, 643, 667, 694, 714
Vol. 2: 47, 95, 180, 219, 258, 262, 277, **284–293**, 318, 350, 381, 400, 429, 471, 519, 619, 770, 773, 806, 811, 826
Vol. 3: 60, 73, 183, 346, 490, 547, 570, 582, 724, 775, 821, 854, 980, 1157
Excavate **Vol. 1:** 520
Exceed **Vol. 1:** 729
Vol. 2: 128, 131
Vol. 3: 360
Exceeding **Vol. 1:** 728
Excel **Vol. 1:** 728
Excellence **Vol. 1:** 537
Vol. 2: 98, 105
Vol. 3: 730, 1034
Excellent **Vol. 2:** 102
Vol. 3: **716–718**
Exception **Vol. 1:** 674
Exceptive clause **Vol. 1:** 500
Vol. 3: **538, 540 f.**, 1195
Excess **Vol. 1:** 108, 169, 495, 501, 625, 728 f.
Vol. 2: 314
Excessive **Vol. 3:** 922
Exchange **Vol. 1:** 469
Vol. 2: 96, 503
Vol. 3: **166–174**, 197, 885, 1179
Excite **Vol. 1:** 733
Vol. 2: 350
Vol. 3: **556–558**
Excited **Vol. 1:** 107, 528
Vol. 2: 244
Excitement **Vol. 1:** 646
Vol. 2: 149, 181, 652
Vol. 3: 676, 710
Exclude **Vol. 1:** 607 f., 612, 632, 644, 659, 684, 687, 689, 694, 700, 740
Vol. 2: 286
Vol. 3: 105, 402, 470, 954
Exclusion **Vol. 1:** 414, 433, 463, 466 f., 473, 500, 560, 566, 666
Vol. 2: 312, 316, 530, 709, 813
Vol. 3: 534
Exclusive **Vol. 1:** 539
Vol. 2: 273, 724, 888
Exclusiveness **Vol. 2:** 73, 275, 494
Vol. 3: 479, 1167
Exclusivism **Vol. 3:** 191
Excommunication **Vol. 1:** 413, 415
Vol. 2: 33, 302
Vol. 3: 188, 535, 756, 779
Excuse **Vol. 1:** 270, 385
Vol. 2: 138 f., 183, 366, 400, 408, **855–859**
Vol. 3: 128, 885, 951, 1150
Execrate **Vol. 1:** 413, 415 f.
Execute **Vol. 1:** 657, 669, 735
Execution **Vol. 1:** 264, 345, 389–396, 429, 466, 693, 737
Vol. 2: 59, 291, 368, 370, 437, 527
Vol. 3: 96, 159, 538, 796, 865
Executor **Vol. 2:** 368
Exegesis **Vol. 1:** **57**, 59 f., 62, 64 f., 68 f., 71, 575, 579
Vol. 2: 406
Vol. 3: 42, 264, 1120
Exemplar **Vol. 3:** 360
Exemplary **Vol. 1:** 568, 598

Exemplary (*cont'd*)
Vol. 2: 102
Exempt **Vol. 1:** 482, 604, 698, 716
Vol. 2: 370, 578, 775
Vol. 3: 1032
Exercise **Vol. 1:** 312 f., 495 f., 522, 645, 647, 671
Vol. 2: 267, 336, 361, 372
Exercise authority **Vol. 2: 606–611**
Exert oneself **Vol. 3:** 799
Exertion **Vol. 1:** 262 f., 495, 540, 568, 729
Vol. 3: 936
Exhalation **Vol. 3:** 679
Exhaustion **Vol. 1:** 262 f., 393, 395, 730
Vol. 2: 265, 295
Exhibit **Vol. 1:** 371, 696 f.
Vol. 2: 291, 434, 488
Vol. 3: 570 f.
Exhilaration **Vol. 1:** 173
Exhort **Vol. 1:** 65, 88 f., 197, 199, 271, 328 f., 339, 341, 346, 446, **567–573**, 623, 634, 644, 687, 713, 739, 742
Vol. 2: 359, 417, 744
Vol. 3: 69, 84, 87 f., 170, 214
Exhortation **Vol. 1:** 65, 336 f., 341, 400–402, 491 f., 510, 542, 570, 602–604, 607, 623, 630
Vol. 2: 101, 106, 121, 123, 203, 214, 239, 263 f., 272, 423, 435, 438, 517, 598, 766, 912, 924
Vol. 3: 54, 87, 118, 197, 219, 351, 685, 928, 1027, 1088, 1113, 1118
Exile **Vol. 1:** 52–56, 61 f., 141, 196, 262, 294, 379, 410, 414, 531, 539, 612, 632, 683, 685 f., 689 f., 700, 716, 734
Vol. 2: 32, 100, 105, 226, 266, 330, 376, 541, 691, 801, 866, 889
Vol. 3: 69, 79, 94, 147, 149, 190, 193, 249 f., 336, 355, 566, 590, 654, 777, 815, 845, 866 f., 873, 960, 986, 1074, 1099, 1100 f., 1104
Existence **Vol. 1:** 57, 65 f., 70 f., 95, 166, 222, 229, 234, 236, 238, 423, 431, 433, 436, 444, 470, 472 f., 475, 483, 485 f., 492, 500, 516, 539–541, 544, 551 f., 562, 564 f., 595, 597 f., 601 f., 607, 619, 644, 654, 661, 675 f., 678 f., 697, 706 f., 711, 713, 719, 727, 735
Vol. 2: 52, 68, 100, 158, 286, 295, 307, 311, 314, 350, 361, 364, 394, 402, 453, 471, 476, 479, 493, 657, 662, 671, 719, 721
Vol. 3: 122, 224
Existential **Vol. 2:** 384, 399, 906
Existential ontology **Vol. 1:** 65
Existential truth **Vol. 3:** 894
Existentialism **Vol. 1:** 54, **57**, 64 f.
Vol. 3: 328
Existentialist **Vol. 1:** 681
Vol. 3: 58
Existentialist philosophy **Vol. 1:** 54
Exodus **Vol. 1:** 53, **57**, 65, 99, 173, 249, 281, 290, 531 f., 539, 632 f., 737
Vol. 2: 99, 150, 227, 410, 492, 521, 534, 540, 602, 636 f., 640, 871, 889
Vol. 3: 47, 181, 194, 201, 238, 332, 336, 359, 406, 423, 559, 653, 836, 863, 940, 960, 969 f., 975, 1011
Exorcism **Vol. 1:** 121, 384, 451, 453, 572
Vol. 2: 519, 556, 560, 610
Vol. 3: 61, 81, 103, **468–476**, 507 f., 651, 695 f.
Exorcist **Vol. 1:** 322, 670
Vol. 2: 165
Vol. 3: 394, **473–476**, 643, **737–743**
Expand **Vol. 1:** 253
Expansion **Vol. 2:** 359, 462
Expect **Vol. 2: 238–246**, 295, 309, 313, 354, 359, 860, 921
Vol. 3: 744–746
Expectation **Vol. 1:** 296, 329, 423, 440, 482, 544 f., 553, 598, 633 f., 642, 660, 689 f., 702, 706, 712 f., 720, 722, 725, 729, 735
Vol. 2: 44, 95, 110, **238–246**, 264, 294, 307, 325, 329, 337, 340, 377, 383, 385–387, 402, 420, 427, 606, 664 f., 674, 698, 709, 731, 737, 772 f., 857, 875, 894, 900, 902, 905, 912, 915, 923
Vol. 3: 30, 40, 63, 80, 121, 203, 225, 272, 274, 301, 318, 460, 462, 545, 615, 618, 632, 650, 695, 726, 731, 831, 836, 838, 840, 848, 886, 1155
Expediency **Vol. 1:** 397
Vol. 2: 721
Vol. 3: 541, 826
Expedition **Vol. 3: 958–967**
Expel **Vol. 1:** 453, 529
Vol. 2: 463
Expel spirit **Vol. 3:** 473
Expend **Vol. 1:** 479
Vol. 3: 840
Expense **Vol. 2:** 518
Vol. 3: 551
Expensive **Vol. 1:** 260
Vol. 2: 293, 547
Experience **Vol. 1:** 56, 192, 253, 258, 278, 352, 359, 411, 483 f., 514, 527 f., 536, 540, 564, 571, 583, 585, 594, 618, 620, 629, 640, 649, 654, 669, 691, 699, 716, 727
Vol. 2: 78, 103, 115 f., 211, 261, **269–271**, 315, 351, 353 f., 359 f., **390–409**, 420, 422 f., 445, 568, 593, 909, 923
Vol. 3: 55 f., 123, 232, 237, 260, 493, 511, 513, 516, 602, 676, 719, 761, 799, 812, 888, 894, **1147–1152**
Experience distress **Vol. 3: 858 f.**
Experienced **Vol. 1:** 56, 332
Vol. 2: 362
Experiential profession **Vol. 2:** 405
Experiment **Vol. 3: 798–810**
Expert **Vol. 1:** 484, 512
Vol. 2: 222, 392, 456
Expert in Jewish law **Vol. 3: 477–482**
Expiate **Vol. 3:** 146, **148–166**, 167
Expiation **Vol. 1:** 700
Vol. 2: 261, 766
Vol. 3: 353, 364, 422, 574
Expiatory **Vol. 1:** 107, 344, 479, 612, 699
Vol. 2: 582
Vol. 3: 102, 198, 779
Expire **Vol. 1:** 430 f., 734, 737

Vol. 2: 368
Vol. 3: 708
Explain **Vol. 1:** 57, 59, 506, **573–584**
Vol. 2: 362, 401, 555, **726–729**, 907
Vol. 3: 310, **316 f.**, 335, 337, 495, 569 f., 768, 898, 906, 1078, 1137, 1143
Explanation **Vol. 1:** 57, 59, 573
Vol. 2: 139, 169, 823
Exploit **Vol. 3:** 379, 834
Exploitation **Vol. 1:** 268, 547
Vol. 2: 257, 308, 448, 737, 822
Exponent **Vol. 1:** 574
Expose **Vol. 1:** 349, 390, 416, 422, 425, 459, 489, 577, 602, 718
Vol. 2: 140, 284, 339, 350, 368, 448, 542
Vol. 3: 203, 310, 570, 886, 892
Expose to public disgrace **Vol. 2: 291**
Exposition **Vol. 1:** 69, 573 f., 580, 628 f., 709
Vol. 2: 174, 209
Vol. 3: 88, 112, 775, 821, 1052
Expositor **Vol. 2:** 281
Exposure **Vol. 3:** 96
Expound **Vol. 1:** 67, 573, 576 f., 579, 581, 737
Vol. 2: 327, 362, 441, 448
Vol. 3: 352, 478, 761, 767
Express **Vol. 1:** 669, 722
Vol. 2: 353, 431, 648, 884
Expression **Vol. 1:** 579, 580, 602, 642, 655, 705, 727
Vol. 2: 115, 334, 391, 417–424, 430, 547
Vol. 3: 128
Expulsion **Vol. 1:** 466, 687
Vol. 2: 847
Extend **Vol. 1:** 742
Vol. 2: 131
Extend hand **Vol. 3:** 759
Extension **Vol. 1:** 565
Vol. 2: 197 f., 314, 316
Extent **Vol. 2:** 197, 329, 683
Extermination **Vol. 1:** 465, 468
Vol. 2: 308
Vol. 3: 342
External **Vol. 1:** 261, 680, 704 f., 708 f., 714, 717, 720
Vol. 2: 102 f., 136, 336, 605
Vol. 3: 30 f., 106, 234
Extinct **Vol. 3:** 109
Extinction **Vol. 1:** 429, 463 f., 499, 526
Extinguish **Vol. 2:** 658
Vol. 3: 109–111
Extinguisher **Vol. 1:** 63
Extort **Vol. 1:** 212
Vol. 2: 44, 201, 862
Vol. 3: 557 f., 574, 758
Extortion **Vol. 3:** 756
Extortioner **Vol. 3:** 757
Extra-marital **Vol. 1:** 497–500
Vol. 2: 582
Extraction **Vol. 2:** 660
Extradition **Vol. 3:** 594
Extraordinary **Vol. 2:** 621 f.
Extravagance **Vol. 3:** 395
Extravagant **Vol. 2:** 128
Extreme **Vol. 2:** 55
Extremity **Vol. 1:** 687
Vol. 2: 197
Exult **Vol. 1:** 227
Vol. 2: 352–354, 436, 862
Vol. 3: 29
Exultation **Vol. 2: 352–354**, 432
Eye **Vol. 1:** 118, 162 f., 189, 218, 230 f., 234, 261, 319, 381, 423 f., 453, 458, 561, 565, 585, 613, 656, 667, 683, 695, 726 f., 731
Vol. 2: 28, 110, 116, 153 f., 174, 176, 187, 192, 215 f., 279, 302, 350 f., 484, 487, 552, 579, 690, 726, 728, 873, 925
Vol. 3: 192, 312, **511–521**, 717, 916 f., 993, 1002
Eye of a needle **Vol. 1:** 116
Vol. 2: 843
Vol. 3: 213
Eye-salve **Vol. 3: 518 f.**
Eye-service **Vol. 1:** 587
Vol. 3: 572
Eyesight **Vol. 2:** 490
Eyewitness **Vol. 1:** 266, 395
Vol. 2: 645
Vol. 3: 60, 290, 773, 894, 1033, 1122
Ezekiel **Vol. 1:** 52, 66, 128, 280, 499, 531
Vol. 2: 189, 226, 240, 583, 670, 711, 823
Vol. 3: 79, 104, 139, 249, 269 f., 418, 439, 609, 692, 784, 788, 986, 1098–1101, 1103
Ezekiel's vision **Vol. 2:** 97, 612 f.
Vol. 3: 419, 787 f., 871, 1098
Ezra **Vol. 1:** 50, 52 f., 64, 66, 245
Vol. 2: 307, 369, 439, 466, 636, 848
Vol. 3: 34, 51, 250, 451, 478 f., 485

Fable **Vol. 2:** 643, 645, 757
Vol. 3: 816
Face **Vol. 1:** 181, 211, 431, **585–587**, 609
Vol. 2: 46, 61, 161, 212 f., 263, 326, 384, 395, 482, 484, 572, 793
Vol. 3: 512, 514, 521, 531, 862–864
Face of God **Vol. 1:** 211, **585**
Vol. 2: 68, 215, 218, 312, 317
Fact **Vol. 2:** 407
Factions **Vol. 1:** 533
Vol. 3: 1031
Factor **Vol. 1:** 692, 738
Facts **Vol. 3:** 759, 876, 888
Factual narrative **Vol. 2:** 643
Factual truth **Vol. 3:** 894
Faculty **Vol. 2: 391**
Vol. 3: 128, 131
Faculty of comprehension **Vol. 3: 130–133**
Fade **Vol. 1:** 411, 673, 678, 724
Fail **Vol. 1:** 609 f., 673
Vol. 2: 400, 406, 445
Vol. 3: 839, **952–956**, 1104
Fail to reach **Vol. 3: 952–956**
Failing **Vol. 3: 346 f.**
Failure **Vol. 1:** 219, 378, 426, 544, 597, 607, 723, 725 f., 736, 742
Vol. 2: 92, 165, 178, 263, 265, 282, 308, 315, 395, 399, 407, 435, 443, 478, 665, 820
Vol. 3: 542, 573, 577, 585, 802, 807

Faint **Vol. 1:** 262
Vol. 2: 265
Faint-hearted **Vol. 1:** 329, 504
Vol. 2: 259
Vol. 3: 687, 955
Fair **Vol. 1:** 204, 625, 637
Vol. 2: 102 f., 438
Vol. 3: **845–849**
Fair weather **Vol. 3:** **1000–1004**
Fairness **Vol. 2:** **497–500**
Faith **Vol. 1:** 50 f., 57, 59 f., 74, 76, 78–81, 93, 95, 97, 110, 112, 116, 120, 123, 138, 148–150, 154, 157–160, 163, 166, 180, 185, 191, 215, 222 f., 225, 228, 236, 238, 244, 248, 255–257, 261, 275, 277, 281 f., 286, 289, 297 f., 300 f., 303 f., 308 f., 311, 316, 318, 321–325, 328, 330, 333, 336, 341, 346, 350 f., 354 f., 358 f., 361, 372, 379 f., 382, 384, 386, 397 f., 401, 408, 414, 417, 422, 424, 426, 433 f., 439–441, 452, 455, 459–461, 467, 472, 475, 478, 480, 483, 486, 489, 491–493, 496 f., 499, 502, 504 f., 509 f., 525, 528 f., 532, 534, 540, 542 f., 547, 551 f., 559, 562, 571, **587–606**, 607–609, 619, 624, 633, 637, 639, 641, 643 f., 647, 649–651, 656, 659–662, 675, 689, 691, 695, 698 f., 704, 712–714, 719, 722 f., 730 f., 735–740
Vol. 2: 31, 45, 47, 63 f., 68, 73, 78, 94 f., 99, 111 f., 117, 120–123, 125 f., 129–133, 135 f., 142, 156, 162, 168, 170, 175–177, 179 f., 182 f., 186, 190, 194, 196, 198, 200, 207 f., 213, 215, 217 f., 221, 223, 229, 239–243, 250 f., 266, 273, 277, 280, 286, 297, 300–303, 310, 314 f., 318 f., 327, 330 f., 335, 338, 340, 342, 349, 354, 360 f., 364, 374 f., 396, 404 f., 407, 418, 443, 445–447, 449–452, 460, 462, 469–471, 473, 482, 488, 504, 509, 515 f., 535, 542 f., 545–549, 560, 563, 581, 595, 597, 603, 605 f., 615, 617 f., 620 f., 624 f., 636, 641 f., 645, 654 f., 658, 672, 676, 678, 682, 708, 716–721, 724, 729, 736, 766, 768, 771, 776, 786, 789, 793–795, 800, 804, 809, 812, 817 f., 827, 835, 839, 843 f., 857–859, 861, 868, 871, 873, 875, 877, 881, 884, 891, 894, 900, 906, 925 f.
Vol. 3: 48, 55, 57, 61, 71–73, 106–110, 118, 120, 127, 129, 132, 136, 142–144, 161, 163, 165 f., 168, 171 f., 191, 202–204, 211 f., 214 f., 220 f., 225–228, 232 f., 236, 240, 246, 252, 257, 264, 270, 277 f., 280–282, 286 f., 289, 291 f., 296, 299 f., 310, 313, 315, 317, 319, 325, 328, 333, 337, 342 f., 347, 363–368, 372 f., 383, 385 f., 389, 391, 393 f., 403, 416–418, 420, 433 f., 447, 463, 470 f., 489, 492, 499, 505, 507, 516 f., 520, 523, 529 f., 532, 535, 548–550. 576, 580–582, 584–586, 591, 602, 613, 646, 675, 685, 710, 728, 746, 751, 764, 768, 771, 774, 779 f., 783, 793, 800 f., 803, 809, 814, 818, 821, 824–826, 832, 837–839, 842, 844, 846, 849, 861, 869, 878, 889, 891, 899, 903, 908, 915, 917, 925, 927, 934, 945, 951, 954 f., 965–968, 973, 990, 995, 1011 f., 1021 f., 1031, 1033, 1042, 1045–1047, 1053, 1067, 1070, 1111–1150 f., 1158, 1188 f., **1211–1214**
Faithful **Vol. 1:** 99, 118, 217, 293, 406, 424, 455, 513, 532, 568, 571, 594, 627, 656, 684
Vol. 2: 73, 136, 159, 229, 237, 239, 249, 308 f., 312, 315, 353, 358, 360, 367, 837
Vol. 3: 228, 357, 362, 367, 526, 800, 809, **874–901**, 1046 f., 1065
Faithfulness **Vol. 1:** 74, 227, 251, 311, 346, 357, 367, 386, 490, 499, 591, 594, 597 f., 603, 659
Vol. 2: 77, 105, 119, 181, 240, 255, 261, 263, 315, 364, 396, 428, 498, 540, 797 f.
Vol. 3: 45, 70, 79, 121, 135, 157, 166 f., 192, 215, 234, 320, 354, 366–368, 373, 391, 514, 565, 578, 626, 649, 685, 729, 776, 810, **874–901**, 966
Faithless **Vol. 1:** 423, 448, 455, 511
Vol. 2: 36, 418, 479
Faithlessness **Vol. 2:** 49, 307, 351, 541
Vol. 3: 1054
Fake **Vol. 2:** 556
Fall **Vol. 1:** 52, 57, 72, 79, 86 f., 113, 336, 352, 433 f., 524, 542, 567, **606–611**, 682, 692 f., 724
Vol. 2: 45, 51, 123, 245, 287, 354, 366 f., 394, 405, 420, 423, 460, 478, 504, 651, 681, 692, 705 f., 708, 710, 714 f., 764, 778, 791, 794, 888 f., 910, 914, 916 f., 930
Vol. 3: 277, 468, 470, 578, 585 f., 725, 733, 735, 806, 810, 954, 996, 1063, 1100, 1148
Fall away **Vol. 1:** 416, 554, **606–611**
Vol. 2: 123, 285, 325, 708 f., 717, 775, 791
Vol. 3: 803, 838
Fall behind **Vol. 3:** 251
Fall beside **Vol. 3:** **585 f.**
Fall down **Vol. 3:** 806
Fall of angels **Vol. 1:** 102 f.
Fall from grace **Vol. 1:** 611
Vol. 2: 120
Vol. 3: 363
Fall of Satan **Vol. 1:** 83
Fall short **Vol. 1:** 56, 546, 675
Vol. 2: 161, 380
Fallacy **Vol. 1:** 550, 577
Fallen **Vol. 1:** 102, 222, 384, 451 f., 468, 525
Vol. 2: 237, 568, 723
Fallen angels **Vol. 2:** 213
Vol. 3: 829
Fallen humanity **Vol. 3:** 32
Fallen spirits **Vol. 2:** 205
Falling stars **Vol. 3:** 736
Fallible **Vol. 1:** 678 f.
Vol. 2: 439
Fallow **Vol. 2:** 822
Vol. 3: 190, 918
False **Vol. 1:** 66, 124, 228, 347, 357, 456, 496, 504, 512, 591 f., 607, 679, 681
Vol. 2: 51, 169, 225, 314, 407, 473, 491, 606, 724, 921
Vol. 3: 201, 988, 1054
False accusation **Vol. 3:** 95
False alternatives **Vol. 3:** 942
False apostle **Vol. 1:** 228, 710
Vol. 2: 472, 677
Vol. 3: 88, 886

False brother **Vol. 1:** 254, 322
Vol. 2: 472
False Christ **Vol. 1:** 124
Vol. 2: 472, 915 f., 930
False claim **Vol. 3:** 81, 932
False confidence **Vol. 1:** 308
False congregation **Vol. 1:** 296
False divination **Vol. 3:** 201
False doctrine **Vol. 1:** 352, 487
Vol. 2: 78, 133, 135, 171, 286, 625, 710
Vol. 3: 887
False estimate **Vol. 3:** 888
False evidence **Vol. 3:** 1041
False expectations **Vol. 2:** 902
Vol. 3: 804
False freedom **Vol. 3:** 70
False gods **Vol. 2:** 73 f., 285 f., 453, 503
Vol. 3: 919
False gospel **Vol. 1:** 415
False hope **Vol. 2:** 240
False idea **Vol. 3:** 930
False independence **Vol. 3:** 604
False lips **Vol. 2:** 468
False messiah **Vol. 3:** 378
False name **Vol. 2: 648–656**
False oath **Vol. 3:** 76, 881
False outlook **Vol. 2:** 49
False peace **Vol. 2:** 781
False piety **Vol. 3:** 141
False practice **Vol. 1:** 352
False prayer **Vol. 2: 864**
False prophecy **Vol. 3:** 94, 1097
False prophet **Vol. 1:** 114, 125, 323, 383, 512, 527, 550, 567
Vol. 2: 154, 208, 240, 458, 470, 472, 474, 629, 633, 651, 701, 754, 773, 778, 904
Vol. 3: 51, **74–89**, 99, 210, 377, 475, 628, 768, 800, 803, 856, 868, 888, 962, 1098
False prophetess **Vol. 3:** 844
False reasoning **Vol. 2:** 458
False reliance **Vol. 3:** 788
False representation **Vol. 3:** 341
False saviour **Vol. 3:** 803
False security **Vol. 1:** 79, 424, 542, 596, 610
Vol. 2: 841
False shepherd **Vol. 1:** 559
Vol. 2: 413
False standard **Vol. 1:** 566
Vol. 3: 825
False step **Vol. 2: 705–707**
Vol. 3: 585 f.
False teacher **Vol. 1:** 138, 261, 311, 402, 425, 443, 460, 535, 578, 637
Vol. 2: 94 f., 152, 221, 447, 453, 459 f., 463, 472 f., 509, 518, 574, 579, 645, 766
Vol. 3: 128, 137, 344, 500, 710, 765 f., 864, 888, 915, 942, 954, 1003, 1054
False teaching **Vol. 1:** 238, 257, 460, 469, 604, 611
Vol. 2: 268, 509
Vol. 3: 70, 380, 999
False way **Vol. 3:** 938
False witness **Vol. 2:** 470, 472, 686, 871
Vol. 3: 529, 880, **1038–1050**
False words **Vol. 3:** 876
Falsehood **Vol. 1:** 66, 225, 232, 359, 448, 653
Vol. 2: 71 f., 492
Vol. 3: 576, 876, 880, 882, 889–893, 1079
Falsify **Vol. 2:** 370
Fame **Vol. 1:** 400
Vol. 2: 46, 265
Vol. 3: 840, 1156
Familiar **Vol. 1:** 484, 614 f.
Vol. 2: 392, 395
Familiar spirit **Vol. 2:** 554
Family **Vol. 1:** 159, 165, 182, 192, 194–198, 207 f., 240, 254, 256 f., 264 f., 286 f., 289, 294, 308, 512, 530 f., 614 f., 617, 619, 621, 624–626, 629, 634, 640
Vol. 2: 35, 92, 95, 206, 225, 234, 247 f., 250 f., 317, 363, 386 f., 428, 508, 538 f., 548 f., 582, 608, 655, 692, 711, 737, 789, 905
Vol. 3: 36, 355, 448, 673, 756, 777, 852, 865, 870 f., 928, 930, 1053, 1093
Family gods **Vol. 2:** 317
Family of manuscripts **Vol. 1:** 70
Family ties **Vol. 2:** 825
Family tree **Vol. 2:** 35 f.
Vol. 3: 652, 658, 872
Famine **Vol. 1:** 118, 203, 380, 531, 642, 716
Vol. 2: 264–268, 274, 318, 688, 711, 730, 827, 836, 911
Vol. 3: 201, 249, 498, 590, 713
Famous **Vol. 1:** 381
Fan **Vol. 2:** 411
Fanatical **Vol. 2:** 101
Fanaticism **Vol. 2:** 386
Vol. 3: 1052
Fantasy **Vol. 1:** 679
Vol. 2: 181, 430
Far **Vol. 2:** 52 f.
Far off **Vol. 1:** 523, 691
Vol. 2: 113
Far-reaching **Vol. 2:** 428
Farce **Vol. 2:** 168
Farewell **Vol. 2:** 169, 356, 549, 914
Vol. 3: 757
Farm **Vol. 2:** 29
Farmer **Vol. 1:** 625, 656
Vol. 2: 245, 822
Farmer of taxes **Vol. 3: 755–759**
Farrer, Austin **Vol. 3: 334**
Fascination **Vol. 1:** 625
Fashion **Vol. 1:** 380, 492, 521, 708
Fast **Vol. 1:** 120, 143, 245, 384, 487, 495, 515, **611–613**, 625, 630, 672
Vol. 2: 159, 216, 260, 264, 267, 272, 277, 358, 383, 534, 585, 714, 754, 864, 885, 893
Vol. 3: 51, 408, 543, 804, 921, 954, 996, 1007
Fasten **Vol. 1:** 171, 241, 663
Vol. 3: 859
Fat **Vol. 1:** 119, 261, 672
Vol. 2: 154, 335
Vol. 3: 159, 416, 423
Fatal **Vol. 1:** 336, 422, 510, 647, 699
Vol. 2: 138, 226, 435
Fatalism **Vol. 3:** 834
Fate **Vol. 1:** 103, 163, 243, 257, 267, 277, 313,

Fate (*cont'd*)
315, 390, 403 f., 419, 431, 434, 436, 439, 450, 453, 464, 472, 516, 545, 594, 597, 692 f.
Vol. 2: 61, 63, 66, 80, 120, 136, 138, 192, 205, 259, 298, 303, 393, 406, 416, 449, 457 f., 501, 510, 657, 662, **664–666,** 920
Vol. 3: 27, 205, 260, 270, 421, 439 f., 561, 577, 583, 602, 626, 628, 717, 719–721, 744, 776, 833 f., 1054
Fate of spirits **Vol. 3: 475**
Father **Vol. 1:** 49, 65 f., 76 f., 79, 90, 173, 176 f., 190, 198, 203, 213, 222, 238, 240, 251, 255 f., 277 f., 282, 286–289, 298, 301, 311, 323 f., 326, 329, 336–338, 346, 356, 359, 375, 409 f., 440, 442, 453, 461 f., 464, 469 f., 486 f., 492, 509, 511, 522, 526, 549, 556, 570, 575, **614–621**, 637–639, 651, 655, 667, 674, 681, 693, 704, 712, 716, 720, 729 f., 740
Vol. 2: 46, 62–64, 71, 73, 75 f., 78 f., 81, 83 f., 101, 120, 125, 137, 165, 170, 178 f., 185 f., 192, 194 f., 203 f., 216 f., 229, 231 f., 243, 245, 247, 250, 254, 262, 269, 276, 278, 289 f., 303, 307, 317–319, 332, 342, 349, 358 f., 366, 381, 383, 386, 388, 401, 403 f., 426, 435, 437, 450, 486, 495, 497, 499 f., 505–507, 516 f., 541 f., 546, 548 f., 561, 566, 571, 578, 588, 604, 607, 610, 624 f., 645, 653, 655, 686, 718, 721–723, 725, 737 f., 770, 780 f., 799, 825, 830, 832, 834, 857, 867–873, 878 f., 881, 883, 885, 896 f., 899, 904, 917, 921, 927–930
Vol. 3: 32, 47, 61, 71, 78, 114, 135, 172, 174, 186 f., 202, 225, 228, 242, 244, 257, 281, 286, 313 f., 320, 326 f., 343, 362, 395, 403, 409, 416, 435, 463, 472, 504, 509, 517, 523, 527, 529, 569, 588, 624, 635–642, 644–648, 650, 652, 656, 659 f., 675, 683, 710, 728, 731, 748, 770, 776–779, 790, 803, 807, 848, 863, 865, 871, 891, 935, 941, 946, 965, 1017 f., 1045 f., 1055, 1057 f., 1060, 1069, 1074 f., 1107, 1114, 1122, 1133, 1135, 1150, 1152, 1154, 1163, 1178, 1186, 1204
Father in heaven **Vol. 2: 193**
Father of glory **Vol. 2:** 46
Father of lies **Vol. 1:** 458
Father of lights **Vol. 2:** 495
Vol. 3: 556
Father of mercies **Vol. 2:** 598
Father of nations **Vol. 1:** 79
Fatherhood **Vol. 1:** 619–621
Fatherland **Vol. 1:** 615 f.
Vol. 2: 476
Fatherless **Vol. 1:** 615 f
Vol. 2: 737 f.
Vol. 3: 1074
Fatherly **Vol. 2:** 106
Fatigue **Vol. 1:** 262
Fatten **Vol. 1:** 743
Fault **Vol. 1:** 261, 345 f., 525, 550, 574, 608
Vol. 2: 63, 142, 144 f., 215
Vol. 3: 92, 529, 573
Fault-finding **Vol. 2:** 143
Faultless **Vol. 3:** 101, 923
Favour **Vol. 1:** 52, 216, 395, 501, 540–542, 590, 622
Vol. 2: 72, 115 f., 119, 122, 167, 190, 257, 263, 308, 317, 356, 385, 428, 438, 485, 538, 547, 622, 815 f., **817–820,** 837, 863
Vol. 3: 149, 151, 167, 918, 1053
Favourable **Vol. 3: 744–746**
Favourable opportunity **Vol. 3: 833–839**
Fear **Vol. 1:** 111, 168, 173, 239, 265, 276, 310, 327, 329, 360 f., 409, 412, 420–422, 431–435, 439, 448, 452–456, 484, 507, 510, 530, 537, 559, 570, 577, 586, 590, 609, 611, **621–624,** 646, 652, 675, 679, 686–688, 691, 715, 719
Vol. 2: 49, 64, 85, 90 f., 93–95, 99, 178, 180, 213, 217 f., 227, 239 f., 242, 245, 261, 263, 266, 271, 281, 349, 357–360, 391, 396, 419 f., 434, 449, 478, 484, 491, 594, 604, **621–626,** 705, 736, 772, 807, 817, 819, 830, 855, 866, 894, 926
Vol. 3: 27, 30, 39, 98, 117, 130, 136, 157, 202, 249, 258, 318, 324, 341, 382, 557, 561 f., 597, 657, 710 f., 721, 747, 800, 953, 1028, 1036, 1095
Fearful **Vol. 1:** 364, 403
Vol. 2: 238, 241, 244
Vol. 3: 982
Fearlessness **Vol. 2:** 103, 734
Vol. 3: 592, 1095
Feast **Vol. 1:** 53, 59, 116, 122, 224, 274, 291, 308, 332, 384, 416, 515, **624–635,** 641, 654, 666, 691, 743
Vol. 2: 226, 273, 277, 314, 354–356, 385, 410, 437, 441, 461, 463, 478, 521 f., 536, 674, 690, 716, 727, 737, 755, 783–788, 880, 885, 887, 927
Vol. 3: 51, 69, 407, 410, 421, 424, 431, 436, 440, 478, 568, 608, 669, 673, 745, 781, 873, 919, 1074 (*also* → Festival)
Feast of Booths **Vol. 3:** 813
Feast of the Covenant **Vol. 2:** 441
Feast of Dedication **Vol. 1:** 626, 629
Vol. 3: 165
Feast of Lots **Vol. 1:** 626
Feast of New Wine **Vol. 3:** 1162
Feast of Oil **Vol. 3:** 1162
Feast of Renewal of Covenant **Vol. 1:** 627
Vol. 2: 441, 784
Feast of Tabernacles **Vol. 1:** 100, 626, 628 f., 632
Vol. 2: 217, 355, 644
Vol. 3: 789, **811–814,** 1005
Feast of Unleavened Bread **Vol. 1:** 249, 633
Vol. 2: 461, 463
Feast of Weeks **Vol. 1:** 625–628, 631
Vol. 2: 783
Feast-offering **Vol. 2:** 410
Feature **Vol. 2:** 335 f.
Fee **Vol. 1:** 484
Feeble **Vol. 1:** 192
Vol. 2: 211, 263
Vol. 3: 178
Feed **Vol. 1:** 250, 277, 320, 341, 617, 629, 670, 687, 743
Vol. 2: 411, 543, 823

Vol. 3: 358, 545
Feeding the five thousand **Vol. 1:** 250, 283, 341, 384, 729, 743
Vol. 2: 379, 523, 534, 630, 699
Vol. 3: 240, 508 f.
Feeding the four thousand **Vol. 1:** 250, 283, 341, 729, 743
Vol. 2: 523, 630, 699
Feel **Vol. 2:** 398
Feel compassion **Vol. 2:** **594–598**
Feel pain **Vol. 2:** **419–421**
Feeling **Vol. 1:** 106, 230, 555, 568, 622
Vol. 2: 116, **180–184,** 245, 257, 312, 352, 357, 419, 547, 568, 599, 875
Vol. 3: 122 f., 557, 677, 680, 719, 908, 1134
Feet-washing **Vol. 1:** 153, 630
Vol. 2: 303, 535, 754, 812
Vol. 3: 547, 597, 611, 848
Felix **Vol. 1:** 270, 341, 346, 495, 695
Vol. 2: 258, 451, 596, 707
Vol. 3: 40, 65, 718
Fell **Vol. 1:** 867
Fellow **Vol. 1:** 255 f., 258 f., 680, 689, 691
Fellow-citizen **Vol. 2:** 794
Fellow-heir **Vol. 2:** **295–303**
Fellow-worker **Vol. 3:** 548, **1147–1152**
Fellowship **Vol. 1:** 95, 97, 126, 148, 175, 213, 219, 222, 225, 232, 237, 257, 259, 291 f., 294, 298–301, 304, 315, 319, 347, 367, 369 f., 386, 424, 434, 440 f., 448, 452, 455, 467, 482 f., 489–493, 519, 554, 586, 596, **635–644,** 657, 685, 688, 691, 696, 702, 719, 722 f.
Vol. 2: 31, 39, 48, 75 f., 78, 104, 121, 129 f., 152, 162, 237, 242, 249–251, 253, 271 f., 275, 277, 286, 302, 304, 319, 360, 386, 402–404, 427, 444, 473, 478 f., 499, 520, 533, 536, 546 f., 549, 596, 653, 655, 705, 742, 762 f., 768, 789, 795, 810, 812, 826 f., 859, 861, 879
Vol. 3: 47, 57, 104, 106, 129, 135, 163, 225, 227, 245, 256, 262 f., 346, 349, 378, 459, 518, 535 f., 547, 553, 572, 580, 602, 614, 681, 693, 702, 724 f., 745, 749, 751, 793, 832, 848, 854, 891, 924, 934, 937, 941, 945, 1025
Female **Vol. 2:** 161, 287, **569–571**
Vol. 3: **1055–1075**
Fence **Vol. 3:** 140, 773, 949, **950 f.**
Ferment **Vol. 2:** **461–463**
Ferocity **Vol. 1:** 420, 515
Vol. 3: 230
Fertile **Vol. 2:** 211, 265
Fertility **Vol. 1:** 208 f., 354, 497 f., 560, 611 f., 624 f.
Vol. 2: 791
Vol. 3: 274, 425, 692, 782, 866, 918 f., 986, 1069, 1071, 1093
Fertility cult **Vol. 2:** 539, 541, 573
Fertility gods **Vol. 2:** 265
Fertility rites **Vol. 2:** 69, 567, 583
Fertilize **Vol. 1:** 377, 498
Fertilizer **Vol. 3:** 445, 448
Fervent **Vol. 2:** 868
Fervour **Vol. 1:** 318
Festal **Vol. 3:** 208
Fester **Vol. 1:** 683
Festival **Vol. 1:** 245, 249 f., 272, 274, 304, 360, 612, **624–635,** 700
Vol. 2: 311, 326, 355, 521, 676, 783–788
Vol. 3: 50, 107, 232 f., 237, 255, 408, 424, 501, 556, 692, 669, 733, 835 (*also*→Feast)
Festival of enthronement **Vol. 2:** 374 f., 644
Festival of Lights **Vol. 1:** 627, 631
Festival of Wood-carrying **Vol. 1:** 627
Festive **Vol. 2:** 353–355, 358
Festus **Vol. 1:** 270, 341, 453, 529
Vol. 2: 369, 450
Vol. 3: 718, 884
Fetter **Vol. 1:** 171, 190
Vol. 3: 591 f.
Fever **Vol. 1:** 94, 377, 572, 636, 652 f., 656
Few **Vol. 1:** 97, 283, 735, 739
Vol. 2: **427–429,** 683, 692, 720
Fiancée **Vol. 3:** 1055
Fickleness **Vol. 3:** 833, 887
Fiction **Vol. 1:** 550
Vol. 2: 152, 643
Fiction **Vol. 3:** 554, 1081
Fidelity **Vol. 1:** 589, 594 f., 603
Vol. 2: 694
Vol. 3: 354, 879
Field **Vol. 1:** 93, 209, 222, 263, 267, 277, 411, 517, 519 f., 525, 647, 673, 689, 744
Vol. 2: 30, 216, 245, 296, 833
Vol. 3: 119, 191, 229, 526, 1058
Field of blood **Vol. 1:** 93
Field semantics **Vol. 3:** 1141
Fierce **Vol. 1:** 260 f., 520, 653
Fiery **Vol. 1:** 653–656
Fifth Commandment **Vol. 3:** 95
Fiftieth **Vol. 2:** 783
Fig **Vol. 1:** 73, 417, 515, 600, **721–728**
Vol. 2: 267, 382, 623, 630, 871, 912, 916 f.
Vol. 3: 256, 517, 532, 557, 736, 865, 867–869
Fight **Vol. 1:** l64, 431, 435, 470, 544, **644–652,** 653, 662, 675
Vol. 2: 135, 138, 305, 360, 362
Vol. 3: 250, 601, 677, 946 f., **958–967,** 981
Figurative **Vol. 1:** 122, 229, 268
Vol. 2: 53, 149, 266, 269, 738, 743–760
Vol. 3: 99, 102, 180, 311, 499, 710, 737, 754, 858, 936, 949, 986, 994
Figure **Vol. 1:** 71, 234, 266, 375, 585, 708 f.
Vol. 2: 284, 287, 291, 337, 380, **743–756**
Vol. 3: 483
Figure of speech **Vol. 2:** 278
Figurines **Vol. 3:** 915 f.
Fill **Vol. 1:** 318, 514, 728, 732, 736
Vol. 2: 128, 195, 209, 215, 229, 358 f., 386, 855
Fill the hand **Vol. 2:** 60, 149
Fill up **Vol. 3:** 955
Filth **Vol. 1:** **479 f.**
Filthiness **Vol. 1:** 448
Final **Vol. 1:** 423, 433, 443, 446, 499, 554, 563, 566, 583, 587, 628, 651, 653, 656 f., 667, 674, 693, 699, 725, 737

Final (*cont'd*)
Vol. 2: 53, 56, 58, 100, 136, 154, 197, 300, 353, 357, 363, 383, 403, 461, 625, 785
Final hour **Vol. 3:** 849
Final judgment **Vol. 2:** 47, 202 f., 208, 301, 366, 383, 417, 597, 630, 665, 767, 826
Vol. 3: 140, 193, 360, 500, 658, 695, 731, 778 f., 838, 947
Final state **Vol. 1:** 445
Final time **Vol. 2:** 58
Finality **Vol. 1:** 359
Vol. 2: 718
Finality of judgment **Vol. 3:** 99
Finally **Vol. 2:** 55, 62 f.
Vol. 3: 252, **952–956**
Financial **Vol. 1:** 477, 642
Financial help **Vol. 2:** 328
Financial support **Vol. 3:** 525
Find **Vol. 1:** 630, 709, 724
Vol. 2: 833
Vol. 3: 513, **527–533,** 754
Find fault **Vol. 2:** 139, 143
Find favour **Vol. 2:** ll6
Find out **Vol. 1:** 676
Vol. 2: 398
Fine **Vol. 2:** 98, 104, 577, 582
Vol. 3: 96, 420
Fine linen **Vol. 3:** 794
Finery **Vol. 2:** 217
Finger **Vol. 1:** 683
Vol. 2: 148
Finger of God **Vol. 1:** 651
Vol. 2: 74, 150
Vol. 3: 475
Finish **Vol. 1:** 429, 581, 734
Vol. 2: 59 f., 64, 382
Vol. 3: 349–351, 499
Finishing-post **Vol. 1:** 493
Finite **Vol. 2:** 77
Fir **Vol. 1:** 723
Fire **Vol. 1:** 144, 146, 151, 182, 205, 209, 224, 231, 314, 318, 322, 380, 387, 390, 414, 418, 420, 467, **652–658,** 700, 711
Vol. 2: 45, 157, 193, 205, 208, 210, 304, 435, 452, 461, 485, 490, 493, 682, 746, 779, 785, 836
Vol. 3: 93, 95 f., 99, 109–111, 143 f., 210, 239, 266, 315 f., 421 f., 426, 436, 443, 445–448, 470, 526 f., 639, 695, 713 f., 808 f., 859 f., 912, 914 f., 947, 952, 962, 982 f., 989 f., 992, 1014, 1079, 1091, 1096 f., 1178
Fire and brimstone **Vol. 3:** 1002
Firebrand **Vol. 3:** 557
Fireplace **Vol. 1:** 652
Firm **Vol. 1:** 97, **658–664,** 735
Vol. 2: 129, 153, 267, 489, 611, 659, 706, 716
Vol. 3: 387, 390, 394, **558–560,** 797, 878
Firmament **Vol. 1:** 522 f.
Vol. 2: 184, 188–190, 192 f.
Firmicus Maternus **Vol. 1:** 327
Firmness **Vol. 2:** 123
First **Vol. 1:** 164 f., 177, 193, 195, 288, 334, **664–670,** 712
Vol. 2: 44, 55, 157, 550, 693, 703, 720, 725, 729
Vol. 3: 190, 415 f., 598, 855, 920
First cause **Vol. 3:** 331
First day **Vol. 1:** 630 f.
Vol. 3: 410
First and last **Vol. 2:** 55, 57 f., 70, 80, 279, 282, 482
First man (→ Man, first)
First-born **Vol. 1:** 166, 177, 193 f., 208, 221, 256, 288, 304, 445, 519, **664–670,** 692, 707, 713
Vol. 2: 310, 317, 491, 637, 703, 798, 835
Vol. 3: 38, 190, 266, 636, 638, 644, 872, 1014
First-fruits **Vol. 1:** 166, 187, 210, 386, 638
Vol. 2: 40, 48, 186, 226, 242 f., 288, 672, 675, 783, 884
Vol. 3: 72, 199, 204, 297, 303, **415–436,** 701, 852
First-ripe **Vol. 1:** 724
Fiscal term **Vol. 3:** 854
Fish **Vol. 1:** 119, 175, 249 f., 344, 509, 518, 623, 666, **670–671,** 674, 725, 733
Vol. 2: 32 f., 233, 351 f., 624, 630, 662, 685, 728
Vol. 3: 444, 543, 753, 757, 985
Fish-costume **Vol. 1:** 670
Fisherman **Vol. 1:** 488 f., 493, 642
Vol. 3: 313, 757
Fishlike **Vol. 1:** 670
Fist **Vol. 1:** 163
Vol. 2: 148, 150
Vol. 3: 857
Fit **Vol. 1:** 241, 505, 515
Vol. 2: 102, 385
Vol. 3: 348 f.
Fitness **Vol. 3:** 348
Fitting **Vol. 2:** 101, 212, **668 f.,** 683
Vol. 3: 349, 353
Five **Vol. 2:** 685, **689 f.,** 692 f.
Fix **Vol. 1:** 332, 477, 658, 734 f.
Fixed order **Vol. 3:** 730, 734
Flame **Vol. 1:** 653, 656
Vol. 3: 110
Flame-coloured **Vol. 1:** 653
Flamen Dialis **Vol. 2:** 461
Flash **Vol. 1:** 610
Flattery **Vol. 2:** 116, 259, 470
Vol. 3: 1053
Flavia Neapolis **Vol. 3:** 457
Flavour **Vol. 1:** 657
Vol. 2: 211
Flay **Vol. 1:** l62
Vol. 3: 377, 421
Flee **Vol. 1:** 431, 493, 500, 512, **558 f.**
Vol. 2: 215
Fleeting **Vol. 1:** 433, 512, 516, 651
Vol. 2: 475
Vol. 3: 691
Flesh **Vol. 1:** 54, 87, 106, 114, 138, 163, 169, 184, 221 f., 225, 229 f., 232 f., 236, 240, 257, 282, 286, 290, 299, 308, 311, 315, 323, 327, 336 f., 401 f., 411, 424, 446, 448, 455, 457 f., 461, 466 f., 469 f., 473, 506, 522, 535, 555–557, 592, 602, 625, 629, 637 f., 647, 670,

671–682, 683, 690 f., 695, 719, 726 f., 738 f., 741
Vol. 2: 62, 71, 75, 79 f., 91, 94, 163, 169, 171, 185, 209, 218, 225, 233, 235, 242, 269 f., 282, 339, 349, 366, 378, 398 f., 404, 445 f., 459, 477, 504 f., 521, 523, 532, 558, 565 f., 571 f., 579, 587, 602, 611, 617, 668, 673, 682, 709, 722, 806, 816, 818, 836, 919, 925, 928 f.
Vol. 3: 32, 54, 158, 174, 178, 186, 204, 227 f., 269, 273, 301, 313 f., 322, 364, 423 f., 447, 534 f., 538, 581, 597, 630, 645, 680, 685, 687, 691 f., 702, 724, 802, 813, 826, 939, 944 f., 949, 964, 994 f., 1021, 1064, 1101, 1117, 1158, 1176, 1199 f.
Flesh and blood **Vol. 2:** 599
Flew, Anthony **Vol. 3:** 1137
Flexibility **Vol. 3:** 1067
Flies **Vol. 2:** 637
Flight **Vol. 1:** 280, 558 f., 674, 685
Vol. 2: 317, 350, 461
Vol. 3: 1007, 1011
Flock **Vol. 1:** 115, 252, 286, 303, 305, 320, 503, 623, 632, 684
Vol. 2: 31 f., 34, 56, 136, 383, 412 f., 429, 519, 586, 721, 723, 819, 832, 838, 841, 928
Vol. 3: 421, **564–568**
Flog **Vol. 1:** 161 f., 407
Flood **Vol. 1:** 72, 168, 185, 382, 508, 522, 531, 593, 610, 657
Vol. 2: 205, 382, 569, 613, 681 f.
Vol. 3: 203, 248, 259, 469, 605, 628, 634, 653, 695, 851, 906, 982 f., 989 f., **991**
Florilegium **Vol. 3:** 487
Flour **Vol. 1:** 249 f.
Vol. 3: 422, 917
Flourish **Vol. 1:** 678
Vol. 2: 211, 360
Flow **Vol. 1: 682 f.**
Vol. 2: 119
Flower **Vol. 1:** 277, 411, 609, 648, 673, 678
Vol. 3: 521–527
Flowing water **Vol. 3:** 985
Fluid **Vol. 1:** 741
Flute **Vol. 2:** 436
Flutter **Vol. 2:** 422 f.
Fly **Vol. 1:** 172, 608
Vol. 3: 469
Foal **Vol. 1:** 117
Focus **Vol. 2:** 325–329
Fodder **Vol. 1:** 743
Vol. 2: 211
Vol. 3: 444
Fodor, J. A. **Vol. 3:** 1134
Foe **Vol. 1:** 241, 531
Vol. 2: 63, 83
Fog **Vol. 3: 1000–1004**
Fold **Vol. 2:** 31, 586
Vol. 3: 572
Folk lore **Vol. 3:** 59
Follow **Vol. 1:** 118, 324, 335, 359, 402, 423 f., 446, 464, 480–494, 588, 591, 593, 600, 605, 615, 619, 644, 649, 651, 659, 667, 684, 702, 733
Vol. 2: 30, 133 f., 160, 173, 177, 262 f., 291, 301 f., 350, 413, 431, 444, 825, 833, 846
Vol. 3: 233, 349, 448, 946, 1108, 1163
Follower **Vol. 1:** 173, 213, 274, 361, 396, 480, 533, 616, 669
Vol. 2: 57, 94, 96, 112, 279 f., 311, 339, 341–343, 368, 413, 426, 624, 806, 920
Vol. 3: 529 f., 724, 998, 1059
Folly **Vol. 1:** 227, 277, 281, 397, 418, 550, 555, 673
Vol. 2: 127, 143, 148, 171, 181, 189, 391, 400, 479, 620
Vol. 3: 122–130, 240, 995
Fond **Vol. 2: 547–550**
Food **Vol. 1:** 61, 73, 119, 169, 172 f., 203, 207, 226, 249 f., 252, 277, 282, 318, 330, 352, 360, 384 f., 393, 451, 464, 480, 494 f., 497, 500, 509, 565, 586, 611, 670, 672, 674, 691, 696, 711, 728 f., 731, 743 f.
Vol. 2: 201, 218, **264–277,** 318, 370, 402, 434, 452, 475, 590, 631, 682, 709 f., 801, 811, 831, 833
Vol. 3: 106, 117, 144, 417, 424, 445, 449, 499, 545, 547, 556, 680, 683, 706, 750 f., 793, 804, 860, 865
Food of immortality **Vol. 2:** 534
Food-laws **Vol. 3:** 113
Food-offering **Vol. 3:** 421
Fool **Vol. 1:** 108, 281, **413–418,** 550, 574, 728
Vol. 2: 239, 430, 583, 833
Vol. 3: 820, 914, 953
Foolhardy **Vol. 1:** 364
Foolish **Vol. 1:** 85, 106, 258, 277, 280 f., 513, 542, 546, 551, 670, 675, 708, 727
Vol. 2: 430, 619, 658
Vol. 3: 122–133, 447, 563
Foolishness **Vol. 3:** 53, 714, 938, **1023–1036,** 1058
Foot **Vol. 1:** 239, 393, 449, 674
Vol. 2: 28, 149, 212, 282, 349, 369, 414 f.
Vol. 3: 107, 560, 805, 914, 943, 966, 989, 1059
Foothold **Vol. 1:** 710
Footstep **Vol. 2:** 358, 452
Footstool **Vol. 1:** 477
Vol. 2: 74, 245, 611
Forbearance **Vol. 1:** 398, 699, 734
Vol. 2: 63, 79, **256–259,** 700, **764–767,** 834, 863
Vol. 3: 128, 163, 215, 364, 818, 825, 1020
Forbearing **Vol. 2:** 652
Forbid **Vol. 1:** 332, 413, 415, 456, 572, 619, 625, 687
Vol. 2: 154, 206, **220–223,** 244, 296, 446
Vol. 3: 56, 188
Forbidden **Vol. 1:** 87, 139, 171, 221, 389 f., 426, 499, 505, 611, 630 f., 655, 670, 685
Vol. 2: 458, 573, 811
Forbidden degrees **Vol. 2: 577**
Vol. 3: 96
Vol. 3: 95, 538
Force **Vol. 1:** 453, 508, 543, 651, 653, 678 f., 692, 694, 717, 720, 733
Vol. 2: 67, 258, 540, **601–606, 663 f.,** 812

Force (*cont'd*)
Vol. 3: 711–718, 951, **967–981,** 1083
Ford **Vol. 3:** 758
Forearm **Vol. 1:** 393
Forebear **Vol. 1:** 287
Forecast **Vol. 1:** 699
Forecourt **Vol. 1:** 633
Forefather **Vol. 1:** 280, 285, 324, 615, 665
Vol. 2: 378
Vol. 3: 234 f.
Forehead **Vol. 2:** 572, 864, 869
Vol. 3: 498, 500
Foreign **Vol. 1:** 305, 505, 522, 550 f., 553, 622, 655, **683–692**
Vol. 2: 35, 99, 159, 251, 288, 308, 328, 349, 538, 540, 735, **739–742,** 790, 794, 801, 803, 805
Foreign landlords **Vol. 3:** 641, 951
Foreign policy **Vol. 2:** 320
Foreigner **Vol. 1:** 308, 392, 474, 715
Vol. 2: 305, 309–311, 335, 519, 735, **788–790,** 823
Vol. 3: 193, 455, 757, 789, 980
Foreknowledge **Vol. 1:** 273, 278, 378, 382 f., 471, 477 f., 540, 542, 668, **692–697**
Vol. 2: 118, 397, 608, 819
Vol. 3: 517, 1018
Foreman **Vol. 2:** 595
Vol. 3: 268
Forensic **Vol. 1:** 438
Vol. 2: 122
Vol. 3: 166, 372 f.
Foreordained **Vol. 2:** 299
Vol. 3: 132
Forerunner **Vol. 1:** 125, 150, 544 f.
Vol. 2: 109, 305, 353
Vol. 3: 121, 795, 940, **945–947,** 1045
Foresee **Vol. 1:** 471, 693, 695
Vol. 2: 352, 430, 602, 917
Vol. 3: 492, **511–518**
Foreshadow **Vol. 1:** 115, 158, 266, 290, 545
Vol. 2: 313
Vol. 3: 73, 863
Foresight **Vol. 1:** 692–694
Vol. 2: 318
Vol. 3: 39
Foreskin **Vol. 1:** 307–309, 672
Forest **Vol. 3:** 352
Forestall **Vol. 2:** 415
Vol. 3: 747
Foretaste **Vol. 2:** 271
Foretell **Vol. 1:** 528
Vol. 3: 44–48, 74–89
Forethought **Vol. 1:** 692 f.
Forfeit **Vol. 1:** 240, 484
Vol. 2: 155
Vol. 3: 136–138, 174, 178, 190
Forgery **Vol. 3:** 448
Forget **Vol. 1:** 441, 484, 546, 570, 728
Vol. 2: 272, 275, 366, 440, 606, 781
Vol. 3: 316, 806
Forgetfulness **Vol. 3:** 840, 847
Forgiveness **Vol. 1:** 86 f., 97, 110, 146, 148, 155–158, 191, 216, 222–225, 301, 303, 317, 327 f., 333, 346, 351, 354 f., 358 f., 371, 375, 467, 492, 499 f., 545, 643, 673, **697–703,** 722, 730
Vol. 2: 74, 116, 122 f., 137, 156, 168, 212, 214, 237, 239 f., 270, 302, 332, 366, 386, 400, 407, 448 f., 494, 521, 523 f., 533, 536, 543, 545 f., 595, 631, 654 f., 667 f., 691, 696, 732 f., 767, 769, 771, 787, 813, 861, 868, 870 f., 898
Vol. 3: 48, 52, 55 f., 62, 71, 73, 98, 107, 135, 149 f., 152–155, 157, 161, 167, 174, 199, 212 f., 221, 343, 374, 402, 481, 508, 528 f., 565, 576, 579 f., 582, 586, 618, 622, 657, 696, 705, 728, 748, 803, 838, 997 f., 1012, 1059, 1061, 1108, 1143
Foregiving **Vol. 1:** 617, 620, 640
Vol. 2: 652
Form **Vol. 1:** 50, 66, 71, 204, 234, 299, 355, 371, 380, 525, 547, 636, 678, **703–714,** 722, 737
Vol. 2: 67, 74, 80, 82, 99, 125, 142, 203, 243, 284, **286–289,** 290 f., 488, 500, 502, 590, 657, 673, 739, 768
Vol. 3: 70, 119, 260, 513 f., 516, 554 f., 597, 604, 644 f., 864, **903–906,** 1027
Form criticism **Vol. 1: 57,** 58, 67 f., 576
Vol. 3: 58, 234, 333
Form-history **Vol. 1:** 57
Formal **Vol. 1:** 664, 714, 738
Vol. 2: 276, 287, 312
Formalism **Vol. 2:** 812
Formality **Vol. 1:** 394
Formalized **Vol. 3:** 705
Former **Vol. 1:** 665
Vol. 2: 419
Former Prophets **Vol. 1: 66**
Formerly **Vol. 2: 713–716**
Formless **Vol. 1:** 380
Formula **Vol. 2:** 279, 281 f., 319, 330, 339 f., 356, 424, 552, 619, 653, 655, 659, 729, 797, 897
Vol. 3: 61, 234, 373, 476
Formula quotations in Matthew **Vol. 3:** 657
Formulation **Vol. 1:** 579, 705
Fornication **Vol. 1:** 106, 233, 469, 496–501, 559, 672
Vol. 2: 586 f., 677 f., 682
Vol. 3: 95, 1165
Forsake **Vol. 1:** 493, 552
Vol. 2: 387, 450
Vol. 3: 560
Forsaken **Vol. 1:** 113, 174
Vol. 2: 82, 738
Fort **Vol. 3:** 948
Forthteller **Vol. 3:** 77
Forthwith **Vol. 3:** 834
Fortified camp **Vol. 3: 959–967**
Fortify **Vol. 3:** 605, 950
Fortitude **Vol. 3:** 354
Fortress **Vol. 1:** 636
Vol. 2: 324, 801
Vol. 3: 1010
Fortuitous **Vol. 3:** 720
Fortunate **Vol. 1:** 215

Vol. 2: 840
Fortunatus **Vol. 1:** 741
Fortune **Vol. 1:** 208, 435, 482, 489, 543, 585, 596, 671, 673
Vol. 2: 49, 108, 116, 146, 148, 320, 594, 898
Vol. 3: 45, 138 f., 925, 936
Fortune-teller **Vol. 1:** 463
Fortune-telling **Vol. 3:** 1104
Forty **Vol. 2:** 689, **696,** 697, 893
Forty stripes **Vol. 3:** 96
Forty-two months **Vol. 2: 688**
Forum **Vol. 2:** 142
Forum Romanum **Vol. 3:** 789
Forward **Vol. 1:** 665
Foul **Vol. 1:** 110, 114
Found **Vol. 1:** 376 f., 383
Foundation **Vol. 1:** 244, 279, 302, 327, 329, 375, **376–389,** 390 f., 540, 542 f., 596, 598, 602, **658–664,** 684, 693, 697
Vol. 2: 64, 129, 189, 217, 245, 249, 302, 314, 452, 582, 659, 706
Vol. 3: 84, 350, 384 f., 387–395, 397, 500, 795, 797, 865, 872, 948
Foundation of Salem **Vol. 2:** 324
Foundation-stone **Vol. 2:** 652
Vol. 3: 391
Founder **Vol. 1:** 168, 641, 669
Vol. 3: 69
Foundling **Vol. 1:** 616
Fountain **Vol. 1:** 151, 552
Vol. 3: 498
Four **Vol. 2:** 658, 687, **688 f.,** 690, 697, 769
Vol. 3: 179
Four hundred **Vol. 2:** 689, 697
Foursquare **Vol. 2:** 700
Fourteen **Vol. 2:** 685, 691
Fourth **Vol. 2:** 693, 711
Fourth school of Jewish philosophers **Vol. 3:** 1168
Fourth philosophy **Vol. 2:** 810
Fox **Vol. 1:** 118, 173
Vol. 3: 950
Fracture **Vol. 1:** 302
Vol. 2: 414
Fragile **Vol. 1:** 678
Vol. 3: 910, 915
Fragment **Vol. 1:** 464
Vol. 2: 32, 296
Fragmentary **Vol. 2:** 304
Fragmentation of truth **Vol. 3:** 899
Fragrance **Vol. 1:** 122, 439, 650
Vol. 2: 293 f.
Vol. 3: 599–601, 689
Frailty **Vol. 1:** 678 f.
Vol. 2: 498
Vol. 3: 212
Frame of mind **Vol. 2: 616–620**
Frankincense **Vol. 1:** 586
Vol. 2: 293 f.
Vol. 3: 238 f., 423
Frankness **Vol. 1:** 329, 715
Vol. 2: 734–737
Fraternal **Vol. 1:** 572
Fratricide **Vol. 3:** 578
Fraud **Vol. 2:** 470
Vol. 3: 574
Fraudulent **Vol. 3:** 574
Free **Vol. 1:** 120, 223, 275, 310, 346, 371, 401, 432, 439, 452, 470, 482, 506, 525 f., 529, 534, 536 f., 540, 542, 562, 572, 632, 651, 666, 677, 684, 697, 699, 702, **715–721,** 723, 728, 742
Vol. 2: 40, 42, 63, 74, 122, 126, 143, 158, 164, 166, 188, 245, 259, 265, 306, 329, 367, 406, 415, 420, 453, 595, 652, 715, 718, 788, 820, 890
Vol. 3: 102 f., 142, **177–221,** 407, 537, 545, 590, 753, 991, 1062
Free from guilt **Vol. 3:** 152
Free will (→ Will, free)
Freeborn **Vol. 1:** 411, 715
Freedman **Vol. 1:** 297, 715, 718
Vol. 3: 589–599
Freedom **Vol. 1:** 54, 62, 79, 81, 148, 219, 238, 248, 286, 289, 298, 310, 360, 383, 386, 400, 412, 435, 439, 447, 458, 475, 483, 494, 500, 525, 534, 569, 629, 633, 642, 667, 674, **715–721,** 728, 731, 737
Vol. 2: 63, 103, 132, 160 f., 245, 265, 273, 275, 307, 329, 335, 393, 402 f., 451, 516, 605, 607, 609, 611, 631, 706, 727, 734–736, 873
Vol. 3: 37, 79, 120, 129, 141, **177–221,** 352, 488, 561, 590, 592–594, 597–599, 674, 776, 824, 838, 917, 944, 1017, 1055, 1162, 1164
Freedom movements **Vol. 1:** 717
Freedom of choice **Vol. 2: 606–611**
Freedom of Israel **Vol. 2: 308**
Freedom of Jerusalem **Vol. 2: 308**
Freedom-loving **Vol. 2:** 660
Freeman **Vol. 1:** 299, 392
Vol. 2: 412
Freethinkers **Vol. 1:** 62, 555
Freewill-offering **Vol. 1:** 344, 534
Vol. 2: 329
Vol. 3: 422 f. 432, 753, 854 f.
Freeze **Vol. 1:** 671
Frege, G. **Vol. 3:** 1128
Frenzy **Vol. 1:** 528
Fresh **Vol. 2:** 670, **674–676**
Fresh water **Vol. 3:** 986
Fretful **Vol. 2:** 599
Friend **Vol. 1:** 77, 206, 215, **254–260,** 270, 284, 365, 484, 555, 557, 559, 571, 640, 663, 665
Vol. 2: 63, 83, 256, 356, 359, 392, 538, 541 f., **547–550,** 585, 663, 735, 881
Vol. 3: 49, 217, 369, 443, 448, 502, 577, 580, 625, 639, 1017
Friend of the bridegroom **Vol. 2:** 383, 549, 585
Friendliness **Vol. 2:** 105, 311, 622
Friendship **Vol. 1:** 338, 553 f., 687
Vol. 2: 134, 538, **547–550,** 683, 776, 798
Fright **Vol. 1:** 621, 673
Frighten **Vol. 1:** 226, 328, 527
Vol. 2: 621
Fringes **Vol. 1:** 254
Frivolity **Vol. 1:** 501
Frivolous **Vol. 3:** 903

Frogs **Vol. 1:** 114, 408
Vol. 2: 637
Vol. 3: 672
Front **Vol. 1:** 665
Frontier **Vol. 2:** 337
Frost **Vol. 1:** 652
Frostbite **Vol. 1:** 652
Frozen **Vol. 1:** 443
Fructify **Vol. 1:** 498
Vol. 2: 188
Frugal **Vol. 1:** 597
Vol. 2: 419
Fruit **Vol. 1:** 77, 85, 87, 112, 139, 178, 181, 187, 228, 240, 297, 358, 382, 389 f., 417, 496, 515, 540, 557, 565, 633, 669, 671, 681–683, 686, **721–728,** 739 f., 743
Vol. 2: 32, 44, 104, 130 f., 154, 230, 245, 261, 267, 271, 343, 360, 397, 432, 458, 545, 623, 662, 693, 711, 736, 754, 761 f., 771, 781 f., 809, 871, 912, 916
Vol. 3: 40, 174, 203, 226, 249, 257, 320, 421, 470 f., 522, 525 f., 532, 678, 702, 714, 728, 793, 802, 809, 814, 855, 857, 865–870, 918, 920, 922, 927, 995, 998, 1000, 1012, 1026, 1149, 1158
Fruit of the light **Vol. 2: 495**
Fruit-bearing **Vol. 1:** 542
Fruit-trees **Vol. 3:** 952
Fruitful **Vol. 1:** 180, 211, 214, 496
Vol. 2: 128, 193, 232
Vol. 3: 508
Fruitfulness **Vol. 1:** 723
Vol. 2: 711
Vol. 3: 415
Fruitless **Vol. 1:** 263, 547, 549, 721, 723
Vol. 2: 32, 142
Vol. 3: 869
Frustrate **Vol. 2:** 435
Vol. 3: 166
Frustration **Vol. 1:** 468, 681
Vol. 2: 828
Vol. 3: 236, 801, 814, 858
Fuchs, E. **Vol. 3:** 898, 1139 f.
Fuel **Vol. 1:** 389
Vol. 2: 710 f.
Fugitive **Vol. 3:** 594
Fulfil **Vol. 1:** 99, 178, 216, 289, 322, 335, 337, 349, 352, 367, 369, 409, 417, 492, 509, 545, 556, 596, 604, 640, 658, 674, 711, 713, 719, **728–744**
Vol. 2: 59 f., 62–64, 77, 127, 132, 149, 154, 156, 165, 168, 235, 238, 297, 313, 328 f., 332, 342, 374, 410, 417 f., 442 f., 445 f., 470, 474, 543, 546, 642, 665, 716, 812 f., 819, 926
Vol. 3: 187, 360, 489, 491
Fulfiller **Vol. 1:** 303
Fulfilment **Vol. 1:** 72, 95, 117, 138, 170, 175, 214, 223, 228, 243, 251, 290, 305, 311, 329, 339, 368, 370, 372, 374 f., 411, 416, 428 f., 439, 445, 460, 485, 492, 532, 536, 538, 545, 560, 570, 581, 587, 592, 601–603, 615, 624, 626, 634, 637, 647, 657, 697, 701, 719, 736 f.
Vol. 2: 39, 59, 62 f., 73, 82, 86 f., 100, 108–111, 170, 174, 195, 203, 240–242, 245, 258, 262, 281, 294, 299 f., 303, 314, 327, 338, 351, 356 f., 379, 403, 441, 443, 490, 585, 691, 714, 732, 786, 819, 909, 920 f., 923 f., 927
Vol. 3: 47 f., 69, 71–74, 82, 188, 202, 204, 220, 257, 329, 378, 390, 494 f., 500, 516, 632, 702, 732 f., 749, 756, 762, 806 f., 813, 836 f., 845, 890, 1013, 1023, 1073, 1096, 1105, 1112, 1121, 1149
Full **Vol. 1:** 546, 732
Vol. 2: 416
Vol. 3: 102
Full of idols **Vol. 2: 284–286**
Full moon **Vol. 3:** 734
Fuller **Vol. 1:** 151
Fuller, R. H. **Vol. 3: 287–289**
Fullness **Vol. 1:** 93, 95, 171, 237 f., 323, 402, 417, 522, 532, 552, 601, 638, 676, 697, 723, **728–744**
Vol. 2: 39, 67, 77–79, 83, 87, 106, 119, 131, 163, 187, 197, 211, 246, 251, 257, 342 f., 359, 453, 477, 504, 629, 640, 653, 669, 690, 715, 722, 782 f., 798 f., 819, 834, 844, 855
Vol. 3: 53, 71, 74, 82, 137, 171 f., 182, 252, 329, 403, 489, 494 f., 505, 510, 642, 728, 730, 804, 827, 838, 849, 1073, 1121
Fullness of time **Vol. 3:** 843
Fully-grown **Vol. 2:** 59
Fumes **Vol. 2:** 294
Fumigation **Vol. 2:** 293
Function **Vol. 1:** 128 f., 133, 188–190, 193 f., 196–198, 219, 230 f., 237, 280, 300, 302, 336, 349, 352, 373, 375, 378, 486, 533, 536, 544, 549, 572, 648, 667, 681, 711, 737
Vol. 2: 59, 121, 147, 181, 230, 243, 255, 290, 296, 328, 391, 414, 445, 447
Vol. 3: 49–51, 76, 86, 88, 681, 704, 1067, 1139, **1155–1158**
Function of genealogies **Vol. 3: 653–660**
Functionary **Vol. 2:** 327
Fundamental **Vol. 2:** 43
Funeral **Vol. 1:** 263, 431, 654
Vol. 2: 416, 418
Vol. 3: 260
Funeral song **Vol. 2: 418**
Fungi **Vol. 2:** 465
Funk, R. W. **Vol. 3:** 899
Furies **Vol. 1:** 420
Furnace **Vol. 2:** 628
Furnish **Vol. 3: 118–120, 349–351**
Furnishings **Vol. 2:** 291
Furrow **Vol. 1:** 493
Further **Vol. 3: 1147–1152**
Furtherance **Vol. 2:** 128
Furthest **Vol. 1:** 665
Furtiveness **Vol. 1:** 421
Fury **Vol. 1:** 108 f., 739
Vol. 2: 854 f.
Fusion **Vol. 1:** 584, 643 f.
Futile **Vol. 2:** 239, 242, 399, 683
Vol. 3: 200, 810, 821, 903, 935
Futility **Vol. 1:** 385, 431, 524 f., 546, 549, 551 f.
Vol. 2: 119, 400, 473, 793
Vol. 3: 219, 431, 914

Future **Vol. 1:** 56 f., 184, 237, 243 f., 289, 311, 323–327, 372, 383, 438, 482, 489, 496, 508, 512, 519, 525, 531, 551, 554, 562, 587, 592 f., 596–598, 601 f., 604, 611, 638 f., 654, 659–661, 670 f., 673, 676, 681, 690, 692, 695, 704, 706, 713 f., 719
Vol. 2: 35–37, 40, 56–58, 62, 65, 102, 108, 119, 122 f., 142, 203, 215, 218, 225, 231, 239 f., 242 f., 244, 254, 266 f., 271, 288, 295, 298, 300 f., 306, 313, 319, 325, 333, 337 f., 350, 353 f., 365, 367, 376, 382, 384–386, 388, 393, 396, 415, 417 f., 420 f., 423, 461, 515, 517, 521, 532, 606, 665 f., 670, 717, 732, 737, 789 f., 797, 823, 844, 886–888, 891, 900, 905, 908 f., 911, 917, 921, 924–926, 928 f.
Vol. 3: 47, 77, 79, 87 f., 194, 203, 213 f., 252, 316, 349, 529, 728, 826, 829, 831 f., 834, 836, 840, 1099

Gaal **Vol. 2:** 521
Gabinius **Vol. 1:** 363
Gabriel **Vol. 1:** 101 f., **103 f.,** 474
Vol. 3: 279, 660, 1071
Gad **Vol. 1:** 543
Vol. 2: 317
Vol. 3: 1092
Gadamer, H.-G. **Vol. 3:** 898, 1123, 1127, 1140
Gadarene **Vol. 1:** 117, 420
Vol. 2: 631
Vol. 3: 985
Gadites **Vol. 2:** 638
Gaia **Vol. 1:** 420
Gain **Vol. 1:** 138, 533, 651, 700, 728, 733
Vol. 2: 288, 835, 837–840, 845, 918
Vol. 3: 134–145, 196, 227, 564, 752, 765, 935, 1054, 1119
Gain attention **Vol. 3:** 874
Gain influence **Vol. 3:** 1078
Gain insight **Vol. 3: 122–130**
Gain mastery **Vol. 3:** 716, 1078
Gaius **Vol. 1:** 689
Vol. 3: 521, 1045
Galatia **Vol. 1:** 301
Vol. 2: 34
Vol. 3: 524, 710, 742
Galatians **Vol. 1:** 158, 235, 397, 478, 593, 708, 727
Vol. 2: 120, 559, 573, 625, 826, 828, 899
Vol. 3: 129, 314, 752, 1111
Galaxy **Vol. 3:** 397
Gale **Vol. 3:** 557, 736
Galilean **Vol. 1:** 171, 581
Vol. 2: 740
Vol. 3: 430
Galilee **Vol. 1:** 67, 167, 170, 303, 629, 642, 670
Vol. 2: 328, 332 f., 381, 767, 804, 849, 918
Vol. 3: 283, 288, 296, 313, 340, 442 f., 454, 456, 458, 481, 508 f., 641, 757, 983 f., 992, 1010, 1060 f.
Gall **Vol. 1:** 107, 202
Vol. 2: 27–29, 267, 295, 831, 836
Vol. 3: 922

Gallio **Vol. 1:** 361
Vol. 2: 369, 451, 766
Gallows **Vol. 1:** 389, 394
Gamaliel **Vol. 1:** 341, 591
Vol. 2: 34
Vol. 3: 189, 480, 768, 778, 873, 1157
Gamaliel II **Vol. 3:** 273
Game **Vol. 1:** 625
Vol. 3: 149, 261, 422, 929
Game-tree principle **Vol. 3:** 1142
Ganymedes **Vol. 3:** 259
Gap **Vol. 1:** 614, 734
Garden **Vol. 1:** 559
Vol. 2: 210, 266, 274, 760
Vol. 3: 986
Garden of Eden **Vol. 1:** 139, 389, 433
Vol. 2: 298, 761, 889
Gardener **Vol. 3: 918–922,** 1060
Garland **Vol. 1:** 405
Garment **Vol. 1:** 204 f., 240, **312–317,** 556, 613, 666, 671
Vol. 2: 40, 188, 226, 263, 299, 486, 491, 493, 556, 671, 673, 714
Vol. 3: 107, 860, 921
Garrison **Vol. 1:** 710
Vol. 2: 134
Vol. 3: 605
Gate **Vol. 1:** 254, 303
Vol. 2: 29–31, 207, 210, 280, 363, 441, 652, 733 f., 807
Vol. 3: 388, 395, 397, 603, 871, 940, 948
Gate of God **Vol. 1:** 140
Gates of Hell **Vol. 3:** 383, 385, 713
Gath **Vol. 3:** 248
Gather **Vol. 1:** 273, 291, 297 f., 304 f., 466, 490, 544, 610, 724 f.
Vol. 2: 31–35, 131, 161, 194, 226, 237, 310, 328, 359, 413, 531, **829–836,** 866, 928
Vol. 3: 255, 526, 531, 567, 745, 804
Gather an army **Vol. 3: 958–967**
Gayomart **Vol. 2:** 645
Vol. 3: 617
Gaza **Vol. 2:** 848
Vol. 3: 248, 453
Gaze on **Vol. 3: 520**
Gazelle **Vol. 3:** 1065
Ge **Vol. 2:** 188
Gear **Vol. 3:** 913
Geba **Vol. 3:** 426
Gebul **Vol. 3:** 446
Gedaliah **Vol. 3:** 249, 478
Gehazi **Vol. 1:** 485
Gehenna **Vol. 1:** 231, 418, 656, 700
Vol. 2: 205–210, 298
Vol. 3: 265, 271, 682
Gehinnom **Vol. 2:** 208 f.
Gem **Vol. 2:** 556
Vol. 3: 394–396, 753
Gemara **Vol. 1: 58,** 69
Vol. 3: 485
Gematria **Vol. 2: 683–685**
Vol. 3: 657
Gemeinde **Vol. 1: 58,** 59
Genealogies of Jesus Christ **Vol. 3: 653–660**

Genealogy **Vol. 1:** 65 f., 72, 77, 81, 85, 141, 176, 181 f., 208, 244, 255, 619
Vol. 2: 35 f., 124, 318, 331, 467, 644 f., 684 f., 691, 694
Vol. 3: 63, 191, 653–660, 664, 768, 872, 1026, 1062, 1073, 1119
Genealogy of Moses **Vol. 3:** 660
Genera **Vol. 2:** 158
General **Vol. 1:** 475
Vol. 3: 601, **958–967**
General resurrection **Vol. 3:** 277, 287
General revelation **Vol. 3:** 336
General semantics **Vol. 3:** 1125
Generate **Vol. 1:** 452, 497 f.
Vol. 3: 1153
Generation **Vol. 1:** 176, 179, 181, 187, 208, 294, 305, 308, 565, 596, 603
Vol. 2: 35–39, 54, 248, 271, 365, 381, 387, 582, 584, 629 f., 635, 680, 682, 689, 691 f., 696, 766, 798, 892, 910–912, 916 f., 923
Vol. 3: 213, 242, 283, 732, 827 f., 1030
Generation of vipers **Vol. 2:** 311
Generative **Vol. 2:** 657
Generative poetics **Vol. 3:** 1142
Generosity **Vol. 2:** 49, 98, 400, 694, 857
Vol. 3: 141, 853 f., 926, 955
Generous **Vol. 1:** 254, 642, 715
Vol. 2: 539, 652
Vol. 3: 752
Genesis **Vol. 1:** 65, 181, 510 f.
Vol. 3: 980
Genesis Apocryphon **Vol. 3:** 487
Genius **Vol. 1:** 653
Gennesaret **Vol. 3:** 983–985, 992, 1059
Genre, Literary **Vol. 1:** 57, **58,** 68, 582
Gentile **Vol. 1: 58,** 62, 115, 129, 155–157, 159, 167 f., 175, 202, 277, 307, 309 f., 320, 346, 350, 360, 375, 402, 417, 419, 434, 448, 473, 476–478, 508, 514, 531, 541, 544, 554 f., 593, 601, 619, 627, 632, 642, 644, 659, 667, 684–686, 689, 691, 695, 730 f., 733, 737, 740
Vol. 2: 31, 35, 37, 77, 83, 85 f., 94, 111–113, 126 f., 129, 139, 156, 158, 163, 178, 183, 223, 235–237, 251, 261, 275, 294, 302, 310, 312, 315–317, 325, 328, 340, 356, 359, 368, 378, 385, 399 f., 413, 437, 443 f., 446, 453, 495, 499, 519, 558, 567, 573, 581, 587, 592, 596 f., 641, 655, 664, 682, 688 f., 695, 702, 712, 721 f., 728–731, 736, 741, 773, **788–805,** 827, 844, 867, 880, 888, 898, 922 f.
Vol. 3: 38, 53 f., 56, 68, 63, 66, 71–73, 101, 106, 125, 163, 168, 172, 182, 186, 193 f., 194, 197, 198, 203, 214, 227, 241, 251 f., 296, 324, 327, 352, 361, 363, 378, 387, 389, 410, 431, 453 f., 457 f., 491, 504 f., 515, 523, 549, 552, 555, 560, 569, 576, 579 f., 584, 591, 629, 656, 662, 672, 675, 686, 714, 750, 752, 755, 757, 793, 795, 812, 869 f., 909, 913, 916, 922, 929, 931, 944, 949, 951, 954, 956, 961, 976, 1010, 1018 f., 1043, 1052, 1164, 1184, 1189 f., 1199
Gentile Christians **Vol. 1:** 145, 226, 228, 256, 261, 310 f., 340, 473, 552, 593
Vol. 2: 241, 286, 315 f., 328 f., 398, 437, 660 f., 732, 795
Vol. 3: 101
Gentile churches **Vol. 1:** 61, 632, 739
Vol. 2: 315 f., 329
Gentle **Vol. 1:** 282, 431, 469, 570
Vol. 2: 218, **256–259**
Gentleman **Vol. 2:** 562
Gentleness **Vol. 2:** 105, **256–259,** 360
Vol. 3: 525
Genuflexion **Vol. 1:** 207
Genuine **Vol. 1:** 356, 607, 637, 681
Vol. 2: 102, 105, 280, **468–470,** 574, 858
Vol. 3: 808–810, 874–901
Genuineness **Vol. 3:** 631
Geographical **Vol. 1:** 517 f.
Geological eras **Vol. 2:** 889
Gerar **Vol. 2:** 140
Gerasene **Vol. 2:** 623, 699
Vol. 3: 592
Gerassa **Vol. 1:** 226
Gerhardsson, B. **Vol. 3:** 59
Gerizim **Vol. 1:** 67, 210
Vol. 2: 591, 878, 927
Vol. 3: 450–452, 458, 460–462, 465, 789, 1010
German idealism **Vol. 3:** 686
Gersham **Vol. 2:** 636 f.
Geschichte **Vol. 1:** 58, **60**
Gesture **Vol. 1:** 413
Vol. 2: 150–152, 157, 630, 859
Get **Vol. 3:** 192, **747–751**
Get back **Vol. 3: 747–751**
Get ready **Vol. 3: 116–120, 349–351**
Get through **Vol. 3:** 255
Get up **Vol. 3:** 279
Get well **Vol. 3:** 259
Gethsemane **Vol. 1:** 305, 343, 442, 490, 559, 615, 646
Vol. 2: 32, 82, 178, 420, 429, 624, **710–713,** 851, 868, 871 f., 911
Vol. 3: 211, 378, 591, 657, 803, 978, 1022
Ghetto **Vol. 2:** 309
Ghost **Vol. 1:** 452
Vol. 2: 281, **552–562**
Vol. 3: 324
Giant **Vol. 1:** 452
Gibeah **Vol. 3:** 426
Gibeon **Vol. 1:** 195, 511
Vol. 3: 426, 812
Gibeonites **Vol. 3:** 154, 159
Gideon **Vol. 2:** 260, 374, 428, 627, 777
Vol. 3: 201, 206, 514, 874, 962, 994
Gift **Vol. 1: 52,** 90, 92, 97, 122, 138, 146, 148 f., 158, 168, 192, 195, 198, 212, 214, 216, 218, 225, 228, 232 f., 236, 244, 250 f., 279, 287, 289 f., 300 f., 305, 329, 357–359, 371 f., 375, 385, 389, 413–415, 428, 478, 485, 496, 498, 502, 511, 531 f., 535 f., 558, 571, 573, 586, 601 f., 607, 609, 617, 620, 637 f., 642, 648, 655, 661, 691, 699, 716, 718, 722 f., 731, 733, 739, 742
Vol. 2: 39–44, 62 f., 74, 76 f., 79, 83, 96, 102, 106–108, 115–123, 152, 162, 167, 169, 178, 186 f., 194, 210, 218, 228, 230, 240, 242 f.,

253, 255 f., 266, 270 f., 275, 277, 288, 294 f., 297, 302, 310, 326, 329, 336, 355 f., 360, 374, 385 f., 400, 410, 419, 445, 447, 469, 475, 480 f., 492, 498 f., 533, 540, 548, 550, 566, 580 f., 590, 594–598, 602, 611, 617 f., 632, 638, 641, 650, 675, 687, 693, 718, 721, 723, 728, 771, 777 f., 780 f., 785, 787, 789, 794, 798, 812 f., 816, 824, 826, 828, 830, 832, 834 f., 841, 844, 852, 859, 861, 868, 873, 877, 881, 883, 885, 918, 928, 930
Vol. 3: 69, 72, **74–89,** 110, 124, 131 f., 135, 138–140, 143 f., 149, 163, 168, 189 f., 199, 216, 228, 240, 243, 257, 315, 323, 349, 357, 360, 363 f., 372 f., 402 f., **415–418,** 421–423, 428, 433 f., 436, 458, 472, 499, 530, 536, 541 f., 547, 589, 600, 638–640, 647, 649, 691, 693, 699–702, 704, 706–708, 713 f., 728 f., 745 f., 748 f., 763, 789, 791, 810, 819, 853, 855, 874, 919, 922, 927, 944, 955, 967, 986, 988, 1002, 1004, 1016, 1018, 1029 f., 1032, 1059, 1067, 1070, 1169
Gift of first fruits **Vol. 3: 415–417**
Gihon **Vol. 1:** 122
Vol. 3: 986
Gilgal **Vol. 2:** 225
Vol. 3: 78, 426
Gilgamesh epic **Vol. 3:** 265, 602, 613
Gird **Vol. 3: 116–122,** 966
Gird up **Vol. 3:** 128
Girdle **Vol. 3:** 120 f., 966
Girl **Vol. 1:** 283, 287, 505
Vol. 3: 1071
Gischala **Vol. 2:** 804
Give **Vol. 1:** 235, 300, 319, 454, 509, 548, 642, 651, 659, 703, 717, 730, 738, 740, 742
Vol. 2: 39–44, 63, 116, 121, 131, 186, 269, 277, 280, 282, 357, 359, 411, 499, 594–598
Vol. 3: 153, 727, 748, 854 f.
Give account **Vol. 2:** 137, 244, 369 f.
Give an address **Vol. 3:** 821
Give attention **Vol. 3:** 125
Give away **Vol. 2:** 367, 596
Vol. 3: 134–136
Give back **Vol. 3: 134–136,** 146
Give birth **Vol. 2:** 318, 329
Give drink **Vol. 2: 274–277**
Give God glory **Vol. 1:** 345
Vol. 2: 46, 816
Give ground **Vol. 1:** 741
Give impression **Vol. 3:** 821
Give information **Vol. 3: 316 f.**
Give life **Vol. 2:** 280, **476–484**
Give lot **Vol. 2: 299**
Give in marriage **Vol. 2: 575–582**
Give mind to **Vol. 2: 616–620**
Give notice **Vol. 3:** 47
Give offence **Vol. 3:** 433
Give out **Vol. 3: 402–404, 952–956**
Give rest **Vol. 3: 254–258**
Give up **Vol. 1:** 413, 698
Vol. 2: 156, 217, 241, 244, 361, **367 f.**
Vol. 3: 134–136
Give up ghost **Vol. 3:** 680
Give way **Vol. 1:** 741
Vol. 2: 256
Giver **Vol. 1:** 375, 498, 543, 716, 718, 738
Vol. 2: 827
Vol. 3: 417
Giving **Vol. 1:** 732
Vol. 2: 594–598, 694, 827 f.
Giving birth **Vol. 3: 857 f.**
Glad **Vol. 2: 356–361,** 436
Glad tidings **Vol. 2: 107–115**
Gladden **Vol. 2: 354–356**
Gladness **Vol. 2:** 107, 353, **354–356,** 590
Vol. 3: 121, 680, 919
Glaucus **Vol. 3:** 75
Glaze **Vol. 3:** 914
Gleam **Vol. 3:** 395
Gleaming **Vol. 2: 484–486**
Gleaning **Vol. 1:** 541, 724
Vol. 3: 867, 918, 1074
Glib **Vol. 1:** 682
Glitter **Vol. 3:** 395
Gloom **Vol. 1:** 110, 421–423, 425
Vol. 2: 215
Gloomy **Vol. 2:** 206
Glorification **Vol. 2:** 203, 372, 400, 787, 809
Vol. 3: 725, 863
Glorified Christ **Vol. 1:** 131, 399, 587, 709
Vol. 2: 48, 289, 332, 625, 787, 819
Glorify **Vol. 1:** 89, 211, 235, 312, 643, 649, 706 f.
Vol. 2: 44, 79, 128, 229, 272, 306, 352 f., 360, 394, 425, 606, 819, 862, 874
Vol. 3: 672, 848 f.
Glorious **Vol. 1:** 435, 707, 717
Vol. 2: 44, 263
Vol. 3: 317
Glory **Vol. 1:** 73, 100, 204, 222, 227 f., 235, 261, 280, 311, 313 f., 323, 327, 329, 345 f., 352, 381, 386, 401, 405 f., 411, 464, 469 f., 504, 508, 546, 560, 574, 576, 587, 592, 637–639, 643–645, 653, 655 f., 669, 673, 675, 677 f., 688, 696, 704, 706, 712, 730, 732, 735, 740
Vol. 2: 44–52, 71, 75, 78 f., 82 f., 112, 119, 131, 146, 160–162, 176, 190, 196, 203 f., 213, 217 f., 229, 235, 240, 242–245, 272, 278, 289 f., 303, 328 f., 336, 354, 357, 360, 366, 377, 380, 388, 397, 420, 425, 473, 482, 485–488, 493, 503, 543, 546, 563, 605, 607, 614 f., 627 f., 632, 637, 641, 650, 653 f., 669, 672, 694, 696, 718, 724, 736, 774, 779, 781, 834, 839, 844, 863, 877, 894, 909, 916, 928 f.
Vol. 3: 55, 117 f., 128, 138, 163, 165, 199 f., 214, 220, 262, 277, 281, 313 f., 316 f., 320–323, 343, 349, 373, 397 f., 416, 433, 504, 514, 516, 518, 532, 554, 563, 588 f., 606, 621, 631, 633 f., 645, 705, 717, 722 f., 725, 733–735, 749, 790, 806, 821, 825 f., 838, 848, 860, 863 f., 890, 914, 925, 954, 1006, 1008, 1020, 1155, 1166
Glossalalia (→ Tongues, speaking in)
Glue **Vol. 2:** 348 f.
Gluttony **Vol. 1:** 169, 561
Vol. 2: 271, 274
Vol. 3: 921

Gnash the teeth **Vol. 2:** 416 f., **421**
Gnat **Vol. 1:** 116
Gnaw **Vol. 2:** 421
Gnomic discourse **Vol. 2:** 890
Gnosis **Vol. 1:** 55
Vol. 2: 393
Vol. 3: 1073
Gnostic **Vol. 1:** 55, **58,** 60, 103, 123, 127, 133–135, 212, 237 f., 313–316, 338 f., 347, 455, 479, 500, 524, 534, 547, 570, 604, 638, 680, 706, 709, 740
Vol. 2: 36, 72, 159, 171, 185, 187 f., 195, 219, 221, 248, 250, 253, 265, 280, 286, 310, 314, 393 f., 397, 403 f., 439, 447, 449, 457, 481 f., 506, 557, 584, 601, 608, 655, 674, 677 f., 683, 701, 830, 840, 919, 928
Vol. 3: 40, 85, 123, 128, 205, 220, 344, 602, 622, 640, 643, 645–647, 661, 825, 832, 891, 930, 932, 939–941, 945, 1020, 1029–1031, 1054, 1115 f., 1118
Gnosticism **Vol. 1:** 50, 54 f., **58,** 86, 133, 179, 230, 233 f., 247, 301, 387, 422, 432, 438 f., 487, 500, 510, 513, 522 f., 525, 601, 616, 669, 678 f., 705, 708, 740
Vol. 2: 60, 129, 158, 219, 251, 391, **393 f.,** 401, 404, 419, 448, 453, 477, 480, 485, 490 f., 493, 495, 567, 645 f., 717, 719, 906
Vol. 3: 206, 231, 273, 324, 457, 502 f., 595, 617, 630–632, 706, 772, 827, 832, 936, 1034 f., 1046, 1119
Go **Vol. 3: 945–947**
Go about **Vol. 3: 943–945**
Go after **Vol. 3:** 860
Go aside **Vol. 3: 583–585**
Go astray **Vol. 1:** 541, 608
Vol. 2: 457–461, 708
Vol. 3: 585 f.
Go away **Vol. 1:** 320, 606, 608
Vol. 2: 359
Vol. 3: 362
Go before **Vol. 2:** 412
Go forth **Vol. 1:** 713
Go forward **Vol. 2:** 128
Go to law **Vol. 2:** 365
Go up **Vol. 2: 184–187,** 326
Vol. 3: 421
Goad **Vol. 1:** 511
Vol. 2: 155
Goal **Vol. 1:** 69, 92 f., 95, 168, 186, 188, 250, 263, 289, 314, 319, 325, 358, 384 f., 432, 451, 460 f., 481, 484 f., 489, 491, 538, 540 f., 583, 597, 600–605, 640, 647, 713, 719, 731
Vol. 2: 48, **52–66,** 75, 77, 95 f., 99, 106, 120, 130, 157, 162, 194 f., 204, 231, 241, 243–245, 252, 287, 313, 402, 404, 443, 445, 453, 569, 665, 703, 715, 741, 772, 806 f., 817, 819 f., 886, 891, 908
Vol. 3: 216, 225, 350 f., 363, 617, 725, 728, 752, 755 f., 759, 762, 779, 831, 839, 843, 849, 935, 938 f., 946, 991, 1020, 1158, 1177
Goat **Vol. 1:** 114–116, 224 f., 299
Vol. 2: 148, 151, 296, 413, 606
Vol. 3: 98, 164, 199, 420, 423, 564, 567
Goblet **Vol. 2:** 274
Goel **Vol. 3:** 191
Gog and Magog **Vol. 1:** 508, 657
Vol. 2: 701, 792
Vol. 3: 389, **959–967**
God **Vol. 1:** 70, 73–79, 81, 84–87, 89, 94 f., 97–99, 101–104, 106, 108–114, 116, 119, 122–126, 129, 133, 136, 138–140, 142 f., 147–149, 151 f., 154, 157, 159 f., 162–169, 171–175, 177–180, 183–191, 195, 197, 200, 202–205, 208–210, 212–219, 221–225, 227–229, 231, 234–240, 243–245, 248, 250–253, 255–257, 259, 261, 263, 268–270, 272–281, 284–290, 294 f., 297–300, 302–305, 308 f., 311–327, 329–336, 338–347, 349–361, 363, 365–387, 389 f., 397–402, 408–418, 420–427, 430, 433 f., 436 f., 439–441, 444–462, 464–479, 481–492, 494–496, 499–514, 516–518, 520–535, 537 f., 540–560, 562–568, 570–572, 574–576, 580–582, 585–605, 607–612, 614–629, 632 f., 636–641, 644–647, 649–654, 656–662, 665, 667–669, 672–681, 684–686, 688–691, 693–702, 704, 706–708, 712–714, 716–720, 722 f., 726, 728–738, 740–744
Vol. 2: 29 f., 32–35, 37–39, 41–51, 53–55, 57–61, 63–65, **66–90,** 91–96, 98–102, 105 f., 109–113, 115–125, 127–129, 131–135, 137, 139–142, 144–149, 151 f., 154–156, 158–165, 167–170, 173–179, 181–204, 206, 208, 211–218, 220, 222 f., 225–232, 235–245, 247–253, 255–263, 265–268, 270–275, 277–279, 281 f., 284 f., 287–290, 294–307, 309–313, 315, 317, 325–329, 332, 335–340, 342 f., 349–351, 353–358, 360, 363–369, 373, 376–389, 391, 393–405, 407 f., 411–413, 415–420, 422, 424–436, 440–451, 453, 456, 458, 460, 462, 501–503, 508–514, 516, 519, 521, 539, 565, 567, 576, 602, 609, 619, 627, 631, 635–638, 646, 648–661, 674, 687, 718, 720 f., 725, 727, 736, 765, 772, 777, 794, 813, 815–819, 832, 842, 855–882, 884 f., 888 f., 891–894, 898 f., 902, 904–906, 908 f., 911, 916–923, 927, 929
Vol. 3: 28–31, 36–38, 41, 45–48, 53–58, 65 f., 69–74, 77–79, 81–83, 93, 95–98, 101, 105 f., 111, 113, 117–121, 125–132, 134–136, 138–145, 148 f., 151–153, 155, 160–173, 177–181, 186–191, 195, 197–200, 202, 204 f., 207, 210–216, 218–221, 224–230, 232–257, 262–266, 268–281, 284–287, 289 f., 293, 297–304, 309–337, 340–353, 355–373, 377, 380–383, 386–393, 395, 397 f., 400–411, 416 f., 425, 428–436, 445, 457, 460–462, 465, 486–476, 479, 482, 484–488, 490–492, 495, 498–509, 512–518, 522–526, 528–537, 539 f., 542–544, 546–552, 554–559, 561–563, 565–567, 571 f., 574, 576, 578–586, 588–591, 593–598, 600–605, 607–616, 618–651, 653, 658 f., 662–664, 670–675, 678, 681–687, 689–696, 698, 701 f., 704 f., 707 f., 710–718, 720–726, 728–734, 737, 740–743, 745–751, 754 f., 760–766, 768 f., 771–773, 776–779, 782–787, 789–795, 797, 799–815, 817–821, 824–833, 835–839, 841–844, 846–

849, 851–857, 860, 863–866, 868–872, 874, 876–886, 888–894, 899–901, 904–906, 909, 911–917, 919 f., 922–924 f., 927 f., 934, 937–947, 950 f., 953–956, 959–961, 963–973, 975, 978–981, 983 f., 986–991, 995, 997 f., 1000–1014, 1016–1023, 1025 f., 1028–1033, 1036, 1040–1050, 1053 f., 1056, 1058, 1060, 1066, 1068–1070, 1073 f., 1078–1081, 1084, 1087–1123, 1132 f., 1137, 1148–1155, 1157 f., 1161, 1163–1169, 1176–1178, 1180, 1182, 1184 f., 1187–1196, 1198, 1200–1206, 1209, 1211, 1213 f.
God Almighty **Vol. 2:** 67
God, concepts of **Vol. 1:** 54 f.
God, to have **Vol. 2:** 78
God Most High **Vol. 2:** 67, 375, 591
God, names of **Vol. 1: 56,** 71, 98
Vol. 2: 67 f., 318, **375, 649–656**
God of Abraham **Vol. 2:** 73
God of this age **Vol. 3:** 831
God of the Amen **Vol. 1:** 98
God of Bethel **Vol. 2:** 67
God of eternity **Vol. 3:** 827
God of the future **Vol. 3: 969**
God of glory **Vol. 2:** 46
God of heaven **Vol. 2: 193**
Vol. 3: 485
God of hope **Vol. 3: 969**
God of Isaac **Vol. 2:** 73
God of Israel **Vol. 1:** 208, 272, 280, 383, 476, 626
Vol. 2: 29, 53, 67, 69–73, 215, 285, 309, 335, 492, 512, 796 f., 830, 863, 867, 876, 909
Vol. 3: 318, 794, 828, 881
God of Jacob **Vol. 2:** 73
God of Seeing **Vol. 2:** 67
God of Truth **Vol. 1:** 98
Vol. 3: 877, 882, 901
God of this world **Vol. 2:** 381, 494, 609
Vol. 3: 694
God-breathed **Vol. 3:** 327, 491, **689–708**
God-fearer **Vol. 1:** 359–361, 688
Vol. 2: 85
Vol. 3: 931
God-fearing **Vol. 1:** 227, 542, 623
Vol. 2: 85, 91, 492
Goddess **Vol. 2:** 85
Vol. 3: 231, 845, 861, 1055, 1068 f., 1071
Goddess of fate **Vol. 2:** 303
Godforsaken **Vol. 2:** 86
Godhead **Vol. 1:** 204, 740
Vol. 2: 70, 506, 819
Vol. 3: 310
Godless **Vol. 1:** 109, 125, 259, 277, 416, 449, 552, 586, 598, 687, 734
Vol. 2: 49, 53, 56, 71, 91, 155, 239, 265, 304, 310, 312, 405 f., 417, 442, **468–470,** 475, 479, 486, 549, 705, 707, 777, 810
Vol. 3: 31, 96, 140, 224, 394, 574, 578, 580, 836, 839, 847, 983, 1024 f., 1068, 1149
Godlessness **Vol. 1:** 716 f., 719
Vol. 2: 91, 94, 265, 474
Vol. 3: 573, 580, 1079
Godliness **Vol. 1:** 112, 228, 240, 327, 361, 496, 559, 622, 687
Vol. 2: 85, **90–95,** 131, 232, 439, 468, 621, 659
Vol. 3: 33, 100, 353, 561, 574, 577, 584, 692, 727, 768, 1119
Godly **Vol. 1:** 125, 186, 467, 474, 551, 555, 575, 597
Vol. 2: 91, 94, 181, 475, 485
Vol. 3: 203
Godly sorrow **Vol. 2:** 420
Gods **Vol. 1:** 128, 189, 481, 492, 497, 528, 537, 569, 585, 616
Vol. 2: 66–90, 92, 164, 166 f., 184, 188, 190, 224 f., 232–237, 239, 259 f., 265, 271, 284–287, 309, 396, 407, 425, 430, 432, 439, 452, 498, 510, 564, 572, 612, 633, 644, 649, 657, 662–664, 705, 722, 859, 871, 876
Vol. 3: 27, 45, 49 f., 69, 76, 103 f., 123, 138, 146, 148 f., 186 f., 200–202, 205 f., 209, 216 f., 224, 260 f., 317 f., 340, 353, 388, 397, 415, 432, 460, 515, 549 f., 561 f., 583, 593, 634 f., 679, 715–717, 719, 727, 739, 760, 781 f., 806, 840, 851, 916, 919, 925, 930, 936 f., 959, 1000 f., 1006, 1009, 1024, 1029, 1039, 1068, 1081, 1101, 1148
Gold **Vol. 1:** 204, 380, 319, 390, 464, 498, 537, 648, 656, 682, 743
Vol. 2: 28, **95–98,** 102, 235, 349, 572, 574, 683, 728, 795, 831, 836, 844, 852
Vol. 3: 107, 200, 391 f., 518, 809, 812, 814, 855, 914 f., 957
Golden **Vol. 2:** 95
Golden age **Vol. 1:** 508, 640
Vol. 2: 95 f., 337, 888
Vol. 3: 217
Golden altar **Vol. 3:** 812
Golden calf **Vol. 2:** 356, 637
Vol. 3: 1013
Golden girdle **Vol. 3:** 120 f.
Golden rule **Vol. 2:** 442
Goldsmith **Vol. 2:** 95
Golgotha **Vol. 1:** 581
Vol. 2: 718
Gomer **Vol. 2:** 754
Gomorrah **Vol. 1:** 657, 677
Vol. 2: 366, 767
Vol. 3: 93, 96, 203, 240, 344, 444, 560, 628
Gong **Vol. 2:** 97
Good **Vol. 1:** 55 f., 85, 118, 163, 168, 212, 232 f., 236, 336, 348–351, 356, 370, 389, 413, 434, 458, 463, 468 f., 473, 490, 495, 501, 504, 509 f., 523, 536 f., 540, 543, 552, 556, 561–565, 568, 570, 585, 604, 612, 623, 649, 653 f., 671, 673, 676 f., 680 f., 708, 715, 720–723, 731
Vol. 2: 62, 86, **98–107,** 115 f., 118, 130, 157 f., 178, 182 f., 206, 239, 241, 243, 269, 271 f., 274, 279–281, 286, 288, 334, 350, 357, 367, 369, 391, 394 f., 403, 445–447, 476, 490, 497, 506, 659, 683, 714, 719, 770, 781, 806 f., 811, 815, 817, 844, 857, 866, 889
Vol. 3: 73, 127, 130, 138, 140, 227, 351, 358, 410, 522, 693, 720, 751, 775, 779, 807, 865, 869, 933, 938, 1021, 1054, 1148, 1156

Good behaviour **Vol. 3:** 140
Good day **Vol. 3: 1000–1004**
Good deed **Vol. 2:** 425
Vol. 3: 1147–1152
Good Friday **Vol. 1:** 634
Good health **Vol. 2:** 356
Good news **Vol. 2: 107–115,** 387, 410, 611
Vol. 3: 45 f., 69, 71, 696
Good order **Vol. 3:** 27
Good pleasure **Vol. 2: 817–820**
Good sense **Vol. 2: 616–620**
Good turn **Vol. 2:** 115
Good works **Vol. 1:** 316, 604, 735
Vol. 2: 83, 95, 101, 117, 129, 191, 242, 266, 384, 446, 597, 645, 830, 834 f., 842, 844, 846
Vol. 3: 129, 135
Goodness **Vol. 1:** 84, 86, 185, 345, 380, 484, 562, 566, 616, 620, 695, 700
Vol. 2: 72, 76, 79, 98, 105, 139, 270, 290, 386, 397, 718, 812, 905
Vol. 3: 356, 572, 687, 762
Goods **Vol. 1:** 381, 457, 537, 588, 639, 642, 728 f.
Vol. 2: 255, 361, 844 f.
Vol. 3: 201, 913
Goodwill **Vol. 1:** 558
Vol. 2: 115, 358, **817–820**
Vol. 3: 151, 169, 745, 1169
Gore, Charles **Vol. 1:** 548 f.
Gorgias **Vol. 3:** 138, 1083, 1086
Gospel **Vol. 1:** 50, 54, 62, 74, 95, 123, 129 f., 132 f., 146–148, 150, 153, 157 f., 165 f., 168, 171, 180, 182, 222, 238 f., 248, 258 f., 269, 275, 297, 310 f., 322, 331, 336, 338, 350, 367, 370, 384, 396–399, 437, 464, 469, 474, 476 f., 489, 496, 505, 508, 517, 524, 540, 547, 551, 554, 558, 560, 566, 576, 590, 593, 599, 601–603, 605, 607, 613, 638, 643 f., 647, 658 f., 675, 677, 683, 702, 719, 722, 727, 733
Vol. 2: 30, 43, 75, 77 f., **107–115,** 119, 122, 126, 129, 149, 156, 161, 169, 176, 179, 214, 221 f., 235, 242, 250, 254 f., 263, 302, 328 f., 338, 356–360, 367, 379, 387, 404, 435, 443, 451, 453, 494, 559, 569, 597, 604 f., 610 f., 625, 627, 645 f., 665, 673, 678, 702, 706, 709, 726, 741, 780, 782, 786, 794 f., 812, 818, 825, 839, 844, 875, 899, 901, 903, 906, 910 f., 913, 915
Vol. 3: 38, 44–46, 50, 52, 54 f., 58 f., 61, 63 f., 67–73, 85, 108, 118, 128, 142, 169, 174, 198, 212–214, 217, 228, 241–243, 280, 313–315, 323 f., 347, 349, 352, 367, 384, 393, 400, 495, 510, 526, 546, 548, 551 f., 560, 563, 570, 586, 592, 596, 600, 705, 710, 718, 725, 742, 746, 751, 771, 773 f., 794, 818, 830, 862, 864, 868, 884–888, 914, 922, 935, 959, 964, 966, 975, 980, 1021, 1025, 1043 f., 1053 f., 1060, 1080, 1110, 1114, 1122, 1152
Gospel according to the Egyptians **Vol. 1:** 50
Vol. 2: 219
Gospel according to the Hebrews **Vol. 1:** 50
Vol. 2: 219
Gospel, another **Vol. 2:** 112, 766
Gospel of Marcion **Vol. 1:** 50
Gospel of the Nazarenes **Vol. 1:** 576
Vol. 3: 795
Gospel of Peter **Vol. 1:** 50
Vol. 3: 285, 297
Gospel of Philip **Vol. 1:** 50
Vol. 2: 310
Vol. 3: 661
Gospel of Thomas **Vol. 1:** 50
Vol. 2: 168, 219, 462, 751 f., 757
Gospel of Truth **Vol. 1:** 616
Gospel of the Twelve Apostles **Vol. 1:** 50
Gossip **Vol. 3:** 45, 346 f., 525
Gourd **Vol. 1:** 241
Govern **Vol. 1:** 194, 573, 662
Vol. 2: 374, 381, 663
Vol. 3: 217, 678, 944 f.
Governing **Vol. 2:** 158
Government **Vol. 1:** 193, 199, 291, 588, 654
Vol. 2: 373, 607 f., 801–804, 859
Vol. 3: 97, 324, 353, 755, 758, 1028
Government of God **Vol. 1:** 152, 379, 551
Governor **Vol. 1:** 169, 190, **269 f.,** 363, 519, 649
Vol. 2: 254, 377, 511, 608
Grace **Vol. 1:** 52, 74, 93, 97, 112, 129, 147, 154, 157, 163, 180, 190, 211, 227 f., 290, 300, 305, 311, 324, 326, 356, 358, 370 f., 397, 436, 439–441, 455, 466 f., 478, 488, 509, 532, 535, 538, 541 f., 547, 571, 585, 587, 589, 596, 601, 605, 607, 609, 611, 622, 655, 659, 660, 668, 680, 698, 700, 703, 727, 730, 732, 739 f.
Vol. 2: 39, 42, 44, 72–79, 83, 94, 106, **115–124,** 129, 131, 139, 152, 183, 198, 208, 215, 243 f., 253, 255, 261, 264, 302, 356, 360, 364, 366, 368, 393 f., 396, 400, 445, 498 f., 504, 516, 519, 522, 536, 540, 543, 546, 550, 565, 581, 594, 597 f., 649, 660, 699, 708, 713, 718, 741, 769, 771, 791, 797, 815, 818, 826 f., 842–844, 859, 862 f., 866, 878, 928
Vol. 3: 28, 31, 69, 71 f., 81, 84, 97, 118, 135, 138, 140, 142–145, 161, 163, 167 f., 199, 214 f., 221, 228, 235, 251 f., 315 f., 325, 344, 348, 350, 354, 356, 359, 363–365, 373, 402, 436, 449, 505, 528 f., 536, 552, 578, 581, 586, 649, 705, 717, 725, 728, 746, 748 f., 762, 779, 801, 809, 817–819, 825, 842, 844, 854, 857, 869, 879, 883, 888 f., 912, 920, 954, 969, 1020, 1067, 1151, 1163, 1167, 1178–1180
Grace and truth **Vol. 3: 889 f.**
Graceful **Vol. 2:** 115
Vol. 3: 818
Gracious **Vol. 1:** 212, 345, 357, 386, 540, 585 f., 597, 611, 622, 638, 699, 716, 731
Vol. 2: 68, 77, 86, 105, 115 f., 216, 240, 242, 275, 357, 360, 395, 598, 624, 652, 812, 819
Vol. 3: 148–166, 167, 448
Graciousness **Vol. 2: 256–259**
Grade **Vol. 2:** 50
Gradually **Vol. 3:** 839
Graft **Vol. 1:** 644
Vol. 2: 660, 712 f., 794
Vol. 3: 227, 320, **865–870**

Grain **Vol. 1:** 249, 252, 289, 313
Vol. 2: 32
Vol. 3: 421 f., 526, 852, 1053, 1163
Grammar **Vol. 3:** 206, 1081, 1085–1087, 1119 f., 1141
Grammatical structure **Vol. 3:** 1124
Granary **Vol. 2:** 830
Grandchildren **Vol. 3:** 1056
Grandeur **Vol. 1:** 474, 638
Vol. 2: 92, 261, **424–427**
Grandson **Vol. 1:** 287
Grant **Vol. 1:** 454, 506, 649
Vol. 2: 40 f., 116, 175, 353, 368, 438
Grant life **Vol. 2:** 119
Grapes **Vol. 1:** 224, 725
Vol. 2: 32 f., 737
Vol. 3: 866 f., **918–922**
Grapevine **Vol. 3: 918–922**
Grasp **Vol. 1:** 241, 533, 607, 649, 713, 742
Vol. 2: 391, 406
Vol. 3: 130, **716–718, 747–751,** 822
Grass **Vol. 1:** 411, 515, 627, 673, 678, 743 f.
Vol. 2: 27, 210 f.
Vol. 3: 521–527, 1009, 1101
Grass, Hans **Vol. 3: 282 f.**
Grasshopper **Vol. 2:** 831
Vol. 3: 112
Grassland **Vol. 3:** 1004
Grateful **Vol. 2:** 115, 121, 395
Gratification **Vol. 1:** 457
Gratitude **Vol. 1:** 183, 335, 702, 728
Vol. 2: 108, 115, 202, 353, 400, 444, 668, 825, 874
Vol. 3: 207, **816–819**
Grave **Vol. 1: 263–266,** 470, 655
Vol. 2: 138, 206, 328, 331, 341, 418, 726 f., 780, 924, 928
Vol. 3: 239, 246, 256, 262, 269, 499, 1053, 1100
Graven **Vol. 3:** 488, 916
Graven image **Vol. 2:** 226
Graven object **Vol. 2: 573 f.**
Graze **Vol. 3:** 565
Grease **Vol. 2:** 335
Great **Vol. 1:** 600
Vol. 2: 130, 363, 369, **424–427,** 428
Vol. 3: 115, 457
Great commandment **Vol. 2:** 147, 426
Great God **Vol. 2:** 82
Great year **Vol. 3:** 653
Greater **Vol. 1:** 728, 730
Vol. 2: 426
Vol. 3: 792, 1030
Greatest **Vol. 1:** 285
Vol. 2: 427
Greatness **Vol. 1:** 732
Vol. 2: 105, 197, 272, 316, 426, 429
Greece **Vol. 1:** 55, 140 f., 193, 243, 264, 279, 392, 493, 497 f., 616, 624 f., 641
Vol. 2: 92, 96, 102, 124, 166, 802 f., 830, 898, 918
Vol. 3: 49, 103, 259, 421, 679, 739, 851
Greed **Vol. 1: 137–139,** 456, 611
Vol. 2: 115, 421
Vol. 3: 381, 756 f., 820, 1053 f.
Greediness **Vol. 3: 601–605**
Greedy **Vol. 3:** 564
Greek **Vol. 1:** 59, **62,** 140, 220, 228, 307, 309, 311, 349, 351, 361, 369, 382, 397, 408, 422, 431, 444, 502, 510–512, 524, 560, 575, 589, 622, 686 f., 691, 709, 715
Vol. 2: 85, 92, 99, 102 f., **124–127,** 159, 166 f., 170, 173, 180, 188, 208, 212, 223, 234, 257, 260, 266, 274, 302, 315, 321, 372, 430, 657, 707, 790, 802, 805, 847–851, 876, 879
Vol. 3: 65, 106, 277, 513, 730, 791, 834, 840, 852, 980
Greek prepositions **Vol. 3: 1171–1215**
Greek view of truth **Vol. 3:** 889
Green **Vol. 1:** 390, 653, 744
Vol. 3: 396
Greet **Vol. 1:** 206, 585, 724
Vol. 2: 328, 517, 549, 779
Greet by name **Vol. 3:** 1063
Greeting **Vol. 1:** 206 f., 212 f., 241, 246 f., 427, 587, 609, 732
Vol. 2: 170, 352, **356–358,** 516, 549, 597, 777, 780 f.
Vol. 3: 258
Gregarious **Vol. 2:** 412
Gregory Nazianzen **Vol. 2:** 505
Gregory of Nyssa **Vol. 3:** 148
Grey **Vol. 1:** 205, 227
Griddle **Vol. 1:** 249
Grief **Vol. 1:** 202, 311, 467, 520, 529, 593, 673
Vol. 2: 157, 227, 360, 416–420, **421–423**
Vol. 3: 691, 1051, 1167
Grieve **Vol. 2:** 260, **421–423,** 807
Griffin-vulture **Vol. 1:** 173
Grind the teeth **Vol. 2:** 421
Grinding **Vol. 3:** 1058
Grip **Vol. 1:** 675
Vol. 3: 747
Groan **Vol. 1:** 385
Vol. 2: 416–424, 862, 884, 925
Vol. 3: 180, 702
Grope **Vol. 1:** 421
Grotto **Vol. 3:** 782
Ground **Vol. 1:** 70, 376, 416, 433, 470, 500, 513, 517, 604, 609, 623, 633, 637, 653, 658, 662, 669, 679, 693, 695 f., 699 f., 702, 710 f., 721, 743
Vol. 2: 67, 104, 137–139, 143, 232, 253, 298, 302, 318, 359 f., 439
Vol. 3: 1183
Groundless **Vol. 1:** 550
Groundwork **Vol. 1:** 662
Group **Vol. 1:** 208, 229, 237, 274, 280, 286–288, 297, 301–304, 311, 341, 463, 487, 489, 498, 505, 533–536, 539, 602, 627 f., 632 f., 643 f., 693, 712, 732 f., 742
Vol. 2: 306, 310–313, 315 f.
Grove **Vol. 2:** 233
Vol. 3: 782, 785
Grovelling **Vol. 2:** 259
Grow **Vol. 1:** 181, 284, 289, 504, 557, 681, 722, 728, 732
Vol. 2: 123, **128–131,** 162, 201, 223, 252 f.,

Grow (*cont'd*)
271, 656 f., 668
Vol. 3: 57, 870, 1033, 1118
Grow luxuriantly **Vol. 3:** 27
Grow old **Vol. 2: 713–716**
Grow up **Vol. 2:** 270, 369
Vol. 3: 215, 352
Grow weary **Vol. 3:** 628
Growl **Vol. 2:** 421, 423
Grown **Vol. 2:** 65, 425
Growth **Vol. 1:** 92, 174, 214, 238, 282, 302, 305, 343, 602, 625, 722 f., 725 f., 731, 744
Vol. 2: 128–131, 169, 185, 230, 360, 400
Vol. 3: 835
Grudge **Vol. 1:** 107, 557
Grudging **Vol. 1:** 214
Vol. 3: 818
Gruesome **Vol. 2:** 206
Grumble **Vol. 1:** 465
Vol. 2: 144 f., 175, 261, 423, 771
Vol. 3: 805
Guarantee **Vol. 1:** 99, 247, 308, **365–376,** 594, 637, 658 f., 713
Vol. 2: 40, 120, 243, 265, 272, 300, 382, 406, 789, 839
Vol. 3: 489, 497, 500, 701, 738
Guarantor **Vol. 1:** 371–375, 641
Vol. 2: 239
Guard **Vol. 1:** 247, 280, 335, 366, 395, 610, 614, 663
Vol. 2: 132–137, 177, 379, 413, 438, 864
Vol. 3: 201, 215, 277, 497, 512, 557, 565, 948
Guardian **Vol. 1:** 188, 191, 196, 477, 498, 560
Vol. 2: 161, 213, 215, 254, 307, 581, 737, 838
Vol. 3: 566
Guardian angel **Vol. 1:** 102, 304
Vol. 2: 194
Gudea **Vol. 2:** 679
Guest **Vol. 1:** 249, 271, 612, 686 f.
Vol. 2: 32, 521, 712, 825
Vol. 3: 49, 160, 424, 589, 744 f., 759
Guest room **Vol. 1:** 690
Vol. 3: 177–189
Guidance **Vol. 1:** 308, 485, 512, 579, 655
Vol. 2: 215, 296, 460, 875
Vol. 3: 334, 702, 720, 753, 777, 938
Guide **Vol. 1:** 118, 225, 351 f., 423, 484, 543, 565, 567–570, 585, 654
Vol. 2: 70, 216, 364, 412, 509
Vol. 3: 105, 163, **775–780, 935–943,** 1020
Guideline **Vol. 3:** 399
Guild **Vol. 1:** 291 f.
Guile **Vol. 2:** 270
Vol. 3: 469
Guileless **Vol. 1:** 561
Vol. 2: 470–474
Vol. 3: 691
Guilt **Vol. 1:** 85, 89, 221–224, 237, 294, 324, 331, 344, 349, 374, 397, 433, 436–438, 448, 452, 463, 479, 554, 556, 562 f., 590, 608, 611, 652, 674, 698 f., 702, 732
Vol. 2: 72, 78, **137–145,** 151, 155, 166, 175, 197, 215, 225–227, 239, 263, 366, 386, 400, 405 f., 416 f., 420, 457, 460, 544, 567 f., 583 f., 768 f.
Vol. 3: 41, 98, 105, 150 f., 153 f., 156, 162, 196, 202, 359, 430, 514, 529, 535, 573 f., 577–579, 586, 720, 725, 756, 779, 818, 823 f., 856, 923, 925, 932, 1040
Guilt-offering **Vol. 3:** 155, 196, 428, 856
Guiltless **Vol. 1:** 563
Vol. 3: 257
Guilty **Vol. 1:** 373, 390, 413, 436, 449, 458, 500, 506, 516, 524, 578, 607, 609
Vol. 2: 137, 237, 363, 365, 368, 370, 407, 463, 667, 727
Vol. 3: 310, 342 f., 355, 420, 448, 574, 740
Gulf **Vol. 1:** 240, 303, 640,. 670
Vol. 2: 185
Gullet **Vol. 3:** 679
Gum **Vol. 2:** 293 f., 349
Gunkel, Hermann **Vol. 1:** 68
Vol. 3: 85
Gush **Vol. 1:** 682
Gutiérrez, Gustavo **Vol. 3:** 973–975
Güttgemanns, E. **Vol. 3:** 1123, 1142

H source **Vol. 1: 61**
Haaraloth **Vol. 3:** 1010
Habakkuk **Vol. 1:** 66
Vol. 3: 78, 366
Habiru **Vol. 2:** 305
Habit **Vol. 2:** 437 f., 547, 790
Habitation **Vol. 2: 247–251,** 925 f.
Habitual **Vol. 2:** 391
Hack **Vol. 1:** 726
Hadad-rimmon **Vol. 3:** 275
Hades **Vol. 1:** 101, 118, 205, 303, 419–421, 438, 464, 674, 677
Vol. 2: 29 f., 85, 186, **205–210,** 284, 433, 482, 490, 701, 727, 731
Vol. 3: 54, 260, 383, 387, 678, 683, 856, 946, 984
Hadrian **Vol. 1:** 309, 328
Vol. 2: 308, 333, 792, 898
Vol. 3: 217, 735
Haemorrhage **Vol. 1:** 682 f.
Vol. 3: 987
Haenchen, E. **Vol. 3:** 63
Hagar **Vol. 1:** 76, **80 f.,** 411, 531 f., 650
Vol. 2: 452, 755
Vol. 3: 594, 1014, 1057, 1070
Haggadah **Vol. 1: 58,** 59, 64, 67, 69 f., 485, 599
Vol. 2: 333, 534, 661
Vol. 3: 244, 669
Haggai **Vol. 1:** 52, 66
Vol. 2: 337
Vol. 3: 78, 783
Hagiographa **Vol. 1: 58 f.,** 63, 66
Vol. 3: 485, 638
Hail **Vol. 1:** 206, 380
Vol. 2: 189, 356, 637, 830
Vol. 3: 846, **1000–1004**
Hair **Vol. 1:** 116, 203 f., 227, 609, 671 f., 682
Vol. 2: 50, 159 f., 162, 197, 465, 657, 661
Vol. 3: 741, 1004, 1099
Hair shirt **Vol. 3:** 120
Hair-splitting **Vol. 3:** 428

Halachah **Vol. 1:** 58, **59,** 64, 67, 69, 334, 485
Vol. 2: 610, 811
Vol. 3: 654, 773 f.
Half-hearted **Vol. 1:** 318
Half-shekel **Vol. 1:** 684
Vol. 3: 752–755, 853, 1179
Halicarnassus **Vol. 3:** 217, 219
Hall **Vol. 1:** 68
Hallel **Vol. 2:** 522, 528
Vol. 3: 669 f.
Hallel cup **Vol. 2: 522**
Hallelujah **Vol. 1:** 97, **99 f.**
Vol. 2: 878
Hallow **Vol. 1:** 310
Vol. 2: 74, 229, 650, 653
Halo **Vol. 3:** 1002 f.
Halt **Vol. 2:** 359, 415
Vol. 3: 254
Ham **Vol. 2:** 622
Hammer **Vol. 2:** 97
Vol. 3: 1097
Hammerer **Vol. 1:** 63
Hammurabi **Vol. 1:** 140
Vol. 2: 200, 555, 582, 612, 677
Vol. 3: 593 f.
Hamper **Vol. 1:** 674
Vol. 2: 221–223, 414
Hananiah **Vol. 3:** 1097 f., 1161
Hand **Vol. 1:** 197, 206, 225, 231, 315, 393, 395, 478 f., 515 f., 540, 546, 561, 609, 636, 645, 650
Vol. 2: 28, 60, 77, 144, **146–153,** 163, 188, 190, 192, 194, 201, 203 f., 225, 230, 235, 237, 252 f., 282, 285, 287, 367 f., 378, 380, 385, 411, 414 f., 423, 513, 571 f., 614, 710, 726, 813, 820, 839, 866, 869, 877
Vol. 3: 105, 108, 212, 243, 256, 475, 588, 696, 716, 749 f., 763, 793, 805, 860, 989, 992
Hand down **Vol. 2:** 311
Vol. 3: 765, **772–775**
Hand of God **Vol. 1:** 623, 655, 738
Vol. 2: 49, 72, 86, 188, 194, 196, 199, 204, 614
Vol. 3: 554, 633, 680, 713, 717, 747, 825, 916
Hand on **Vol. 2:** 171
Hand over **Vol. 2:** 119, 361, **367 f.,** 543
Vol. 3: 135, 471, 1058
Handicraft **Vol. 3:** 1028
Handiwork **Vol. 2:** 574
Handle **Vol. 2:** 270, 275
Handle shamefully **Vol. 2:** 50
Handmaid **Vol. 2:** 119, 262
Handshake **Vol. 2:** 146
Handwriting **Vol. 2:** 146, 148
Handy **Vol. 1:** 475
Hang **Vol. 1:** 265, 389–394, 417
Vol. 2: 291, 321
Vol. 3: 96
Hanker **Vol. 1:** 677
Hannah **Vol. 2:** 116, 260, 856
Vol. 3: 30, 235, 263, 1057 f., 1069, 1072
Hannas **Vol. 3:** 35
Hannibal **Vol. 2:** 290
Hansen's disease **Vol. 2: 464**
Hanukkah **Vol. 1:** 626, 631
Vol. 3: 165
Happen **Vol. 1:** 181
Happiness **Vol. 1:** 216, 501, 640
Vol. 2: 60, 108, 352, 419, 484, 490, 780 f.
Vol. 3: 138, 260, 559, 926, 1034
Happy **Vol. 1:** 79, **206–218**
Harass **Vol. 1:** 226, 727
Vol. 2: 413, 599
Harassment **Vol. 2:** 374
Harbour **Vol. 1:** 645, 743
Vol. 2: 102, 660
Hard **Vol. 1:** 419 f.
Vol. 2: 97, **153–156,** 178, 183 f., 304, 388, 407, 710, 843
Vol. 3: 132, 396, 586
Hard to interpret **Vol. 3:** 124
Hard to understand **Vol. 3: 122–130**
Hard work **Vol. 3:** 858, 936
Hardened, hardening **Vol. 1:** 106, 220, 317, 357, 370–372, 424, 467, 565
Vol. 2: 153–156, 174, 178, 304, 315, 741
Vol. 3: 251, 253, 1020, 1094
Harder **Vol. 2:** 281
Hardhearted **Vol. 2:** 153, 155
Hardness **Vol. 2:** 98, **153–156,** 182
Hardness of heart **Vol. 1:** 384, 429
Vol. 2: 37, **180–184,** 627, 834
Vol. 3: 132, 538
Hardship **Vol. 1:** 262, 420, 563, 645, 647, 727
Vol. 2: 419, 544
Vol. 3: 27, 256, 719–725, **858 f.,** 1162
Harem **Vol. 1:** 560
Vol. 2: 578
Vol. 3: 606, 673, 1058
Harlot **Vol. 1:** 100, 141, 142, 356, 470, 497–499, 501, 593
Vol. 2: 349 f., 365, 475, 486, 575 582 f., 587, 653, 692, 795
Vol. 3: 95, 139, 490, 656, 757, 856, 920, 1068, 1070
Harlotry **Vol. 3:** 267
Harm **Vol. 1:** 443, 451 f., 510, 553, 561, 563, 565, 572
Vol. 2: 28, 862
Vol. 3: 27, 341, 693
Harmful **Vol. 1:** 422, 561, 565, 625
Vol. 2: 27
Harmless **Vol. 1:** 563
Vol. 2: 286
Harmonic **Vol. 1:** 522
Harmonious **Vol. 3:** 687
Harmonization **Vol. 1:** 130, 241
Vol. 3: 283, 296, 654 f., 704
Harmony **Vol. 1:** 113, 206, 209, 498, 595, 627, 692, 716
Vol. 2: 62, 78, 163, 363, 439, 619, 658, 660, 780–782
Vol. 3: 33, 678, 818, 909, 927
Harp **Vol. 3:** 671
Harris, M. J. **Vol. 3: 302–305**
Harrow **Vol. 1:** 726
Harsh **Vol. 1:** 202, 420, 520
Vol. 3: 709

Harshness **Vol. 2:** 256
Harvest **Vol. 1:** 171, 204, 249, 263, 289, 292, 296, 516, 624–627, 719, 722, 724, 733
Vol. 2: 35, 265, 271, 359, 364, 514, 662, 737, 783, 785, 861
Vol. 3: 134, 143, 189, 278, 304, 407, 503, **521–527,** 701, 846, 918
Harvest festival **Vol. 2:** 463, 783
Hasidim **Vol. 2:** 810
Vol. 3: 270, 461
Hasmon **Vol. 1:** 63
Hasmoneans **Vol. 1:** 59, 63, 309, 363
Vol. 2: 308, 310, 337, 810, 812, 849 f.
Vol. 3: 34, 440, 442, 452, 649, 960
Haste **Vol. 1:** 596, 684
Hasten **Vol. 1:** 558
Vol. 2: 246, 315, 385
Vol. 3: 320, 1168
Hasty **Vol. 3:** 953
Hat **Vol. 2:** 160, 162
Hate **Vol. 1:** 202, 255, 359, 409, 424, 525, **553–557,** 727
Vol. 2: 86, 100, 288, 310, 318, 386, 540, 549, 659, 824, 838
Vol. 3: 28, 212, 683, 777, 832, 945, 1045
Hatra-Khorsabad-Nimrud **Vol. 2:** 679
Hatred **Vol. 1:** 458, 539, 553, 555
Vol. 2: 105, 180, 261, 309, 316, 359, 403, 405, 420, 449, 473, 478, 548, 625, 806, 808
Vol. 3: 681, 908, 926
Haughtiness **Vol. 2:** 263, 618
Vol. 3: 29 f.
Haunt **Vol. 2:** 136
Haustafeln **Vol. 3: 928–932,** 1075
Have **Vol. 1:** 137, **635–644**
Have need of **Vol. 3: 956–958**
Have no opportunity **Vol. 3: 833–839**
Have no time **Vol. 3: 833–839**
Have in view **Vol. 2:** 132
Havoc **Vol. 3:** 729
Hay **Vol. 1:** 743 f.
Vol. 2: 210 f.
Hazael **Vol. 3:** 248
Hazardous **Vol. 1:** 725 f.
He who is **Vol. 2:** 69
Head **Vol. 1:** 120, 166 f., 192, 196 f., 203, 230, 232, 238, 241, 294, 301 f., 305, 520, 609, 614, 617, 633 f., 648, 676, 726
Vol. 2: 129, 151, **156–163,** 184, 195, 212 f., 232, 234, 243 f., 249 f., 259, 268, 363, 370, 388, 562 f., 568, 571, 579, 661, 668 f., 691, 722 f.
Vol. 3: 108, 159, 219 f., 298, 310, 390, 403, 504, 556, 670, 741, 865, 1060, 1066
Head of the corner **Vol. 2:** 159
Head of gold **Vol. 2:** 96
Head-covering **Vol. 2: 213**
Head-dress **Vol. 1:** 405
Vol. 3: 715
Headache **Vol. 1:** 163
Headquarters **Vol. 3: 959–967**
Headship **Vol. 3:** 1063 f.
Heal **Vol. 2:** 150, 153 f., **163–172,** 414, 466, 561, 630, 633, 754, 875
Vol. 3: 56, 106, 211, 216, 348, 428, 476, 725, 861, 1000
Healer **Vol. 1:** 600
Vol. 2: 490
Vol. 3: 782, 859
Healing **Vol. 1:** 83, 117, 119–121, 163, 198, 213 f., 219 f., 234, 261, 267, 300, 328 f., 340, 384, 390, 427–429, 443, 454, 487, 489, 509, 516, 529–531, 572, 656, 685, 701, 729
Vol. 2: 85, 121, 141, 151, **163–172,** 185, 379, 396, 448, 464, 466, 553, 560, 595, 597, 601 f., 606, 610, 623, 625, 628, 630 f., 665 f., 712, 715, 801, 865, 920
Vol. 3: 37, 57, 61, 147, 180, 212 f., 261, 357, 408 f., 441 f., 444, 475, 481, 508, 519 f., 651 f., 657, 680, 731, 792, 840, 848, 859–861, 916, 922, 982, 987, 990 f., 997 f., 1043, 1059, 1061, 1108–1110, 1152
Health **Vol. 1:** 119, 240, 727
Vol. 2: 102, **163,** 352, 356 f., 478, 552, 777, 781
Vol. 3: 693, 805
Healthy **Vol. 2:** 102, **169–171**
Vol. 3: 125, 712 f.
Heap **Vol. 1:** 520, 610
Vol. 2: 157
Hear **Vol. 1:** 97, 230, 261, 272, 340, 347, 372, 409, 419, 427, 439, 480, 485 f., 529, 548, 591, 594, 604, 637, 688, 704, 727, 734 f., 742
Vol. 2: 91, 110, 154–156, **172–180,** 203, 257, 285, 313, 358 f., 366, 369, 383, 395, 398, 405, 413, 427, 440, 443, 473, 720, 812, 857 f., 860, 862, 864, 866, 868, 877, 929
Vol. 3: 105, 113 f., 127, 139, 173, 216, 218, 310, 313 f., 513, 528, 544, 744, 822, 868, 1161
Hearer **Vol. 1:** 577, 583, 599, 603, 725
Vol. 2: 269, 379, 459
Vol. 3: 363
Hearing **Vol. 1:** 630, 738
Vol. 3: 1062
Heart **Vol. 1:** 106 f., 151, 169, 184, 212, 225, 230, 232, 240, 248, 261, 308, 311, 318 f., 322, 341, 347, 349–351, 357, 368, 371 f., 379, 418, 424 f., 448, 456 f., 460, 492, 501, 506, 509, 518, 552, 566, 587, 592, 604, 648, 660, 673, 682, 726, 729, 741 f.
Vol. 2: 40, 60, 63, 96, 105, 123, 139, 150, 154–156, 176–178, **180–184,** 197, 217 f., 225, 262, 285, 306, 351, 355, 365, 420 f., 423 f., 444, 446, 468, 470, 492, 565–567, 571, 580, 588, **599 f.,** 641, 670, 727, 736, 831 f., 855, 857, 864
Vol. 3: 69, 102, 106–108, 124 f., 128, 313, 351, 474, 484, 490, 493, 531, 550, 572, 578 f., 685–687, 691, 710, 809, 820, 823 f., 868, 888, 903
Heart of the earth **Vol. 2:** 351 f.
Hearth **Vol. 1:** 653 f.
Heartless **Vol. 2:** 542
Heat **Vol. 1:** 108, 317, 515 f., 652–654, 656, 743
Vol. 2: 601, 628
Vol. 3: 260, 446, 730 f.
Heathen **Vol. 1:** 115, 117, 145, 219–221, 226,

309, 320 f., 398, 416, 424, 451 f., 469, 519, 586, 655, 684 f., 688 f.
Vol. 2: 73 f., 77, 127, 284–286, 296, 307 f., 349 f., 385, 396, 400, 418, 426, 503, 581, 650, 660, 684, 705, **790–795,** 876 f.
Vol. 3: 32, 130, 193, 209, 310, 341–343, 552, 757, 934 f., 940, 944, 1032, 1058, 1064 f.
Heathenism **Vol. 1:** 626
Vol. 2: 407
Heaven **Vol. 1:** 54, 58, 95, 123, 252, 272, 302, 304, 322 f., 379 f., 383, 387, 402, 410, 446, 449, 451, 464, 466, 474, 497, 508 f., 517 f., 522 f., 525 f., 544, 610, 618, 621, 627, 629, 637, 655, 657, 661–665, 669, 674, 689 f., 735
Vol. 2: 29, 31, 37, 40, 42, 45 f., 48, 70 f., 74, 77, 84, 96, 149, 164, 174, **184–196,** 199–202, 204 f., 209 f., 215, 225, 245, 262, 269, 279 f., 282, 299 f., 317, 319, 329, 349, 351, 353, 355, 358 f., 363, 376 f., 380, 383, 391, 452, 459, 486, 494, 499, 555, 614 f., 619, 642, 646, 650, 652 f., 655, 688 f., 691, 727–730, 734, 761, 764, 804, 818 f., 836, 873, 918–920, 928, 931
Vol. 3: 114, 117, 171, 189, 203, 205, 218, 229, 258, 266, 305, 362, 389, 469, 494, 514, 519, 588, 591, 602, 620, 630 f., 634, 674, 687, 692, 694, 736, 741, 781, 807, 813, 941, 946, 984, 1006, 1054, 1148
Heaven of heavens **Vol. 2: 189**
Heaven, new (→ New heaven)
Heavenly **Vol. 1:** 547, 609, 619, 627
Vol. 2: 144, 147, 281, 294, 326, 332, 387, 925
Vol. 3: 42, 231
Heavenly army **Vol. 1:** 104
Vol. 2: 191
Heavenly banquet **Vol. 3:** 652 f.
Heavenly beings **Vol. 1:** 101, 619
Vol. 2: 376
Vol. 3: 287
Heavenly bodies **Vol. 3: 733–737,** 835, 842
Heavenly body (→ Resurrection body)
Heavenly calling **Vol. 2:** 62
Heavenly city **Vol. 1:** 279, 327, 387, 691
Vol. 3: 397
Heavenly council **Vol. 1:** 363
Heavenly dress **Vol. 1:** 314
Heavenly gift **Vol. 1:** 372
Vol. 2: 270
Vol. 3: 809
Heavenly home **Vol. 1:** 460, 684, 691
Heavenly host **Vol. 1:** 100
Vol. 2: 602
Vol. 3: 964
Heavenly Jerusalem (→ Jerusalem, Heavenly)
Heavenly man **Vol. 1:** 85
Vol. 2: 192, 646
Vol. 3: 632
Heavenly powers **Vol. 1:** 90
Vol. 2: 608 f.
Heavenly sanctuary **Vol. 1:** 587, 677
Vol. 2: 64, 80
Vol. 3: 795, 888
Heavenly sea **Vol. 3:** 984
Heavenly temple **Vol. 3:** 789
Heavenly wall **Vol. 2:** 646
Heavenly world **Vol. 1:** 103, 586, 740
Vol. 2: 48
Vol. 3: 829, 936, 941
Heavy **Vol. 1: 260–263**
Vol. 2: 154
Vol. 3: 184
Heavy shower **Vol. 3: 1000–1004**
Heavy-laden **Vol. 1:** 262
Vol. 2: 262
Hebraism **Vol. 1:** 286, 290, 615
Vol. 2: 175, 832, 837, 876, 895
Hebrew **Vol. 1:** 51, 68 f., 71
Vol. 2: 125 f., 258, **304–323,** 556, 849, 928
Vol. 3: 481, 484 f.
Hebrew view of truth **Vol. 3:** 889
Hebrews **Vol. 1:** 52, 68, 304, 359, 371, 531, 619
Vol. 2: 42, 199, 204, 318, 635
Vol. 3: 107
Hebron **Vol. 3:** 464
Hecataeus **Vol. 2:** 639
Hecate **Vol. 2:** 485
Hedge **Vol. 3:** 407, **948–952**
Hedonism **Vol. 2:** 677
Heed **Vol. 1:** 410, 704
Vol. 2: 172, 351, 370
Vol. 3: 114, 758, 1154
Heedlessness **Vol. 3:** 394
Heel **Vol. 1:** 241
Vol. 2: 431
Hegel, G. W. F. **Vol. 3:** 896, 900 f.
Hegesippus **Vol. 3:** 621, 653, 796
Heidegger, Martin **Vol. 1:** 57, 65
Vol. 3: 898, 1123, 1127, 1130, 1139 f., 1143
Heifer **Vol. 1:** 115
Vol. 3: 154, 159
Height **Vol. 1:** 92, 123, 253, 288, 608
Vol. 2: 184 f., 195 f., **197–205,** 209, 225, 423, 610
Vol. 3: 32, 630, 1014
Heilsgeschichte **Vol. 1: 59**
Heir **Vol. 1:** 80, 185, 208, 214, 286, 289, 532, 556, 669, 719, 731
Vol. 2: 122, 183, 238, 247, **295–304,** 570, 828
Vol. 3: 72, 211, 634, 642, 647, 920, 1057, 1067
Heiress **Vol. 2:** 577
Vol. 3: 1074
Helena **Vol. 3:** 457
Heli **Vol. 3:** 662
Heliodorus **Vol. 3:** 156
Heliopolis **Vol. 2:** 639
Helios **Vol. 3:** 730
Hell **Vol. 1:** 54, 101, 173, 231, 264, 433, 436, 449, 462 f., 509, 559, 623, 653, 655–657
Vol. 2: 30, 37, 85, 136, 143, 184, 186, 188, 191, 196 f., 204, **205–210,** 265, 298, 351, 370, 385, 490 f., 733 f., 764, 791 f., 931
Vol. 3: 99, 110 f., 201, 262, 265, 305 f., 359, 388, 446, 448, 470, 476, 586, 602, 686 f., 946, 984, 1054
Hellanicus of Tripolis **Vol. 2:** 506
Hellas **Vol. 2:** 898
Hellen **Vol. 2:** 124

Hellene **Vol. 2:** 790
Hellenism **Vol. 1: 59,** 63, 68 f., 124, 377, 432, 444, 493, 539, 570, 640, 646
Vol. 2: 92, 224, 277, 307, 311, 324, 372 f., 638, 664
Vol. 3: 31, 97, 127, 287, 325, 428, 440, 479, 577, 634, 685, 729, 740, 748, 776, 924, 931, 959, 1035, 1079, 1147
Hellenist **Vol. 1:** 642
Vol. 2: 124, 152, 311, 740
Vol. 3: 59, 65 f., 465, 548, 908
Hellenist source **Vol. 3:** 700
Hellenistic **Vol. 1:** 399, 409, 435, 442, 468, 474, 496, 514, 539, 547, 560, 562, 570, 601, 613, 645 f., 674, 677 f., 692, 705, 707, 711
Vol. 2: 73, 93, 99, 104, 108 f., 111, 113, 125, 140, 142, 159, 173, 187, 207, 214, 234, 250, 257 f., 281, 284 f., 311, 324, 372 f., 400, 403, 660, 811, 849, 862, 898, 900, 926, 928
Vol. 3: 35, 58 f., 69 f., 101, 138, 199, 217, 220 f., 324, 331, 333, 453, 458, 610 f., 613, 618, 626, 631–633, 635 f., 644–647, 651, 680–682, 685, 689 f., 692, 761, 779, 832, 855, 861–863, 889, 891, 928, 930 f., 933, 940, 958, 989, 998 f., 1029, 1033–1035, 1074 f.
Hellenistic Christianity **Vol. 1:** 601
Vol. 2: 103, 785
Vol. 3: 195
Hellenistic Judaism **Vol. 1:** 77, 216, 357, 487, 499, 502, 512, 522–524, 598, 604, 645, 648, 674, 685, 688, 742
Vol. 2: 77, 93, 99, 241, 324, 396, 638, 651, 661, 745, 804, 810, 821, 823
Vol. 3: 41, 59, 853, 931, 1029, 1033, 1052, 1072, 1117, 1149, 1167
Hellenistic period **Vol. 1:** 62, 64
Vol. 2: 311
Vol. 3: 638, 739, 741, 781, 913, 952
Hellenistic philosophy **Vol. 2:** 399
Vol. 3: 827, 1034 f., 1169
Hellenistic religion **Vol. 1:** 61
Vol. 3: 861
Hellenizing **Vol. 2:** 70, 125, 321, 372
Vol. 3: 452, 635
Hellespont **Vol. 2:** 233
Helmet **Vol. 2:** 97, 244, 925
Vol. 3: 200
Helmsman **Vol. 1:** 198
Help **Vol. 1:** 98, 101, 198, 248, 252, 287 f., 294, 328, 332, 344, 409 f., 464, 468, 474, 509, 522, 531, 544, 546, 563, 567, 607, 614, 625, 645, 678, 686
Vol. 2: 71, 83, 105, 116, 121, 128, 141, 175, 230, 255, 257, 261, 265–267, 299, 326, 331 f., 353, 355, 363, 423, 428 f., 446, 468, 593, 600, 622, 628, 631, 654, 710, 806, 820 f., 825, 844, 855, 860, 877
Vol. 3: 30, 95, 210, 232 f., 341, 356, 727, 782, 802, 836
Helper **Vol. 1: 88–92,** 259, 600, 637
Vol. 2: 262, 281, 332, 363, 576, 709, 724
Vol. 3: 544–549
Helpful **Vol. 3: 544–549**
Helpless **Vol. 1:** 218, 280 f., 284, 288, 312, 358, 407, 548, 716
Vol. 2: 168, 260, 413, 435, 737, 813
Vol. 3: 380, 1073
Hen **Vol. 1:** 174
Henceforth **Vol. 3:** 252
Henderson, I. **Vol. 3:** 1139
Hendiadys **Vol. 2:** 878
Vol. 3: 319, 814
Hengel, Martin **Vol. 3:** 979
Hephaestus **Vol. 1:** 654
Vol. 2: 115
Hera **Vol. 2:** 85
Heracleitus' antitheses **Vol. 3:** 929
Heracles **Vol. 2:** 643, 849
Vol. 3: 634
Heraclitus **Vol. 1:** 63, 654
Vol. 3: 1081 f., 1084
Herald **Vol. 1:** 298, 407, 410, 477, 648, 699
Vol. 2: 108, 111, 682
Vol. 3: 45, **48–57,** 170, 634
Herb **Vol. 1:** 116, 633
Vol. 2: 210 f., 522, 558, 693 f., 813
Vol. 3: 1053
Herculanum **Vol. 3:** 394
Hercules **Vol. 2:** 232, 430
Herd **Vol. 1:** 252, 625
Vol. 2: 410, 412, 841
Vol. 3: 564–568
Herder, J. G. **Vol. 3:** 1123
Herdsman **Vol. 3:** 811
Hereditary **Vol. 1:** 407
Vol. 2: 372, 374
Heresy **Vol. 1:** 50, 247, 556, 740
Vol. 2: 171, 405, 432, 449, 559
Vol. 3: 181, 314, 768, 770 f., 930, 1018
Heretic **Vol. 1:** 117, 413, 416, 462, 466, 533, 535, 632, 708
Vol. 2: 152, 312, 557, 574, 866, 903
Vol. 3: 70, 401, 439, 765, 768, 844, 942, 988, 1119
Heretical **Vol. 1:** 347, 533 f., 607
Vol. 2: 358, 406, 608, 718, 920
Heritage **Vol. 1:** 78, 190
Vol. 2: 295–304, 311, 845
Vol. 3: 140
Hermas **Vol. 1:** 51, 339, 577
Vol. 2: 219, 264
Vol. 3: 929
Hermeneutic, New **Vol. 1:** 584
Hermeneutical circle **Vol. 1:** 584
Hermeneutics **Vol. 1:** 57, **59,** 581–584
Vol. 2: 907
Vol. 3: 335, 1137, 1142
Hermes **Vol. 1:** 60, 101, 552, 579, 654
Vol. 2: 85, 214, 503
Vol. 3: 50, 679, 717, 1085
Hermetic **Vol. 3:** 645
Hermetic literature **Vol. 1: 60,** 522, 595
Vol. 2: 99
Vol. 3: 123, 146, 206, 483, 719, 936, 952, 1034
Hermodios **Vol. 2:** 372
Hermon **Vol. 3:** 1010, 1012

Hero **Vol. 1:** 101, 431, 490, 645
Vol. 2: 92, 498, 562, 602
Vol. 3: 346, 644, 673
Herod Agrippa I **Vol. 1:** 341, 343, 410
Vol. 2: 378, 511, 789, 850
Vol. 3: 908
Herod Agrippa II **Vol. 1:** 324, 453, 590, 593
Vol. 2: 378, 451, 511, 695
Vol. 3: 40, 65, 389
Herod Antipas (tetrarch) **Vol. 1:** 118, 156, 168, 283, 346, 430, 554, 696
Vol. 2: 63, 378, 383, 464, 550, 799, 801, 812, 849
Vol. 3: 361, 441–443, 507, 540 f., 603, 742, 757,1059
Herod Archelaus **Vol. 2:** 849
Vol. 3: 324, 1179
Herod the Great **Vol. 1:** 125, 170, 430, 512, 560, 737
Vol. 2: 235, 308, 378, 511, 550, 578, 849
Vol. 3: 35, 324, 341, 419, 441–443, 452, 710, 756, 783, 788, 872, 921, 1058, 1068, 1179
Herod, king of Chalcis **Vol. 3:** 40
Herod Philip (→ Philip, Herod)
Herodians **Vol. 2:** 462, 850
Vol. 3: **441–443,** 884, 979
Herodias **Vol. 3:** 361, 540 f., 742, 1071
Herodotos **Vol. 1:** 319
Vol. 2: 247, 557, 643, 678
Herod's temple **Vol. 3:** 788 f.
Heroism **Vol. 1:** 433, 435, 437
Hertz, H. **Vol. 3:** 899
Hesiod **Vol. 1:** 640
Vol. 2: 95–97
Hesitate **Vol. 1:** 326
Vol. 2: 374
Vol. 3: 839
Hestia **Vol. 1:** 653 f.
Heyne, C.G. **Vol. 3:** 1138
Hezekiah **Vol. 1:** 295, 509
Vol. 2: 320, 627
Vol. 3: 202, 235, 426, 609, 788, 853, 879, 951
Hiddekel **Vol. 3:** 986
Hidden **Vol. 1:** 50, 244, 252, 282, 313, 385, 425, 504, 587, 604, 609 f., 629, 651, 676, 692, 720
Vol. 2: 83, 112, 147, 149, 176, 183, 190, 197, **211–220,** 255, 263, 288, 354, 377, 397, 401, 461 f., 490, 762, 833 f.
Vol. 3: 54, 77, 132, 138, 310, 317, 321 f., 344, 445, 517, 652, 833, 1031
Hide **Vol. 1:** 50, 313, 346, 401, 585, 701
Vol. 2: **211–220,** 240, 312, 401, 412, 773, 835
Vol. 3: 309, 312 f., 324, 401, 493, 500, 514
Hideout **Vol. 3:** 380
Hierapolis **Vol. 1:** 319
Hierarchical **Vol. 1:** 302
Vol. 3: 1063
Hierarchy **Vol. 1:** 382, 636, 667, 725, 740
Vol. 3: 548
Hieroglyphics **Vol. 1:** 574
High **Vol. 2:** **198–208,** 617 f.
Vol. 3: 29, **1009–1013**
High D. M. **Vol. 3:** 1130
High calling **Vol. 3:** 142
High God **Vol. 3:** 982
High place **Vol. 2:** 199
Vol. 3: 1010
High position **Vol. 2:** 200
High priest (→ Priest, High)
High priestly prayer **Vol. 2:** 231, 654, 723, 929
Vol. 3: 38, 321, 362
High-born **Vol. 1:** 188
High-handed **Vol. 1:** 400
Vol. 2: 510
High-sounding **Vol. 2:** 198
Higher **Vol. 1:** 674
Vol. 2: 259
Higher families **Vol. 2:** 195
Highest **Vol. 2:** 71, **198–200**
Highway **Vol. 1:** 411
Vol. 3: **935–943**
Highwayman **Vol. 3:** **377–379**
Hilary **Vol. 2:** 507
Hilkiah **Vol. 2:** 555
Vol. 3: 485, 878
Hill **Vol. 1:** 239 f., 683
Vol. 2: 217, 225, 262, 326, 329
Hill, D. **Vol. 3:** 85 f., 154
Hill of Salt **Vol. 3:** 444
Hillel **Vol. 1:** 67, 69, 153, 155, 499, 506, 580
Vol. 2: 311, 442, 579
Vol. 3: 494, 534, 538
Hilly **Vol. 3:** **1008 f.**
Hind **Vol. 1:** 520
Hinder **Vol. 1:** 149, 284, 592 f., 636, 730, 740
Vol. 2: **220–223,** 285, 418, 435, 708, 781, 843
Vol. 3: 254, 320, 719
Hindrance **Vol. 2:** **220,** 864, 868, 875
Vol. 3: 857, 994
Hinge **Vol. 2:** 59
Hinnom **Vol. 1:** 93
Vol. 2: 208
Vol. 3: 110, 426, 912
Hippo, synod of **Vol. 1:** 52
Hippocrates **Vol. 2:** 414, 464
Hippocratic oath **Vol. 2:** 166
Vol. 3: **738 f.,** 840
Hippodrome **Vol. 1:** 645
Hippolytus **Vol. 2:** 506
Vol. 3: 36, 245
Hiram **Vol. 2:** 97
Hire **Vol. 2:** 317, 386
Vol. 3: **138–144,** 349
Hired servant **Vol. 3:** **138–144,** 847
Hired shepherd **Vol. 3:** 565
Hireling **Vol. 1:** 559
Vol. 3: 567
Hisda, Rabbi **Vol. 3:** 488
Historian **Vol. 2:** 335
Vol. 3: 289, 297, 336
Historical **Vol. 1:** 437, 472, 518, 524, 597, 601, 603, 605, 617, 638, 686, 707
Vol. 2: 56, 100, 112, 289, 316, 628, 636, 646, 695, 718
Vol. 3: 58, 64 f., 287, 299, 301, 922
Historical background **Vol. 1:** 57–59, 68, 70, 130, 582, 628 f.
Historical criticism (→ Criticism, Historical)

Historical perspective **Vol. 1:** 60
Historical process **Vol. 3:** 826, 831
Historical relativity **Vol. 1:** 583
Historical reliability **Vol. 3:** 654
Historical truth **Vol. 3:** 894
Historical value **Vol. 3:** 862
Historicality **Vol. 1:** 583
Historicism **Vol. 1: 60**
Historicity **Vol. 1:** 678
Vol. 2: 621, 812
Vol. 3: 284, 293, 302, 334, 509, 627, 662
Historie **Vol. 1:** 58, **60**
Historiography **Vol. 2:** 890
Vol. 3: 65
History **Vol. 1:** 50, 53, 56, 59 f., 66, 71 f., 101, 109–111, 124, 126, 137, 142, 167 f., 182, 190, 200, 208 f., 224, 243 f., 258, 272, 290, 308, 333, 336, 338, 345, 347, 366 f., 373, 377–381, 383, 398, 411, 426, 434, 477, 504, 523, 531, 538, 541, 551, 563, 583, 596, 599, 604, 626, 632, 634, 640 f., 655, 679, 694, 700, 713, 716, 737
Vol. 2: 37, 48, 52, 69 f., 72, 100, 109, 116 f., 119, 129, 158, 190, 194 f., 204, 206, 229, 240, 260, 262, 268, 278 f., 285, 289, 295, 297 f., 300, 305 f., 310, 312, 314, 316, 320, 328, 331, 340, 342 f., 353, 361, 393 f., 396 f., 404, 407, 425, 442, 472, 509, 514, 540, 566, 590, 609, 622, 626, 644, 663–666, 691 f., 697, 714, 716–718, 727, 784, 863, 888, 891, 906–908, 914, 917–919, 922, 927 f., 931
Vol. 3: 56, 58, 64 f., 69, 79 f., 86, 88 f., 117, 135, 180, 190 f., 193, 202, 210, 218, 225, 235–238, 246, 257, 268, 275, 280, 289, 301 f., 312, 319, 325, 332–336, 399, 440, 452, 495, 502–505, 543, 550, 578, 631 f., 636 f., 643, 649, 652–654, 657 f., 660, 680, 720, 731, 734, 771, 785, 828 f., 836, 841–844, 846, 871, 899, 905, 926, 969, 986, 1014, 1018, 1020, 1032 f., 1069, 1087 f., 1094 f., 1099–1105, 1112, 1114, 1147 f., 1153, 1166
History of ideas **Vol. 1:** 694
Vol. 2: 490
History of Judah **Vol. 2: 306–308**
History of Israel **Vol. 2:** 35, 70, **306–308,** 315, 319, 797, 807, 862, 871
History of redaction **Vol. 1: 67**
History of religions **Vol. 1: 60 f.,** 130
Vol. 2: 223, 453, 493
Vol. 3: 464
History of religions school **Vol. 3:** 635 f.
Hittite code **Vol. 3:** 419
Hittite law **Vol. 3:** 94 f.
Hittites **Vol. 2:** 98
Vol. 3: 656
Hivites **Vol. 2:** 636
Hjelmsley, L. **Vol. 3:** 1126
Hoar frost **Vol. 1:** 683
Hodayot **Vol. 2:** 622
Vol. 3: 487, 669
Hold **Vol. 1:** 560, 595, 597, 635 f., 712, 741 f.
Vol. 2: 64, 133, 135, 142, 244, 611
Vol. 3: 716–718
Hold back **Vol. 1:** 607, 722
Vol. 2: 222
Hold fast **Vol. 1:** 455
Vol. 2: 301, 315, 350, 654
Vol. 3: 737, 860, 1047
Hold out **Vol. 2:** 240
Hold to **Vol. 2: 451–453**
Hold together **Vol. 2:** 263, 546
Holiness **Vol. 1:** 101, 151, 175, 204, 219, 221, 225, 258, 304, 386, 473, 538, 627, 655, 673, 675
Vol. 2: 76, 79, 91, 129, 144, 217, **224–232, 236–238,** 244, 253, 307, 415, 447, 492, 676, 689, 782, 807 878
Vol. 3: 79, 215, 342, 361, 514, 578, 651, 750, 776, 778, 786, 805, 934, 1064
Holiness code **Vol. 1: 61,** 65, 626
Hollow **Vol. 1:** 546
Holocaust **Vol. 3:** 421
Holy **Vol. 1:** 74, 108, 117, 189, 235, 243, 300, 305, 336, 339, 368, 370, 424, 451, 474, 542, 545, 585, 621, 634, 645, 647, 653 f., 657, 719
Vol. 2: 56, 70–72, 78, 91–93, 129, 187f., **223–238,** 248, 253, 293, 302, 307, 324, 326, 445, 473, 549, 650, 653, 669, 862 f., 865, 868, 885
Vol. 3: 32, 36, 38, 93, **100–102,** 105, 107 f., 171, 174, 207, 221, 228, 321, 395, 407, 534, 645, 690, 779, 785, 794, 852, 870, 892
Holy assembly **Vol. 1:** 272
Holy city **Vol. 1:** 200
Vol. 2: 231, 327, 700, 803
Vol. 3: 436, 490, 734
Holy communion **Vol. 2:** 644
Holy congregation **Vol. 1:** 296
Holy family **Vol. 1:** 290
Holy garments **Vol. 1:** 151
Holy of holies **Vol. 1:** 223, 280
Vol. 2: 190, 230, 293 f.
Vol. 3: 156, 543, 794 f., 812, 814 f., 941
Holy nation **Vol. 2:** 380, 839
Holy one **Vol. 1:** 101, 266, 293
Vol. 2: 71, 221, 227, 231, 238, 541
Vol. 3: 474, 636, 800, 893, 1028
Holy One of Israel **Vol. 2:** 225 f.
Holy ones **Vol. 2:** 298, 302
Holy people **Vol. 2: 226 f.,** 307, 380, 797 f.
Holy place **Vol. 1:** 114, 121 f., 478, 685, 687
Vol. 2: 230, 325, 328, 718, 866
Vol. 3: 41, 104, 199, 239, 323, 418, 433, 436, 543, 785–787, 794 f., 812, 814, 1005
Holy race **Vol. 2: 232**
Holy Roman emperors **Vol. 3:** 386
Holy root **Vol. 3:** 869
Holy seed **Vol. 3:** 654
Holy servant **Vol. 2:** 229
Holy Spirit (→ Spirit, Holy)
Holy tent **Vol. 1:** 211
Holy war **Vol. 1:** 382, 429, 646, 650
Vol. 2: 225, 374, 650, 830, 888
Vol. 3: 248, 590, 960, 963
Holy writings **Vol. 1: 58**
Vol. 3: 483
Homage **Vol. 1:** 246, 347
Vol. 2: 92 f., 186, 194, 201, 615, 859, 876 f.

Home **Vol. 1:** 327 f., 449, 460, 615 f., 652, 654, 672, 687, 690
Vol. 2: 193 f., 244, 251, 305, 394, 461, 575, 788, 818, 839 f.
Vol. 3: 205, 231, 286, 476, 562
Home, be at **Vol. 2: 788–790**
Homeland **Vol. 1:** 615, 684, 686, 690
Vol. 2: 194, 266, 311, 788
Homeless **Vol. 2:** 386, 822
Vol. 3: 547, 560, 623
Homer **Vol. 3:** 49
Homesickness **Vol. 1:** 460
Homicide **Vol. 1:** 429
Homiletic **Vol. 1:** 628
Homily **Vol. 1:** 737
Homoeopathic **Vol. 3:** 982
Homonymy **Vol. 3:** 1124
Homosexual **Vol. 1:** 448, 461, 497
Vol. 2: 569–571
Homosexuality **Vol. 2:** 142
Vol. 3: 95, 104
Honest **Vol. 3:** 351, 379, 758, 875, 882
Honesty **Vol. 1:** 413, 695
Vol. 3: 564, 572, 785, 879
Honey **Vol. 1:** 682 f.
Vol. 3: 382
Honi the circle-drawer **Vol. 3:** 638
Honorarium **Vol. 1:** 198
Vol. 2: 50
Honour **Vol. 1:** 111, 120, 122, 192, 195, 198–200, 220, 255, 287, 290, 304, 315, 336, 344, 386, 405, 415, 431, 435, 453, 470, 474, 478, 552 f., 572, 594, 616 f., 619, 645, 647–649, 665, 668 f., 687 f., 715, 717, 722
Vol. 2: 44–52, 73, 80, 91 f., 94, 101, 105, 116, 119, 127, 134, 146, 159, 191, 203 f., 229, 257, 265, 278, 295, 305, 319, 334, 336, 340, 343, 349, 352, 363, 367, 417, 424, 435, 538, 550, 674, 712, 772, 806, 840, 844, 863, 871, 878, 890
Vol. 3: 52, 138, 142, 262, 281, 342, 388, 588, 594 f., 652, 672, 717, 752, 755, 800, 809, 863, 871, 948, 953, 1007, 1053, 1055, 1064
Honourable **Vol. 1:** 442, 521, 524
Vol. 2: 91, 95, 105, 587, 654
Honourable purpose **Vol. 3:** 912
Hook **Vol. 3:** 182
Hope **Vol. 1:** 56, 78 f., 98, 109, 147, 180, 216 f., 229, 236, 261 f., 274, 279, 282, 289 f., 305, 320, 323 f., 328 f., 337, 372, 385 f., 400 f., 406, 426 f., 434, 440, 444, 466 f., 492, 504 f., 547, 554, 562, 564, 571, 586, 589, 592, 596, 598, 601, 604, 608 f., 629, 638 f., 641, 644, 658, 672, 679, 683, 694, 697, 710, 712–714, 724 f., 730
Vol. 2: 47, 51, 54, 73, 82, 111, 118 f., 122 f., 142, 178, 208, 218, **238–246,** 249, 263, 266, 301, 307, 313, 315, 337, 339, 342, 357, 360, 366, 377, 385, 399, 418 f., 447, 479, 495, 515, 531, 545, 550, 654, 674, 736, 764, 771–774, 776, 783, 789, 791, 807, 809, 822, 842, 858, 874, 887, 896, 901, 909, 914, 919, 925 f.
Vol. 3: 74, 141, 143, 200, 202, 214, 220, 225, 228, 249 f., 252, 257, 286, 317, 320, 341, 361 f., 389, 528 f., 556, 563, 578, 649, 682, 687, 702, 725, 744, 810, 813, 818, 836, 839, 845, 866 f., **968–970,** 1005, 1025, 1047, 1094, 1151
Hope of glory **Vol. 2:** 47
Hope of Israel **Vol. 2:** 772
Hope of salvation **Vol. 3:** 965
Hopeless **Vol. 1:** 336, 464, 596, 716
Vol. 2: 118, 215, 283, 413, 418 f.
Hopelessness **Vol. 2:** 131, 138
Hophra **Vol. 3:** 918
Horace **Vol. 2:** 239
Horae **Vol. 3:** 845
Horeb **Vol. 2:** 281, 636 f., 892
Vol. 3: 252, 1005, 1013, 1091
Horizon **Vol. 1:** 583 f., 681
Vol. 2: 198
Horn **Vol. 1:** 114, 118, 121
Vol. 2: 689, 693, 754
Vol. 3: 191, 198, 212, 419, 436, **714–716,** 815, 873
Horn of salvation **Vol. 3:** 715
Horned One **Vol. 3:** 715
Horror **Vol. 1:** 75, 114, 431, 437, **526–530,** 610, 622
Vol. 2: 622
Horse **Vol. 1:** 117, 203, 205, 510, 657, 743
Vol. 2: 189, 226, 232, 257, 538, 550, 572, 574
Vol. 3: 209, 266, 362, 490, 557, 1162
Hort, F. J. A. **Vol. 1:** 70
Hosanna **Vol. 1:** 97, **100,** 281
Vol. 3: 792
Hosea **Vol. 1:** 66, 109, 255, 290, 320, 368, 498, 532
Vol. 2: 240, 374, 396, 541, 576, 580, 583, 597, 754
Vol. 3: 79, 208, 267, 355, 592, 721, 1093, 1103
Hosea's children **Vol. 2:** 581, 797
Hosius of Cordova **Vol. 2:** 506
Hospice **Vol. 1:** 687 f.
Vol. 2: 823
Hospitable **Vol. 1:** 686
Hospitality **Vol. 1:** 686–690
Vol. 2: 358, 538, **547–550,** 590, 807
Vol. 3: 443 f., 561, 568, 744, 746, 1065, 1075
Host **Vol. 1:** 102, 280, 332, 380, 522, 647, 666, 690, 733
Vol. 2: 69, 189
Vol. 3: 589
Host of heaven **Vol. 2: 189,** 368
Hostages **Vol. 3:** 146
Hostile **Vol. 1:** 113, 269, 328, 407, 422, 451, 501, 507, 510, 512, 553, 555, 597, 610, 650, 680 f., 683 f., 687, 693
Vol. 2: 124, 150, 239, 309, 394, 491, 712, **739–742,** 816
Vol. 3: 127 f., 171, 198, 227, 346, 747, 983, 1006
Hostilities **Vol. 1:** 625
Hostility **Vol. 1:** 398, 402, 419, 430, 515, 555, 688, 724
Vol. 2: 311, 806 f., 827
Vol. 3: 39, 172, 185, 345, 452, 721, 1049

Hot **Vol. 1: 317–319**
Vol. 2: 727, 844, 881
Vol. 3: 321
Hour **Vol. 1:** 321, 324, 420, 423, 627, 629, 710
Vol. 2: 55, 217, 359, 384, 892, 917, 927
Vol. 3: 605, 826, 833, **845–849**
House **Vol. 1:** 149, 170, 174, 225, 272, 274, 292, 300–303, 308, 426, 440, 498, 596, 598, 617, 632, 638, 641 f., 655, 658, 660–662, 687 f., 695, 697, 716, 730, 734, 738
Vol. 2: 40, 129, 177, 189, 193, 236, **247–256,** 285, 290, 428, 489, 509, 714, 732, 738, 832, 837, 873, 925, 929
Vol. 3: 120, 189, 225, 229, 382, 390 f., 435, 465, 468, 472, 504, 647–650, 707, 782 f., 786, 789, 910, 915, 1001, 1005, 1032, 1108
House of David **Vol. 1: 426,** 544
Vol. 2: 248, 319, 336 f., 342, 374, 730, 732 f., 866
Vol. 3: 649 f., 652, 715, 873, 1073
House of God **Vol. 1:** 140
Vol. 2: 67, 194, 247–249, 317, 327
Vol. 3: 647, 783, 786, 789, 792, 853
House of holiness **Vol. 2:** 312
House of Israel **Vol. 1:** 174, 368, 726
Vol. 2: 226, **305,** 314 f., 320, 400, 695, 732
Vol. 3: 65, 453 f., 567
House of Jacob **Vol. 3:** 1012
House of the Lord **Vol. 2:** 247
House of prayer **Vol. 2:** 325
Vol. 3: 430, 791
House of steadfastness **Vol. 2:** 312
House of truth **Vol. 2:** 312
House-church **Vol. 1:** 301 f.
Vol. 2: 250, 550
Vol. 3: 547
House-owner **Vol. 2:** 608
House-steward **Vol. 2: 254**
House-tables **Vol. 3: 928–932**
House-wall **Vol. 3: 948–950**
Household **Vol. 1:** 156, 159 f., 167, 194, 198, 256, 303, 472, 614, 633, 689, 691
Vol. 2: 83, 122, **247–256,** 318, 487, 510, 562, 794
Vol. 3: 928 f.
Household of God **Vol. 3:** 934
Household gods **Vol. 3:** 377, 533
Household servant **Vol. 2:** 164
Vol. 3: 609
Householder **Vol. 2:** 714
Vol. 3: 378
Howl **Vol. 3:** 1051
Huldah **Vol. 3:** 1057
Huleh **Vol. 3:** 991
Human **Vol. 2:** 355, 359, 362, 439, **564–569,** 659
Human life **Vol. 1:** 58
Human nature **Vol. 3:** 926
Human race **Vol. 1:** 665
Human sacrifice **Vol. 1:** 352
Vol. 3: 421, **425 f.**
Humane **Vol. 3:** 429, 448, 981
Humanistic attitude **Vol. 2:** 99
Humanitarian **Vol. 2:** 43, 667
Vol. 3: 406, 410–412, 746
Humanity **Vol. 1:** 86, 233, 255, 427, 474, 521, 524, 547, 556, 625, 631, 672, 675, 678, 680, 694, 709, 718 f.
Vol. 2: 57 f., 126, 267, 287, 349, 441, 564 f., 607, 671, 799, 912
Vol. 3: 653, 724
Humanity of Jesus **Vol. 2:** 36
Humble **Vol. 1:** 109, 308, 345, 479, 495, 547, 584, 587, 609, 612
Vol. 2: 149, 203, 225, 244, **256–264,** 417, 422, 427, 435, 617 f., 821, 825, 856, 864
Vol. 3: 445, 685, 691, 718, 800, 914
Humble-minded **Vol. 2: 259–264,** 617 f.
Humbling **Vol. 2:** 202, 265
Humboldt, W. von **Vol. 3:** 1123, 1127
Hume, David **Vol. 1:** 56
Humiliate **Vol. 2:** 260, 430
Vol. 3: 345
Humiliated **Vol. 3:** 588
Humiliation **Vol. 1:** 154, 256, 398, 400, 520, 548, 569, 712
Vol. 2: 203 f., 212, **259–264,** 903
Vol. 3: 618, 620, 625, 630, 1017
Humility **Vol. 1:** 117, 135, 154, 227, 239, 285, 400, 489, 548 f., 700
Vol. 2: 117, 200 f., 203, 240, **256–264,** 423, 428 f., 617 f., 771, 822, 828, 859, 862, 919
Vol. 3: 27, 30, 32, 161, 218, 525, 544, 546, 589, 693, 727, 807, 859, 926, 928, 1032, 1143
Humour **Vol. 2: 430–436**
Hundred and forty-four thousand **Vol. 2:** 320, 700
Vol. 3: 416 f.
Hunger **Vol. 1:** 109, 217, 250, 252 f., 272, 277, 381, 497, 613, 651, 653, 671
Vol. 2: 264–277, 463, 478, 521, 523 f., 536, 596, 633, 665
Vol. 3: 360, 383, 677, 707, 723, 728, 1092
Hungry **Vol. 2:** 157, 237, 263, **264–277,** 386, 824 f.
Vol. 3: 189, 358, 424, 547
Hunt **Vol. 1:** 609
Vol. 2: 805–807
Hur **Vol. 2:** 637
Vol. 3: 878
Hurt **Vol. 1:** 413, 656, 726
Husband **Vol. 1:** 84, 87, 232, 235, 302, 395, 453, 506 f., 623
Vol. 2: 50 f., 349, 400, 512, 539, 541, 549, 562 f., 582 f., 880
Vol. 3: 138, 172, 189, 219, 325, **534–543,** 660, 928 f., 1055, 1057, 1064, 1066–1068, 1070, 1073
Husbandry **Vol. 1:** 498
Hush-money **Vol. 3:** 556
Husk **Vol. 1:** 704 f.
Hybris **Vol. 3:** 353
Hygiene **Vol. 1:** 119 f., 309
Hygienic purpose **Vol. 2:** 461
Hymenaeus **Vol. 1:** 466
Vol. 2: 550
Vol. 3: 471, 915
Hymn **Vol. 1:** 67, 147, 212 f., 237, 381 f., 386,

398, 400, 402, 547, 598, 628, 649, 651, 669, 706
Vol. 2: 45, 49, 105, 261 f., 270, 289 f., 343, 358, 445, 500, 504, 528, 614, 618, 775, 782, 874, 877 f., 926
Vol. 3: 77, 172, 235, 322, 505, 603, 610, 612, **668–676,** 714, 721, 816 f., 890, 967, 1032, 1115 f.
Hymn to Zeus **Vol. 3:** 331
Hyperbole **Vol. 1:** 116, 168, 713
Vol. 2: 385
Vol. 3: 758
Hypocrisy **Vol. 1:** 282, 299
Vol. 2: 43, 448, 462, **467–474,** 813, 831
Vol. 3: 180, 183 f., 482, 883, 1032, 1052 f.
Hypocrite **Vol. 1:** 205, 261, 416
Vol. 2: 222, 304, 311, **467–474,** 730, 813
Vol. 3: 251, 389
Hypostasis **Vol. 2:** 67, 442, 444, 507, 650
Vol. 3: 1116
Hypostatic appearance **Vol. 1:** 101
Hypostatize **Vol. 3:** 356
Hypostatized **Vol. 1:** 382, 586
Vol. 2: 290
Hypothesis **Vol. 1: 61**
Hypothetical **Vol. 1:** 591, 601
Hyssop **Vol. 1:** 225
Hysteria **Vol. 1:** 163

I am **Vol. 1:** 79, 250, 323, 628
Vol. 2: 31, 68, 79 f., 119, **278–283,** 482, 494, 715, 741
Vol. 3: 204, 567 f., 591, 631, 969, 1022
I-saying **Vol. 3:** 614, 622, 624 f.
I-style **Vol. 2:** 278 f.
I-Thou **Vol. 2:** 71, 75, 287
Vol. 3: 330
Iaba **Vol. 3:** 476
Iae **Vol. 3:** 476
Iamblichus **Vol. 2:** 214, 556
Ibzan **Vol. 1:** 170
Ice **Vol. 3:** 1105
Ichabod **Vol. 2:** 45
Iconium **Vol. 3:** 203, 226, 544
Idaean Dactyls **Vol. 2:** 553
Idea **Vol. 1:** 66, 87, 105, 130, 242, 358, 460, 483, 491, 598, 616, 636, 641, 643, 679, 704
Vol. 2: 72, 99, 103, 169, 185, 192, 207, 284, 314, 392 f., 434, 719
Vol. 3: 123, 126, 224, 231, 513, 531, 682, 778, 1027
Ideal **Vol. 1:** 426, 460, 491 f., 502, 640–642, 670
Vol. 2: 92, 99, 102 f., 130, 141, 234, 325, 337, 618, 820
Vol. 3: 217, 777, 779
Idealism **Vol. 1:** 694
Vol. 3: 931
Idealization **Vol. 2:** 250, 824
Vol. 3: 57
Idealized **Vol. 1:** 627
Ideational theory **Vol. 3:** 1129
Identification **Vol. 1:** 709
Vol. 2: 282, 302, 314, 343, 796, 825, 920
Identification formula **Vol. 2: 279**
Identify **Vol. 1:** 439, 481, 489, 634, 707, 709 f.
Vol. 2: 77, 123, 312, 318, 411, 618
Identity **Vol. 1:** 316, 444, 598, 707
Vol. 2: 80, 82, 282, 308, 632, 669, 835, 923
Vol. 3: 277 f., 292, 305, 454, 543
Ideology **Vol. 2:** 111, 373
Idiom **Vol. 3:** 481
Idle **Vol. 1:** 73
Vol. 2: 265
Vol. 3: 687, 945, 955
Idle words **Vol. 3:** 1143
Idol **Vol. 1:** 75, 120, 138, 239, 252, 261, 350–352, 382, 390, 428, 444, 537, 546, 550–552, 589, 643, 731
Vol. 2: 92, 96 f., 135, 158, 175, 178, 235, 268 f., 273, **284–293,** 309, 325, 402, 432, 458, 470, 555, 650, 677, 722, 793, 859, 877, 893
Vol. 3: 45, 94, 119, 206, 209, 248, 310, 331, 432 f., 471, 690, 782, 802, 828, 888, 904, 913, 1101 f., 1165
Idol-worship **Vol. 3:** 310
Idolater **Vol. 1:** 467
Vol. 2: 284–286, 660
Vol. 3: 1072
Idolatrous **Vol. 1:** 75, 151, 410, 532
Vol. 3: 469, 806, 964, 1008
Idolatry **Vol. 1:** 75, 138, 141, 231, 451 f., 496, 499 f., 514, 531, 550 f., 555, 559, 681, 688
Vol. 2: 96, 138, **284–286,** 436, 587, 678, 682, 699, 720, 791, 794
Vol. 3: 28, 31, 33, 79, 81, 93 f., 96, 104, 200, 250, 579, 582, 606, 692, 786, 802, 872, 914, 931, 989, 1055, 1121, 1165
Idumea **Vol. 1:** 269, 309
Idumean **Vol. 3:** 788, 1168
Ignatius **Vol. 1:** 51, 339, 535
Vol. 2: 271, 316, 550
Vol. 3: 724, 950
Ignoble **Vol. 2:** 50
Vol. 3: 912
Ignominy **Vol. 3: 562–564**
Ignorance **Vol. 1:** 85, 417, 422, 455, 501, 561, 737
Vol. 2: 166, 230, 261, **390–409,** 430, 458, 882, 912 f., 916
Vol. 3: 844, 936, 997, 1022, 1026
Ignorant **Vol. 2: 406–408,** 661, 801
Ignore **Vol. 2:** 29, 683, 767
Vol. 3: 57
Ilium **Vol. 2:** 233
Ill (→ Sick)
Ill-disposed **Vol. 1:** 202
Vol. 2: 259
Ill-fortune **Vol. 2:** 148
Ill-repute **Vol. 3:** 341
Ill-temper **Vol. 1:** 681
Ill-timed **Vol. 3: 833–839**
Ill-treat **Vol. 2:** 202
Vol. 3: 27 f.
Ill-treated **Vol. 1:** 644
Vol. 2: 420
Ill-will **Vol. 1:** 557
Vol. 3: 1019, 1166
Illegal **Vol. 2:** 451

Illegitimate **Vol. 1:** 500
Vol. 2: 141, 311, 372
Illicit union **Vol. 2:** 586 f.
Illiterate **Vol. 3:** 1058
Illness (→ Sickness)
Illuminate **Vol. 1:** 212, 246
Vol. 2: 289, 394
Vol. 3: 318
Illumination **Vol. 2: 490–496**
Vol. 3: 705, 893
Illuminations **Vol. 1:** 629
Illumine **Vol. 1:** 422
Vol. 2: 183, 412, 484 f., **490–496**
Illusion **Vol. 1:** 546, 551, 713
Vol. 2: 44, 458
Vol. 3: 123, 597
Illusory **Vol. 1:** 546
Illustrate **Vol. 1:** 547, 627, 670
Illustration **Vol. 2:** 434, 501
Illustrative stories **Vol. 2:** 743–760
Illustrious **Vol. 2:** 291
Vol. 3: 716–718
Image **Vol. 1:** 71, 75, 86, 87, 95, 107, 114, 138, 168, 175, 203, 205, 236 f., 339 f., 360, 380, 382, 386, 407, 469, 491, 522, 552, 580, 586, 609, 654, 657, 661 f., 693, 707, 714
Vol. 2: 57, 65, 85, 98, 158, 161, 196, 226, 233, 242, 247, 253, 259, 277 f., **284–293,** 318 f., 393, 470, **500–508,** 571, 650, 672, 693, 743, 746, 834, 871, 876, 926
Vol. 3: 50, 76, 207, 214, 219, 334, 392, 485, 489, 498, 513, 554, 570 f., 644 f., 649, 701, 705, 724, **903–906,** 913, 915 f., 1056, 1063, 1068, 1075, 1158
Image of the beast **Vol. 2: 288**
Image of God **Vol. 2:** 51, 79, 161, **284, 287–289, 502,** 505, 565, 569
Imagery **Vol. 1:** 118, 204, 406, 523, 549, 645, 647–649
Vol. 2: 38, 104, 231, 385
Vol. 3: 522, 526, 686, 736, 863, 1008, 1048
Imagination **Vol. 1:** 330, 550
Vol. 2: 44
Vol. 3: 127, 513
Imbecile **Vol. 1:** 509
Imhotep **Vol. 2:** 166
Imitate **Vol. 1:** 214, 287, 400 f., **480–494,** 498, 522, 638, 702
Vol. 2: 160, 291, 350, 510, 552, 782
Vol. 3: 724
Imitation **Vol. 3:** 775
Imitator **Vol. 3:** 942
Immaculate conception **Vol. 3:** 663
Immanence **Vol. 1:** 71, 522
Vol. 3: 353, 1117
Immanent **Vol. 1:** 70, 460, 661, 688, 711
Vol. 2: 376
Immaterial **Vol. 1:** 229, 602
Vol. 2: 192
Vol. 3: 875
Immature **Vol. 1:** 282
Vol. 2: 428, 675
Immeasurable **Vol. 3:** 827
Immediacy **Vol. 3:** 703 f.
Immediate **Vol. 1:** 512
Immerse **Vol. 1:** 144, 147, 155, 224
Immersion **Vol. 1:** 143 f., 149 f., 152, 225
Vol. 3: 105, 695
Immigrant **Vol. 1:** 625
Imminence **Vol. 1:** 322 f., 496, 513–515, 612, 725
Vol. 2: 53, 438, 732, 894, 921
Vol. 3: 440, 838
Imminent **Vol. 2:** 55, 315, 382 f., 891, 900, 910, 915, 922, 925, 930
Immobilization **Vol. 1:** 239
Immoderate **Vol. 1:** 625
Immodesty **Vol. 1:** 496
Immolate **Vol. 1:** 235
Immoral **Vol. 1:** 467, 497
Vol. 2: 224, 438, 782
Immorality **Vol. 1:** 138, 231, 466, **494–503,** 555, 681
Vol. 2: 263, 402, 422, 669, 676–678, 792
Vol. 3: 535 f., 802, 903, 926, 931, 945, 1064, 1067, 1165
Immortal **Vol. 1:** 66, 229, 233, 432 f., 435, 467–469, 705
Vol. 2: 40, 77, 188, 232, 271, 274, 476, 565, 658 f.
Vol. 3: 99, 122, 125, 220, 263, 679, 690, 1034
Immortality **Vol. 1:** 58, 430–432, 435, 444, 463, 467–470, 709
Vol. 2: 47, 113, 125, 201, 207, 239, 241, 268, 477, 480, 539, 661, 761, 763, 925
Vol. 3: 231, 260, 267, 271–274, 323, 679, 681 f., 686, 692, 926, 936, 939, 946
Immovable **Vol. 1:** 586, 663
Immune **Vol. 2:** 309, 573
Immutability **Vol. 3:** 553
Impact **Vol. 1:** 733
Impaired **Vol. 2:** 415
Impale **Vol. 1:** 391, 393
Impart **Vol. 1:** 207 f., 479, 620
Vol. 2: 645
Impart knowledge **Vol. 3:** 766
Impart revelation **Vol. 3: 324 f.**
Impartial **Vol. 1:** 503, 505, 587, 639
Vol. 2: 438, 497
Vol. 3: 353, 356
Impassibility **Vol. 1:** 108
Vol. 3: 724
Impatient **Vol. 2:** 238
Vol. 3: 691
Impede **Vol. 2:** 414
Impediment **Vol. 1:** 163, 428
Vol. 2: 155, 220
Vol. 3: 180, 860
Impel **Vol. 1:** 408, 497
Vol. 3: 691
Impending **Vol. 1:** 725
Vol. 2: 382, 384
Impenetrable **Vol. 1:** 422
Impenitence **Vol. 2:** 155, 713
Impenitent **Vol. 1:** 106, 357 f.
Vol. 2: 183, 352, 584, 834
Vol. 3: 315, 1096
Imperative **Vol. 1:** 571, 602

Imperfect **Vol. 1:** 491, 518, 587
Vol. 2: 62, 304, 473, 717
Vol. 3: 199
Imperial **Vol. 1:** 395
Vol. 2: 93, 518, 574
Vol. 3: 221
Imperial cult **Vol. 2:** 108 f., 111, 234
Imperishable **Vol. 1:** 236, 467–470, 647
Vol. 2: 56, 218, 300, 349, 597, 657
Vol. 3: 267, 303, 995
Imperium **Vol. 2:** 373
Impermanence **Vol. 1:** 437
Vol. 3: 814, 995
Impersonal **Vol. 1:** 484, 566, 693
Vol. 3: 676 f.
Impervious **Vol. 2:** 154
Impiety **Vol. 1:** 461, 622
Vol. 2: 91 f.
Implanted **Vol. 1:** 731
Vol. 3: **865–870**
Implement **Vol. 2:** 96
Implication **Vol. 1:** 482, 668
Vol. 2: 333
Vol. 3: 370, 373
Implicit **Vol. 2:** 387
Implore **Vol. 1:** 569 f.
Vol. 2: 860
Vol. 3: 473, **737–743**
Imply **Vol. 1:** 608, 680
Vol. 2: 121
Importance **Vol. 1:** 260, 375, 528, 538, 627, 662, 679, 690
Vol. 2: 130, 165, 325, 327, 333, 378, 428
Vol. 3: 589
Important **Vol. 1:** 625 f., 666, 676, 739
Vol. 2: 146, 275, 425
Imports **Vol. 3:** 851
Importunate widow **Vol. 3:** 1059
Importuner **Vol. 3:** 29
Importunity **Vol. 2:** 730, 881
Impose **Vol. 1:** 537, 552, 613
Vol. 3: 108
Impossible **Vol. 1:** 669, 699, 719
Vol. 2: 243, 606, 718
Vol. 3: 914
Imposter **Vol. 2:** **457–461,** 558
Vol. 3: 32, 757
Imposture **Vol. 1:** 550
Impotence **Vol. 1:** 497
Vol. 2: 285, 449, **601–616**
Vol. 3: 691, 714, 1102
Impoverishment **Vol. 1:** 642
Impregnable **Vol. 1:** 659
Impress **Vol. 1:** 712
Vol. 2: **288 f.**
Vol. 3: 32, 497, 500, 1112
Impression **Vol. 2:** 44 f., 284, 390
Vol. 3: 904
Impressive **Vol. 3:** 570, 792
Imprint **Vol. 2:** **284–293**
Imprison **Vol. 2:** 136, 207
Vol. 3: **590 f.**
Imprisoned **Vol. 3:** 547
Imprisonment **Vol. 1:** 219, 323, 432, 564, 731
Vol. 2: 30, 206, 368
Vol. 3: 96, **591 f.**
Improve **Vol. 2:** 326, 823
Vol. 3: 721
Improvement **Vol. 3:** 146, **351 f.**
Impulse **Vol. 1:** 107, 354, 456 f., 459 f., 555, 636, 710
Vol. 3: 719
Impure **Vol. 1:** 451, 639
Vol. 2: 225
Impurity **Vol. 1:** 138, 152, 155, 231, 448, 475, 479, 496
Vol. 2: 415, 579, 669
Vol. 3: 104, 425, 926, 989, 1005
Imputation **Vol. 1:** 671
Imputed relation **Vol. 3:** 1130
Imputed righteousness **Vol. 3:** 371
Imputed sin **Vol. 3:** 825
In Christ **Vol. 3:** **1192 f.**
In line with **Vol. 2:** **451–453**
Inability **Vol. 1:** 556, 561
Vol. 2: 100, 156
Vol. 3: 132, 341, 995
Inaccessible **Vol. 1:** 445
Inactivity **Vol. 1:** 73, 240, 441
Vol. 2: 240
Vol. 3: 111, 1155
Inadequacy **Vol. 1:** 319
Vol. 2: 821
Vol. 3: 177, 814
Inalienable **Vol. 1:** 669
Vol. 2: 298
Vol. 3: 649
Inanimate **Vol. 1:** 429
Inappropriate **Vol. 2:** 431, 433
Inarticulate **Vol. 1:** 409
Inattentive **Vol. 2:** 172
Inauguration **Vol. 1:** 724
Vol. 2: 262, 384, 673
Incalculable **Vol. 3:** 824
Incantation **Vol. 1:** 409, 450
Vol. 2: 168, 552
Vol. 3: 673, 1087
Incapable **Vol. 1:** 681
Vol. 2: 405, 446
Incapacity **Vol. 1:** 742
Vol. 3: 993
Incarcerate **Vol. 1:** 452
Incarnate **Vol. 1:** 575, 671, 678, 739
Vol. 3: 645
Incarnation **Vol. 1:** 58, 66, 179, 347, 438, 547–549, 644, 668, 678 f., 706
Vol. 2: 86, 111, 343, 373, 378, 500, 504, 535 f., 590, 661, 828, 835, 907, 927 f.
Vol. 3: 174, 323, 630, 646, 661, 663, 679, 843, 931, 1070, 1115, 1117
Incense **Vol. 1:** 151, 478, 509, 655
Vol. 2: 28, 96, 226, **293–295,** 713, 723, 728, 831
Vol. 3: 156, 159, 419, 422, 436, 445, 447, 600, 790, 847
Incense-altar (→ Altar of incense)
Incest **Vol. 1:** 499 f.
Vol. 2: 33, 142

Incest (*cont'd*)
Vol. 3: 95, 574
Incite **Vol. 1:** 107, 110, 674
Vol. 3: 516, **556–558,** 559
Inclination **Vol. 1:** 334, 533, 682
Vol. 2: 116, 710
Vol. 3: 939
(*also* → Evil inclination)
Include **Vol. 2:** 313, 400
Inclusion **Vol. 1:** 739
Vol. 2: 316
Incognito **Vol. 2:** 268
Income **Vol. 2:** 898
Vol. 3: 417, 852
Incomparability of God **Vol. 2:** 501 f.
Incomparable **Vol. 1:** 615, 619, 729
Vol. 2: 245
Incompatible **Vol. 1:** 501, 506, 513 f., 681
Vol. 2: 82, 309, 439
Vol. 3: 542
Incomplete **Vol. 2:** 100, 304
Incomprehensible **Vol. 1:** 363, 529
Vol. 2: 100, 105 f.
Vol. 3: 75
Incomprehension **Vol. 3:** 507
Incongruous **Vol. 1:** 724
Inconsistency **Vol. 1:** 506
Vol. 2: 349, 451
Vol. 3: 369
Inconstant **Vol. 2:** 457
Incorporation **Vol. 1:** 237, 285, 303, 481, 643
Vol. 3: 869, 1209
Incorporeal **Vol. 3:** 178, 677
Incorruptible **Vol. 1:** 467 f., 674
Vol. 2: 242
Vol. 3: 281
Incorruption **Vol. 1:** 380, 470
Vol. 2: 924
Increase **Vol. 1:** 411, 600, 728, 730, 732 f., 742
Vol. 2: 128–131, 317, 445
Incredibility **Vol. 1:** 594
Incredible **Vol. 2:** 263
Inculcate **Vol. 1:** 598
Inculpate **Vol. 2:** 370
Incur **Vol. 1:** 611
Vol. 2: 405
Indebted **Vol. 1:** 648
Vol. 2: **666–668**
Vol. 3: 752
Indecency **Vol. 1:** 505
Indecision **Vol. 3:** 119
Indeed **Vol. 3:** **874–901**
Indefinite **Vol. 2:** 697
Indelible **Vol. 1:** 310, 680
Indemnity **Vol. 3:** 152
Indent **Vol. 2:** 288
Independence **Vol. 1:** 102, 190, 263, 377, 422, 484, 522, 537, 542, 680 f., 742
Vol. 2: 84, 202
Vol. 3: 78, 811, 960
Independent **Vol. 1:** 604, 627, 642 f., 697, 718
Vol. 2: 195, 265, 325, 336, 441, 650
Vol. 3: 455, 592, 677, 692, **727 f.,** 834
Indestructible **Vol. 1:** 337, 468
Vol. 2: 96, 325
Vol. 3: **177–189**
Indeterminism **Vol. 1:** **54**
India **Vol. 1:** 653
Vol. 2: 278, 293
Indicate **Vol. 2:** 648
Vol. 3: 310
Indicative **Vol. 1:** 602
Indict **Vol. 1:** 349
Indictment **Vol. 1:** 84
Vol. 3: 1041
Indifference **Vol. 1:** 318, 459, 553, 647, 737
Vol. 2: 435, 438, 481, 699
Vol. 3: 57, 370
Indifferent **Vol. 3:** 369
Indigence **Vol. 3:** 1055
Indignation **Vol. 1:** 106–108, 656
Indignity **Vol. 1:** 264 f.
Vol. 3: 739
Indirect **Vol. 1:** 578
Vol. 2: 150
Indispensability **Vol. 3:** 445
Indispensable **Vol. 1:** 618
Indissolubility **Vol. 1:** 384
Vol. 2: 349, 583, 592
Indistinct image **Vol. 2:** **743–756**
Individual **Vol. 1:** 94, 156, 195, 215, 224, 233, 235, 237, 275, 294, 303, 305, 308, 354 f., 357, 367, 379, 382, 387, 409, 432–435, 463, 482, 485, 505, 520, 525, 536 f., 539, 568 f., 595, 597, 600, 612, 617 f., 620, 624, 626, 632 f., 636, 640–643, 647, 658, 662, 680, 682, 699, 702, 707, 711, 716, 721, 723, 732, 739
Vol. 2: 71 f., 79, 99, 115, 117 f., 121 f., 133 f., 145, 158 f., 220, 222, 241 f., 249, 259, 273, 288, 298, 301, 303 f., 310–313, 320, 329, 353–355, 376, 385, 388, 410, 412, 422, 445, 476, 565, 611, 800, 864, 889
Vol. 3: 54, 139, 146, 193, 200–202, 234, 236, 261, 268 f., 277, 232, 355, 358, 393, 421, 470, 546, 550, 578 f., 613, 653, 663, 692, 694, 699–701, 707, 720, 746, 776, 783, 799, 810, 834, 842, 847, 866, 868, 912, 937, 1052, 1088 f., 1100, 1102
Individualistic **Vol. 2:** 253
Individualization **Vol. 1:** 433, 625
Indivisible **Vol. 1:** 501
Indolence **Vol. 2:** 772
Induce **Vol. 1:** 589
Vol. 2: 266
Indulge **Vol. 2:** 116, 419
Indulgence **Vol. 1:** 77, 625, 698
Vol. 2: 270 f., 462
Indulgent **Vol. 2:** 256, 817
Industrial **Vol. 3:** 138
Industry **Vol. 3:** 605
Indwelling **Vol. 2:** 243
Vol. 3: 226
Ineffable **Vol. 1:** 705
Ineffective **Vol. 1:** 207, 319, 546 f.
Ineffectual **Vol. 1:** 546, 550
Inefficacy **Vol. 1:** 547
Inertia **Vol. 3:** 709
Inescapable **Vol. 1:** 609

Vol. 2: 138
Inevitable **Vol. 1:** 326 f., 418, 431 f., 437, 681, 719
Vol. 2: 128, 138, 155, 399
Vol. 3: 324
Inexcusable **Vol. 2:** 137
Inexhaustible **Vol. 2:** 165
Inexperience **Vol. 1:** 280 f.
Vol. 2: 391, 468, 674
Inexplicable **Vol. 3:** 528
Inexpressible **Vol. 1:** 669
Inextinguishable **Vol. 3: 110 f.**
Infallible **Vol. 1:** 351, 527
Infamous **Vol. 2:** 291
Infancy stories (→ Birth narratives)
Infant **Vol. 1:** 280 f., 283, 290, 308, 512, 737
Vol. 2: 294
Vol. 3: 447
Infant baptism (→ Baptism, infant)
Infant communion **Vol. 1:** 160
Infant mortality **Vol. 1:** 498
Infant sacrifice **Vol. 3:** 84
Infatuation **Vol. 3:** 577, 1024
Infection **Vol. 1:** 611
Vol. 2: 461 f.
Inference **Vol. 1:** 580
Inferior **Vol. 1:** 208, 259, 387
Vol. 2: 412, 513
Vol. 3: 344, 695, **952–956**
Inferiority **Vol. 1:** 734
Vol. 2: 447
Infertility **Vol. 3:** 444
Infiltration **Vol. 1:** 539
Infinite **Vol. 1:** 164
Infirmity **Vol. 1:** 183, 452, 674, 679
Vol. 2: 164 f.
Vol. 3: 180, 409
Inflame **Vol. 1:** 418, 656
Inflammation **Vol. 3:** 109
Inflation **Vol. 3:** 1162
Inflict blow **Vol. 3:** 857
Inflict pain **Vol. 2: 419–421**
Influence **Vol. 1:** 165, 196, 302, 414, 423, 543, 564, 567 f., 587, 590 f., 611, 618, 624, 655, 676
Vol. 2: 49, 66 f., 126, 130, 136, 159, 206, 221, 259, 307, 309, 319, 333, 338, 349, 366, 372, 393, 403, 406, 462, 582, 866
Vol. 3: 50, 103, 415, 479, 481, 834, 864, 1054, 1123
Influential **Vol. 1:** 188
Vol. 2: 915
Vol. 3: 480
Inform **Vol. 1:** 246, 350
Vol. 3: 49, 468, 759, **771 f.**
Information **Vol. 2:** 32, 234, 341, 858
Vol. 3: 44, 47, 50, 55, 57, 69, 76, 766, 875, 1106
Informed **Vol. 2:** 406
Ingathering **Vol. 1:** 686, 724
Vol. 2: 359
Ingrafting **Vol. 1:** 159
Ingratiate **Vol. 2:** 254, 837
Ingratitude **Vol. 1:** 399, 552
Vol. 2: 400
Ingredient **Vol. 2:** 294
Inhabit **Vol. 1:** 690
Vol. 2: 247–251
Inhabitant **Vol. 1:** 286, 508, 519, 521, 726
Vol. 2: 324, 326–328, 367, 802
Inhabited **Vol. 1:** 518
Inharmonious **Vol. 2:** 393
Inherent **Vol. 1:** 673
Inherit **Vol. 1:** 215, 222, 276, 287, 301, 433, 436, 470, 518, 552, 563, 625, 643, 667, 675
Vol. 2: 258, **295–304,** 388, 608
Inheritance **Vol. 1:** 289, 390, 448, 469, 636, 640, 651, 696
Vol. 2: 40, 135, 193, 230, 247, 258, **295–304,** 311, 339, 380, 438, 495, 671, 839
Vol. 3: 72 f., 136, 191, 200, 391, 633, 701, 777, 807, 819, 853, 1057, 1073 f.
Inheritor **Vol. 1:** 79
Vol. 2: 295–303
Inhibit **Vol. 2:** 628
Inhospitable **Vol. 1:** 657
Inhuman **Vol. 1:** 670
Vol. 2: 542
Inhumane **Vol. 3:** 594
Inhumation **Vol. 1:** 264
Iniquity **Vol. 1:** 115, 202, 231, 296, 308, 607, 673, 734
Vol. 2: 138, 261, 742
Vol. 3: 154, 164, 171, 241, 693
Initiate **Vol. 1:** 176, 178, 189, 255, 316, 430, 596, 625, 705, 716
Vol. 2: 60, 118
Vol. 3: 61, 103, 205, **501–506,** 1085
Initiated **Vol. 1:** 577, 616, 654
Vol. 2: 233
Initiation **Vol. 1:** 144, 149, 151, 154 f., 159 f., 237, 286, 288, 432, 470, 611, 616
Vol. 3: 740
Initiative **Vol. 1:** 157, 275, 488
Vol. 2: 119, 317, 334, 374, 582, 792
Vol. 3: 75 f., 266
Initiator **Vol. 2:** 78
Injunct **Vol. 3: 324 f.**
Injure **Vol. 1:** 182, 687
Vol. 3: 573–576, 583
Injury **Vol. 1:** 241, 463
Vol. 2: 166 f.
Vol. 3: 94, 152
Injury to livestock **Vol. 3:** 95
Injustice **Vol. 1:** 219, 410, 687, 716
Vol. 2: 93, 258, 363, 365, 458, 822, 841, 864
Vol. 3: 92, 514, **573–576,** 586
Ink **Vol. 1:** 203, 247
Vol. 3: 490, 493
Inlay **Vol. 2:** 349
Inn **Vol. 1:** 688
Vol. 3: 229
Innate **Vol. 1:** 481, 525
Inner **Vol. 1:** 679 f.
Vol. 2: 283
Vol. 3: 208, **794**
Inner life **Vol. 2:** 181 f.
Vol. 3: 125, 684 f.

Inner man **Vol. 1:** 169
Vol. 2: 78, 244
Vol. 3: 127, 679, 681, 683
Inner powers **Vol. 3:** 680
Inner shrine **Vol. 3: 794**
Innermost being **Vol. 1:** 683
Vol. 2: 180
Innocence **Vol. 1:** 221 f., 269, 287 f., 390, 395, 507, 510, 561
Vol. 2: 149, 318, 429, 583
Vol. 3: 266, 563, 740, 1055
Innocent **Vol. 1:** 737
Vol. 2: 137, 139, 367, 417
Vol. 3: 101, 103, 125, 154, 165, 201, 342, 355, 358, 537, 542, 721, 809, **923–928,** 1071
Innocent blood **Vol. 3:** 159
Innocuous association **Vol. 3:** 802
Innovation **Vol. 3:** 61
Innumerable **Vol. 2:** 683
Inopportune **Vol. 3: 833–839**
Insatiable **Vol. 1:** 137–139, 459 f.
Inscribe **Vol. 2:** 573
Inscription **Vol. 2:** 139, 173, 308 f., 331, 333 f., 339, 378 f., 433
Vol. 3: 482–495, 500
Inscrutability **Vol. 2:** 197, 363
Insect **Vol. 1:** 172, 252
Vol. 2: 268
Insecurity **Vol. 2:** 138
Insensible **Vol. 2:** 575
Insensitive **Vol. 2:** 153 f.
Inseparable **Vol. 2:** 386
Insight **Vol. 1:** 129, 421, 437, 483–485, 567 f., 597, 662, 671, 680, 742
Vol. 2: 220, 316, 353, 391–393, 400, 444, 457, 517, 616
Vol. 3: 122–133, 513, 684, 693, 720, 745, 778, 926, 1025, 1028 f., 1032
Insignificance **Vol. 1:** 174, 290, 381
Vol. 2: 101, 260, 354, 605, 899
Vol. 3: 868, 993
Insincerity **Vol. 2:** 270
Insinuation **Vol. 1:** 565
Vol. 2: 263
Insipid **Vol. 3: 443–449,** 1024 f.
Insistene **Vol. 1:** 700
Insolence **Vol. 2:** 260
Vol. 3: 27–29, 1024
Insolvency **Vol. 3:** 594
Inspect **Vol. 1:** 128, 188 f.
Vol. 2: 393
Vol. 3: 129
Inspiration **Vol. 2:** 147, 233, 342
Vol. 3: 75 f., 86, 327, 491, 689 f., 696 f., 1117
Inspire **Vol. 1:** 427, 529, 578, 629, 734
Vol. 2: 372, 445, 819
Inspired by God **Vol. 3: 689–708,** 771
Inspirer of prophecy **Vol. 3:** 705
Install **Vol. 2:** 149, 200
Installation **Vol. 2:** 151
Instalment **Vol. 2:** 39 f.
Instantaneous **Vol. 2:** 168
Instigate **Vol. 1:** 643
Instinct **Vol. 1:** 457 f., 460, 497, 502, 650
Vol. 2: 180, 182, 660 f.
Institution (*also* → Words of institution) **Vol. 1:** 71, 120, 130, 192, 194, 238, 297–300, 302, 304, 425 f., 473, 486, 667
Vol. 2: 101, 125, 231, 335, 373 f., 579 f., 657, 922
Vol. 3: 42, 50, 52, 79, 97, 181, 188, 191, 407, 440, 561
Institutionalize **Vol. 2:** 123
Vol. 3: 84, 705
Instruct **Vol. 1:** 330, 340, 349, 421, 526, 574, 597, 680, 735
Vol. 2: 112, 298
Vol. 3: 45, 352, **501–506, 759–780, 1026–1034**
Instruction **Vol. 1:** 52, 64, 69 f., 246, 281, 332, 341, 462, 487, 491, 567 f., 570, 578, 593, 595, 600, 603, 617, 627
Vol. 2: 32, 72, 141, 219, 235, 307 f., 310 f., 315, 328, 332, 440, 696, 719, 873
Vol. 3: 33, 44, 57, 75, 119, 135, 353, 408, 483, 485, 531, 756, **759–780,** 809, 1095, 1106
Instructor **Vol. 1:** 333
Vol. 3: 759
Instructress **Vol. 3:** 353
Instrument **Vol. 1:** 125, 136, 141, 231, 273, 353, 381, 389–392, 395, 414, 509 f., 523, 540, 655, 726
Vol. 2: 97, 195, 302, 335, 364, 434, 436, 486, 836, 863
Vol. 3: 113, 189, 268, 324, 364, 873 f., 913, 1182
Insubordination **Vol. 3:** 1054
Insubstantial **Vol. 1:** 512, 744
Insult **Vol. 1:** 259, 395, **413–418,** 566, 727
Vol. 2: 49, 140, 257
Vol. 3: 27 f., 340, **346 f.,** 430, 447, 872
Insupportable **Vol. 2:** 266
Insurrection **Vol. 2:** 320
Intact **Vol. 2:** 60
Integration **Vol. 1:** 190
Vol. 2: 336
Integrity **Vol. 1:** 396, 467, 643
Vol. 2: 61, 237
Vol. 3: 50, 102, 291, 572, 692, 879, 882
Intellect **Vol. 1:** 399, 420, 568
Vol. 2: 171, 567, 617
Vol. 3: 122–130, 531, 823
Intellectual **Vol. 1:** 437, 444, 486, 494 f., 536, 567, 595, 616, 742
Vol. 2: 59, 93, 166, 181 f., 265, 391, 397 f., 400, 405, 407, 478
Vol. 3: 122–133, 230, 337, 349, 713, 825, 935, 1078, **1081–1119**
Intellectual death **Vol. 1:** 431
Intelligence **Vol. 2: 616–620**
Vol. 3: 122–130
Intelligent **Vol. 2:** 256, 392, **616–620**
Vol. 3: 130–133
Intelligible **Vol. 1:** 522, 582
Vol. 2: 884
Vol. 3: 124, 130
Intemperance **Vol. 1:** 672
Intend **Vol. 1:** 471, 696, 704, 718
Vol. 2: 342

Vol. 3: 230, 823
Intense **Vol. 1:** 726
Vol. 2: 244, 312, 356
Intensification **Vol. 1:** 631
Vol. 2: 876
Intensity **Vol. 1:** 654
Vol. 2: 197
Intention **Vol. 1:** 59, 119, 325, 426, 433, 496, 534, 573, 577 f., 600, 608, 677, 693, 695–697, 711, 719
Vol. 2: 39, 150, 181, 281, 306, 315, 326, 443, 867
Vol. 3: 49, 68, 88, 122 f., 506, 691, 914, 916, 947, **1015–1023,** 1143, 1149
Intentional **Vol. 1:** 609
Interact **Vol. 1:** 680
Intercalary days **Vol. 1:** 627
Intercede **Vol. 1:** 210, 647, 688
Vol. 2: 307, 861, 874, **882–885**
Vol. 3: 152, 682, 1079
Intercession **Vol. 1:** 78, 103 f., 213, 504, 699 f., 727
Vol. 2: 117, 152, 199, 294, 424, 637 f., 857, 861, 863, 868, 874 f., 882–884
Vol. 3: 40, 42, 130, 155, 230, 232, 244, 505, 746, 819, 1097, 1205 f.
Intercessor **Vol. 1:** 83, 88 f., 544
Vol. 2: 147, 313, 874, 884
Vol. 3: 33
Interchangeable **Vol. 2:** 84
Intercommunion **Vol. 3:** 1186
Intercourse **Vol. 1:** 235, 496–498, 506, 639, 678
Vol. 2: 577, **586 f.**
Vol. 3: 95 f., 100, 103 f.
Interdependence **Vol. 2:** 329
Interest **Vol. 1:** 278, 324, 366, 641, 721
Vol. 2: 254, 395, 497, 830, 837, 861
Vol. 3: 519, 532
Interesting **Vol. 2:** 670
Interfere **Vol. 2:** 317
Interim judgment **Vol. 2:** 363
Intermediary **Vol. 1:** 104, 372, 449
Vol. 2: 442
Vol. 3: 215, 284, 465, 640, 645
Intermediate beings **Vol. 1:** 101, 451
Intermediate state **Vol. 1:** 313, 315, 442
Vol. 2: 761
Vol. 3: 272, 279
Internal **Vol. 1:** 704, 708
Vol. 2: 102
Interpose **Vol. 1:** 731
Vol. 2: 650
Interpret **Vol. 1:** 57, 59, 69, 103, **573–584,** 679
Vol. 2: 125, 305, 339 f., **362–367,** 468, 555, 621
Vol. 3: 75, 316, 492, 962
Interpretation **Vol. 1:** 57–59, 65 f., 69, 71, 333, 398, 411, 415, 485, 512, 539, 566, **573–584,** 598, 616, 628, 737
Vol. 2: 83, 121, 294, 312, 314, 329, 332, 342, 351, 383, 386, 388, 391, 442 f., 549, 616, 811, 839, 903
Vol. 3: 76, 87, 89, 112, 184, 203, 316, 392, 484, 487 f., 494, 761–763, 777, 789, 1080, 1099, 1120, 1142, 1163
Interpretation of tongues **Vol. 3: 1080**
Interpreter **Vol. 1:** 69, 220, 373 f., 512, 573
Vol. 2: 401
Vol. 3: 210, 480, 485, 704
Interrogate **Vol. 2:** 362, 365, 451
Interrupt **Vol. 1:** 625
Intertestamental period **Vol. 1:** 527
Vol. 2: 227, 308
Vol. 3: 135, 193, 440
Interval **Vol. 1:** 503, 540
Vol. 2: 429
Intervene **Vol. 2:** 111, 200, 510
Vol. 3: 263
Intervention **Vol. 1:** 379, 381, 385, 512, 521, 543 f., 551, 609, 643, 670, 716, 738
Vol. 2: 48, 117, 166, 184, 201 f.
Vol. 3: 48, 93, 177, 318 f., 355 f., 846
Intestines **Vol. 2:** 599
Intimacy **Vol. 3:** 860
Intimate **Vol. 1:** 482, 672, 712
Intimidation **Vol. 3:** 557
Intoxication **Vol. 1:** 513, 515, 528
Vol. 3: 859
Intrigue **Vol. 3:** 820
Introduce **Vol. 1:** 544
Vol. 2: 408, 437
Introduction **Vol. 1:** 167
Introductory formula **Vol. 3: 487–492,** 1107
Introductory greeting **Vol. 3:** 818
Introspection **Vol. 2:** 407
Introspective **Vol. 2:** 355
Intuition **Vol. 2:** 393
Invader **Vol. 3:** 916
Invalid **Vol. 1:** 514, 720
Vol. 3: 224, 890
Invariable **Vol. 1:** 351
Invasion **Vol. 3:** 93, 391, 1009
Invective **Vol. 1:** 413
Invention **Vol. 1:** 675
Vol. 2: 111
Vol. 3: 65, 506
Invest **Vol. 1:** 207
Vol. 2: 80, 151
Investigate **Vol. 1:** 64, 189, 266, 580
Vol. 2: 362–367, 392
Vol. 3: 492, 531
Investigation **Vol. 3: 530–532,** 935
Investiture **Vol. 3:** 36
Invincible **Vol. 1:** 443
Inviolability **Vol. 2:** 325, 443, 592
Vol. 3: 583, 805
Invisible **Vol. 1:** 95, 299, 360, 374, 385, 469, 491, 576, 580, 595, 602, 704
Vol. 2: 77–79, 86, 163, 190 243, 288, 399, 613 f.
Vol. 3: 128, 365, **511–518,** 647
Invitation **Vol. 1:** 270, 272–274, 324, 339, 483
Vol. 2: 262, 307, 520
Vol. 3: 53, 55, 114, 118, 529, 869
Invite **Vol. 1:** 409, 529, 542, 569 f.
Vol. 2: 32, 270, 386, 812, 825
Vol. 3: 49, 1029
Invocation **Vol. 1:** 271, 276, 367, 569 f., 615–

Invocation (*cont'd*)
618, 620 f.
Vol. 2: 76, 168, 512, 530 f., 556, 862
Vol. 3: 565, 741, 1039
Invocation of saints **Vol. 1:** 78
Involuntary **Vol. 1:** 561
Vol. 3: 434
Involved **Vol. 1:** 601
Involvement **Vol. 2:** 351, 358, 477 f., 816
Inward **Vol. 1:** 612
Vol. 3: 320
Inward parts **Vol. 2: 599 f.**
Ionians **Vol. 1:** 497
Ionic **Vol. 3:** 870
Ionic philosophy **Vol. 2:** 657
Iota **Vol. 3:** 181 f.
Iranian **Vol. 1:** 434
Vol. 2: 645 f., 836
Vol. 3: 275, 928, 1035
Iranian cosmology **Vol. 3:** 693
Irenaeus **Vol. 1:** 59, 116, 154, 180
Vol. 2: 506, 645, 677
Vol. 3: 855
Iris **Vol. 3:** 1000, 1002
Iron **Vol. 1:** 164, 407, 463, 726
Vol. 2: 27, **95–98,** 188
Vol. 3: 392, 914
Iron age **Vol. 2:** 97
Iron furnace **Vol. 2:** 98
Irony **Vol. 1:** 277, 382, 411, 413, 479, 590, 710
Vol. 2: 170, 263, 358, 380, 398 f., 402 f., **430–436,** 620, 714, 828, 834, 836
Vol. 3: 386, 394, 452, 768, 887, 967
Irrational **Vol. 2:** 659
Vol. 3: 681, **1081–1119**
Irreconcilable **Vol. 1:** 473, 501, 553
Vol. 3: 104
Irregular **Vol. 2:** 138, 459
Irregularity **Vol. 2:** 273
Vol. 3: 731
Irrelevant **Vol. 1:** 680
Vol. 2: 402
Irreligion **Vol. 1:** 74, 186
Vol. 3: 200
Irreligious **Vol. 2:** 94, 782
Irreproachable **Vol. 2:** 137, 139
Vol. 3: 171, 228, **923–928**
Irresistible **Vol. 1:** 459, 609
Irresponsibility **Vol. 1:** 559
Vol. 2: 272
Irreverence **Vol. 1:** 112
Vol. 2: 430, 436
Irrevocable **Vol. 1:** 207, 356 f., 365, 416, 443, 572, 611, 718 f.
Vol. 2: 77, 307, 681
Vol. 3: 72, 174
Irrigation **Vol. 3:** 986–988
Irritable **Vol. 1:** 107
Irruption **Vol. 1:** 612
Vol. 2: 382
Isaac **Vol. 1:** 65, 76, **81,** 82, 214, 411, 532, 556, 574, 617
Vol. 2: 68, 73, 76, 316–319, 431, 587, 627, 649, 651, 691, 725, 746, 865
Vol. 3: 69, 73, 195, 263, 359, 369 f., 418, 421, 425, 514, 523 f., 600, 608, 642, 661, 800, 806, 965, 969, 1009, 1057, 1091, 1112, 1135, 1179
Isaac, sacrifice of **Vol. 1:** 76, 79, 81 f., 403, 604, 713
Vol. 3: 369 f. (*also* → Akedah)
Isaiah **Vol. 1:** 54, 66, 109, 127, 273, 378, 407, 485, 531, 538 f., 596, 673, 737, 743
Vol. 2: 86 f., 109, 111, 154, 174, 183, 189, 225, 306, 355, 374, 420, 432, 613, 649, 740, 754
Vol. 3: 69, 79, 248, 367, 388 f., 391, 427, 430, 494, 609, 842, 912, 916, 920, 1001, 1006, 1093 f., 1101
Isaiah Apocalypse **Vol. 1:** 50
Iscariot **Vol. 2: 321** (*also* → Judas Iscariot)
Ishmael **Vol. 1:** 80 f., 411, 532
Vol. 2: 128
Vol. 3: 249, 661
Ishmael, Rabbi **Vol. 2:** 591
Ishtar **Vol. 2:** 201, 553
Isis **Vol. 1:** 64, 176, 206, 271, 595
Vol. 2: 67, 214, 224, 289 f., 521, 539, 554
Vol. 3: 138, 216, 501, 717, 785, 861, 1068, 1085
Isis-hymn **Vol. 3:** 760
Island **Vol. 2:** 233, 353
Isles of the blessed **Vol. 2:** 761
Isolated **Vol. 2:** 195, 295
Isolation **Vol. 3:** 710, 1097
Israel **Vol. 1:** 49, **61,** 65, 67, 71, 74, 76, 80 f., 101 f., 104, 111 f., 117, 121, 134, 151 f., 155, 170, 172–174, 177, 190, 194 f., 199, 205, 209 f., 225, 245, 249, 252, 255, 257 f., 281, 286, 288 f., 293 f., 296 f., 299, 302 f., 305 f., 308, 320, 324, 333, 355–357, 366 f., 369 f., 372 f., 377, 380–383, 390, 393, 405, 407, 411, 414, 416, 423, 425 f., 429, 433, 444, 450, 460, 467, 481, 484 f., 487, 489, 497–499, 509 f., 518, 527, 531 f., 538–541, 543 f., 546, 551, 553–555, 557, 560, 585 f., 593, 610–612, 617, 619, 622, 625 f., 628 f., 632, 637, 640 f., 650, 655, 661, 667, 673, 675, 684–691, 698–700, 713, 716, 724 f., 734, 737 f.
Vol. 2: 37 f., 45, 53, 56, 63, 68–73, 77, 80 f., 86, 100, 104, 111, 122, 125, 127, 130, 134, 142, 146, 149, 154–156, 158, 173 f., 177, 190, 202 f., 206, 218, 222 f., 225, 229–231, 237, 239–242, 245, 247, 249, 252, 257 f., 265, 269, 275, 284 f., 287, 296–298, 300–302, **304–323,** 325 f., 328 f., 331, 335 f., 339, 342 f., 350, 353, 358, 363 f., 367–369, 373–375, 377–379, 382, 385, 396, 410, 412 f., 415, 425 f., 431 f., 441 f., 445, 453, 458, 485, 490, 495, 521, 534, 541, 545, 558, 573, 576 f., 580, 583–585, 597, 602, 607 f., 610, 612, 615, 627, 629, 636, 641 f., 644, 649 f., 652, 660, 664, 670, 677, 679 f., 688, 690 f., 695 f., 698, 700, 712, 730, 754, 772, 777, 779, 782, 786, 790–794, 796–800, 802, 805, 810, 812, 822, 825, 835, 838, 840, 844, 848, 850, 859, 862 f., 865 f., 872, 880, 882, 888,

890, 893, 916–918, 921
Vol. 3: 30, 33 f., 36–38, 50, 65 f., 69, 71–73, 77, 79 f., 95, 97, 104 f., 117, 135, 147, 150, 172, 190, 192–194, 198 f., 201–203, 206–212, 216, 218 f., 229, 232, 234–239, 241, 249, 251–253, 268–270, 299 f., 311, 318, 333, 341, 355–357, 359 f., 363, 382, 387, 392, 397, 400, 405–407, 416, 418, 420, 426 f., 431, 450, 454–456, 468 f., 478, 484 f., 505, 522, 531, 545, 557, 564 f., 567, 586, 590, 594, 605 f., 608, 611 f., 614, 621, 626, 630, 636–638, 642, 644 f., 650, 652–654, 658, 692, 720 f., 729, 734, 745, 762, 769, 776 f., 787, 790, 793 f., 800, 806 f., 828, 851 f., 866, 871–873, 881, 893, 905, 911 f., 914, 916, 918, 920, 937 f., 940, 950, 952 f., 960, 962, 964, 970, 984, 986, 1006 f., 1009, 1013 f., 1016 f., 1019, 1028 f., 1032, 1041, 1057, 1063, 1068 f., 1071, 1092, 1095, 1100 f., 1103–1105, 1112, 1121, 1148, 1162
Israel, modern **Vol. 2:** 308
Israel of God **Vol. 1:** 61, 257
Vol. 3: 400, 871
Israel and sonship **Vol. 3: 636**
Israelite **Vol. 1:** 123, 170, 177, 180, 195, 208, 216, 218, 221, 245, 250, 252, 288, 299, 309, 321, 349, 360, 379 f., 434, 451, 485, 509, 527, 543, 559, 622, 640, 688, 690–692, 716
Vol. 2: 53, 70, 134, 174 f., 180, 213, 239, **304–316,** 324–326, 336, 353, 373, 424, 428, 441, 462, 592, 626, 819, 822, 835
Vol. 3: 36, 65, 77, 93, 96, 140, 150, 190, 207, 238, 262, 272, 274 f., 341, 379, 421, 424, 427, 429, 455, 460, 531, 590, 593–595, 609f., 653, 656, 740, 752, 806, 811, 836, 841, 851–853, 870, 953, 960, 962, 964 f., 1010, 1028, 1057, 1104, 1162
Issachar **Vol. 2:** 317
Vol. 3: 139
Issue **Vol. 1:** 604, 703
Vol. 2: 62, 138, 846
Issue of blood **Vol. 3:** 1059
Isthmian games **Vol. 1:** 406
Italian Cohort **Vol. 2:** 596
Italy **Vol. 1:** 55
Ithaca **Vol. 2:** 372
Itinerant **Vol. 1:** 132, 322
Ivory **Vol. 2:** 349
Ivy **Vol. 1:** 648

J source **Vol. 1:** 57, 61, 66, 72, 512
Jabbok **Vol. 2:** 317
Jabesh **Vol. 1:** 574
Jabez **Vol. 3:** 478
Jabneh **Vol. 3:** 453, 921
Jacinth **Vol. 3:** 396
Jackal **Vol. 3:** 950, 1051
Jacob **Vol. 1:** 61, 65, 76 f., 116, 140, 182, 208, 214, 255, 264, 272, 320, 408, 430, 511, 531, 538, 556, 574, 596, 617, 645, 648, 697
Vol. 2: 68 f., 73, 116, 128, 140, 185, 247, **304–323,** 329, 337, 375, 416, 426, 431, 466 f., 558, 578, 649, 651, 791, 796, 860, 865, 899
Vol. 3: 73, 139, 194, 203, 263, 359, 418, 425, 458 f., 461, 514, 608, 642, 649, 655, 658, 683, 734, 736, 739, 806, 815, 852, 860, 872, 879, 965, 969, 1012, 1040 f., 1059, 1091, 1094, 1135
Jacob's ladder **Vol. 3:** 630
Jacob's well **Vol. 3:** 459, 461, 987
Jael **Vol. 1:** 687
Jairus **Vol. 1:** 340
Vol. 2: 418, 433, 623, 630
Vol. 3: 280, 293, 558, 1059
Jambres **Vol. 2:** 219, 557 f., 642
James **Vol. 2: 316**
James, apostle **Vol. 1:** 643
Vol. 2: 148, 652, 816
Vol. 3: 241, 283, 297, 346, 454, 588, 795, 822
James, epistle **Vol. 1:** 304, 318, 346, 604 f., 731
Vol. 2: 28, 63, 370, 422 f., 435, 449 f., 738, 771, 775, 825, 868
Vol. 3: 52, 107, 346, 369, 525, 582, 687, 1151
James, the Lord's brother **Vol. 1:** 256, 310
Vol. 3: 130, 256, 288, 387, 621, 796
James, William **Vol. 3:** 896
James the younger **Vol. 2:** 320
Vol. 3: 1060
James and Zoker **Vol. 3:** 621
Jamnia **Vol. 1:** 51
Vol. 2: 313
Vol. 3: 401, 485, 921
Janik, A. **Vol. 3:** 1136
Jannes **Vol. 2:** 219, 557 f., 642
Jar **Vol. 3: 910–913**
Jason **Vol. 2:** 804
Jasper **Vol. 3:** 395 f., 395–397, 948
Javan **Vol. 2:** 124
Jaw **Vol. 1:** 694
Vol. 2: 30
Jealous **Vol. 1:** 108, 543, 667
Vol. 3: 156, 572
Jealousy **Vol. 1:** 106, 201, 557 f., 681, 739
Vol. 2: 587, 618, 818
Vol. 3: 243, 691, 1054, 1166 f.
Jebel Musa **Vol. 3:** 1013
Jebel Usdum **Vol. 3:** 444
Jebus **Vol. 2:** 324
Jebusite **Vol. 2:** 186, 324, 375, 636
Vol. 3: 783, 787, 1010
Jeconiah **Vol. 1:** 683
Vol. 3: 655, 912, 957
Jedidiah **Vol. 3:** 605
Jehoiachin **Vol. 2:** 69
Vol. 3: 609, 1104
Jehoiada **Vol. 3:** 82, 430
Jehoiakim **Vol. 1:** 652
Vol. 3: 478, 1096
Jehoshaphat **Vol. 2:** 754
Vol. 3: 478
Jehovah **Vol. 1:** 71 f.
Vol. 2: 69
Jehovah-shalom **Vol. 2:** 777
Jehovah's Witnesses **Vol. 2:** 81
Jehu **Vol. 1:** 543
Vol. 3: 1092
Jeopardize **Vol. 2:** 415

Jeopardy **Vol. 2:** 360
Vol. 3: 577
Jephthah **Vol. 1:** 352
Vol. 3: 421, 425 f.
Jeremiah **Vol. 1:** 52, 66, 93, 245 f., 368, 409, 485, 499, 531, 717
Vol. 2: 70, 105, 154, 183, 226, 239 f., 252, 285, 306 f., 374, 479, 541, 583, 612, 754
Vol. 3: 79, 83, 94, 96, 159 f., 234 f., 249, 381, 427, 430, 484, 609, 701, 721, 788, 811, 866, 881, 912, 914, 916, 961, 1068, 1091, 1095–1098, 1103, 1120, 1161
Jeremias, Joachim **Vol. 1:** 148
Vol. 3: 83, 620
Jeremy, Epistle of **Vol. 1:** 50
Jericho **Vol. 1:** 49, 593, 713
Vol. 2: 225, 754
Vol. 3: 78, 444, 469, 758, 788, 874, 948
Jeroboam I **Vol. 1:** 127, 332, 515
Vol. 2: 374
Vol. 3: 426, 872, 999
Jeroboam II **Vol. 3:** 1092
Jerome **Vol. 1:** 50, 53, 71, 251
Vol. 2: 75, 219, 804
Vol. 3: 402
Jerubbaal **Vol. 1:** 195
Jerusalem **Vol. 1:** 52 f., 61 f., 72, 75, 108, 116 f., 125, 129, 131, 133, 136, 138, 166, 170, 174 f., 196, 199, 210, 214, 240, 286, 296 f., 301, 303–305, 310, 317, 320, 323 f., 333, 340, 344, 361, 363 f., 366, 390, 393, 395 f., 411, 416, 473, 478, 528, 532, 538, 554, 559, 586, 610, 612, 629, 632, 640, 642, 683, 686, 691, 724 f., 731, 735–737
Vol. 2: 33, 37 f., 45, 54, 56, 63, 112, 125, 174, 185 f., 188, 190, 194, 208, 216 f., 225, 227, 229, 231, 234, 245, 271, 296, 305, 308, 311, 321, **324–330,** 331, 335, 349, 363, 373, 375 f., 379, 381, 400, 418, 450–452, 467 f., 489, 528, 592 f., 597, 612, 623 f., 649 f., 664, 679, 681, 688, 693, 700 f., 706, 713, 740, 754 f., 761, 763, 778, 785, 793, 802–804, 809, 815, 818, 826 f., 834, 844, 846 f., 849, 852, 864–866, 878, 888, 895, 902, 904, 909 f., 914–918, 921, 927, 930
Vol. 3: 28, 34–38, 40, 62–66, 71, 82, 87 f., 94, 101, 106, 112, 118 f., 160, 177, 198, 203, 229, 236, 250 f., 269, 271, 286 f., 289 f., 295 f., 315, 320 f., 380, 391, 410, 426, 428, 430, 435, 441, 443, 451 f., 456, 458, 460, 464 f., 499, 509, 546, 553, 557, 559 f., 591 f., 598 f., 605, 615, 624, 642, 653, 669, 692, 698, 700, 709f., 721, 723, 735 f., 741, 752 f., 758, 762, 782–786, 791 f., 795, 807, 838, 854, 856, 871 f., 908, 912, 914, 920, 944, 948 f., 952, 957, 960, 962, 965, 976 f., 1006, 1008, 1010 f., **1014,** 1047, 1052, 1062, 1067–1070, 1074, 1094, 1097, 1100, 1103, 1114, 1168, 1183, 1201
Jerusalem above **Vol. 2:** 329, 356, 803
Vol. 3: 1070
Jerusalem Council **Vol. 1:** 62, 135, 157, 221, 261, 310, 330 f., 363
Vol. 2: 321, 795, 827
Vol. 3: 106, 410, 812, 1164
Jerusalem decree **Vol. 3:** 87
Jerusalem, heavenly **Vol. 1:** 142, 304, 411, 421
Vol. 2: 186, 188, 191, 194, 207, **326,** 329, 487 f., 585
Vol. 3: 143, 203, 871, 944
Jerusalem, new **Vol. 1:** 185, 380, 390, 448, 587
Vol. 2: 30, 199, 231, 329, 423, 473f., 482, 495, 615, 652, 671, 674, 692, 696, 700 f., 763, 795, 803 f., 931
Vol. 3: 99, 107, 387, 395, 397 f., 404, 558, 732, 734, 784, 813, 948, 1010, 1012, 1068
Jerusalem Talmud (→ Talmud, Jerusalem)
Jesse **Vol. 1:** 407
Vol. 3: 649, 867
Jesus **Vol. 1:** 66, 75, 77, 79, 83, 85 f., 89–93, 95–100, 102, 104, 106, 111 f., 117 f., 120, 122–125, 127–136, 141–149, 153, 160, 162 f., 167 f., 170–174, 176–180, 182 f., 185, 187, 191, 198 f., 204 f., 212, 215, 217, 219–224, 226, 228, 231, 234 f., 239, 245, 250 f., 253, 255–263, 265–267, 296 f., 273 f., 278 f., 281–287, 289 f., 296–298, 302, 304 f., 309–311, 313, 317, 321–324, 328, 334–341, 343, 346 f., 351, 356, 358 f., 361, 363–365, 369, 372, 374 f., 377 f., 382, 384 f., 389–404, 407, 409, 411, 413–415, 417 f., 420 f., 423–425, 427–430, 435–441, 443, 445 f., 448, 452–455, 457, 461, 466 f., 469 f., 473–478, 480, 482 f., 486–491, 493, 495, 499 f., 504, 506, 509–512, 515 f., 520, 525, 528–530, 532, 539–542, 544 f., 548 f., 551 f., 554, 556, 558–561, 564–566, 570, 572, 575, 577 f., 581–583, 590, 592 f., 599–604, 612 f., 615, 619 f., 623, 628–634, 637–639, 642–644, 646, 649–651, 657, 659, 662 f., 666–670, 675–680, 684 f., 689, 691, 693, 701 f., 704, 707 f., 717, 720, 722–725, 729, 736–742, 744
Vol. 2: 36, 69, 73, 79, 109 f., 113, 174, 194, 223, 230, 241, 253, 299–301, 314, 321, **330–348,** 373 f., 379, 383, 398, 400, 404 f., 459, 495, 519, **653–656,** 691, 695, 702, 708–710, 713, 716, 721–725, 728 f., 775, 785, 794, 799–801, 812, 818 f., 824 f., 831–846, 851, 855–861, 867–882, 893, 895 f., 898–922, 928–930
Vol. 3: 30 f., 37–39, 41 f., 48, 50, 55–64, 66 f., 71–74, 81–89, 99, 106 f., 110, 114 f., 118, 120, 129, 131 f., 135 f., 143, 147 f., 160–163, 170 f., 173 f., 179–189, 195–199, 202, 204 f., 209, 211–213, 215, 219–221, 225 f., 228 f., 240–246, 253, 257, 261, 263 f., 276–278, 280–287, 289–294, 296–302, 313–316, 319–323, 325 f., 329 f., 333, 340, 342–344, 347 f., 360–362, 364, 366, 370, 372, 378–380, 382–387, 390, 392–395, 402–404, 408–410, 415, 423, 428–435, 440, 442, 445–448, 454–456, 460, 462 f., 470–476, 481 f., 489–492, 494 f., 499, 506–510, 516 f., 519, 522 f., 526 f., 529 f., 532, 536, 538–543, 545–547, 556–560, 567–569, 571, 579–582, 584, 589, 592, 595–598, 603, 605, 607, 610–612, 614, 617–634, 636, 639–646, 648, 651–654, 656–664, 669 f., 674 f., 682 f., 685, 695–698, 700–706,

710, 712, 717, 725, 729, 731 f., 737, 740–742, 746, 748–751, 753–755, 757 f., 761–764, 767–770, 773–775, 784 f., 789–796, 801–807, 809, 813–815, 818 f., 822, 824–826, 832, 837–839, 843 f., 847–849, 860–864, 867–869, 873 f., 883 f., 886, 890–893, 901, 909, 911 f., 916, 919–922, 924 f., 931, 934, 939, 941 f., 945 f., 951 f., 954, 956, 962, 964 f., 967–970, 975–980, 984 f., 987 f., 990, 998, 1002 f., 1007, 1009–1012, 1014, 1017 f., 1021 f., 1025, 1033, 1043–1047, 1049, 1052, 1059–1062, 1067 f., 1070 f., 1073, 1079, 1106–1110, 1113–1116, 1118–1122, 1132 f., 1137, 1140, 1143, 1149 f., 1152, 1154 f., 1157, 1161–1164, 1168, 1176, 1178, 1180, 1182, 1191 f., 1199, 1201, 1206, 1209–1212

Jesus and Moses **Vol. 2: 640–642,** 893

Jesus and revolution **Vol. 3: 967–981**

Jesus as truth **Vol. 3: 891 f.**

Jesus as the Word **Vol. 3: 1114–1117**

Jesus' equality with God **Vol. 2: 499 f.**

Jesus ben Sirach **Vol. 1:** 626
Vol. 2: 331, 622
Vol. 3: 270, 479, 911, 916 (*also* → Ecclesiasticus)

Jesus-groups **Vol. 2:** 308, 311

Jethro **Vol. 1:** 195
Vol. 2: 636 f.
Vol. 3: 33

Jew **Vol. 1:** 67, 117, 141, 155 f., 194, 199, 202, 228, 253, 257 f., 261, 266, 279, 282, 296 f., 308–311, 317, 340, 350, 361, 363, 366, 385, 394–397, 402 f., 417, 419, 424, 434 f., 453, 462, 473, 476, 487, 503, 506, 510, 529, 545, 554, 565, 575, 589–591, 593, 601, 615, 618, 622, 627 f., 630, 637, 642, 659, 684–686, 688, 694, 708, 720, 730, 737, 739 f., 742
Vol. 2: 35, 69, 83, 94, 104, 113, 124–127, 129 f., 135, 139, 148, 155 f., 159, 163, 177 f., 213 f., 216–218, 221, 241, 254, 261, 282, 285 f., 288, 303, **304–323,** 328, 331 f., 338, 349, 353, 356, 358, 369, 372, 378 f., 381, 399 f., 405, 407, 413, 444–446, 448–451, 460, 467, 474, 499, 652, 655, 660 f., 682, 695, 707, 712, 721 f., 727, 729, 736, 740, 786, 789, 793 f., 799–801, 804, 816, 818, 828, 834, 849 f., 877 f., 917, 930
Vol. 3: 34, 38, 51, 65 f., 82, 97, 101, 106, 132, 147, 163, 168, 172, 186–188, 190, 199, 203, 213 f., 216, 229, 237, 240, 251 f., 269, 275, 277, 280, 287, 313, 320, 342, 352, 361–363, 378, 408, 431, 435, 441 f., 452 f., 455, 459–463, 465, 470, 490, 493 f., 504, 509, 523, 529, 532 f., 549, 558, 561, 571, 579, 582, 584 f., 641, 658, 671, 686, 701, 714, 751 f., 754, 756 f., 778, 785, 790, 795, 813, 818, 853, 870, 872 f., 883, 885, 892, 908 f., 940, 949, 951, 954, 964, 976 f., 997 f., 1020, 1025, 1035, 1040, 1043, 1048, 1062, 1101, 1111, 1113, 1122, 1132, 1149, 1163, 1165, 1184, 1189 f., 1195, 1199

Jewel **Vol. 1:** 469
Vol. 2: 218
Vol. 3: 391, 395, 397, 872, 948

Jewellery **Vol. 1:** 522
Vol. 2: 96

Jewish **Vol. 1:** 144, 154–159, 182, 199 f., 228, 230, 236, 243 f., 252, 257, 264 f., 267, 272, 277, 296 f., 304 f., 308–311, 313–316, 322, 331, 334, 336 f., 347 f., 350, 360, 363 f., 370, 374, 377, 390, 394–396, 399, 403, 409, 414 f., 423, 427 f., 434 f., 442, 444, 446, 449, 455, 463, 465, 474 f., 487, 499, 505 f., 508 f., 514 f., 527, 534, 539, 545, 559, 580 f., 590, 597, 607, 616, 618, 624, 627 f., 631 f., 641, 655, 661, 686, 691, 694, 706, 714, 725, 742
Vol. 2: 30, 32, 35, 41, 46, 51, 70 f., 73, 80, 91, 112, 120, 125, 128, 133–135, 140, 144, 150, 152, 158, 160, 169, 178, 191, 204, 208 f., 211, 215, 218, 221 f., 228, 234, 236 f., 241, 250, 254, 261, 266 f., 269, 271, 275, 279, 284, 291, 294, 302, **304–316,** 324, 327, 329, 331–335, 339, 350, 352 f., 368, 407, 410, 426 f., 429, 437 f., 442, 446, 448, 461 f., 826 f., 849 f., 888, 927
Vol. 3: 31, 35, 38–41, 50, 58 f., 63, 70–72, 80, 85, 89, 98, 101, 106, 148, 163–165, 168, 181 f., 184–189, 191, 195–197, 227, 240, 253, 265, 270, 272, 282, 287, 291, 293, 300, 311 f., 320, 324, 361 f., 369 f., 373, 383, 390, 393, 397, 401, 403, 408–410, 418, 431, 439–441, 452–454, 458, 460 f., 464, 466, 471 f., 476, 479, 482, 491 f., 494 f., 502, 510, 526, 558–560, 580, 584, 599, 603 f., 606, 611, 615–619, 622, 629–632, 636 f., 644, 647, 652, 656 f., 659, 662, 669, 693, 715, 717, 728, 735, 741, 754–756, 762, 764–766, 768, 774 f., 783–785, 789 f., 793, 803, 805, 813, 817–819, 829 f., 832, 847, 861, 867–869, 872, 877, 882, 885, 888, 892, 908, 913, 919–921, 924, 929, 931–934, 939 f., 944, 962, 964, 976–979, 984, 986 f., 990 f., 1014, 1029–1032, 1035, 1043, 1059, 1061, 1063 f., 1066 f., 1073, 1111, 1116, 1119, 1163 f., 1184, 1197, 1199

Jewish Christians **Vol. 1:** 55, **61,** 62, 157, 226, 310 f., 340, 368, 473, 632, 689
Vol. 2: 126, 135, 221, 236, 241, **314–316,** 331, 333, 437, 499

Jewish missionary activity **Vol. 2:** 792

Jewry **Vol. 1:** 473

Jezebel **Vol. 1:** 416
Vol. 2: 555, 582, 677 f., 724
Vol. 3: 81, 426, 844, 846, 1005, 1013, 1057, 1067

Jinn **Vol. 1:** 509

Joab **Vol. 1:** 324
Vol. 2: 116

Joanan **Vol. 2:** 320

Joanna **Vol. 3:** 1060

Job **Vol. 1:** 211, 434, 467, 547, 562, 568, 645, 652, 672
Vol. 2: 67, 93, 144, 274, 432, 771, 773, 775, 841, 860
Vol. 3: 140, 177–179, 209, 234 f., 261, 342, 346, 425, 468, 528, 564, 609, 721, 800, 802, 842, 866, 915, 950, 997, 1041, 1160

Job's comforters **Vol. 1: 89**

Job's comforters (*cont'd*)
Vol. 3: 209
Joda **Vol. 2:** 320
Joel **Vol. 1:** 66, 224, 512, 531, 683
Vol. 2: 329, 690, 785
Vol. 3: 87, 213, 250, 594, 693, 699 f., 732, 1001
Johanan, Rabbi **Vol. 2:** 784
Johanan ben Zakkai **Vol. 3:** 921
John **Vol. 1:** 52, 63, 116, 134, 199, 202, 204 f., 244, 303, 347, 359, 424, 438–441, 458, 483, 490, 524 f., 528, 538 f., 542, 603, 612, 623, 628–631, 633, 637 f., 643, 678 f.
Vol. 2: 34, 76, 114, 148, 193, 204, 217, 302, 315, 339, 359, 367, 403 f., 480, 494, 546, 557, 567, 625, 652, 736, 775, 786, 907, 927
Vol. 3: 40, 46 f., 98, 107, 136, 241, 320, 454, 481, 495, 529, 559, 588, 717, 795, 822, 908, 1010, 1113
John the Baptist **Vol. 1:** 77, 111, 116, 128, **145 f.,** 149 f., 155–158, 187, 219, 273, 309, 323, 335, 343, 346, 356, 358, 409, 411, 428, 430, 446, 541, 545, 559, 571, 599, 612, 638, 657, 722, 729, 739
Vol. 2: 104, 110, 113, 130, 136, 159, 176, 229, 245, 262, 272, 275 f., 311, 338, 353, 358 f., 366, 368, 379, 383, 399, 410, 427, 429, 443, 467, 487, 494, 550, 580, 585, 592, 624, 669, 676, 708, 786, 799, 801, 902
Vol. 3: 39, 52, 55 f., 63, 81–83, 86 f., 110, 115, 118 f., 121, 144, 179, 182, 198, 202, 212, 321, 360 f., 393, 436, 439, 489, 507, 516, 519, 527, 540, 555, 558 f., 570, 580, 603, 620, 623, 644, 658, 660 f., 674, 695, 697, 711, 713, 717, 742, 758, 767, 790 f., 804, 822, 848, 869, 890, 893, 920 f., 940, 947, 965, 969, 987, 990 f., 1006–1009, 1017, 1030, 1044 f., 1048, 1062, 1071 f., 1107, 1115, 1121, 1154, 1157, 1208, 1210
John of Gischala **Vol. 3:** 1168
John, high priest **Vol. 3:** 40
John Hyranus I **Vol. 1:** 309
Vol. 2: 810, 815, 849
Vol. 3: 439, 450, 452, 872
John Hyranus II **Vol. 2:** 850
Vol. 3: 39
Join **Vol. 2:** 300, **348–350,** 353, 356, 395, 579
Vol. 3: 535, 539, **1160–1165**
Joiner **Vol. 1:** 241
Joint **Vol. 1:** 238, 241
Joke **Vol. 2:** 430
Jonah **Vol. 1:** 66, 358, 517, 671
Vol. 2: 215, **350–352,** 381, 629 f., 679 f., 687, 831, 888
Vol. 3: 52–54, 83, 89, 236, 628
Jonathan **Vol. 2:** 69, 116, 540, 849
Vol. 3: 190, 195, 218, 875 f., 962
Jonathan (Alexander Janneus) **Vol. 1:** 394
Vol. 2: 659, 849 f.
Jonathan (son of Ananus) **Vol. 3:** 39
Jonathan (high priest) **Vol. 3:** 34 f., 51
Joppa **Vol. 1:** 528
Vol. 2: 596
Vol. 3: 1065
Jordan **Vol. 1:** 55, 67, 144, 629
Vol. 2: 185, 639
Vol. 3: 237, 559, 695–698, 704, 758, 788, 951, 985 f., **991**
Joseph **Vol. 1:** 104, 264, 337, 408, 430, 512, 531, 555, 580, 650
Vol. 2: 116, 306, 317–320, 331, 416, 431 f., 558, 636 f.
Vol. 3: 458–460, 479, 531, 591, 658, 670, 720, 739, 872, 880, 1167, 1179
Joseph of Arimathea **Vol. 1:** 265
Vol. 2: 216, 387
Vol. 3: 292, 361, 1017
Joseph Barsabbas **Vol. 2:** 299
Joseph of Nazareth **Vol. 1:** 256, 279, 506, 530, 559
Vol. 2: 86, 333
Vol. 3: 243, 249, 320, 324, 430, 652–655, **658–663,** 931, 1062, 1070 f., 1073
Joseph, son of Tobias **Vol. 3:** 758
Josephus, Flavius **Vol. 1:** 87, 102, 149, 151, 156, 178, 201–204, 221, 230, 243, 252 f., 258 f., 269 f., 277, 313, 329, 334, 341–343, 345, 355, 363, 365, 377, 387, 394, 396, 409 f., 412, 428, 435, 442, 450 f., 472, 495, 510 f., 513, 515, 529 f., 532–534, 554, 559 f., 574, 578, 580, 586, 599, 615, 618, 627, 629, 641, 646, 683, 694 f., 698, 700, 709
Vol. 2: 33, 43, 61, 109, 125, 136, 150, 160, 182, 207, 222, 234 f., 258, 259, 308–311, 320, 324, **331,** 373, 377, 381, 461, 463, 512, 557, 565, 570, 578 f., 591 f., 607 f., 651, 659 f., 679, 688, 707, 779, 792, 810 f., 879, 899
Vol. 3: 34, 36, 39 f., 51, 80, 96, 98, 119, 125 f., 210, 218, 273, 279, 439, 449–451, 459, 479 f., 485 f., 545, 575, 606, 680 f., 756, 758, 769, 772, 783, 789, 795, 813, 871, 939, 948, 989, 1042, 1058, 1162, 1164
Joses **Vol. 3:** 1060
Joshua **Vol. 1:** 53, 66, 208, 332, 340, 393, 485
Vol. 2: 69, 151, 297, 330–332, 466, 628, 638, 712, 878
Vol. 3: 78, 208 f., 212, 418, 469, 609, 772, 841, 867, 926, 948, 962
Joshua ben Levi, Rabbi **Vol. 3:** 488, 1162
Joshua's long day **Vol. 2:** 628
Josiah **Vol. 1:** 55, 632
Vol. 2: 306, 325, 466, 521, 555, 778, 797
Vol. 3: 34, 426, 478, 485, 783, 878, 1057, 1095 f.
Journey **Vol. 1:** 173, 263, 626, 649
Vol. 2: 191, 266, 317 f., 327, 679
Vol. 3: 121, 229, 454, 602, 630, 679, 935, **945–947**
Joy **Vol. 1:** 119 f., 122, 217, 227, 263, 335, 358 f., 381, 400, 411 f., 423, 459 f., 490, 530, 561, 603, 607, 612, 633, 648, 729–731, 734, 741
Vol. 2: 103, 107, 115, 122, 130, 149, 180 f., 218, 247, 268, 276, **352–361,** 386, 388, 408, 416, 419–421, 423 f., 429–431, 433, 435 f., 450, 462, 482, 519, 521, 524, 585, 590, 711 f., 780 f., 783, 809, 817, 833, 862, 873 f., 887,

894, 901
Vol. 3: 168, 268, 361, 529, 567, 668, 672, 674, 682, 687, 701, 721, 783, 817, 835, 848, 921, 941, 956, 1152
Joyful **Vol. 2:** 239, 244, 272, 735
Joyous **Vol. 2:** 240
Jubilation **Vol. 1:** 410
Vol. 2: 353, 540
Jubilee **Vol. 1:** 698
Vol. 3: 191, 594, 756
Jubilees, Book of **Vol. 2:** 528
Vol. 3: 487
Judah **Vol. 1:** 49, **61 f.,** 72, 118, 140 f., 518, 544, 597
Vol. 2: 38, 226, 247, 272, **304–323,** 325 f., 335 f., 374, 577, 592, 636, 696, 815, 823, 848, 899, 916
Vol. 3: 94, 249 f., 256, 356, 359, 367, 397, 435, 526, 557, 649, 654, 821, 853, 872 f., 1071, 1100, 1104, 1179
Judah ben Elai, Rabbi **Vol. 3:** 1058
Judah the Prince, Rabbi **Vol. 3:** 488
Judaism **Vol. 1:** 61, 63 f., 67, **69,** 72, 76–78, 85, 92, 99, 101, 109, 120, 127 f., 145, 153–156, 160, 166, 169, 174, 178, 180, 195, 200, 212 f., 216, 219, 221, 227, 235, 245, 259, 261, 264, 280, 284, 288, 295, 302, 308 f., 311 f., 326, 329 f., 334, 345, 351, 354, 356, 360, 371, 381 f., 387, 394–396, 399, 402, 405, 407, 414, 416, 435, 437, 449, 451, 472, 485–488, 503, 509, 511, 515, 524, 534 f., 543 f., 555, 565, 580, 595, 597–599, 601, 614, 617 f., 629, 632–634, 643, 645, 656, 669, 672 f., 686, 688 f., 691, 700, 714, 717, 721, 729 f., 736 f.
Vol. 2: 37, 43, 48 f., 53 f., 56, 67, 71, 73, 82, 100, 104 f., 109, 125, 131, 141, 147, 149, 151, 159, 168, 174 f., 182, 186, 191, 207, 211, 216, 227, 237, 240 f., 248, 266, 280 f., 283, 285, 287, 298, **307–316,** 324, 336 f., 340, 353, 355, 357, 377, 383, 385, 396–398, 418, 420, 427, 437, 440–442, 450, 468, 479, 486, 499, 516, 556, 565, 578, 591, 599, 603, 612–614, 640 f., 660, 663, 667, 672, 676, 678, 689 f., 715, 720, 761, 773, 784, 786, 792, 794, 798, 803, 808, 810–814, 818, 823, 830, 833, 867 f., 880 f., 892, 903, 919 f., 928, 930
Vol. 3: 28, 31, 41, 45, 54, 59, 66, 86, 96, 105 f., 108, 142, 157, 167, 181, 183, 192–194, 220, 233, 250–253, 256, 266, 274, 293, 296, 300, 311, 331, 342, 348, 358, 361, 377, 383, 392, 397, 407, 428, 434, 439, 441, 450, 453, 460 f., 466, 485–491, 494, 498, 522, 528, 543, 545, 550, 552, 566, 568, 575, 579 f., 595, 610 f., 613 f., 623, 637, 648 f., 652, 654, 659, 668, 671 f., 682, 685, 692 f., 696, 729, 740, 746, 748, 761 f., 766, 769, 772, 777 f., 784, 789, 808, 825, 828 f., 832, 836, 843, 853 f., 867, 892, 920, 931 f., 938, 983 f., 989 f., 1006 f., 1029, 1033, 1035, 1042, 1052, 1054, 1056, 1072, 1074, 1117, 1120, 1149–1151, 1154, 1161, 1167
Judaism, liberal **Vol. 1: 69**
Judaism, Talmudic **Vol. 1: 69**
Vol. 2: 332
Judaizers **Vol. 1:** 61, **62,** 78 f., 157 f., 331
Vol. 2: 570, 741, 828
Vol. 3: 524, 884, 1164
Judaizing **Vol. 1:** 309, 487
Vol. 2: 133
Judas **Vol. 2: 316–321**
Judas Barsabbas **Vol. 2: 321**
Vol. 3: 87, 908
Judas, brother of Jesus **Vol. 2: 320**
Judas of Damascus **Vol. 2: 320**
Judas the Galilean **Vol. 1:** 591
Vol. 2: 34, **320**
Vol. 3: 378, 1167 f.
Judas Iscariot **Vol. 1:** 93, 129, 143, 222, 299, 356, 364, 464, 478, 520, 689, 725
Vol. 2: 44, 299, **321,** 339, 368, 437, 526–528, 549, 851, 854
Vol. 3: 70, 115, 378, 387, 397, 448, 470, 472, 532, 569, 582, 584, 793, 804, 912, 1053, 1060
Judas Maccabaeus **Vol. 1:** 63, 340, 627
Vol. 2: 810, 849
Vol. 3: 51, 318, 961 f.
Judas, son of James **Vol. 2: 320**
Judas the prophet **Vol. 1:** 570 f.
Jude **Vol. 1:** 52
Vol. 2: 320, 459, 897
Vol. 3: 344, 653
Judea **Vol. 1:** 67, 94, 166, 269 f., 297, 301, 303, 395, 512
Vol. 2: 54, **305, 316,** 320, 826, 921
Vol. 3: 63, 324, 456, 458, 460, 478, 508, 756–758, 1008, 1093, 1114, 1168, 1179
Judge **Vol. 1:** 60, 97, 107, 112, 115, 118, 168, 185, 189 f., 196, 219 f., 248, 273, 320, 323, 327, 344 f., 349, 356, 373, 399, 410, 425, 445, 464, 469, 473, 482, 503–505, 519, 525, 529, 531, 539, 566, 587, 637, 648, 655 f., 674, 678, 680, 684
Vol. 2: 71, 119 f., 140, 143, 148, 194, 204, 209, 216, 230, 238, 253, 257, 259 f., 298, 314, 327, 358, **361–371,** 372, 381, 383, 385, 390–392, 411, 440, 450, 456, 468, 490, 503, 510, 518, 574, 604 f., 607, 609 f., 612, 614, **616–620,** 622, 721, 727, 771, 818, 833, 859, 865 f., 877, 894, 899, 929
Vol. 3: 95, 115, 118, 124, 134, 136, 144, 173, 201, 216, 218, 279, 343, 346, 355, 361 f., 373, 402 f., 492, 576, 584, 588, 617 f., 621, 627, 630, 633, 639, 646, 674, 686, 691, 738, 740, 749, 812, 830, 840, 865, 871, 885, 935, 1054, 1057, 1062, 1104, 1108, 1150, 1152, 1158, 1161
Judges **Vol. 1:** 53, 55, 66, 426, 716, 739
Vol. 2: 98
Vol. 3: 49, 73, 279
Judge's oath **Vol. 3:** 740
Judgment **Vol. 1:** 77, 79, 83 f., 86, 89, 91, 102 f., 106 f., 109–113, 115, 146, 156, 163, 167, 171–173, 175, 185, 190 f., 203, 205, 209 f., 219, 224, 228, 231, 233, 240, 243 f., 320 f., 326 f., 343, 345, 347–350, 353, 356, 358 f., 364, 372, 386, 390, 396, 414–418, 423, 425,

Judgment (*cont'd*)
429 f., 433 f., 439–441, 443, 446, 449, 452, 462, 465–468, 471 f., 474, 486, 495, 499 f., 503 f., 514, 516–518, 524 f., 531, 533, 536, 542, 546, 550 f., 554, 559, 564, 566, 583, 585, 597 f., 602, 610 f., 623 f., 652 f., 655–657, 667, 670, 674, 676, 703, 705, 722, 724 f., 737
Vol. 2: 28, 31–33, 37–39, 47, 53, 56, 58, 70, 72, 75, 98, 101–103, 111, 117 f., 136, 141, 143, 146–148, 154–156, 169, 174, 178, 189, 191, 193, 198, 202 f., 205, 208, 210, 214–218, 228, 230, 237, 239 f., 243, 245, 249, 252, 257, 260, 262, 265, 267, 271, 275 f., 283, 285 f., 294, 296, 301, 306 f., 313, 326, 328, 335, 339, 351 f., 354, **361–371,** 381, 391 f., 395 f., 398 f., 401, 407, 413, 417 f., 422, 440, 446, 449 f., 457, 468, 471, 482 f., 485, 526, 540, 544, 570, 583–585, 591, 595–597, 602, 609 f., 614 f., 618, 620, 625, 630, 633, 638, 642 f., 654, 665, 679–681, 692, 698–702, 706, 709 f., 714, 717, 720, 724, 735 f., 740 f., 762–764, 766, 777, 779, 791–793, 795, 797, 809, 811, 813, 815, 822, 834, 836, 841, 843 f., 854, 866, 875, 887–894, 898, 909, 915–918, 920, 928–931
Vol. 3: 28 f., 31, 51, 53, 69, 79, 82 f., 87, 96 f., 99, 113, 117, 127 f., 130, 136, 140–143, 145, 161, 163, 173 f., 187 f., 193, 196, 203–205, 221, 224, 232, 240, 247, 249, 253, 265, 267, 271, 277, 279, 303, 305, 311 f., 319, 321, 342, 344 f., 354, 356, 360, 362, 366, 371, 374, 380, 391, 394, 402, 430, 436, 470, 476, 478, 498, 500, 502, 508, 526 f., 557, 560, 562 f., 566, 576, 582, 586, 589, 591, 604 f., 626, 629 f., 633, 636, 643, 645, 648 f., 677, 679, 682, 692, 695, 697, 714, 728 f., 731–733, 735–737, 740, 745, 760, 768, 772 f., 778, 790 f., 793, 801, 822, 824 f., 832, 836, 846, 848, 856, 867, 869, 874, 893, 895, 911–913, 918 f., 938, 962, 964, 967, 983 f., 994, 997, 1001, 1003, 1008 f., 1012, 1040 f., 1043, 1050, 1054, 1058, 1073, 1080, 1086, 1089–1098, 1100 f., 1103, 1105, 1111, 1114, 1148 f., 1151 (*also* → Last judgment)
Judgment seat **Vol. 1:** 347
Vol. 2: 361, **369–371,** 875, 925 f.
Vol. 3: 322, 589, 710
Judicial **Vol. 1:** 196, 267, 395, 415, 471, 572, 640
Vol. 2: 137, 362, 365, 439
Vol. 3: 93, 168
Judicious **Vol. 2:** 169, 616
Judith **Vol. 1:** 50, 626
Vol. 3: 873, 962
Jug **Vol. 1:** 742
Juggler **Vol. 2: 552–562**
Julius Africanus **Vol. 3:** 655, 872
Julius Caesar **Vol. 1:** 269
Junction **Vol. 1:** 241
Jung, G.C. **Vol. 3:** 1137
Junias **Vol. 1:** 130
Juno **Vol. 1:** 108
Vol. 2: 85
Jupiter **Vol. 1:** 705
Vol. 2: 85, 308, 558
Vol. 3: 735
Jupiter Capitolinus **Vol. 3:** 753
Jupiter Lapis **Vol. 3:** 739
Juridical **Vol. 1:** 132, 195, 199
Vol. 2: 407
Jurisdiction **Vol. 1:** 360, 364, 395, 610, 627
Vol. 2: 608
Jurist **Vol. 2: 438–451**
Juror **Vol. 1:** 205
Vol. 2: 674
Just **Vol. 1:** 137, 304, 336, 370, 554, 593, 637, 659, 673, 719, 738
Vol. 2: 72, 78, 237, 354, 363, 365, 372, 417, 447, 497, 499, 566
Vol. 3: 352–377, 758, **833–839,** 924, 1002
Just One **Vol. 1:** 476
Justice **Vol. 1:** 116, 261, 332, 356, 396, 410, 438, 447, 501, 503 f., 543, 640, 651, 666
Vol. 2: 93, 119, 139, 141, 201, 226, 233, 260, 363, 368, 396, 443, 484, 486, 510, 612, 614, 658, 665, 694, 737 f.
Vol. 3: 27, **97–99,** 103, 117, 130, 138, 183, 261, 353, 356, 389, 479, 561, 575, 606, 640, 645, 648 f., 777, 1053, 1074, 1079, 1087, 1102–1104
Justification **Vol. 1:** 73, 78, 86, 97, 152, 154, 157 f., 223, 228, 275, 347, 379, 398–401, 437, 439, 472, 475, 547, 564, 571, 602, 604 f., 639, 662, 673, 681, 687, 695 f., 701 f., 720
Vol. 2: 42, 72, 78, 95, 118–120, 122 f., 129, 203, 214, 242, 359, 387, 444, 450 f., 504, 645, 723, 844, 882, 884
Vol. 3: 142–144, 161, 168 f., 171, 227, 436, 549, 951, 1122, 1184
Justify **Vol. 2:** 73, 75, 118, 120, 122, 282, 370, 388, 408, 445, 447
Vol. 3: 168, 220, **352–377**
Justifying **Vol. 1:** 601, 730
Justin Martyr **Vol. 1:** 51, 154, 180, 535
Vol. 2: 316, 556, 832
Vol. 3: 58, 453, 855
Justly **Vol. 3: 352–377**
Justus **Vol. 2:** 299, 331

Kaddish **Vol. 2:** 229
Kadesh **Vol. 2:** 635
Vol. 3: 33, 1013 f.
Kähler, Martin **Vol. 1:** 60
Kairos **Vol. 3:** 834
Kakia **Vol. 2:** 271
Kalach **Vol. 1:** 140
Kalendarium of Antiochus **Vol. 2:** 128
Kali **Vol. 3:** 1068
Kalneh **Vol. 1:** 140
Kamithos **Vol. 3:** 35
Kant, Immanuel **Vol. 1:** 64
Vol. 3: 899
Karaites **Vol. 1:** 67
Vol. 2: 126
Karma **Vol. 3:** 679
Käsemann, E. **Vol. 3:** 58, 84, 372, **619**

Katz J.J. **Vol. 3:** 1134
Keep **Vol. 1:** 332, 337–341, 526, 611, 623, 635, 638, 691
Vol. 2: 132–137, 177 f., 191, 266, 271, 282, 297, 300, 327, 333, 354 f., 440, 444, 653, 838
Keep alive **Vol. 2: 476–484**
Keep clear of **Vol. 3:** 903
Keep faith **Vol. 2:** 798
Keep from harm **Vol. 3: 205–216,** 686
Keep holy **Vol. 3:** 406
Keep peace **Vol. 2: 776–783**
Keep safe **Vol. 2:** 838
Keep silence **Vol. 3:** 873, 1066, 1109
Keep in touch **Vol. 3:** 774
Keep watch **Vol. 3:** 134
Kegel, G. **Vol. 3:** 300
Kenites **Vol. 3:** 405, 478
Kenotic **Vol. 3:** 1117
Kenoticism **Vol. 1:** 548 f.
Vol. 2: 500
Kepler, Johannes **Vol. 3:** 735
Keret, Legend of King **Vol. 1:** 511
Vol. 2: 553
Kernel **Vol. 1:** 704 f.
Kernel-texts **Vol. 3:** 1142
Kerygma **Vol. 1:** 54 f., 57, 59, **62,** 65, 397, 400, 547, 551, 601, 605
Vol. 2: 339, 341, 343, 380, 387 f., 430, 633, 906
Vol. 3: 44–68, 213 f., 281 f., 322, 333
Kethubim **Vol. 3:** 671
Key **Vol. 2:** 207, 223, **726–734**
Vol. 3: 498, 1052
Keys of the kingdom of heaven **Vol. 2: 731–733**
Vol. 3: 384, 387, 763
Keystone **Vol. 3: 388–390**
Kfar Bilu **Vol. 3:** 453
Kibroth-hatta'avah **Vol. 1:** 456
Kick **Vol. 1:** 511
Vol. 2: 155
Vol. 3: 560
Kid **Vol. 1:** 114
Vol. 2: 521
Kidnapper **Vol. 3: 380**
Kidnapping **Vol. 1:** 717
Vol. 3: 95, 593
Kidney **Vol. 1:** 230
Vol. 2: 181
Kidron **Vol. 2:** 236, 713
Vol. 3: 796
Kieffer, R. **Vol. 3:** 1123
Kierkegaard, Søren **Vol. 1:** 57
Vol. 3: 897–899, 1143, 901
Kill **Vol. 1:** 174 f., 220, 222 f., 336, 390, 394 f., 401, **429–447,** 451, 463, 468 f., 508, 608, 610, 623, 629, 632–634, 740
Vol. 2: 202, 229, 234, 312, 327 f., 370, 446, 624, 871
Vol. 3: 253 f., **417–436,** 769, 860
Kiln **Vol. 2:** 574
Kin **Vol. 1:** 673
Kind **Vol. 1:** 704
Vol. 2: 35, 75, **98–107,** 116, **256–259,** 284, **500–508,** 550, **656–661**
Kindle **Vol. 1:** 241, 653 f.
Vol. 3: 859
Kindly **Vol. 3:** 148
Kindness **Vol. 1:** 461, 665
Vol. 2: 79, 105 f., 115, 158, 237 f., 270, 594, 770, 834
Vol. 3: 227, 572, **1147–1152**
Kindred **Vol. 1:** 181, 626
Vol. 3: 190
King **Vol. 1:** 100, 115, 117, 121, 123, 177 f., 195, 210, 269 f., 293, 317, 321, 323, 331 f., 366, 373, 375, 405, 408, 425–427, 464, 511, 537 f., 543, 581, 606, 609, 617 f., 622 f., 649, 651 f., 684, 732
Vol. 2: 49, 55, 57, 70 f., 74, 77, 96, 109, 167, 175, 190, 218, 234, 257 f., 294, 296, 306–308, 319 f., 325–327, 335–338, 341 f., 358, 363 f., **372–390,** 411–413, 432, 434, 441, 449, 458, 502, 510, 518, 521, 585, 590, 607, 612 f., 615, 641, 644, 649, 693 f., 701, 703, 711, 721, 781, 788, 797, 877, 898, 905, 931
Vol. 3: 37, 78 f., 94, 97, 121, 140, 143, 154, 197, 201, 206, 208, 217 f., 269, 275, 335, 342, 355, 357, 481, 490, 497, 509, 561, 588, 593–595, 605–609, 614, 636 f., 648, 650, 652, 715, 718, 735, 754, 758, 851, 937, 1060, 1089, 1154
King of ages **Vol. 1:** 469
King of Israel **Vol. 1:** 100, 395, 617
Vol. 2: 146, 375, 378, 380
King of Jacob **Vol. 2:** 375
King James' Version **Vol. 1:** 70
King of the Jews **Vol. 1:** 63, 205
Vol. 2: 315, 378–380, 449
King of kings **Vol. 2:** 378, 514
King Solomon's mines **Vol. 2:** 97
Kingdom **Vol. 1:** 406, 424, 451 f., 508, 516, 519, 523 f., 526, 578, 649, 689, 720, 729, 734
Vol. 2: 37 f., 56, 62, 70, 74, 76, 85, 95, 98, 104, 112, 129, 150, 158, 193, 196, 227, 229, 241, 258, 271, 306, **372–390,** 469, 486, 510, 531 f., 585, 604, 607–609, 613, 641, 653, 661, 701, 703, 709, 717, 749, 758, 779, 795, 832, 842, 868, 881, 894, 904, 924, 929, 931
Vol. 3: 52, 74, 147, 204, 213, 215, 245 f., 312, 317, 319, 360, 392, 472, 621, 648, 650, 695, 803, 806, 940, 1044
Kingdom of Christ **Vol. 1:** 701
Vol. 2: 388
Kingdom of David **Vol. 1:** 100
Kingdom of the dead **Vol. 3:** 989
Kingdom of the Father **Vol. 2:** 381
Kingdom of glory **Vol. 2:** 202
Kingdom of God **Vol. 1:** 10, 62, 77, 86 f., 116, 124 f., 138, 146–149, 160, 167, 174, 179, 213 f., 216 f., 219, 222, 238, 250, 263, 275, 277 f., 284 f., 290, 298, 300, 321–323, 326, 329, 358, 369, 381, 384, 434, 453 f., 470, 482, 489, 518, 525, 560 f., 563, 590, 599, 612, 620, 646, 651, 657, 666, 675 f., 679, 691
Vol. 2: 31, 37, 54, 57, 74, 98, 110, 113, 118, 147, 151, 168, 178, 216, 222 f., 241, 250, 267 f., 270, 272, 275, 277, 295, 300–303, **376 f., 381,** 382, 386–389, 401, 426 f., 429, 443, 462,

Kingdom of God (*cont'd*)
502, 535, 543, 548 f., 580, 583, 604, 619, 640, 653, 695, 714 f., 727 f., 730–734, 749, 752 f., 781, 791, 809, 813, 819, 824, 832–834, 840, 843, 846, 857, 871, 888, 899, 902, 904, 906, 911, 920 f.
Vol. 3: 55, 65, 81, 106, 131, 141 f., 181, 184, 221, 225 f., 314, 360, 365, 392, 503, 507, 514, 518, 522, 530, 532, 576, 603, 618–620, 685, 696, 701, 711 f., 725, 746, 762, 792, 803, 807, 830, 832, 844, 866, 920, 922, 941, 965, 969 f., 998, 1052, 1059, 1062, 1070, 1106, 1152, 1158, 1178
Kingdom of heaven (→ Kingdom of God)
Kingdom of Israel **Vol. 1: 52,** 61
Kingdom of Judah **Vol. 1: 52,** 61
Vol. 2: 319 f.
Kingdom of priests **Vol. 2:** 380
Vol. 3: 36
Kingly **Vol. 2:** 242, 335–337, **372–389**
Kings, Books of **Vol. 1:** 66, 68, 537 f., 625
Kings of the east **Vol. 2:** 378
King's scribe **Vol. 3:** 478
Kingship **Vol. 1:** 210, 241, 374, 405 f., 425–427
Vol. 2: 139, 234, 339, **372–389,** 432, 644
Vol. 3: 349, 649
Kingu **Vol. 2:** 200
Kinsfolk **Vol. 1:** 194
Kinship **Vol. 1:** 207, 414, 675
Vol. 3: 635, 653, 871, 1163
Kinsman **Vol. 2:** 226
Vol. 3: 178, 190 f., 193
Kiss **Vol. 1:** 206 f.
Vol. 2: 530, 538, **547–550,** 812, 859, 876
Kittim **Vol. 3:** 961
Klausner, J. **Vol. 3:** 292
Knapsack **Vol. 1:** 143
Knead **Vol. 3:** 916 f.
Knee **Vol. 2:** 196, 414, 856, **859–861,** 925
Kneel **Vol. 2: 855–886**
Knife **Vol. 1:** 308
Knock **Vol. 2:** 220, 705, **855–881 f.**
Vol. 3: 227
Know **Vol. 2:** 240, 262, 276, 280, 289, **390–409,** 413, 445, 488 f., 543
Vol. 3: 130, 267, 460, 861
Know the name **Vol. 2:** 648
Knowability **Vol. 2:** 397
Knower of hearts **Vol. 2: 180–184**
Knowing ones **Vol. 2:** 397
Knowledge **Vol. 1:** 58, 60, 85, 93, 107, 123, 138, 197, 212, 222, 225, 233, 238, 244 f., 247, 277, 281 f., 303, 325, 334, 347 f., 352, 386, 389, 421 f., 432, 442, 444, 453, 481, 483 f., 486, 488, 496 f., 500, 504, 512, 525, 530, 538 f., 555, 562, 565, 567 f., 587, 595, 597 f., 600–603, 605, 620, 637 f., 644, 650, 675, 684 f., 692–697, 707 f., 716, 735, 740, 742 f.
Vol. 2: 60, 71 f., 75, 78, 103, 118, 122, 129, 158, 181–183, 188, 198, 202, 216–218, 220 f., 223, 227, 229, 243 f., 252 f., 267, 269, 271, 274, 287, 298, 304, 357, **390–409,** 446, 448, 453, 456, 460 f., 469, 480, 490 f., 493 f., 503, 538 f., 545, 567, 597, 620, 626, 645 f., 648, 655, 661, 720–722, 730, 757, 830, 834 f., 865, 879, 922
Vol. 3: 36 f., 39, 44, 46, 58, 73, 84, 133, 206, 212, 214 f., 221, 258, 265, 310, 313 f., 316 f., 327, 332, 335 f., 358, 403, 427, 431, 433, 461 f., 476, 481, 483, 493, 501 f., 515, 517, 521 f., 528, 530, 533, 542, 554, 573, 580, 600, 630, 638–642, 679 f., 719 f., 749, 759, 761, 765 f., 775 f., 777, 799, 809, 819, 826 f., 885, 887, 903, 912, 914, 926, 934 f., 939, 963, 995 f., 1017, 1022, 1025–1032, 1034 f., 1052, 1073, 1083 f., 1086 f., 1111, 1156
Known **Vol. 2:** 338, 746 f.
Koine **Vol. 1:** 59, **62**
Korah **Vol. 1:** 294
Vol. 2: 638
Vol. 3: 1054
Korzybski, A. **Vol. 3:** 1125
Krishna **Vol. 3:** 330
Kronos **Vol. 2:** 232
Künneth, W. **Vol. 3: 292**
Kuthites **Vol. 3:** 450

Laban **Vol. 1:** 574
Vol. 2: 140, 317, 521, 578
Vol. 3: 139, 533, 739, 879, 1040 f.
Labour **Vol. 1:** 85, 115, 180, 186 f., **260–263,** 271, 466, 519, 551, 564, 722 f.
Vol. 2: 262, 269, 317, 475, 839, 890
Vol. 3: 54, 144, **857 f., 1147–1152**
Labour-pains **Vol. 3:** 856
Labourer **Vol. 1:** 430
Vol. 2: 386, 711, 861
Vol. 3: 349, 847, 920
Lachesis **Vol. 3:** 260
Lachish **Vol. 3:** 428, 483
Lack **Vol. 1:** 384, 489, 494, 504, 516, 541, 562, 593, 648, 723, 731 f., 740 f.
Vol. 2: 183, 217, 221, 264 f., 269, 274, 286, 391, 395 f., 401, 406–408, 422, 434, 456, 459, 499
Vol. 3: 247–253, 573, **952–958**
Lack of sense **Vol. 3:** 1023–1026
Lad **Vol. 1:** 283 f.
Ladanum **Vol. 2:** 294
Ladd, G.E. **Vol. 3: 293**
Ladder **Vol. 1:** 140
Vol. 2: 185, 317, 319
Laden **Vol. 1:** 565, 699, 742
Lady **Vol. 2: 510–520**
Lahama **Vol. 1:** 170
Lair **Vol. 2:** 586
Laity **Vol. 1:** 629
Lake **Vol. 3:** 557, **982–992**
Lake, K. **Vol. 3:** 292
Lake of fire **Vol. 2:** 304, 701
Vol. 3: 99, 962
Lamb **Vol. 1:** 111, 114 f., 118 f., 142, 164, 223, 240 f., 274, 317, 386, 448, 482, 525, 629 f., 633 f., 651 f., 691, 702
Vol. 2: 58, 80, 147, 194, 218, 231, 280, 329, **410–414,** 458, 461, 463, 473, 482, 495, 521 f., 527–529, 532, 534, 543, 569, 581, 585, 615,

625, 654, 665, 674, 676, 691, 700, 727 f., 763, 799, 801, 844
Vol. 3: 181, 200, 216, 335, 349, 398, 416 f., 421, 423, 431, 435, 454, 471, 490, 500, 516, 568, 582, 611, 633, 674, 714 f., 925, 943, 988, 990, 1032, 1068, 1072
Lamb of God **Vol. 1:** 525, 629, 702
Vol. 2: 411
Lame **Vol. 1:** 637
Vol. 2: 153, 167, 170 f., 358, **414 f.,** 597, 606, 625, 630, 633
Vol. 3: 213, 320, 351, 792, 902, 1000
Lamech **Vol. 2:** 681, 770
Vol. 3: 578
Lament **Vol. 1:** 178, 286, 547
Vol. 2: 361, **416–424,** 433, 436, 598, 862, 890
Vol. 3: 78, 670, 720, 725, 908, 911
Lamentation **Vol. 1:** 262, 378, 410, 551
Vol. 2: 33, 167, **416–424,** 806, 823, 860
Vol. 3: 668, 672 f., 1051
Lamentations, Book of **Vol. 1:** 59, 717
Lamp **Vol. 1:** 234
Vol. 2: 212, **484–496,** 556, 710 f.
Vol. 3: 445, 732, 748, 882
Lamp-bearer **Vol. 2:** 578
Lampe, G.W.H. **Vol. 3: 292**
Lampstand **Vol. 1:** 304
Vol. 2: 217, 484 f., **486 f.,** 691, 712
Vol. 3: 736, 787 f., 812, 814
Lance **Vol. 3:** 590
Land **Vol. 1:** 76, 243, 360, 390, 498 f., 515 f., **517–526,** 537, 565, 607, 625, 640 f., 684, 688, 710, 726, 735, 741
Vol. 2: 187, 248, 257, 265, 275, **295–304,** 305, 307, 309, 311, 315–317, 357, 362 f., 367, 374, 448, 511, 540, 691, 698, 788, 822
Vol. 3: 33, 70, 94, 102, 104, 117, 135, 190, 195, 210, 235, 269, 274, 355, 357, 522, 853
Land of promise (→ Promised land)
Landed property **Vol. 2: 845–847**
Landowner **Vol. 2:** 297, 788, 843
Vol. 3: 852
Landscape **Vol. 2:** 92, 303
Langer, S.K. **Vol. 3:** 1130
Language **Vol. 1:** 59, 62
Vol. 2: 124, 157, 308 f., 648, 740, 784, 786, 791, 907, 925, 927
Vol. 3: 78, **113 f.,** 335, 483, 757, **1078–1081,** 1121
Language, function of **Vol. 3:** 335, 895, **1078–1123**
Language and meaning in religion **Vol. 3: 1123–1143**
Language and thought **Vol. 3: 1126 f.**
Language-event **Vol. 1:** 583
Vol. 3: 1140
Language-game **Vol. 3:** 1131, 1135, 1138
Languish **Vol. 2:** 422
Laodicea **Vol. 1:** 318 f. 363
Vol. 2: 597, 727, 826, 844, 881
Vol. 3: 321, 402, 518 f., 958
Laodiceans, Epistle to the **Vol. 1:** 51
Vol. 2: 219
Lapis lazuli **Vol. 3:** 396, 398
Lapse **Vol. 1:** 359, 608
Vol. 3: 573, 577, 586
Large **Vol. 2:** 177, 194, **424–429,** 443, 709
Vol. 3: 455
Large-heartedness **Vol. 2: 484–486**
Lasciviousness **Vol. 3:** 996
Lash **Vol. 1:** 161 f.
Vol. 3: 1079
Last **Vol. 1:** 56, 97, 326, 653, 665–667, 669
Vol. 2: 52–66
Vol. 3: 920
Last Adam **Vol. 2:** 57, 481, 504, 566
Vol. 3: 684
Last day **Vol. 1:** 421
Vol. 2: 53, 118, 298, 364, 378, 861, 887, 894, 929
Vol. 3: 411, 749
Last days **Vol. 1:** 151, 218, 224, 244, 420, 460, 496, 612, 556, 566, 607, 610
Vol. 2: 75, 219, 302, 354, 377, 379, 397, 413, 443, 604, 607, 609, 642, 649, 654, 709, 727, 740, 772, 785, 787, 875
Vol. 3: 34, 40, 71, 209 f., 299, 341, 469, 700, 836, 842, 847, 1118
Last enemy **Vol. 1:** 440
Last hour **Vol. 2:** 384
Vol. 3: 845, 848 f.
Last judgment **Vol. 1:** 56, 65, 83, 324, 333, 417, 473, 742
Vol. 2: 191, 205, 208, 245, 262, 365, 481, 488, 499, 682, 700 f., 867, 928 f.
Vol. 3: 97, 135 f., 143, 242, 634 (*also* → Judgment)
Last Supper (→ Lord's Supper)
Last things **Vol. 1: 56**
Vol. 2: 245, 691
Vol. 3: 312
Last times **Vol. 1:** 452, 675
Vol. 2: 61
Vol. 3: 215, 838
Last will and testament **Vol. 2:** 317
Lasting **Vol. 2:** 96, 393
Late **Vol. 1:** 607
Vol. 3: 839
Late rain **Vol. 3: 1000–1004**
Latent **Vol. 1:** 711
Later **Vol. 1:** 665
Vol. 3: 952–956
Lateran Council **Vol. 3:** 244
Latin **Vol. 2:** 126
Latinism **Vol. 1:** 363
Vol. 3: 448
Latter **Vol. 3: 952–956**
Latter days **Vol. 2:** 337
Latter Prophets **Vol. 1: 66**
Laud **Vol. 3:** 816
Laugh **Vol. 2:** 357, 361, 416 f., 422, 424, **429–436**
Vol. 3: 347
Laughter **Vol. 2: 429–436**
Vol. 3: 280
Laurel **Vol. 1:** 470, 648
Laver **Vol. 3:** 812
Lavish **Vol. 1:** 730

Law **Vol. 1:** 52–54, 58 f., 62, 64 f., 67, 70, 73 f., 77–79, 86, 98, 102 f., 107, 109, 112 f., 116 f., 129, 157, 164, 183 f., 190, 196–198, 214, 218–221, 228, 230 f., 234, 243, 245, 252, 258, 261, 263–265, 268 f., 271, 282, 284, 293–297, 302, 309–311, 321 f., 327 f., 331–336, 340 f., 347, 349 f., 353, 355, 357 f., 360 f., 365, 367 f., 370 f., 373 f., 390, 397 f., 402, 412, 416–418, 424, 430, 434, 436–439, 446, 448, 452, 457 f., 461, 463, 468, 471–473, 477 f., 481, 484–487, 499 f., 503, 506, 512, 532, 543 f., 547, 554, 556, 564, 570, 573–575, 579, 589, 591 f., 595, 597 f., 601, 606 f., 609 f., 612, 622, 625, 627, 630 f., 637, 645, 654, 659, 663, 667, 674–676, 678, 680 f., 685–688, 690 f., 694, 699, 708, 714 f., 717–720, 729 f., 733–735, 738
Vol. 2: 59, 61–64, 73, 77, 86, 91 f., 94, 99–101, 103, 111 f., 114, 116–120, 122 f., 125–127, 131–138, 141 f., 144, 148, 174, 176 f., 180 f., 186, 188, 211, 216, 222, 228, 235, 237, 241 f., 247, 254–256, 259, 261 f., 266, 281–283, 288, 296, 298, 301, 307, 312, 320, 327, 329, 349, 355, 357, 365, 368, 385, 398 f., 406, **436–456,** 460, 468 f., 475, 488, 492, 498 f., 503 f., 510 f., 513, 516, 519, 540–544, 546, 550, 552, 555, 559, 566, 576–579, 583, 590, 595 f., 605, 607, 610, 617, 621, 631, 637, 639–642, 645, 656–660, 662–668, 673, 678, 686, 693 f., 708 f., 714–716, 719, 727, 737, 741 f., 748, 754, 767, 776 f., 784, 786, 793–795, 797, 799, 801, 810–813, 816, 822, 827 f., 830, 833, 837, 842, 889, 922
Vol. 3: 33 f., 36 f., 41 f., 49, 51, 56, 65, 69 f., 72 f., 84, 86, 89, 92, 94, 97–99, 101, 105 f., 108, 115 f., 127, 135, 137, 140, 150, 161, 163, 167 f., 172, 181–187, 189, 192, 200, 204, 224, 226 f., 239, 251, 253, 257 f., 271, 277 f., 311, 320, 329 f., 332, 346, 348, 352–356, 358–361, 363–365, 374, 380, 383, 390, 393, 405 f., 408, 427 f., 431, 439 f., 442, 459, 465, 478–485, 488, 493, 533, 537, 541, 544, 549, 556, 559, 561, 572–574, 578–581, 583–586, 591, 593 f., 596 f., 606, 620, 625, 650, 670, 680, 691, 701 f., 706, 711, 722, 738, 742, 760–769, 772–775, 777–779, 787, 792, 800, 824, 843, 852 f., 855, 882, 884 f., 892, 937, 939, 944, 946, 948 f., 954, 995, 1014, 1020, 1026, 1029, 1035, 1040, 1043 f., 1050, 1052 f., 1057 f., 1094–1096, 1103 f., 1106 f., 1109, 1121 f., 1148–1151, 1153–1155, 1157 f., 1162–1164, 1167, 1177
Law, apodeictic **Vol. 2: 41**
Law, casuistic **Vol. 2: 441**
Law, ceremonial **Vol. 1:** 75
Law, summary of **Vol. 2:** 177
Law and prophets **Vol. 2: 174,** 177, 444
Vol. 3: 311
Law of Christ **Vol. 2: 446**
Law of evidence **Vol. 2:** 686
Law of God **Vol. 2:** 440
Law of holiness **Vol. 2: 226**
Law of the land **Vol. 2:** 439
Law of liberty **Vol. 2: 449 f.**
Vol. 3: 228
Law of sin **Vol. 2:** 282
Law of Yahweh **Vol. 2:** 440
Law-book **Vol. 1:** 243
Law-breaker **Vol. 2:** 29, 143, 572
Lawbreaking **Vol. 3:** 577
Lawcourt **Vol. 2:** 142, 362
Vol. 3: 234, 236, 740, 1048
Lawful **Vol. 1:** 500, 535
Vol. 2: 104, 138, 253, 281, **606–611**
Vol. 3: 409, 534, 707, 758
Lawgiver **Vol. 2: 438–451,** 485, 580, 635–642, 677, 721, 871
Vol. 3: 346, 564
Lawgiving **Vol. 2: 438–451,** 784–786
Lawless **Vol. 2: 438–451,** 468, 677, 810, 901
Vol. 3: 365, 1149
Lawlessness **Vol. 1:** 125, 556, 639, 681
Vol. 2: 438–451, 494, 901
Vol. 3: 137, 471, 505, 571
Lawsuit **Vol. 1:** 267, 345
Vol. 2: 363
Vol. 3: 93, 1041, **1155–1158**
Lawyer **Vol. 2:** 147, 177, 223, **438–451,** 730
Vol. 3: 477–482, 883, 1052
Lax **Vol. 1:** 333, 560
Vol. 2: 801
Laxity **Vol. 3:** 369
Lay **Vol. 1:** 413, 477, 662, 684, 696
Lay aside **Vol. 1:** 314, 470
Vol. 3: 120, 815
Lay down **Vol. 1:** 660
Vol. 2: 439
Vol. 3: 254
Lay down life **Vol. 2:** 42, 101, 359, 413
Vol. 3: 547, 567, 683
Lay foundation **Vol. 2:** 64
Lay hold **Vol. 1:** 596
Vol. 3: 747–751
Lay to heart **Vol. 1:** 106
Lay waste **Vol. 1:** 468
Vol. 3: 1004–1014
Layard, Austen **Vol. 2:** 679
Layer **Vol. 2:** 586
Laying on of hands **Vol. 1:** 197, 207, 284, 684, 735
Vol. 2: 28, 122, **146–153,** 875
Vol. 3: 115, 240, 422, 916
Layman **Vol. 1:** 98
Vol. 2: 456 f.
Lazarus **Vol. 1:** 117, 265, 409, 430, 443
Vol. 2: 178, 267, 418, 433, 466, 548, 630, 706, 801, 825, 846, 929
Vol. 3: 39, 99, 179, 240, 280, 293, 303, 381, 558, 682, 819, 856, 1044, 1059, 1061, 1079
Lazy **Vol. 3:** 1024
Lead **Vol. 1:** 471, 486, 489, 509, 532, 570, 573, 575, 579, 585, 604, 623, 638, 645, 648–650, 669, 680, 719 f.
Vol. 2: 70, 72, 149, 152, 222, 230, 358, 377, 408, 410, 846, 871
Vol. 3: 314, 392, **935–943**
Lead astray **Vol. 1:** 413, 423, 452, 460, 468 f., 487, 493, 510, 566, 570, 588, 602 f., 689

Vol. 2: 156, 281, 407, **457–461,** 469, 471, 474, **707–710,** 793, 808, 841
Vol. 3: 81, 499, 801, 810, 939, 996
Lead away **Vol. 1:** 685, 688
Lead back **Vol. 2:** 462
Lead out **Vol. 2:** 313
Lead in a straight way**Vol. 3: 351 f.**
Lead in triumph **Vol. 3:** 600
Leader **Vol. 1:** 132, 164 f., 168, 191, 193, 198, 200, 220, 270, 293 f., 424, 462, 475, 568, 591, 596, 610, 629, 664–666, 725, 739 f.
Vol. 2: 50, 95, 372, 379, 514, 724, 799
Vol. 3: 199, 219, 384, 568, 593, 642, 795, 809, 930, **935–943,** 1007, 1054
Leaderless **Vol. 2:** 800
Leadership **Vol. 1:** 196 f., 199, 300, 425
Vol. 2: 114, 121, 317, 374
Vol. 3: 700, 915, 1169
Leaf **Vol. 1:** 515, 652
Vol. 3: 865–870
League **Vol. 2:** 306
Leah **Vol. 1:** 61
Vol. 2: 305 f., 317, 319, 578, 796
Vol. 3: 139, 993
Lean **Vol. 1:** 255
Leaney, A.R.C. **Vol. 3:** 288 f.
Leap over **Vol. 1:** 632
Learn **Vol. 1:** 69, 333, 481, 483–485, 599
Vol. 2: 179, 289, 291, 313, 392, 395, 398, 422
Vol. 3: 78, 513, 724, 820
Learn Christ **Vol. 3:** 765
Learn by heart **Vol. 3:** 59
Learned in law **Vol. 2: 438–451**
Learner **Vol. 1:** 136, 483–485
Vol. 2: 291
Learning **Vol. 2:** 61, 140, 659
Vol. 3: 483, 493
Least **Vol. 2:** 55, **427–429**
Leather **Vol. 1:** 243, 254
Vol. 2: 465
Vol. 3: 109, 120 f., 483
Leather-worker **Vol. 1:** 279
Vol. 3: 811–815
Leave **Vol. 1:** 488, 607, 697 f., 701
Vol. 2: 394
Vol. 3: 247–253, 254, 560
Leave behind **Vol. 3: 247–253**
Leave country **Vol. 2: 788–790**
Leave off **Vol. 3:** 251
Leave over **Vol. 3: 243–253**
Leaven **Vol. 1:** 249, 630, 634
Vol. 2: 216, 385, 428, **461–463,** 675 f., 714, 716, 755, 834
Vol. 3: 132, 184, 422 f., 431, 442, 1058
Leaves **Vol. 1:** 390, 723 f.
Vol. 2: 382
Lebanon **Vol. 1:** 165
Lectionary **Vol. 1:** 245
Vol. 3: 485
Lecture **Vol. 3:** 1087
Leda **Vol. 3:** 216
Left hand **Vol. 1:** 103
Vol. 2: 146–153
Left-handed **Vol. 2:** 414
Leg **Vol. 1:** 393, 656
Vol. 2: 414 f., 817
Legal **Vol. 1:** 258, 286, 337, 344, 365, 368, 373, 375, 392, 395 f., 402, 468, 475, 477, 488, 503–506, 543, 558, 606, 645, 650, 658–660, 664, 668, 687, 697 f.
Vol. 2: 121, 132, 137, 139, 141–143, 254, 256, 296,. 305, 307, 312, 335, 349, 362–364, 366 f., 369, 372, 427, 437–451, 510, 512, 662 f., 716
Vol. 3: 68, 92, 97, 134, 144, 194, 355, 359, 497, 530, 1039, 1043
Legal concept **Vol. 2:** 39
Legal demands **Vol. 3:** 583
Legal due **Vol. 3:** 753
Legal expert **Vol. 2: 438–451**
Legalism **Vol. 1:** 259, 331, 335, 338 f., 361, 371, 397, 399–402, 487, 532, 597, 602, 681
Vol. 2: 134, 267, 327, 730
Vol. 3: 71, 370, 934
Legalistic **Vol. 2:** 106, 133, 221, 361, 671
Vol. 3: 72, 105, 107, 996
Legend **Vol. 1:** 58
Vol. 2: 784 f.
Vol. 3: 662, 706, 876
Legendary **Vol. 1:** 594
Legion **Vol. 1:** 175, 475
Vol. 3: 475
Legislate **Vol. 2:** 438–451, 738
Legislation **Vol. 1:** 506
Vol. 2: 438–451
Legitimacy **Vol. 1:** 599
Vol. 3: 653 f., 656
Legitimate **Vol. 1:** 498
Vol. 2: 372
Vol. 3: 571, 1044
Legitimation **Vol. 2:** 329
Vol. 3: 643
Leibniz, G.W. **Vol. 3:** 896, 899
Leiden magical papyrus **Vol. 2:** 683
Leisure **Vol. 2:** 360
Leivestad, R. **Vol. 3: 619**
Lend **Vol. 2:** 241
Vol. 3: 953
Length **Vol. 1:** 253
Leniency **Vol. 1:** 467, 698, 700
Vol. 2: 257, 769, 817
Lent **Vol. 3:** 146
Lentils **Vol. 1:** 249
Leo **Vol. 2:** 688
Léon–Dufour, X. **Vol. 3: 300**
Leontopolis **Vol. 2:** 331
Vol. 3: 35, 451
Leopard **Vol. 1:** 119
Leper **Vol. 2:** 358, 410, 414, **463–466,** 599, 630 f.
Vol. 3: 37, 106, 159, 419 f., 508, 569, 860, 1000, 1061
Leprosy **Vol. 1:** 151, 163, 204, 225, 241, 685
Vol. 2: 171, 349, 396, **463–466,** 633
Vol. 3: 104, 108, 986, 989, 997, 1061
Leprous **Vol. 2: 463–466**
Lepton **Vol. 2:** 849 f., 852
Lesbian **Vol. 1:** 498

Less than **Vol. 3: 952–956**
Lesson **Vol. 3:** 330, 719
Let alone **Vol. 1:** 698
Let go **Vol. 1:** 698, 701
Vol. 3: 177
Let know **Vol. 3:** 316
Let loose **Vol. 3:** 469
Let pass **Vol. 1:** 697 f.
Let slip**Vol. 1:** 682 f.
Lethargy **Vol. 3:** 279
Leto **Vol. 1:** 508
Vol. 3: 1071
Letter **Vol. 1:** 62, **242–249,** 255, 261, 292, 356, 430, 656, 727, 737
Vol. 2: 113 f., 291, 356, 358, 446, 448, 452, 530, 641, 671, 675
Vol. 3: 112, 477, **482–495,** 498, 742, 744, 765, 904, 1169
Letter to Aristides **Vol. 3:** 872
Letter of commendation **Vol. 1:** 592
Vol. 3: 935
Letters of Paul **Vol. 3:** 492
Level **Vol. 1:** 709
Vol. 2: 259, 563
Level place **Vol. 3: 1009**
Levelling **Vol. 3:** 1011, 1013
Levi **Vol. 1:** 487, 544
Vol. 2: 237, 317, 320, 447, **466 f.,** 592, 639, 693 f.
Vol. 3: 34, 435, 455 f., 658, 757, 853 f., 871, 873
Leviathan **Vol. 1:** 205, 326, 523
Vol. 2: 485
Vol. 3: 983
Levirate marriage **Vol. 1:** 499
Vol. 2: 564, 576, **577 f.,** 588, 691
Vol. 3: 95, 191, 263, 275, 356, 655, 1055, 1074
Levite **Vol. 1:** 65, 98, 170, 230, 294, 360, 538, 554, 636
Vol. 2: 227, 237, 297, 300, 304, 311, 321, **466 f.,** 592, 636, 638, 649, 693 f., 730, 799, 813, 823
Vol. 3: 33–35, 38, 41 f., 415, 424, 433, 478, 551, 565, 852 f., 989
Levitical **Vol. 1:** 80, 211, 245, 314, 337, 341, 408, 619, 677
Vol. 2: 64, 290, 320, 448, **466 f.,** 694
Vol. 3: 38, 41 f., 164, 228, 410, 439, 742, 947
Levitical messiah **Vol. 3:** 657
Levitical scribe **Vol. 3:** 478
Leviticus **Vol. 1:** 65
Levy **Vol. 1:** 296, 537
Vol. 3: 752
Lex talionis **Vol. 3:** 94, 96, 928, 1179
Lexicography **Vol. 3:** 1140 f.
Liability **Vol. 1:** 373
Vol. 2: 362
Vol. 3: 420, 753 f.
Liable **Vol. 1:** 418, 550, 657
Vol. 2: 142, 156, 667, 775
Liar **Vol. 1:** 166, 350, 423 f.
Vol. 2: 470–474, 503
Vol. 3: 281, 529, 887
Libation **Vol. 1:** 648
Vol. 2: 854 f.
Vol. 3: 919
Liberal **Vol. 1:** 639, 642
Vol. 2: 827
Liberal Judaism (→ Judaism, liberal)
Liberality **Vol. 1:** 731
Liberally **Vol. 3:** 403
Liberate **Vol. 1:** 399, 401
Vol. 2: 64, 131
Liberating union **Vol. 3:** 590
Liberating word **Vol. 1:** 384, 397
Liberation **Vol. 1:** 58, 138, 209, 277, 385, 432, 435, 522, 524, **715–721**
Vol. 2: 110
Vol. 3: 41, 277, 592, 598, 679, 720, 860, **972–974**
Liberator **Vol. 2:** 560
Libertine **Vol. 3: 598 f.,** 942
Libertini, Synagogue of the **Vol. 1:** 297
Libertinism **Vol. 1: 62,** 336, 339, 448, 556, 638, 720
Vol. 2: 394, 447, 584, 611, 677
Liberty **Vol. 1:** 62, 331, 435, 458, 470, **715–721**
Vol. 2: 161 f., 211, 444, 884
Vol. 3: 51, 227, 380, 488, 536, 678, 705, 1053, 1151
Libophoenicia **Vol. 2:** 126
Library **Vol. 1:** 377
Lice **Vol. 2:** 637
Licence **Vol. 2:** 678
Vol. 3: 922, 932, 1064
Licentiousness **Vol. 1:** 494, 500, 681
Vol. 2: 256, 436, 587, 868, 892
Vol. 3: 1059
Lick up **Vol. 1:** 520
Lictor **Vol. 1:** 407
Lie **Vol. 1:** 424, 454 f., 458, 461, 466, 471, 550 f., 563, 660, 670
Vol. 2: 72, 77, 312, 393, **467–474,** 555, 567, 736, 813, 831, 847
Vol. 3: 291, 574, 576, 586, 741, 875, 885 f., 892 f., 926, 946, 1041
Lie down **Vol. 1:** 442
Vol. 2: 586
Vol. 3: 255
Lie fallow **Vol. 2:** 822
Lie in wait **Vol. 2:** 132 f., 215, 460
Life **Vol. 1:** 60, 78, 84, 96, 105, 107, 139, 148, 168, 180, 182, 212, 221 f., 226, 229, 231, 234, 236, 241, 243 f., 248, 250 f., 253, 260, 262, 265, 274, 277 f., 281 f., 296 f., 300, 303, 311, 321, 323, 327, 329, 332 f., 335, 337, 347, 350, 354 f., 359, 367, 381, 384, 391, 399–401, 403, 406, 416 f., 421–424, 427, 429–438, 441 f., 444–446, 456–460, 462–465, 467–471, 479f., 483, 488–494, 496, 500, 502, 505 f., 509, 512–515, 517, 521, 524 f., 528, 533 f., 537, 541, 543, 546–552, 556 f., 561, 565, 568, 570 f., 574 f., 597, 601, 603 f., 608–610, 615, 617, 619, 621, 624 f., 627 f., 630, 634, 637 f., 640–645, 649–651, 653 f., 656–659, 662, 666, 669, 671–673, 676–682, 689, 697, 703, 709–711, 713 f., 716–720, 722

f., 726 f., 729, 733, 736, 738, 740 f., 743 f.
Vol. 2: 31, 42, 54, 58, 60 f., 77, 80, 83, 87, 95, 99 f., 102–104, 106, 108, 111, 113, 116–124, 129, 132, 136, 156–159, 162, 166, 178, 180–182, 185f., 201, 203, 205 f., 209, 211, 217f., 221, 225, 228, 239, 242, 244, 258 f., 260, 264 f., 267, 269–271, 274 f., 278–280, 282, 295, 310, 316, 332, 339, 343, 350 f., 353, 357, 361, 366, 368, 370, 387 f., 394 f., 400 f., 404, 406 f., 416, 419–421, 426, 428, 430, 433, 436–439, 441 f., 446 f., 449, 452 f., 458, 460, 472, **474–484,** 485 f., 488, 490–492, 494, 510, 512, 517, 523, 535, 538, 567–569, 571 f., 583, 598, 605 f., 617, 625, 631, 636, 642, 657, 665 f., 671 f., 675 f., 691, 705, 714–716, 718 f., 736, 764, 778, 780, 787, 789, 794, 807, 811, 815–819, 825, 828, 830, 833 f., 837 f., 840, 843, **845–847,** 861, 864, 892, 903, 911, 918 f., 926, 928 f.
Vol. 3: 50, 55 f., 62, 99, 105, 121, 136 f., 140, 145, 151, 153, 155, 157 f., 160, 163, 167, 178, 189–192, 195–197, 199 f., 204 f., 208 f., 212–216, 219f., 225, 227–229, 240, 244, 258, 260–264, 276, 280, 303, 313, 315, 321–323, 347, 353, 359, 378, 400, 416, 424, 432, 435, 440, 444 f., 480, 487, 493, 515, 523 f., 528–530, 533, 546, 555, 581 f., 597, 600 f., 623–625, 631, 638, 645–647, 675, **676–687,** 701–707, 730 f., 746, 748, 772, 774, 809, 811, 819, 827 f., 834, 839, 842, 860, 866, 883, 886, 891, 894, 905, 916, 921, 928 f., **933–947,** 953, 973, 986, 988 f., 993, 1030, 1032, 1045 f., 1053, 1058, 1067, 1079, 1084, 1093, 1095, 1103, 1106, 1114, 1122, 1131, 1163, 1169
Life-bringing **Vol. 3:** 982
Life-destroying **Vol. 1:** 653
Life-force **Vol. 3:** 600, 681, 690 f.
Life-giving **Vol. 1:** 329, 430, 436, 649, 653, 665, 722 f.
Vol. 2: 186, 274, 520, 929
Vol. 3: 280, 599, 703
Life-span **Vol. 1:** 92, 431
Vol. 2: 478, 690
Vol. 3: 826–833, 841–843
Life-style **Vol. 1:** 110, 185, 598
Lifeless **Vol. 1:** 429, 441
Vol. 3: 913
Lifelong **Vol. 1:** 623
Vol. 3: 537
Lifetime **Vol. 2:** 382, 887, 921
Lift up **Vol. 1:** 211, 510, 585
Vol. 2: 187, 204, 225, 259, 642, 764, 873
Vol. 3: 153
Lift up the countenance **Vol. 2:** 621
Light **Vol. 1:** 60, 102, 174, 203, 219 f., 261, 286, 320, 323, 333, 338, 355, 359, 379, 382, 420–425, 432, 477, 483, 490, 513, 522, 525, 556, 562 f., 566, 580, 586, 592, 616, 638, 644, 652, 705, 711, 723
Vol. 2: 46, 70 f., 77, 80, 105, 119, 130, 183, 185, 189, 193, 200, 213 f., 216 f., 232, 250, 278–281, 290, 302, 307, 313, 353, 380, 408, 428, **484–496,** 517, 565, 609, 645, 672, 691, 706, 713, 719, 742, 761, 795, 830, 834, 839, 889, 928
Vol. 3: 47, 110, 118, 163, 184, 204, 212, 268, 276, 310, 312, 314, 316 f., 320–322, 335, 344, 398, 435, 445 f., 468, 471, 495, 503, 554 f., 634, 646, 679, 693, 730–737, 807, 860, 862, 882, 893, 916, 929, 939, 944, 963, 1001, 1012, 1045, 1115, 1150, 1158
Light of knowledge **Vol. 3:** 936
Light and truth **Vol. 3:** 881
Light up **Vol. 2: 490–496**
Light-bearers **Vol. 2:** 493
Lighten **Vol. 1:** 699
Lighthearted **Vol. 2:** 431, 435
Lightness **Vol. 2:** 461
Lightning **Vol. 1:** 610, 654
Vol. 2: 484
Vol. 3: 984, **1000–1004**
Like **Vol. 1:** 206, 491
Vol. 2: 80, 284, 286, 291, 307, **496–508,** 516, 744, 817
Vol. 3: 123, 904
Like-minded **Vol. 2: 500–508**
Like-value **Vol. 3: 348 f.**
Likeness **Vol. 1:** 587, 676, 707, 709
Vol. 2: 242, **284, 286–288, 496–508**
Vol. 3: 555, **903–906**
Liking **Vol. 2:** 116
Lilies of the field **Vol. 2:** 386
Lilith **Vol. 1:** 451
Limb **Vol. 1:** 152, **229–242,** 300
Vol. 2: 414 f.
Lime **Vol. 3:** 111
Limestone **Vol. 3:** 381
Limit **Vol. 1:** 54, 352, 384, 386, 389, 422, 488 f., 494, 500, 548 f., 565, 625, 669, 671, 680 f., 734
Vol. 2: 106, 244, 309, 360, 689, 692, 873
Vol. 3: 27, 400
Limitation **Vol. 3:** 678, 814
Limited period **Vol. 2: 765–767**
Limitless **Vol. 2:** 694
Limp **Vol. 2:** 414 f.
Lindos **Vol. 3:** 317
Line **Vol. 1:** 426 f.
Vol. 2: 337, 436, 451
Line of argumentation **Vol. 3:** 1086
Lineage **Vol. 1:** 220, 616
Vol. 2: 656
Linear history **Vol. 2:** 891
Linen **Vol. 1:** 204 f., 531
Vol. 3: 120, 794
Linger **Vol. 2:** 773
Vol. 3: 227, **839–845**
Linguistic categories **Vol. 3:** 1138
Linguistics **Vol. 1:** 56, 582
Vol. 3: 1123–1143
Link **Vol. 1:** 259, 731
Lintel **Vol. 2:** 410
Lion **Vol. 1:** 116, 118 f., 444, 520, 694
Vol. 2: 215, 320, 411, 421, 628
Vol. 3: 180, 203, 471, 601, 650, 713, 944, 951, 1092
Lion of Judah **Vol. 2:** 340
Vol. 3: 649

Lip **Vol. 3:** 498
Lip-service **Vol. 2:** 93
Liparians **Vol. 3:** 851
Lipit-Ishtar Code **Vol. 2:** 582
Lips **Vol. 1:** 382, 424, 455
Vol. 2: 28, 30, 864
Liquefy **Vol. 1:** 682
Liquid **Vol. 1:** 513, 520, 626
Vol. 2: 854
Vol. 3: 403
List **Vol. 3:** 399, 483
Listen **Vol. 1:** 210, 485, 510, 529, 584, 591
Vol. 2: 155, **172–180,** 316, 413, 435, 444, 867
Vol. 3: 112, 800, 1092
Listener **Vol. 2:** 175, 748
Literal **Vol. 1:** 323, 713
Vol. 2: 266, 415, 685, 917, 927
Vol. 3: 486, 730, 733
Literalism **Vol. 2:** 905
Literary analysis **Vol. 3:** 333
Literary criticism (→ Criticism, literary)
Literary forms (→ Form-criticism)
Literary genre (→ Genre, literary)
Literature **Vol. 3:** 483
Litigant **Vol. 2:** 369
Litigate **Vol. 2:** 363
Litigation **Vol. 2:** 317
Little **Vol. 1:** 283, 358, 461 f., 586, 623
Vol. 2: 157, **427–429**
Little Apocalypse **Vol. 1:** 541
Vol. 2: 65
Vol. 3: 56
Little ones **Vol. 2:** 428, 709
Vol. 3: 394
Little while **Vol. 2:** 429
Little woman **Vol. 3: 1055–1068**
Liturgical **Vol. 1:** 98 f., 280, 346, 514, 618, 620, 628, 642
Vol. 2: 253, 512, 870, 874
Vol. 3: 47, 50, 208, 233, 244, 668, 673, 702, 720
Liturgy **Vol. 1:** 100, 297, 414, 416, 627 f., 633
Vol. 2: 45, 200 f., 353, 530–536
Vol. 3: 78, 462, 638, 674 f., 846
Live **Vol. 1:** 181, 234, 435, 444, 513, 517, 597, 600, 613, 621, 643, 661, 676 f., 679, 682, 685 f., 690 f., 713, 723, 739
Vol. 2: 95, 120, 123, 267, 269, 271, 297, 335, 393, 438, 445, **474–484, 801–804,** 815–819
Vol. 3: 255, 269, 366–368, 760, 805, **811–815**
Live as a Jew **Vol. 2:** 310
Live in **Vol. 2: 247–251**
Live in peace **Vol. 2: 776–783**
Livelihood **Vol. 1:** 277, 357
Vol. 2: 297, 475, 678
Liver **Vol. 1:** 230
Livestock **Vol. 2:** 410, 412, 693
Living **Vol. 1:** 87, 147, 240, 469, 535, 641 f., 659, 665, 683, 690, 711, 723, 736
Vol. 2: 74, 204, 233, 267, 275, 282, 285, 319, 365, 924
Vol. 3: 791
Living creature **Vol. 1:** 280
Vol. 2: 476–484
Living One **Vol. 2:** 197
Living soul **Vol. 3:** 683
Living stone **Vol. 1:** 305
Vol. 2: 83, 230, 249, 253
Vol. 3: 390, 393, 435
Living water **Vol. 2:** 267
Vol. 3: 459, 813 f., 943, 982, **986–988**
Load **Vol. 1:** 260, 711, 728, 742 f.
Vol. 2: 281
Loaf, loaves **Vol. 1:** 249 f., 586
Vol. 2: 534
Vol. 3: 657, 904
Loafer **Vol. 1:** 267
Loan **Vol. 2:** 254, 666, 856, 858
Loan-word **Vol. 2:** 125, 333
Loathe **Vol. 1:** 555, 557
Local **Vol. 1:** 624, 626, 643
Locality **Vol. 2:** 303, 376
Location **Vol. 1:** 527
Vol. 3: 602
Lock **Vol. 2:** 207
Vol. 3: 498
Locke, John **Vol. 1:** 56
Vol. 3: 1130
Locusts **Vol. 1:** 118 f., 342, 409, 511, 612
Vol. 2: 628, 637, 690, 831
Vol. 3: 248, 256, 560, 846, 856, 1001
Lodge **Vol. 3:** 255
Lodging **Vol. 1:** 687
Vol. 3: 177–189
Loft **Vol. 2:** 189
Logia **Vol. 1:** 57 f., **62 f.,** 67 f.
Vol. 2: 757
Vol. 3: 84 f., 1030
Logic **Vol. 1:** 49, 481, 664
Vol. 2: 284
Vol. 3: 119, 379, 571, 876, 1034, 1081, 1085–1087
Logical **Vol. 1:** 333
Vol. 2: 392 f.
Logical antimony **Vol. 3:** 887
Logical necessity **Vol. 3:** 894
Logical positivism **Vol. 3:** 1136
Logos **Vol. 1:** 60, **63,** 102, 166, 178, 374, 438, 575 f., 595, 711, 739
Vol. 2: 125, 140, 185, 288, 355, 404, 535 f., 590
Vol. 3: 35 f., 41, 554, 643, 689, 704, 723, 890, 922, 1033, 1069, 1084 f., **1114–1117,** 1204
Loins **Vol. 1:** 239 f.
Vol. 3: 966
Lois **Vol. 3:** 1070
Loneliness **Vol. 1:** 679
Vol. 2: 307, 360, 420, 478
Vol. 3: 1004, 1073
Long **Vol. 1:** 523
Vol. 2: 239
Long time **Vol. 3: 826–833**
Longing **Vol. 1:** 385, 456, 522, 524, 610, 672
Vol. 2: 103, 108, 238, 244, 247, 265, 267, 270, 325, 394, 420, 423, 539, 789, 900
Vol. 3: 421, 680, 820, 858, 996, 1092
Longsuffering **Vol. 2:** 764, 766, **768–772**
Look **Vol. 1:** 231, 456, 510, 585, 694

Vol. 3: 126, **519 f.**
Look at **Vol. 2:** 393
Vol. 3: 511–520
Look back **Vol. 1:** 493
Look cheerful **Vol. 3:** 254
Look in the face **Vol. 3: 519 f.**
Look for **Vol. 1:** 189
Vol. 2: 244–246
Look forward **Vol. 1:** 633
Look into **Vol. 2:** 393
Look up **Vol. 2:** 194
Vol. 3: 519
Loose (→ Binding and loosing) **Vol. 1:** 171, 190, 577, 698
Vol. 2: 402, 732 f.
Vol. 3: 177–221, 537, 544
Loosen **Vol. 3:** 558
Lord **Vol. 1:** 71, 102, 128, 165–168, 187, 205, 209, 221 f., 256, 270, 325, 346, 355, 381 f., 396, 427, 441, 475 f., 489, 519, 522 f., 526, 540, 546, 549, 559, 569, 571 f., 574, 592, 596, 601, 603 f., 607, 610, 626, 643 f., 652, 659, 662, 665, 668 f., 674 f., 688, 695, 704, 720, 722, 726–728, 733–736
Vol. 2: 47, 58, 68–72, 74, 76 f., 79–81, 84, 112, 119, 129–131, 139, 143 f., 147, 149, 155, 157, 162, 164 f., 173, 180, 186 f., 191, 193 f., 202–204, 213–215, 218, 226, 230 f., 238, 240, 242–244, 250, 263 f., 274, 278 f., 287, 297, 299, 312, 317 f., 325, 329 f., 332, 336, 343, 350, 353, 357, 359, 361, 363, 366, 369, 373, 383, 386, 388, 399, 403, 405, 407, 411–413, 460, 491, **508–520,** 522, 528, 535, 548, 562, 580, 582, 590, 595, 619, 649, 652, 654, 674, 677, 722, 725, 800, 818, 859, 863, 867, 869, 877, 891, 895 f., 915, 922
Vol. 3: 37, 45, 47, 53, 55 f., 60, 62, 66, 69f., 83–85, 88, 95, 98, 115, 118, 120, 130, 135, 140, 155 f., 158–160, 166, 177 f., 191, 195, 202–209, 212, 218 f., 221, 226 f., 233, 239, 241 f., 250, 255, 257 f., 265, 267–269, 272, 277–279, 281–283, 285, 289, 296, 298 f., 313, 317–320, 324, 341–343, 347, 349, 357, 363, 378–380, 386, 388–390, 405–407, 411 f., 420, 422, 426 f., 430, 433, 474–476, 484, 492, 500, 502, 505, 510, 518, 520, 529, 531, 536 f., 541, 544, 548, 560, 567–569, 583, 588, 590–592, 595–597, 600, 602–604, 623, 638 f., 649, 651, 653, 660, 669, 674 f., 683, 685, 687, 698, 701, 710, 718, 728, 731 f., 764, 768, 773, 777 f., 780, 784, 786, 790, 792, 794, 800 f., 805 f., 812, 815, 819, 824 f., 829, 833, 835, 837, 841, 844, 846, 852 f., 857, 860 f., 867, 873, 889, 908, 913, 918, 921, 924 f., 929 f., 938, 942, 945–947, 962, 967, 973–978, 986, 990, 996, 1004, 1011 f., 1016 f., 1022, 1026, 1032 f., 1044, 1058, 1060, 1064, 1079, 1093–1099, 1103, 1106 f., 1114, 1119–1122, 1155, 1166, 1178, 1181, 1192, 1194, 1199, 1205, 1209
Lord it over **Vol. 2: 510–520**
Lord of the flies **Vol. 3:** 469
Lord of heaven **Vol. 1:** 75
Lord of hosts **Vol. 1:** 280
Vol. 2: 69, 326, 375
Vol. 3: 959
Lord of lords **Vol. 2:** 514
Lord of the sabbath **Vol. 3:** 410
Lord of spirits **Vol. 1:** 452
Vol. 3: 272, 615
Lord of time **Vol. 3:** 841
Lord's Day **Vol. 1:** 631
Vol. 2: 518
Vol. 3: 405–415
Lord's Prayer **Vol. 1:** 249–251, 384, 566 f., 615, 619, 621
Vol. 2: 229, 267, 561, 653, 668, 832, **868–873**
Vol. 3: 204, 696, 803, 1022, 1176
Lord's Supper **Vol. 1:** 117, 157, 213, 237, 250 f., 253, 298, 301, 369 f., 414, 467, 473, 513, 629 f., 633 f., 639, 643, 689, 701 f.
Vol. 2: 42, 221, 250, 269, 273–277, 286, 314, 554, 368, 391, **516,** 518, **520–538,** 543, 547, 581, 671, 732, 754, 854, 882, 885, 894–897, 920
Vol. 3: 47, 61, 166, 195, 227, 239, 243–247, 277, 322, 337, 349, 383, 395, 411, 415, 420, 429, 436, 448, 510, 553, 568, 580, 589, 669 f., 704, 706, 724, 750, 773, 778, 819, 905, 922, 990, 1165
Lord's table **Vol. 3:** 435
Lordship **Vol. 1:** 203, 237 f., 248, 298, 302, 355, 462, 475, 492, 522, 637, 639
Vol. 2: 81, 163, 203 f., 374 f., 399, 425, **510–520,** 619, 649, 722, 754
Vol. 3: 45, 55 f., 604, 703, 780, 929, 1006, 1064, 1105 f., 1155
Lose **Vol. 1:** 462, 608–611, 639, 651
Vol. 2: 314, 385, 838
Lose heart **Vol. 1:** 561, 563
Lose life **Vol. 1:** 439, 464, 698
Vol. 2: 203, 918, 920
Vol. 3: 137, 212, 677, 682
Lose way **Vol. 1:** 608
Loss **Vol. 1:** 463, 465, 497, 608, 611, 640, 679, 716
Vol. 2: 31, 318, 420, 422 f., 775
Vol. 3: 134, 278
Lost **Vol. 1:** 322, 332, 359, 463 f., 472, 525, 541, 729
Vol. 2: 287 f., 314, 356, 358, 366, 386, 394, 412 f., 439, 446, 459–461, 857
Vol. 3: 143, 319, 529 f., 532, 567, 580, 628, 750, 754, 920, 1058 f.
Lost tribes **Vol. 3:** 873
Lot **Vol. 1:** 216, 255, 433, 452, 478, 482, 488 f., 491, 554, 689, 741
Vol. 2: 72, 247, 294, **295–304,** 361, 787, 835
Vol. 3: 204, 370, 633, 856, 1058
Lot's wife **Vol. 3:** 240
Loud **Vol. 2:** 201, 426
Love **Vol. 1:** 55, 96, 102 f., 108–110, 112, 126, 166 f., 171, 173, 180, 190 f., 197, 206 f., 215, 232, 235 f., 238–240, 254–260, 262 f., 270, 275, 277 f., 282, 287, 300, 303, 311, 318, 324 f., 329, 334–339, 341, 347, 351 f., 464, 469, 484, 490–492, 496, 498, 502, 525 f., 528, 530, 538, 541 f., 548 f., 552–557, 559,

Love (*cont'd*)
564, 566, 568–570, 574, 590, 596, 601–604, 607, 609, 611, 616 f., 620, 622–626, 630, 638 f., 642, 644, 651 f., 655, 662, 664, 666–668, 679, 687 f., 693, 695 f., 719 f., 722, 730 f., 733 f., 738, 740
Vol. 2: 43, 51, 62 f., 64, 70 f., 76, 78 f., 83, 86, 97, 101, 103–106, 117, 119, 121, 129, 131 f., 134, 141, 144, 147, 149, 162 f., 176 f., 180, 183, 185, 198, 214, 217, 221, 227, 230, 242 f., 253, 258, 264, 267, 269, 286, 301, 304, 310, 318, 328, 358 f., 364, 366, 386, 391 f., 395, 400, 402–405, 413, 418, 422, 426 f., 444–446, 449, 469 f., 473, 475, 478, 482, 493 f., 499, 503, **538–551**, 563, 585, 597, **599 f.**, 604 f., 625, 632, 653, 658 f., 665, 668, 673, 681, 698, 706, 709, 720 f., 733, 736, 745, 771, 774–776, 779 f., 791, 798, 807, 812 f., 815, 817, 824, 826 f., 838, 847, 855, 857, 868, 880, 905, 925, 929
Vol. 3: 32, 45, 47, 54, 79, 97 f., 106 f., 113, 118, 129, 162, 167 f., 171, 173, 183, 192, 198, 202, 215, 219, 225 f., 229, 256, 261, 296, 315, 319, 321 f., 349 f., 360, 378, 380, 427 f., 431 f., 455, 489 f., 505, 519, 532, 534, 536, 543, 545, 547, 553, 562, 565 f., 569, 576, 582, 592, 596 f., 644, 646, 677, 680, 685, 687, 701, 707, 713, 722, 746, 750, 752, 755, 776–779, 800, 806, 810, 818, 832, 838, 848, 868 f., 879, 886 f., 903, 921, 926 f., 929, 932, 942, 944 f., 965, 996, 998, 1001 f., 1034, 1059, 1061, 1063 f., 1093, 1148, 1151, 1155
Love feast **Vol. 2:** 547
Love for mankind **Vol. 2: 547–550**
Love of money **Vol. 2:** 550, 845
Vol. 3: 868
Love of wisdom **Vol. 3: 1034–1036**
Loveless **Vol. 2:** 143, 864, 868
Vol. 3: 377
Lovely **Vol. 3:** 1148
Lover **Vol. 1:** 481, 492, 506, 558
Lovingkindness **Vol. 2:** 237, 261
Vol. 3: 354
Low **Vol. 1:** 566
Vol. 2: 259, 263, 822
Lower **Vol. 1:** 674, 707
Vol. 2: 209 f., 719
Lower regions **Vol. 2: 205–210**
Lowest **Vol. 2:** 55, 57
Lowliness **Vol. 2: 259–264**, 334, 379
Lowly **Vol. 2:** 200, 203, **259–264**, 821
Loyal **Vol. 2:** 125, 149, 237, 319
Loyalty **Vol. 1:** 189, 270, 281, 308, 367, 529, 618, 688
Vol. 2: 71, 117, 132, 134, 146, 218, 239, 397, 451, 487, 595, 785
Vol. 3: 157, 213, 358, 444, 537, 871, 879, 927
Lucian **Vol. 1:** 281
Vol. 2: 556
Vol. 3: 494
Lucifer **Vol. 3:** 468
Lucius of Cyrene **Vol. 2:** 740
Lucky **Vol. 2:** 146
Vol. 3: 31
Ludicrous **Vol. 2:** 285
Luke **Vol. 1:** 69, 116, 135 f., 162, 181, 199, 303, 440, 490, 539–541, 571, 586, 590, 642, 735
Vol. 2: 118, 168, 222 f., 236, 254, 272, 327, 333, 356
Vol. 3: 47, 52, 57, 64 f., 86 f., 654–659, 732, 909
Luke's view of history **Vol. 3:** 86
Lukewarm **Vol. 1: 317–319**
Vol. 2: 727, 844, 881
Vol. 3: 321
Lull **Vol. 1:** 441
Luminary **Vol. 1:** 422, 451, 523
Vol. 2: 490–496
Vol. 3: 730–737
Lump **Vol. 1:** 634
Vol. 2: 462
Vol. 3: 917
Lunacy **Vol. 3:** 734
Lunar calendar **Vol. 3:** 733
Lunar cycle **Vol. 1:** 626
Lunatic **Vol. 2:** 165
Vol. 3: 475
Lure **Vol. 1:** 458, 681
Vol. 2: 707
Lurk **Vol. 1:** 241
Lust **Vol. 1:** 106, 137, 231, 448, **456–461**, 469, 559, 627, 645, 671, 677, 690 f.
Vol. 2: 368, 478, 580, 779
Vol. 3: 32, 97, 183, 582, 596, 680, 685, 1054, 1064
Lustration **Vol. 1:** 144 f., 151, 155 f., 186, 225
Vol. 3: 990
Luther, Martin **Vol. 1:** 50, 77, 299
Vol. 2: 219, 244, 258, 361
Vol. 3: 655, 928
Luxuriant **Vol. 3:** 918
Luxury **Vol. 1:** 118, 205, 531, 671
Vol. 2: 486
Luz **Vol. 2:** 317
LXX (→ Septuagint)
Lycaonia **Vol. 3:** 773
Lycia **Vol. 1:** 573
Lydia **Vol. 1:** 344, 361
Vol. 2: 550, 847
Vol. 3: 1063, 1065 f.
Lying **Vol. 1:** 350, 512, 550, 555
Vol. 2: 469, 586
Lying in state **Vol. 1:** 696
Lying spirit **Vol. 2:** 458
Lynch **Vol. 1:** 344
Vol. 2: 450
Lyre **Vol. 3:** 671
Lysander **Vol. 3:** 635
Lysimachus **Vol. 2:** 310, 849
Lystra **Vol. 1:** 405
Vol. 2: 606
Vol. 3: 203, 226, 457, 558

Macarius of 'Aelia' **Vol. 2:** 506
Maccabean **Vol. 1:** 650, 717
Vol. 3: 270, 818
Maccabean rebellion **Vol. 1:** 75, 688
Vol. 2: 290, **307**

Vol. 3: 35, 479
Maccabees **Vol. 1:** 50, 59, 62, **63**, 233, 645
Vol. 2: 125, 237, 241, 337, 810
Vol. 3: 164, 419, 452, 461, 783, 788, 961
Mace-head **Vol. 2:** 97
Macedonia **Vol. 1:** 301
Vol. 2: 550, 809, 818, 826
Vol. 3: 499, 955, 1021
Macedonian **Vol. 1:** 712
Vol. 2: 33, 372, 802, 804
Vol. 3: 450
Machpelah **Vol. 2:** 318, 847
Macquarrie, John **Vol. 3: 329 f.**
Macrocosm **Vol. 3:** 513
Macrocosmic time **Vol. 3:** 834
Madman **Vol. 3:** 577, 1008
Madness **Vol. 1:** 450, **526–530**
Vol. 2: 27, 431
Vol. 3: 123, 996
Madonna-cult **Vol. 3:** 1070
Magi **Vol. 1:** 170
Vol. 2: 294, **552–562**, 728, 831
Vol. 3: 341, 1071
Magic **Vol. 1:** 95, 119–121, 186, 207 f., 219, 243, 254, 266 f., 320, 346, 409, 420, 450–454, 550, 577, 611, 625, 686, 718
Vol. 2: 74, 151, 168, 170, 214, 286 f., 296, 393, 479, 520, **552–562**, 601 f., 605, 621, 629 f., 648, 650, 652, 654, 656, 662, 728 f., 831, 847
Vol. 3: 180, 206, 231 f., 270, 324, 340, 342, 457, 471 f., 476, 483, 520, 606, 735, 800, 844, 860 f., 982, 1087, 1100, 1157
Magic arts **Vol. 2:** 557
Magic potion **Vol. 2: 552–562**
Magical **Vol. 3:** 202, 1087
Magical ceremony **Vol. 2: 556**
Magician **Vol. 1:** 424
Vol. 2: 552–562, 639, 642
Vol. 3: 463
Magistrate **Vol. 1:** 163, 168, 193, 341, 407
Vol. 2: 234
Vol. 3: 173, 478
Magna Mater **Vol. 1:** 560
Magnanimous **Vol. 1:** 715
Magnesia **Vol. 3:** 757
Magnificat **Vol. 2:** 34, 261
Vol. 3: 30, 219, 241, 612, 674, 718, 1071
Magnificent **Vol. 2:** 425
Vol. 3: 28
Magnify **Vol. 2:** 44, 202, 360, **424–427**
Magus **Vol. 2: 552–562**
Maiden **Vol. 1:** 283 f., 498
Vol. 2: 317
Vol. 3: 1055, **1071–1073**
Maieutic dialogue **Vol. 3:** 1086
Maim **Vol. 2:** 153, **414 f.**
Vol. 3: 98, 594
Main meal **Vol. 2: 520–538**
Main point **Vol. 2:** 157
Maintain **Vol. 1:** 717
Vol. 2: 326 f.
Vol. 3: 212
Maintenance **Vol. 1:** 414, 525, 602
Vol. 2: 135, 271, 737
Vol. 3: 525
Majestic **Vol. 2:** 46, 92
Majesty **Vol. 1:** 95, 99, 163, 185, 344, 559, 618, 732
Vol. 2: 44, 46, 71, 80, 146, 217, 338, **424–427**, 432
Vol. 3: 52, 317, 342, 381, 514, 632, 718, 848, 1033
Majority **Vol. 1:** 95, 97, 541, 686, 732
Make **Vol. 1:** 378, 383, 387, 471, 474, 477, 520, 523, 732
Vol. 2: 77, 252
Vol. 3: 350, **1152–1155**
Make alive **Vol. 1:** 643, 677
Vol. 2: 476–484, 865
Vol. 3: 257
Make amends **Vol. 1:** 308
Make clear **Vol. 3: 316 f.**
Make crooked **Vol. 2:** 370
Make desolate **Vol. 3: 1004–1008**
Make example of **Vol. 2: 291**
Make foolish **Vol. 3: 1023–1026**
Make friends **Vol. 2:** 832, 837
Make fun of **Vol. 2:** 436
Vol. 3: 340
Make great **Vol. 2:** 202, **424–427**
Make holy **Vol. 2: 224–232**
Make judgments **Vol. 3:** 880
Make known **Vol. 1:** 71, 83, 420, 575 f., 701
Vol. 2: 217, 358, **488–490**
Vol. 3: 44–48, 54, 231, 310 f., 314, 316, **317–324**, 569, 760
Make large **Vol. 2: 424–427**
Make laws **Vol. 2: 438–451**
Make like **Vol. 2: 500–508**
Vol. 3: 350
Make low **Vol. 2: 259–264**
Make merry **Vol. 2:** 356
Make new **Vol. 2:** 604, **670–674**
Make one **Vol. 3:** 172
Make one's own **Vol. 3:** 747–751
Make peace **Vol. 2: 776–783**
Make plain **Vol. 2:** 488
Make ready **Vol. 3: 118–120**
Make righteous **Vol. 2:** 94
Make room **Vol. 1: 728–744**
Make ruler **Vol. 3:** 570
Make a show **Vol. 2:** 352
Make a speech **Vol. 3:** 820
Make sport **Vol. 2:** 436
Make straight **Vol. 1:** 411
Make strong **Vol. 3: 716–718**
Make sufficient **Vol. 3: 728–730**
Make visible **Vol. 3:** 312, **317–324**
Make void **Vol. 2:** 43
Vol. 3: 773
Make war **Vol. 3:** 362, **958–967**
Make waste **Vol. 3:** 867
Make wise **Vol. 3: 1026–1034**
Make worthy **Vol. 3: 348 f.**
Maker **Vol. 1: 376–389**
Vol. 2: 655
Vol. 3: 1153–1155

Makeshift **Vol. 1:** 610
Malachi **Vol. 1:** 66
Vol. 2: 318
Vol. 3: 79, 853, 1089
Malachite **Vol. 3:** 396
Malady **Vol. 2:** 167
Malaria **Vol. 1:** 163
Malaysian tribes **Vol. 1:** 308
Malcontent **Vol. 2:** 145
Male **Vol. 1:** 308
Vol. 2: 161, 287, 410, 562, **569–571**
Vol. 3: 1055, 1062 f., 1065, 1067, 1072
Malediction **Vol. 1:** 416
Malefactor **Vol. 2:** 148
Vol. 3: 27, 965
Malevolent **Vol. 2:** 552
Malformation **Vol. 1:** 560
Malice **Vol. 1:** 110, 231, 259, 631
Vol. 2: 270, 379, 463, 676
Malicious **Vol. 2:** 149
Malignant **Vol. 1:** 203, 520
Malinowski, B. **Vol. 3:** 1125
Malta **Vol. 3:** 561, 683
Maltese **Vol. 3:** 96
Maltreat **Vol. 1:** 162, 285
Vol. 2: 50
Mambres **Vol. 2:** 557
Mammon **Vol. 1:** 138, 684
Vol. 2: 73, 255, 286, 382, **829–853**
Vol. 3: 576, 1054
Mamre **Vol. 2:** 557
Vol. 3: 782
Man **Vol. 1:** 50, 57, 59, 84, 87, 103, 114–116, 126, 242, 382, 472, 521 f., 547 f., 621, 640, 665, 667, 672, 674, 677–679, 701, 705, 708, 720, 722, 732
Vol. 2: 46, 65, 94, 160–162, 180–185, 196, 266, 287, 349, 390, 483, 508, 545, **562–572**, 581, 600, 646, 661–663, 715, 739, 781, 813, 819, 889
Vol. 3: 41, 117, 133, 167, 359, 614 f., 620, 630, 632, 678, 680, 687, 691, 776, 915, 1055 f., 1058, 1148
Man, first **Vol. 2:** 46, 159, 504
Man, second **Vol. 1:** 86, 520, 665
Man of God **Vol. 3:** 77 f.
Man of lawlessness **Vol. 2:** 447
Vol. 3: 319
Man of sin **Vol. 1:** 73, 125
Man-centred **Vol. 1:** 501
Manage **Vol. 2:** **247–256**
Management **Vol. 2:** **253–256**
Manager **Vol. 2:** 254
Manasseh **Vol. 1:** 655
Vol. 2: 306, 318, 374, 555, 649
Vol. 3: 426, 450, 872, 962
Mandaean **Vol. 1:** 89, 422, 653
Vol. 3: 921, 936
Mandaeism **Vol. 2:** 278, 491, 646, 830
Mandate **Vol. 2:** 607
Manetho **Vol. 2:** 310
Manhood **Vol. 1:** 93, 302
Mania **Vol. 3:** 1024
Manichaean **Vol. 3:** 108, 231
Manichaeism **Vol. 1:** 422
Vol. 2: 491, 674
Manifest **Vol. 1:** 711
Vol. 2: 216 f., 359, **487 f.**
Vol. 3: 309 f., 316
Manifestation **Vol. 1:** 232, 542, 586, 609, 648, 677, 679, 711
Vol. 2: 447
Vol. 3: 570
Manilius **Vol. 3:** 124
Manipulate **Vol. 2:** 556
Vol. 3: 1098
Mankind **Vol. 1:** 96, 211, 470, 548, 616 f., 672 f., 675, 677 f., 694, 720 f., 737
Vol. 2: 332, 342
Vol. 3: 628
Manliness **Vol. 2:** 562
Vol. 3: 926
Manna **Vol. 1:** 195, 205, **248–253**
Vol. 2: 218, 268 f., 272, 628, 637, 674, 871 f., 928
Vol. 3: 383, 427, 508, 706, 787, 804, 815, 893
Manner **Vol. 1:** 708
Vol. 2: 369, 437, 550
Manner of life **Vol. 1:** 469, 623
Vol. 2: 95, 243, 264, 308, 475
Vol. 3: 349
Manning **Vol. 1:** 733
Mansion **Vol. 3:** 229
Manslaughter **Vol. 1:** 151
Mantle **Vol. 3:** 739
Mantology **Vol. 2:** 621
Manual work **Vol. 2:** 820
Vol. 3: 813
Manufacture **Vol. 1:** 378, 723
Manumission **Vol. 1:** 267
Vol. 3: 95, 379, 593 f., 597 f.
Manure **Vol. 3:** 469
Manuscripts **Vol. 1:** 53, 70
Many **Vol. 1:** **95–97**, 514, 575
Vol. 2: 130, 179, 525 f., 530, 532, 543, 719, 800, 854
Vol. 3: 115, 195–197, 275, 611 f., 682
Many waters **Vol. 3:** 1006
Map **Vol. 3:** 483
Mar **Vol. 1:** 468
Vol. 2: 287 f.
Marah **Vol. 1:** 202
Vol. 2: 637
Maranatha **Vol. 2:** 530 f., **886–935**
Vol. 3: 245, 826
Marathon **Vol. 1:** 624
Marble **Vol. 3:** 391
Marcellus of Ancyra **Vol. 2:** 506 f.
March **Vol. 1:** 342, 409
Vol. 2: 451
Vol. 3: 945
Marcion **Vol. 1:** 55, 379
Vol. 3: 108, 401
Marcosians **Vol. 3:** 640
Marcus Aurelius **Vol. 1:** 68, 232, 720
Vol. 2: 657, 776
Vol. 3: 739
Marduk **Vol. 1:** 140

Vol. 2: 200, 553
Vol. 3: 1102, 1105, 1125
Marduk-Ellil hymns **Vol. 3:** 1088
Mari **Vol. 3:** 46, 1089
Mariamne **Vol. 2:** 550
Marinus **Vol. 3:** 453
Marital **Vol. 1:** 506
Mark **Vol. 1:** 69, 114–116, 134, 199, 235, 399, 556, 655, 727, 735, 739
Vol. 2: 33, 149, 182, 284, 291, 329, 390, 411, 431, **572–575**, 626, 701, 847
Vol. 3: 60, 63 f., 108, 310, 490, 497, 500, 1065
Mark, ending of **Vol. 3:** 294
Mark Antony **Vol. 3:** 731
Mark of the beast **Vol. 2:** 574
Mark of Cain **Vol. 2:** 572, 626
Mark of esteem **Vol. 3:** 816
Markah **Vol. 3:** 453
Market **Vol. 1:** 189, 225, **267 f.**, 283, 352, 625
Vol. 2: 273, 286
Vol. 3: 50, 378, 381, 432, 943
Marriage **Vol. 1:** 103, 138, 153, 155, 207, 278, 308, 335, 368, 384, 408, 414, 426, 448, 457, 494–496, 498–500, 502, 505, 507, 544, 560 f., 625 f., 675, 678, 682, 688, 698, 717
Vol. 2: 32, 59, 126, 139, 141, 188, 221, 230, 311, 317, 349, 400, 412, 444, 517, 541, 545, 549, 564, 570 f., **575–590**, 691, 722, 923
Vol. 3: 35, 95 f., 181 f., 188, 191, 219, 225, 325, 356, 380, 497, 534–544, 562, 583, 606, 913, 1055, 1057, 1059, 1064 f., 1072, 1075, 1093, 1164 f., 1167
Marriage bed **Vol. 2:** **586 f**
Marriage ceremony **Vol. 2:** 576, 578
Marriage feast **Vol. 1:** 274
Vol. 3: 869
Marriage laws **Vol. 1:** 61
Vol. 2: 511, **576–581**, 585
Marriage supper **Vol. 3:** 1068
Married **Vol. 1:** 145, 152, 411, 496 f.
Vol. 2: 87
Vol. 3: 173, 1055
Marry **Vol. 2:** **575–582**, 608, 715, 738
Vol. 3: 545
Mars **Vol. 2:** 85
Marsh **Vol. 3:** 992
Marshall **Vol. 1:** 521
Martha **Vol. 1:** 278
Vol. 2: 418, 929
Vol. 3: 980, 1059–1061
Martyr **Vol. 1:** 222, 257, 312, 406, 435, 438, 440, 455, 474, 529, 645, 649, 694, 709
Vol. 2: 49, 117, 133, 193, 207, 290, 365, 412, 712, 724, 767, 854
Vol. 3: 97, 113, 157, 193–196, 245, 271, 436, 592, 686, 865, 893, 926, 1035
Martyr-theology **Vol. 3:** 165
Martyrdom **Vol. 1:** 163, 235, 403, 440, 647, 651, 653, 707
Vol. 2: 117, 361, 542, 824, 854 f.
Vol. 3: 82, 121, 137, 165, 212, 240, 279, 291, 387, 432, 579, 1042, 1168
Martyrology **Vol. 2:** 368
Marvel **Vol. 1:** 381
Vol. 2: **621–626**
Marvellous **Vol. 2:** **621–626**, 669
Marx, Karl **Vol. 3:** 968
Marxist analysis **Vol. 3:** 971
Marxsen, Willi **Vol. 3:** **284–286**
Mary **Vol. 1:** 104, 120, 187, 213, 256, 278, 506, 512, 530, 559, 623, 668
Vol. 2: 34, 86, 118 f., 261, 332 f., 353, 358
Vol. 3: 30, 430, 555, 652, 655 f., **660–664**, 674, 908, 1009, 1060–1062, 1068, 1070–1073
Mary of Bethany **Vol. 1:** 540
Vol. 2: 418
Vol. 3: 980, 1059–1061
Mary Magdalene **Vol. 1:** 266
Vol. 3: 115, 276, 287 f., 296, 475, 860, 980, 1059–1061
Mary, mother of James and Joses **Vol. 3:** 1060, 1071
Mary, mother of John Mark **Vol. 1:** 642
Vol. 2: 847
Vol. 3: 1065, 1071
Mary, wife of Clopas **Vol. 3:** 1061
Masada **Vol. 1:** 435, 627
Vol. 3: 681, 1167 f.
Mascall, E.L. **Vol. 3:** **334**
Mask **Vol. 1:** 316, 586
Mason **Vol. 1:** 279
Vol. 3: 915
Masonry **Vol. 1:** 241
Masoretes **Vol. 1:** **63**
Masoretic text **Vol. 1:** 50, **63**, 68, 71
Masquerade **Vol. 3:** 864
Mass **Vol. 1:** 528, 732
Vol. 2: 788
Mass media **Vol. 3:** 900
Massah **Vol. 2:** 635
Vol. 3: 800 f., 806
Massilia **Vol. 3:** 149
Mast **Vol. 1:** 241
Mastema **Vol. 1:** 125, 452
Vol. 3: 468
Master **Vol. 1:** 67, 239, 266, 275, 285, 305, 404, 416, 440, 462, 474, 480, 482, 484–486, 488, 494, 609 f., 617, 623, 637 f., 680, 715–717, 720
Vol. 2: 84, 155, 180, 258, 281, 330, 435, 450, 499, **508–520**, 539, 581, 595, 611, 653, 721, 737, 775, 816 f., 833, 837 f., 859, 890
Vol. 3: 29, 49, 78, **115 f.**, 121, 572, 582 f., **589–599**, 716, 759, **765–768**, 776, 916, 928 f., 1065, 1152, 1157
Master-builder **Vol. 1:** 377
Vol. 3: 142 f., 1032
Mastery **Vol. 1:** 265, 460, 571
Vol. 2: 165
Vol. 3: 678
Match-maker **Vol. 1:** 475
Material **Vol. 1:** 209, 458 f., 513, 522, 537, 562, 589, 639, 642, 676, 680, 687, 710, 716, 744
Vol. 2: 99, 187, 200, 265 f., 284, 287, 659, 837, 840 f., 844, 846
Vol. 3: 208, 276, 435, 678, 1058

Material things **Vol. 2:** 32, 328, 356
Material world **Vol. 1:** 58, 139, 233, 250, 387
Materialism **Vol. 1:** 532
Vol. 2: 488
Materialistic **Vol. 1:** 186, 583
Vol. 2: 275
Materialization **Vol. 2:** 337
Mathematics **Vol. 1:** 140, 665
Vol. 2: 743
Vol. 3: 349, 399, 823, 1081
Mattathias **Vol. 1:** 63
Vol. 3: 658, 961
Matter **Vol. 1:** 55, 66, 236, 380, 443, 450, 562, 704 f., 711
Vol. 2: 394, 402, 452, 505
Vol. 3: 146, 273, 595, 941, **1119–1123, 1147–1152, 1155–1158**
Matthan **Vol. 3:** 655
Matthat **Vol. 3:** 655
Matthew **Vol. 1:** 69, 116, 134, 181 f., 199, 571
Vol. 2: 217, 315, 351 f., 467, 691, 715
Vol. 3: 52, 482, 494 f., 654–659, 757–759
Matthias **Vol. 1:** 129, 132
Vol. 2: 299, 787
Vol. 3: 387
Mature **Vol. 2:** 62, 269, 391
Vol. 3: 350, 779, 1031
Maturity **Vol. 1:** 92 f., 284, 302, 325, 474, 565, 568, 647
Vol. 2: 59, 64 f., 103, 129, 187, 563, 721
Vol. 3: 403, 702, 775, 1118
Maxim **Vol. 2:** 757
Maximilla **Vol. 3:** 89
Mazaeus **Vol. 2:** 848
Mazdaism **Vol. 1:** 107, 653
Vol. 2: 492
Mazzoth **Vol. 2:** 522
Meagre **Vol. 2:** 821, 826
Meal **Vol. 1:** 212 f., 219, 250, 272, 282, 292, 308, 367, 369, 414, 480, 629 f., 632–634, 641
Vol. 2: 74, 150, 228, 271–274, 276, 286, 354–356, 520, 522, 581, 599
Vol. 3: 105, 119, 144, 208, 422, 431, 443, 508, 545, 547 f., 588, 706, 744 f., 750, 819, 845 f., 922, 1074
Meal-offering **Vol. 3:** 238, 243, 423
Mean **Vol. 3: 820–826**
Meaning **Vol. 1:** 57, 68, 250, 338, 381, 551, 574, 614, 629, 632 f., 676, 678, 737
Vol. 2: 67, 103, 106, 213, 281, 326, 332, 377, 384, 434, 891
Vol. 3: 102 f., 112, 520, 533, 878, **1081–1119**, 1124, 1137, 1140, 1143
Meaningless **Vol. 1:** 522
Vol. 2: 683, 729
Vol. 3: 1136
Means **Vol. 1:** 580 f., 681
Vol. 2: 164, 167, **845–847**
Vol. 3: 324 f., 1182
Means of deliverance **Vol. 3: 216–221**
Means of ordering **Vol. 3:** 1078
Means of testing **Vol. 3: 808–810**
Measure **Vol. 1:** 602, 711, 728, 733–735, 738, 740 f.
Vol. 2: 122, 131, 266, 362, 366, 369, 424, 448, 683, 698, 891
Vol. 3: 399–404, 436, 559, 799, 841, 935, 948, 1085
Measurement **Vol. 3:** 399
Measuring-line **Vol. 2:** 298
Meat **Vol. 1:** 226, 230, 249, 261, 350–352, 630, 643, 671, 731
Vol. 2: 235, 268 f., 272 f., **284–286**
Vol. 3: 432, 444 f., 566, 802
Meat offered to idols **Vol. 2: 284–286**, 721
Mebaqqer **Vol. 3:** 566
Mechanistic **Vol. 3:** 162
Meddle **266 f.**
Meddlesome **Vol. 2: 552–562**
Medea **Vol. 2:** 553
Medes **Vol. 2:** 678 f.
Vol. 3: 957
Media **Vol. 1:** 141
Medians **Vol. 2:** 557
Mediate **Vol. 1:** 102, 210, 375, 380 f., 466
Vol. 2: 388, 402–404
Vol. 3: 646
Mediation **Vol. 1:** 282, 346, 374, 570 f.
Mediator **Vol. 1:** 101, 103, 127, 238, 294, 304, **365–376**, 380, 382, 450 f., 485, 617, 668 f.
Vol. 2: 72, 80, 84, 117, 167, 178, 343, 442 f., 448, 492, 603 f., 721, 781, 874
Vol. 3: 85, 197, 206, 216, 287, 314, 641, 644, 647, 751, 1029
Mediatorial **Vol. 3:** 554
Medical **Vol. 1:** 302, 443, 692
Vol. 2: 153, **164**, 166–168, 170, 414
Vol. 3: 112, 148
Medical prescriptions **Vol. 3:** 915
Medical test **Vol. 3:** 799
Medicament **Vol. 3:** 448
Medicinal **Vol. 1:** 120, 319
Vol. 2: 211, 710, 712
Vol. 3: 443
Medicine **Vol. 1:** 119, 140, 381, 484, 577, 742
Vol. 2: 166–168, 256, 271, **552–562**
Vol. 3: 709, 738
Meditation **Vol. 1:** 245, 338, 521, 653
Vol. 3: 178
Mediterranean **Vol. 2:** 319
Vol. 3: 757, 983 f.
Medium **Vol. 1:** 512
Vol. 2: 96, 554
Vol. 3: 76, 270, 474
Mediumship **Vol. 2: 559**
Meek **Vol. 1:** 217, 518, 570
Vol. 2: 194, **256–264**, 380
Vol. 3: 807
Meekness **Vol. 1:** 731
Vol. 2: 256–264
Meet **Vol. 1:** 734
Vol. 2: 882–885
Vol. 3: 119, 603, 860
Meet together **Vol. 3:** 143
Meeting **Vol. 1:** 267, 291, 296, 302, 324 f., 363, 466, 587, 698, 713
Vol. 2: 161, 231, 416
Vol. 3: 179, 185

Meeting place **Vol. 2:** 250
Vol. 3: 255
Megara **Vol. 1:** 414
Megiddo **Vol. 3:** 962
Megilloth **Vol. 1:** 58, **63**
Meir, Rabbi **Vol. 1:** 67
Melchi **Vol. 3:** 655, 658
Melchizedek **Vol. 1:** 80, 99 f., 208, 214, 581, 619, 677, 731
Vol. 2: 36, 67, 178, 378, 447, 467, 505, 508, **590–593**, 614, 693 f., 781
Vol. 3: 36, 41 f., 187, 189, 228, 365, 433, 435 f., 457, 616, 627, 852, 854, 922, 947
Melchizedekians **Vol. 3:** 36
Melito **Vol. 3:** 401
Melody **Vol. 3:** 674
Melt **Vol. 1:** 682 f.
Vol. 2: 95, 452
Vol. 3: 1105
Memar Markah **Vol. 3:** 452, 462
Member **Vol. 1:** 153, 189, **229–242**, 275, 278, 301, 303, 305, 310, 341, 344, 368, 433, 475, 484, 496, 500 f., 518, 534, 539, 542, 554–556, 568, 596, 598, 601, 607, 614, 618, 625, 628, 633, 641 f., 653, 689, 691, 700, 732, 739, 741
Vol. 2: 51, 83, 141, 148, 157–160, **247–251**, 273, 312, 314, 350, 363, 366, 385, 414 f., 450, 499, 518, 619, 794
Vol. 3: 364, 701, 1180
Membership **Vol. 1:** 144, 148, 159, 181, 280, 287 f., 299, 308, 364, 414, 539, 641, 693
Vol. 2: 310 f., 377, 441
Vol. 3: 1180
Memorial **Vol. 1:** 263, 624, 632
Vol. 3: 230, 237, 244, 246, 423, 840
Memorial sign **Vol. 3:** 236
Memory **Vol. 1:** 431, 471, 627, 629, 631, 683
Vol. 2: 335, 410, 568
Vol. 3: 64, **230–247**, 477, 488, 493, 593, 657, 680, 776, 1054, 1060, 1122
Memphis **Vol. 1:** 530
Vol. 3: 1088
Memra **Vol. 1:** **63**
Vol. 3: 1116
Men of faithfulness **Vol. 1:** 598
Men Tyrannus **Vol. 3:** 153
Menander **Vol. 1:** 469
Vol. 2: 438, 457, 648, 757
Vol. 3: 279, 463
Mendacious **Vol. 2:** **470–474**
Menelaus **Vol. 3:** 259
Menial **Vol. 1:** 239
Vol. 3: 609, 917
Menorah **Vol. 3:** 789
Menstruation **Vol. 1:** 151
Vol. 2: 577
Vol. 3: 102–104
Mental **Vol. 1:** 240, 527, 676, 680 f., 711, 715
Vol. 2: 163, 284
Mental strain **Vol. 3:** 858
Mentality **Vol. 2:** **616–620**
Mention **Vol. 1:** 619
Vol. 3: **230–247**
Mention honourably **Vol. 3:** 816
Mercenaries **Vol. 2:** 325, 801
Vol. 3: 139, 1054
Merchandise **Vol. 2:** 97 f., 236
Merchant **Vol. 1:** 117
Vol. 2: 502
Vol. 3: 395, 1054
Merciful **Vol. 1:** 349, 356, 616 f.
Vol. 2: **594–598**, 652
Vol. 3: **148–166**, 167
Merciless **Vol. 2:** 97, 154, **594–598**
Vol. 3: 1074
Mercury **Vol. 2:** 85
Mercy **Vol. 1:** 112 f., 116, 180, 185, 189, 191, 197, 228, 258, 261, 335, 345, 356, 359, 464, 570, 593, 611, 615, 620, 666, 671, 679, 687, 730, 732 f.
Vol. 2: 68, 71 f., 78, 104 f., 117 f., 121, 123, 146, 154, 168, 245, 257, 267, 353, 357 f., 364, 388, 407, 413, 435, 443, 449, 492, 517, 543 f., 546, 550, 567, **593–601**, 607, 694, 770, 807, 824, 826, 840, 842, 863, 865, 867, 875
Vol. 3: 52, 56, 98, 118, 152, 161, 202, 211, 215, 224, 241, 358 f., 365, 409, 428 f., 528, 553, 578, 672, 912, 917, 947, 1053 f., 1074, 1166
Mercy-seat **Vol. 1:** 114, 151, 280
Vol. 2: 294, 614
Vol. 3: **148–166**, 812, 815
Meribah **Vol. 2:** 635, 638
Vol. 3: 800 f.
Merit **Vol. 1:** 329, 399, 478, 489, 538 f.
Vol. 2: 44, 141, 301, 813
Vol. 3: 136, 140–144, 342, 348, 358 f., 370, 825, 853, 1053
Meritorious **Vol. 1:** 702
Vol. 2: 873
Vol. 3: 722
Merkabah **Vol. 1:** 527
Merneptah **Vol. 2:** 305
Meron **Vol. 3:** 1010, 1012
Merriment **Vol. 2:** 354, 430
Mesha Stone (→ Moabite Stone)
Meshach **Vol. 2:** 628
Vol. 3: 110
Mesopotamia **Vol. 1:** 177
Vol. 3: 407, 421, 730, 782, 787, 1009, 1029, 1088
Mespila **Vol. 2:** 678
Mess of pottage **Vol. 2:** 316
Message **Vol. 1:** 133, 171, 197, 202, 217, 239, 244, 246–248, 275, 282, 325, 334, 358, 397, 399–401, 409, 411, 468, 482, 486, 489, 511 f., 527, 529, 541, 551, 600 f., 638, 647, 659, 717, 719
Vol. 2: 37, 74 f., 77 f., 107, 109, 112–114, 126 f., 135, 171–173, 175 f., 179, 217, 233, 243, 281, 315, 332, 338, 356–359, 383 f., 387, 403 f., 435, 627, 718 f., 749, 765, 843 f., 918
Vol. 3: **44–48**, 52 f., 55–57, 168, 170 f., 174, 522, 570, 601, 630, 758, 764, 779, 838, 905, 914, 942, 950, 1089, 1094, 1103 f., 1110, 1113, 1120, 1154

Messenger **Vol. 1: 101–104**, 127–130, 133–135, 163, 279, 280, 283, 301, 304, 416, 430, 450, 467, 475, 509, 595, 623, 686, 690, 727
Vol. 2: 107, 109–111, 179, 185, 192, 314, 328, 403, 426, 503, 806
Vol. 3: 45, 49 f., 52, 212, 231, 471, 642 f., 746, 848, 857, 1001, 1043, 1089, 1095, 1097 f., 1107
Messenger of Satan **Vol. 3:** 857
Messiah **Vol. 1: 53**, 63, 72, 77, 79, 123–125, 141, 144–146, 170 f., 177 f., 213, 252 f., 276, 296, 302, 305, 321, 323, 330, 347, 373, 381, 407, 409, 414, 426–428, 451, 455, 470, 473, 544 f., 560, 581, 586, 607, 610, 612 f., 627, 629, 633, 661, 665, 675, 700, 717, 720, 724
Vol. 2: 30, 32, 56, 61, 75, 101, 109, 147 f., 159, 170, 176, 241, 245, 252, 257 f., 282, 294, 308, **313 f.**, 328, **334–343**, 353, 375, 377–379, 385, 400, 411, 458, 498, 503, 515, 521, 558, 580 f., 585, 591 f., 602–604, 607, 609 f., 612–614, 640, 701, 708, 712, 739, 762, 791 f., 794, 808, 811 f., 819, 888, 892, 898 f., 902–904, 927, 930
Vol. 3: 30, 34–36, 46–48, 59, 62, 66, 79 f., 82, 121, 147, 170, 192, 194, 212, 218, 221, 225, 244 f., 250, 271, 293 f., 296, 299 f., 311 f., 358, 378, 397, 432, 462, 490, 506, 517, 522, 524, 529 f., 557, 566, 575, 607, 610, 616, 618–621, 633 f., 637, 639, 642 f., 646, 651 f., 654, 657 f., 662, 690, 693, 699, 710, 715, 722, 735, 804, 829, 858, 863, 867, 883, 906, 919, 926, 956, 967, 1007, 1016, 1044, 1072, 1109 f., 1112, 1122
Messiah, Davidic **Vol. 1:** 426
Vol. 2: 337
Messiah, dying (→ Suffering messiah)
Messiah of hope **Vol. 3: 969 f.**
Messiahship **Vol. 1:** 428, 473
Vol. 2: 282, 339–341, 343, 379
Vol. 3: 110, 131, 717, 864, 1061
Messianic **Vol. 1:** 72, 114, 123, 174, 210, 219, 250, 320–323, 329, 406–408, 473, 599, 633, 666
Vol. 2: 31, 100, 104, 110 f., 165, 241, 252, 309, 313 f., **334–343**, 353, 368, 375 f., 379, 389, 495, 515, 566, 581, 591 f., 599, 604, 610, 629 f., 638, 654, 672, 677, 706, 712, 717, 730 f., 761, 780
Vol. 3: 114, 221, 342, 382 f., 390, 392 f., 395, 430, 519, 610, 615 f., 618 f., 621, 633, 639, 642, 646, 649–652, 655, 657, 663, 697–699, 735, 791, 831, 851, 863, 921, 961, 1006 f., 1060, 1070, 1161
Messianic age **Vol. 1:** 175, 185, 253, 354, 510, 543 f., 700, 724
Vol. 2: 151, 294, 585, 591, 629, 640, 698 f., 792, 798, 859, 892
Vol. 3: 378, 649, 658, 951, 1121
Messianic banquet **Vol. 2:** 270, 276, 761, 871
Messianic claims **Vol. 3:** 343, 442, 462, 649
Messianic community **Vol. 1:** 302
Vol. 2: 30, 34, 207, 731–733
Vol. 3: 182, 699
Messianic consciousness **Vol. 2:** 340 f., 731
Messianic expectation **Vol. 2:** 110, 245, 335, 337 f., 341, 590
Vol. 3: 462, 616, 637, 654, 843, 872
Messianic hope **Vol. 1:** 426, 570, 629
Vol. 2: 174, 337
Vol. 3: 147 f., 636, 648, 651, 867
Messianic interpretation **Vol. 2:** 31, 557
Messianic king **Vol. 1:** 100, 210
Vol. 2: 374, 412, 701
Messianic kingdom **Vol. 3:** 579
Messianic presence **Vol. 2:** 279
Messianic pretender **Vol. 2:** 313
Messianic rule **Vol. 1:** 67
Messianic secret **Vol. 1:** 335
Vol. 2: 341, 379, 752 f., 916
Vol. 3: 131, 320, 503, **506–510**, 619
Messianic shepherd **Vol. 3:** 567 f.
Messianic speculation **Vol. 3:** 655 f.
Messianic titles **Vol. 1: 63**
Vol. 2: 378, 380
Vol. 3: 219, 367, 615, 656
Messianic typology **Vol. 3:** 191
Messianic week **Vol. 3:** 658
Messianic woes **Vol. 3:** 695, 697, 722, 956
Messianic work **Vol. 2:** 165
Messianism **Vol. 1:** 427
Vol. 2: 258, 337–339, 379, 903, 921
Vol. 3: 30, 656
Metal **Vol. 1:** 653 f.
Vol. 2: 96 f., 288
Vol. 3: 396, 483, 498, 808
Metallurgy **Vol. 2:** 98
Metaphor **Vol. 1:** 50, 93, 122, 144, 169, 186 f., 202, 204, 219 f., 224, 239–241, 247, 255, 259 f., 281 f., 284 f., 290, 300, 305 f., 313, 315–317, 320–322, 324 f., 364, 372, 386 f., 390, 405 f., 409, 421, 423 f., 431, 438, 444, 447–449, 471, 477, 479, 481 f., 527, 538, 546, 556, 558 f., 565, 577, 586, 609 f., 617, 635, 643, 645, 648, 650 f., 654, 656–658, 670, 721, 723, 726
Vol. 2: 27–30, 40–42, 91, 155–158, 166, 169 f., 180–182, 185, 211, 224, 234 f., 247–252, 254 f., 259, 264, 266, 268 f., 278 f., 285, 291, 303, 307, 313, 349, 351, 364, 370, 385, 412–415, 421, 423, 444, 451, 462, 479, 484, 486 f., 490, 493, 506, 509, 573, 583–585, 587, 598 f., 612, 705, 707 f., 711, 714, 727 f., 732 f., 738, 743–760. 764. 806. 810, 821, 855, 881, 927
Vol. 3: 50, 99, 109 f., 112, 119, 121, 155, 158, 177, 189, 203, 208, 224, 272, 379, 432, 446 f., 449, 477, 497 f., 505, 525, 529, 534, 557–559, 564–567, 597, 600 f., 674, 690, 695, 701, 703, 722, 730 f., 733–735, 794, 858, 865, 867 f., 871, 874, 902, 911, 914, 948, 951 f., 963, 991 f., 996, 1002, 1010 f., 1049, 1055, 1069, 1072, 1074, 1134, 1137 f.
Metaphysical **Vol. 1:** 422, 492, 561 f.
Vol. 2: 184, 242, 396
Vol. 3: 646–648, 906, 1133, 1136
Metaphysical proof **Vol. 2:** 77
Metaphysics **Vol. 1:** 53, 57, **63 f.**, 665
Vol. 3: 1034, 1081, 1085

Metatron **Vol. 3:** 35
Mete out **Vol. 1:** 572
Metempsychosis **Vol. 1:** 594
Meteorite **Vol. 1:** 610
Meteorological **Vol. 2:** 191
Method **Vol. 1:** 486, 533, 569, 582, 684
Vol. 2: 311, 903
Vol. 3: 59, **935–943**
Methuselah **Vol. 2:** 681, 698
Metonymy **Vol. 1:** 267
Vol. 2: 273
Vol. 3: 198, 434, 815
Micah **Vol. 1:** 66, 109, 170
Vol. 2: 250
Vol. 3: 33, 79, 367, 1006
Micaiah **Vol. 2:** 458
Vol. 3: 478
Mice **Vol. 2:** 831
Michael **Vol. 1:** 83, 101–103, **104**, 452, 504, 508, 572
Vol. 2: 191, 591, 608, 642, 763, 779
Vol. 3: 35, 270, 345, 457, 471, 616, 1054
Michal **Vol. 3:** 1057
Microcosm **Vol. 1:** 232, 521
Vol. 3: 513
Midday **Vol. 3:** 846
Middle **Vol. 1:** 372
Middle Assyrian laws **Vol. 3:** 94
Middle way **Vol. 3:** 939
Middleman **Vol. 1:** 374
Vol. 3: 50
Midian **Vol. 1:** 691
Vol. 2: 636
Vol. 3: 33, 201, 459, 1013
Midianites **Vol. 2:** 367, 635, 638
Vol. 3: 206, 874
Midnight **Vol. 1:** 284, 420, 633
Vol. 2: 136, 881
Midrash **Vol. 1:** **64**, 67, 485, 628, 630
Vol. 2: 125, 187, 755, 913
Vol. 3: 487, 494, 654, 656, 706, 804
Mien **Vol. 1:** 708
Might **Vol. 1:** 95, 142, 167, 175, 228, 336, 347, 466, 531, 638, 649
Vol. 2: 70, 78, 191, 200, 510, **601–616**, 650, 654, 843, 859
Vol. 3: 45, 97, 99, 121, 230, 258, 274, 549, 588, 617, 645, 711, **712–714, 716–718**, 736, 755, 783, 993, 995
Mighty **Vol. 2:** 49, 369, 601–616
Vol. 3: **712–714, 716–718**
Mighty deeds **Vol. 2:** **424–427**
Mighty God **Vol. 2:** 86
Mighty One **Vol. 2:** 70, 602
Mighty works **Vol. 1:** 600
Vol. 2: 383
Migrate **Vol. 2:** 308
Mikwaoth **Vol. 3:** 989
Mild **Vol. 2:** 105, **256–259**
Military **Vol. 1:** 340, 377, 475 f., 505, 536, 553, 645–647, 650, 680, 710, 732
Vol. 2: 104, 220, 788, 898
Vol. 3: 51, 145, 248 f., 502
Military commander **Vol. 3:** **958–967**
Military force **Vol. 2:** 601 f.
Military scribe **Vol. 3:** 478
Military service **Vol. 1:** 687
Vol. 2: 306, 578
Military terms **Vol. 3:** **958–967**
Milk **Vol. 1:** 282, 682 f.
Vol. 2: **268 f.**, 452
Vol. 3: 566
Milkless **Vol. 1:** 515
Mill **Vol. 3:** **390–394**, 1058
Millenarianism **Vol. 2:** 905
Millennium **Vol. 1:** **52**, 53, 64, 254, 508
Vol. 2: 389, 690, **697–703**, 795, 809, 901, 931
Vol. 3: 179, 277, 305, 470 f.
Millstone **Vol. 3:** **390–394**, 1013
Mind **Vol. 1:** 106, 231–233, 245, 266, 350, 355–357, 398, 413, 443, 448, 459 f., 501 f., 514 f., 518, 523, 546 f., 549, 555, 557, 568, 587, 594 f., 636, 638, 676, 678, 680, 700, 706, 708, 723, 739, 742
Vol. 2: 156, 172, 174, 177, 181 f., 212 f., 260, 282, 360, 390–393, 398, 406 f., 422, 437, 476, 564 f., 567, 590, **616–620**, 676, 781, 832, 884 f.
Vol. 3: 101, **122–133**, 204, 221, **230–247**, 558, 672, 712, 724, 760, 789, 824, 826, 1036
Mind of Christ **Vol. 3:** 129
Mindful **Vol. 3:** 230, 1038
Minerva **Vol. 2:** 85
Vol. 3: 1071
Mingle **Vol. 3:** 430
Mining **Vol. 2:** 96 f.
Minister **Vol. 1:** 74, 462, 476
Vol. 2: 381
Vol. 3: 115, 228, 545, 729, 754 f., 758, 807, 813, 853, 855
Minister of death **Vol. 1:** 101
Ministry **Vol. 1:** 175, 192, 219, 329, 403, 419, 429, 477 f., 488, 515 f., 559, 568, 570, 613, 684, 689, 724 f., 735, 742
Vol. 2: 75, 118, 148, 163, 168, 187, 193, 299, 341, 447, 517, 543, 799, 898, 902, 927, 929
Vol. 3: 58, 59, 88 f., 168 f., 171, 182, 323, 552, 603, 659, 696–698, 790, 804, 866, 980, 1011, 1060 f., 1067
Ministry of reconciliation **Vol. 3:** 1111 f.
Ministry of women **Vol. 3:** **1065–1067**
Minor **Vol. 1:** 92, 280 f., 477, 509, 568
Minor judges **Vol. 2:** 363
Minor Prophets **Vol. 1:** **66**
Minority **Vol. 1:** 95, 97, 686
Vol. 2: 254
Mint **Vol. 1:** 704
Vol. 2: **210 f.**, 573, 847
Miracle **Vol. 1:** 57 f., 114, 195, 218, 220, 248, 252 f., 313, 341, 384, 427 f., 470, 487, 574, 583, 596, 599 f., 617, 620, 623, 659, 670, 724
Vol. 2: 85, 91, 151, 164–171, 192, 228, 267, 272, 287, 328, 358, 379, 466, 560 f., 603 f., **620–635**, 654, 749, 858, 863, 901, 920
Vol. 3: 46, 78 f., 110, 212, 216, 233, 261, 503, 516, 520, 554, 571, 638, 664, 700, 714, 717, 763, 769, 800, 804, 806, 848, 851, 922, 984, 1073, 1108, 1110, 1148, 1150

Miracle-worker **Vol. 3:** 643
Miraculous **Vol. 1:** 398, 595, 616, 619, 629, 671, 739
Vol. 2: 166–168, 385
Mire **Vol. 3: 915–917**
Miriam **Vol. 2:** 635, 638
Vol. 3: 77, 1057
Mirror **Vol. 1:** 181
Vol. 2: 284, 290, 603, 756
Miscarriage **Vol. 1:** 124, **176–188**
Mischief **Vol. 1:** 186
Misconceive **Vol. 1:** 715
Misconduct **Vol. 1:** 506
Miserable **Vol. 1:** 561, 565
Vol. 2: 825
Vol. 3: 859
Miserliness **Vol. 1:** 138
Misery **Vol. 1:** 450, 734
Vol. 2: 393, 595
Misfit **Vol. 2:** 92
Misfortune **Vol. 1:** 84, 162, 203, 561, 563 f., 608, 611, 688, 705
Vol. 2: 108, 215, 266, 285, 422, 598, 707
Vol. 3: 264, 528, **719–725**, 856
Mishap **Vol. 1:** 52, 608
Mishmarot **Vol. 1:** 628
Mishnah **Vol. 1:** 51 f., 58 f., **64**, 67, 69 f., 128, 155, 172, 212, 280, 364, 485, 509
Vol. 2: 43, 174, 583, 881
Vol. 3: 488, 493, 741, 752, 761, 989
Misinterpretation **Vol. 1:** 429
Mislead **Vol. 1:** 174, 555, 589, 606, 680
Vol. 2: 457–461, 708
Mismated **Vol. 2: 739–742**
Vol. 3: 1160–1165
Misogyny **Vol. 3:** 1064
Misplaced **Vol. 1:** 531, 729
Misrepresent **Vol. 1:** 644
Vol. 2: 281, 655
Vol. 3: 468, 636
Miss **Vol. 1:** 718
Vol. 2: 172, 460
Vol. 3: 835, **952–956**
Miss goal **Vol. 3:** 419
Miss mark **Vol. 1:** 608
Vol. 2: 457
Vol. 3: 577
Miss way **Vol. 3:** 419, 585
Missiles **Vol. 3:** 109
Missing **Vol. 1:** 332
Vol. 3: 910
Mission **Vol. 1:** 95, 127–129, 133, 135, 142, 146, 155, 214, 256, 282, 331, 339, 361, 403, 411, 488, 510, 536, 538, 547, 581, 596, 599, 601, 603, 620, 657, 667, 678, 700, 736
Vol. 2: 32, 111, 119–121, 126, 150, 169, 173, 222, 257, 272, 275, 309, 314–316, 327, 338, 517, 645, 668, 706, 728, 732, 773, 786 f., 794, 828, 875, 888, 902, 920 f., 924
Vol. 3: 51, 88, 137, 197, 242, 258, 293, 454, 456, 463, 465 f., 472 f., 506, 526, 532, 546, 567, 580, 613, 626, 644, 682, 695, 698–700, 705, 729, 746, 812, 864, 954, 977, 1108, 1114, 1150
Mission-field **Vol. 3:** 985
Missionary **Vol. 1:** 77, 128, 131–134, 166, 192, 214, 247, 263, 303, 329, 335, 350, 355, 359 f., 547, 551, 570, 599, 650, 662, 686, 688 f., 723, 733, 739
Vol. 2: 34, 73, 77, 111, 114, 125, 130, 250, 272, 311, 315 f., 360, 493, 573, 727, 740, 781, 927
Vol. 3: 59 f., 63, 144, 214, 410, 724, 857, 931, 934, 941, 1041, 1152, 1167
Mist **Vol. 2:** 488
Vol. 3: 1000–1004
Mistake **Vol. 2:** 406, 457, 459, 910, 915
Vol. 3: 99, 351, 577, 585, 778
Mistress **Vol. 1:** 239, 498
Vol. 2: 510–520
Vol. 3: 1055
Mistrust **Vol. 1:** 86, 594
Misunderstanding **Vol. 1:** 121, 443, 498, 502, 544, 601, 643, 680, 693, 719 f.
Vol. 2: 28, 312, 316, 434
Vol. 3: 185, 215, 508
Misuse **Vol. 1:** 459, 579, 719
Vol. 2: 123, 606
Misuse authority **Vol. 2: 606–611**
Mite **Vol. 2:** 850
Mithras **Vol. 1:** 64, 176, 255, 374
Vol. 3: 138, 501
Mithras liturgy **Vol. 3:** 690
Mitigate **Vol. 2:** 256
Mitigating **Vol. 1:** 500
Mix **Vol. 1:** 69, 289
Vol. 2: 95 f.
Vol. 3: 543, **910–917**, 1160
Mixed **Vol. 3:** 470
Mixed marriages **Vol. 1:** 155, 688
Vol. 2: 126, 250, 581
Vol. 3: 451, 535 f., 1165
Mixed population **Vol. 2:** 801
Mixer of potions **Vol. 2: 552–562**
Mixture **Vol. 3: 917**
Mnason **Vol. 1:** 167
Mnemonic **Vol. 2:** 685
Moab **Vol. 1:** 208
Vol. 3: 345, 600, 786, 806, 866, 911, 957
Moabite stone **Vol. 3:** 483
Moabites **Vol. 2:** 373, 677
Mob **Vol. 2: 800 f.**
Vol. 3: 559, 711, 713
Mock **Vol. 2: 429–436**
Vol. 3: 253, 340, 343, 563, 570
Mockery **Vol. 1:** 205, 246, 395, 406, 410, 541
Vol. 2: 287, 378 f., 421, **429–436**
Vol. 3: 29, 589, 785, 1096
Mode **Vol. 1:** 547, 706 f.
Model **Vol. 1:** 491
Vol. 2: 151, 284, **290 f.**, 427
Vol. 3: 99, 336, 854, 899, **903–906**, 1061, 1133, 1135
Moderation **Vol. 1:** 494, 501 f., 647
Vol. 2: 99, 103, 130, 266
Vol. 3: 103, 833, 922
Modest **Vol. 2:** 260
Modesty **Vol. 1:** 501

Vol. 2: 257
Vol. 3: 27, 445, **561–564**, 1034
Modia **Vol. 3:** 961
Modification **Vol. 1:** 541
Moira **Vol. 2:** 303
Moisten **Vol. 2:** 188
Mold **Vol. 2:** 465
Molech **Vol. 1:** 655
Vol. 2: 375
Molest **Vol. 3:** 997
Moloch **Vol. 1:** 463
Vol. 2: 83, 375
Vol. 3: 94
Moltmann, Jürgen **Vol. 2:** 908 f.
Vol. 3: 968–972, 975
Moment **Vol. 2:** 925
Vol. 3: 255, 827, **833–839**
Monarchical **Vol. 1:** 190, 192, 198, 200
Monarchy **Vol. 1:** 52, 55, 109, 121 f., 195 f., 425 f., 478, 716
Vol. 2: 319 f., 335, **373–389**, 822, 841
Vol. 3: 33, 79, 828
Monastery **Vol. 1:** 641
Monastic **Vol. 1:** 641
Monastic comunities **Vol. 3:** 78
Monday lections **Vol. 1:** 245
Monepiscopacy **Vol. 1:** 192
Money **Vol. 1:** 93, 142 f., 265, 377, 406, 461, 465, 497, 520, 564, 641, 648, 671, 684, 715, 731
Vol. 2: 32, 42, 49, 96, 131, 216, 221, 226, 321, 326, 497, 583, 666 f., 822, **829–853,** 854,
Vol. 3: 69 f., 120, 155, 189, 200 f., 236, **324 f.**, 379, 420, 545, 547, 557 f., 677, 748, **751–759,** 808, 852, 868
Money, love of **Vol. 1: 137–139**
Money-box **Vol. 1:** 142 f.
Money-changers **Vol. 1:** 704
Vol. 2: 236
Vol. 3: 756, 791
Monism **Vol. 1:** 255
Monistic anthropology **Vol. 2:** 919
Monogamy **Vol. 1:** 166, 335, 383 f.
Vol. 2: 575 f.
Vol. 3: 1064
Monologue **Vol. 2:** 867
Monotheism **Vol. 1:** 77, 452, 543
Vol. 2: 70, 515, 606, 720
Monotheistic **Vol. 2:** 67, 71
Monster **Vol. 1:** 113 f., 431, 508
Monstrous **Vol. 1:** 670
Montanist **Vol. 3:** 108
Montanism **Vol. 3:** 89
Montanus **Vol. 2:** 507
Vol. 3: 89
Month **Vol. 1:** 390, 723
Vol. 2: 157, 689, 694, 887
Vol. 3: 396, 826, 841, 847
Monument **Vol. 1:** 431
Vol. 2: 149, 649
Vol. 3: 246, 777, 1040, 1053
Mood **Vol. 1:** 107
Moon **Vol. 1:** 124, 224, 420, 425, 449, 451
Vol. 2: 128, 192, 484, 487 f., 491, 495 f., 622, 628, 690 f., 889, 916
Vol. 3: 475, **730–737**, 1067
Moon-cult **Vol. 1:** 616
Vol. 2: 67
Moon-goddess **Vol. 3:** 733
Moon-struck **Vol. 3: 733 f.**
Moore, G.E. **Vol. 3:** 897, 1135 f.
Moral **Vol. 1:** 114, 206, 334, 348, 352 f., 365, 419 f., 432, 441, 447–449, 460, 462, 468, 479 f., 498, 502, 524, 559, 562 f., 565, 570 f., 595, 607 f., 628, 645, 699, 708 f., 722, 725 f., 732
Vol. 2: 93, 100, 105, 143 f., 150, 241, 280, 363, 372, 377, 383, 394, 471, 582, 657, 666, 781
Vol. 3: 49, 68, 125 f., 130, 136, 149, 160, 349, 426, 512, 677, 945, 993, 1039, 1053, 1148, 1154
Moral awareness **Vol. 3:** 678
Moral concepts **Vol. 1:** 56
Moral conviction **Vol. 3:** 682
Moral corruption **Vol. 2:** 58
Moral evil **Vol. 1:** 422
Moral freedom **Vol. 1:** 62
Moral goodness **Vol. 2:** 98
Moral impurity **Vol. 1:** 155
Moral instruction **Vol. 3:** 929
Moral language **Vol. 1:** 56
Moral lapse **Vol. 2:** 51
Moral perfection **Vol. 2:** 77
Moral philosophy **Vol. 1:** 56, 502
Vol. 3: 930
Moral powers **Vol. 3:** 684
Moral struggle **Vol. 3:** 679
Morality **Vol. 1:** 483 f.
Vol. 2: 223 f., 420, 660
Vol. 3: 50, 101, 103, 1052 f.
Moralize **Vol. 2:** 67
Morally good **Vol. 2:** 102
Morals **Vol. 1:** 56, 107, 206, 469, 687
Vol. 2: 92, 457, 575
Vol. 3: 573, 583
Mordecai **Vol. 2:** 291
Vol. 3: 51, 873
More **Vol. 1:** 137, 728
Vol. 2: 130
Morning **Vol. 2:** 136
Vol. 3: 846, 902
Morning offering **Vol. 3:** 423
Morning star **Vol. 2:** 486, **490–496**
Vol. 3: 736 f.
Morris, Leon **Vol. 3:** 152, 154
Morrow **Vol. 1:** 251
Morsel **Vol. 2:** 528
Mortal **Vol. 1:** 169, 233 f., 430–432, 435–438, 440, 468–470, 499, 679, 705
Vol. 2: 83, 263, 476, 503, 659, 879
Vol. 3: 267, 575, 681
Mortality **Vol. 2:** 564, 923
Mortification **Vol. 1:** 443
Mosaic dispensation **Vol. 1:** 73
Mosaic legislation **Vol. 1:** 70, 330, 368, 444, 500
Vol. 2: 123, 133
Vol. 3: 95, 182
Mosaic tradition **Vol. 2:** 327
Mosaics in synagogues **Vol. 3:** 396

Moses **Vol. 1:** 53, 55 f., 65 f., 72, 104, 108, 128, 167 f., 173, 194 f., 252 f., 255, 272 f., 297, 309, 311, 326, 330, 332 f., 357, 365, 373–375, 399, 476, 485, 487, 505, 508 f., 532, 539, 543–545, 556, 559, 580, 587, 591, 595 f., 633, 639, 691, 704, 713, 729, 736
Vol. 2: 46, 48, 68 f., 117, 151, 154, 173 f., 180, 186, 202, 209, 212 f., 215 f., 219, 225, 249, 281, 287, 290, 306, 331, 337, 369, 437, 440, 442, 447–451, 453, 460, 488 f., 521, 557, 559, 580, 592, 598, 625, 627, 631, **635–643**, 677, 684, 686, 696, 724, 745, 762, 768, 777, 795–797, 835, 844, 847, 893
Vol. 3: 33, 42, 51, 56, 65, 77 f., 80, 86, 89, 117, 143, 154 f., 159, 179, 181, 186 f., 194, 199, 201 f., 207 f., 225, 234 f., 311, 324, 330, 344 f., 359, 367, 382, 418, 433, 459, 465, 479–482, 484 f., 487, 493–495, 508, 514, 520, 531, 550, 554, 559, 566, 568, 579, 594, 608–610, 630 f., 642 f., 650, 660, 673 f., 692, 699, 701, 721, 729, 740, 752, 764, 772 f., 778, 788, 800, 806, 812, 814 f., 828, 836, 861–864, 875, 877–880, 890, 893, 905, 969, 1001, 1003, 1007, 1009, 1011, 1013 f., 1043, 1057, 1103–1105, 1107, 1118, 1162 f.
Moses' seat **Vol. 1:** 297
Vol. 3: 87, 482, 589, 1162
Most High **Vol. 1:** 225, 321, 380 f.
Vol. 2: 376, 865, 899
Vol. 3: 36, 250, 271, 311, 424, 474, 555, 614, 616, 629, 637, 650, 660, 785, 793
Most honourable **Vol. 3: 716–718**
Mosul **Vol. 2:** 678
Mot **Vol. 2:** 554
Moth **Vol. 1:** 119, 468
Vol. 2: 831
Mother **Vol. 1:** 87, 239 f., 288, 336, 461, 501, 517, 556, 615, 619, 739
Vol. 2: 188, 226, 229, 250, 261, 312, 317, 329, 332, 358, 548, 571, 575, 737, 803
Vol. 3: 215, 987, **1055–1075**, 1163
Mother of God **Vol. 3:** 1070
Mother goddess **Vol. 2:** 85
Mother of harlots **Vol. 1:** 142
Vol. 3: 1070
Mother of Israel **Vol. 3:** 1069
Mother-in-law **Vol. 3:** 1059
Mother-love **Vol. 2:** 599
Motherhood **Vol. 3: 1068–1071**
Motherless **Vol. 1:** 616
Motion **Vol. 3: 556–558**, 681
Motivate **Vol. 1:** 537
Vol. 2: 364
Motivation **Vol. 1:** 358, 397, 558, 686, 691
Vol. 3: 854
Motive **Vol. 1:** 265, 270, 352, 395, 418, 549, 558, 603, 611 f., 622–625, 641, 738
Vol. 2: 43, 103, 137, 181, 244, 331, 350, 360, 437, 858
Vol. 3: 123, 1106
Motiveless **Vol. 1:** 546
Mould **Vol. 1:** 543, 676, 681, 708
Vol. 2: 95, 285
Vol. 3: 904, 917
Moule, C.F.D. **Vol. 3:** 60, 292 f.
Mound **Vol. 3: 951 f.**
Mount **Vol. 2:** 131, **184**
Mount of Olives **Vol. 1:** 629
Vol. 2: 713
Vol. 3: 381, 558, 1010–1012
Mount of transfiguration **Vol. 3:** 863, 1010, 1012
Mountain **Vol. 1:** 379, 387, 504, 559, 600, 602, 610, 661
Vol. 2: 157, 184, 187, 199, 218, 262, 297, 324 f., 353, 489, 870 f., 878
Vol. 3: 117, 391 f., 460, 543, 806, 862 f., 865, **1004–1014**, 1094
Mountain chain **Vol. 3: 1009–1013**
Mountain of God **Vol. 2:** 185, 202, 635
Mountain region **Vol. 3: 1009–1013**
Mountainous **Vol. 2:** 305
Vol. 3: 1008 f.
Mourn **Vol. 2: 417–423**, 433
Vol. 3: 120, 359
Mourner **Vol. 3:** 588
Mournful **Vol. 1:** 705
Mourning **Vol. 1:** 120, 203, 217, 239, 265, 329, 520, 569, 571, 612, 625, 630
Vol. 2: 267, 357 f., **417–423**, 714, 777, 887, 917
Vol. 3: 672 f.
Mourning women **Vol. 2:** 418
Mouth **Vol. 1:** 347, 414, 476, 508, 657, 729
Vol. 2: 28, 72, 80, 83, 132, 157, 216, 237, 252, 267, 451, 726 f.
Vol. 3: 81, 497, 639, 967, 1095
Move **Vol. 1:** 741
Vol. 2: 116, 266
Move quickly **Vol. 3: 945–947**
Movement **Vol. 1:** 487, 521, 602, 720
Vol. 2: 457
Vol. 3: 259, 677 f., 689 f., 707, 841 f., 933
Much **Vol. 2:** 130, 840
Mud **Vol. 3: 915–917**
Muddy **Vol. 3:** 950
Multiform **Vol. 1:** 705
Multiple meaning **Vol. 3:** 878
Multiply **Vol. 1:** 728, 732 f.
Vol. 2: 128, 130 f.
Multitude **Vol. 1:** 95, 292 f., 529, 670, **728–744**
Vol. 2: 214, 696 f., 795, 811, 842
Mummy **Vol. 1:** 263
Mundane **Vol. 1:** 644
Murder **Vol. 1:** 51, 309, 364, 410, 418, 420, 429, 443, 468, 499, 546, 558, 640
Vol. 2: 63, 138, 489, 854
Vol. 3: 82, 94, 96, 103, 201, 422, 680, 708, 1053
Murderer **Vol. 1:** 166, 168, 458, 556
Vol. 2: 472
Vol. 3: 35, 159, 190, 472, 756, 1054
Murderous **Vol. 1:** 657
Murex **Vol. 1:** 205
Murmur **Vol. 1:** 195, 509
Vol. 2: 423
Vol. 3: 799
Muses **Vol. 2:** 372
Music **Vol. 1:** 625
Vol. 2: 92

Vol. 3: 668–676, 873
Musical instruments **Vol. 3:** 77, 669, 671, 689, 873 f.
Musician **Vol. 2:** 578
Vol. 3: 34
Musonius Rufus **Vol. 1:** 498
Must **Vol. 2:** **662–669**, 808 f.
Mustard **Vol. 1:** 173
Vol. 2: 129, 385, 429, 462, 714, 834
Vol. 3: 523, 555, 868, 1012
Muster **Vol. 1:** 189, 292 f., 296, 332 f.
Vol. 2: 683 f.
Vol. 3: 478
Mute **Vol. 1:** 428, 509
Mutilation **Vol. 1:** 307, 309, 311
Vol. 3: 96
Mutual **Vol. 1:** 240, 300, 303, 385, 639, 643, 662, 686, 724, 733
Vol. 2: 51, 313, 317, 404
Muzzle **Vol. 1:** 115
Mycenae **Vol. 3:** 851
Mylitta **Vol. 1:** 497
Myrrh **Vol. 1:** 120–122, 265 f.
Vol. 2: 28, **293–295**, 712
Vol. 3: 154
Myrtle **Vol. 1:** 648
Mysteries of Aion **Vol. 3:** 827
Mysterious **Vol. 2:** 364
Mystery **Vol. 1:** 64, 129, 167, 169, 171, 179, 351, 370 f., 427, 498, 509, 541, 565 f., 661, 677, 737, 740
Vol. 2: 64, 69, 72, 75, 176, 178, 197 f., 255, 274, 341 f., 349, 401, 726, 736, 794, 835, 922
Vol. 3: 49 f., 84, 138, 169, 311, 314, 316, 321 f., **501–506**, 664, 721, 833, 844, 1019 f., 1031–1033, 1109
Mystery of lawlessness **Vol. 2:** 447, 901
Mystery religions **Vol. 1:** 59, **64**, 123, 150, 176, 186, 230, 271, 282, 284., 286, 288, 316, 327, 373, 432, 438 f., 470, 484, 595, 611, 616, 625, 643, 650, 654, 705–708, 716
Vol. 2: 60, 202, 214, 233, 239, 265, 274, 276, 457, 539, 763, 862, 898
Vol. 3: 103, 205, 231, 497, 501–503, 577, 593, 647, 706, 748, 772 f., 831, 928, 1031, 1033 f., 1085
Mystic **Vol. 2:** 185, 357
Vol. 3: 128, 640, 720, 724, 1079
Mystical **Vol. 1:** 66, 123, 302, 337, 500, 513 f., 636, 638, 643 f.
Vol. 2: 201, 539, 584
Vol. 3: 225
Mystical identity **Vol. 3:** 425
Mysticism **Vol. 1:** 432, 527, 643
Vol. 2: 76 f., 173, 393, 403, 479, 762
Vol. 3: 232
Myth **Vol. 1:** 53 f., 57, 87, 230, 336, 507 f., 523, 640, 669
Vol. 2: 60, 125, 196, 200, 204, 310, 314, 394, 404 f., 408, 613, 633, **643–647**, 761, 858, 906 f.
Vol. 3: 35, 40, 237, 274, 281 f., 317, 328, 618, 765, 768, 887, 921, 1029, 1031, 1033, 1047, 1081, 1119, 1138 f.
Myth of Er **Vol. 2:** 762
Vol. 3: 260
Myth and ritual school **Vol. 2:** 644
Mythical **Vol. 1:** 498, 508, 523, 594, 616
Vol. 2: 280, 297, 405
Vol. 3: 996, 1106
Mythological **Vol. 1:** 617
Vol. 2: 201 f., 250, 278, 404, 906
Vol. 3: 55, 96, 1117
Mythology **Vol. 1:** 124, 126, 140, 229 f., 233, 508, 514, 522, 563
Vol. 2: 158, 188 f., 200, 394, 430, 479, 688 f.
Vol. 3: 617, 645, 733, 903

Naamah **Vol. 3:** 867
Naaman **Vol. 1:** 144, 246
Vol. 2: 396, 464
Vol. 3: 156, 986, 991
Naasene hymn **Vol. 3:** 936
Nabal **Vol. 2:** 649
Naboth **Vol. 1:** 165, 640
Vol. 3: 1091
Nablus **Vol. 3:** 457
Nachman ben Isaac, Rabbi **Vol. 3:** 367
Nacre **Vol. 3:** 395
Nadab **Vol. 2:** 638
Nag Hammadi **Vol. 1:** 616, 646
Vol. 2: 219, 751, 925
Nahal Mishmar **Vol. 2:** 97
Nahum **Vol. 1:** 66
Vol. 2: 432, 679
Vol. 3: 78
Nail **Vol. 1:** 330, 393, 402
Vol. 2: 98, 348
Nain **Vol. 2:** 600, 630
Vol. 3: 280, 303, 558, 1059, 1071
Naked **Vol. 1:** **312–317**
Vol. 2: 207, 212, 854, 926
Vol. 3: 310, 359, 547, 563
Namara **Vol. 3:** 453
Name **Vol. 1:** 101, 146, 152, 167, 174, 179, 192, 200, 205, 209, 211, 244, 247, 271–274, 276, 290, 293, 309, 321, 338, 340, 345 f., 382, 415, 455, 466, 471, 489, 499, 550, 555 f., 566, 570 f., 581, 600, 607, 616, 618 f., 700, 715
Vol. 2: 32, 68, 71, 74 f., 86, 110, 117, 120, 122, 134, 148, 157, 160, 190 f., 193, 200, 203, 217, 226, 228–231, 247, 254, 262, 281, 305–308, 317–320, 324–327, 330–335, 338, 340, 342 f., 358 f., 376, 381, 387, 425, 427, 450, 458, 512–514, 556, 560, 572, 574, 602, 624, 627, **648–656**, 666, 676, 695, 722, 777, 791, 800, 803, 810, 837, 858, 865, 868, 871, 928 f.
Vol. 3: 178, 181, 191, 202, 206, 209, 212 f., 224, 231, 233, 237, 257, 271 f., 316, 320 f., **324 f.**, 341–344, 395, 434, 475 f., 479, 484, 487, 490, 500, 576, 608, 611, 621, 645, 647 f., 658, 660, 670, 725, 729, 741, 746, 763, 784, 786, 819, 871 f., 913, 924, 969, 1041, 1043, 1053, 1056, 1157, 1162, 1210
Name changes **Vol. 2:** 649
Namelessness **Vol. 2:** 649
Names of God (→ God, names of)
Naomi **Vol. 3:** 191

Naphtali **Vol. 2:** 317
Vol. 3: 873
Naramsin **Vol. 1:** 140
Narcotic **Vol. 1:** 443
Vol. 2: 28
Narrative **Vol. 1:** 57 f., 62, 66, **573–584**
Vol. 2: 113
Vol. 3: 234
Narrow **Vol. 2:** 812, 888
Narrow door **Vol. 1:** 646
Vol. 2: 29, 31
Nathan **Vol. 1:** 108, 177 f., 210, 426
Vol. 2: 374, 612, 614, 691
Vol. 3: 78, 636, 648, 654 f., 659, 787, 1090, 1092
Nathanael **Vol. 1:** 724
Vol. 2: 339
Vol. 3: 115, 517, 893
Nation **Vol. 1:** 612, 625, 641, 677, 685, 687 f., 734, 740
Vol. 2: 105, 128, 179, 310, 319 f., 349, 363 f., 415, 435, 437, 786, **788–805**
Vol. 3: 36, 39, 65, 79, 206, 227, 356 f., 407, 522, 807, 826, **870–873**, 1079, 1096
National **Vol. 1:** 269, 409, 426, 539, 545, 626, 654, 724
Vol. 2: 305, 309, 337, 373, 376, 795
Vol. 3: 355
National differences **Vol. 2:** 83
National guardians **Vol. 1:** 102
National unity **Vol. 1:** 332
Nationalistic **Vol. 2:** 377, 385, 389
Nationalists **Vol. 3:** 377, 980
Nationality **Vol. 1:** 258
Nations **Vol. 1:** 58, 97, 101, 109, 111, 115, 142, 164, 186, 214, 224, 374, 380, 390, 407, 477, 508, 519, 523, 541, 550, 574, 640, 685 f., 688, 692, 699, 735
Vol. 2: 32, 45, 70, 74, 83, 190, 226, 237 f., 240, 242, 308–310, 316, 359, 364, 374–378, 396, 432 f., 460 f., 492, 615, 627, 650, 654, 690, 697, 701 f., 724, **788–805**, 863, 888, 890, 893
Vol. 3: 79 f., 159, 192, 202, 207, 250 f., 268, 357, 363, 567, 633, 638, 648, 791, 866, 871, 913
Nativity **Vol. 1:** 623
Natorp, P. **Vol. 3:** 899
Natural **Vol. 1:** 441, 469, 551, 616 f., 631, 647, 654, 679 f., 690, 702, 722 f., 725, 742
Vol. 2: 138, 182, 267, 271, 414, 419, 548, **656–661**, 712, 806
Vol. 3: 231, 281, 301, 706
Natural law **Vol. 2:** 165, 236
Natural man **Vol. 1:** 422 f.
Vol. 2: 75, 101, 182, 184, 605, 609
Vol. 3: 684
Natural order **Vol. 2:** 77, 162, 631
Natural phenomena **Vol. 1:** 102
Vol. 2: 602, 607
Natural products **Vol. 3:** 415
Natural science **Vol. 3:** 1029
Natural theology **Vol. 1: 70**
Vol. 2: 287
Vol. 3: 327, 885
Naturalism **Vol. 1:** 669
Naturalistic **Vol. 3:** 1106
Nature **Vol. 1:** 68, 70, 101, 107, 167, 179, 182, 186, 288, 315, 380, 384, 437, 470, 481, 483 f., 488, 492, 535, 538, 542 f., 548, 555, 561, 564, 620, 625–627, 636, 643 f., 653, 670, 677, 679, 692, 694, 699, 703, 705 f., 710, 712, 714–716, 725 f., 734
Vol. 2: 47, 75, 86, 105, 162, 179 f., 245, 279, 287–289, 303, 340, 356, 375, 393 f., 396, 432, 439, 441, 446, 476, 500–508, 514, 552, 564, 601 f., 617, 628 f., 633, 651, **656–662**, 672, 675 f., 863
Vol. 3: 23, 118, 174, 204, 260, 325, 327, 330 f., 528, 560, 595, 764, 835, 845 f., 867, 993, 1105, 1157
Nature miracles **Vol. 2:** 630
Nature of God **Vol. 1:** 108
Vol. 2: 68 f.
Vol. 3: 514 f.
Nature of Jesus **Vol. 3:** 516
Nature of language **Vol. 3: 1123–1126**, 1140
Nature religions **Vol. 3:** 246
Nature-idolatry **Vol. 3:** 837
Navigation **Vol. 3:** 731, 735
Nazara **Vol. 2:** 333
Nazarene **Vol. 1:** 535, 600
Vol. 2: 312, **330, 332–334, 346**, 867
Nazareth **Vol. 1:** 123, 170, 279, 384, 600, 669, 693, 738
Vol. 2: 101, 165, 194, **330–335**, 338, 341–343, **346**, 624, 728, 730, 825
Vol. 3: 56, 213, 472, 507, 1030
Nazirite **Vol. 1:** 645
Vol. 2: 224 f., 227 f., 440, 450, 638
Vol. 3: 101, 206, 420, 422, 431, 793, 919, 921
Neapolis **Vol. 3:** 453, 458
Near **Vol. 2: 52–66**, 73, 113, 237, 382
Nearest **Vol. 1:** 665
Nearness **Vol. 2:** 30, 168, 366, 384, 388, 479, 491, 518
Vol. 3: 762 f., 997
Nebo **Vol. 3:** 453, 806
Nebuchadnezzar **Vol. 1:** 140 f., 340, 686
Vol. 2: 96, 98, 320, 431, 555
Vol. 3: 50, 110, 147, 193, 202, 269, 392, 557, 608, 782, 788, 851, 866, 914, 918, 1161
Necessary **Vol. 2:** 130, 244, 310, 350, **663–666**, 845
Vol. 3: 48, 728, 758, **956–958**
Necessity **Vol. 1:** 173, 278, 310, 318, 326, 384, 561, 611, 623, 679, 692
Vol. 2: 139, 480, 505, 588, **662–669**, 808, 912
Vol. 3: 39, 56, 261, 324, 444, 504, 573, 723, 779, 835, **956–958**, 1054
Neck **Vol. 1:** 241, 609
Vol. 3: 1164
Necromancy **Vol. 1:** 450
Vol. 2: 206, 553 f.
Necropolis **Vol. 1:** 431
Nectas **Vol. 1:** 513
Nedebaeus **Vol. 3:** 949
Need **Vol. 1:** 143, 165, 191, 257 f., 272, 278, 285, 314, 318 f., 409, 426, 436, 473, 500, 525, 544,

548, 578, 597, 600, 604, 614, 622, 642, 673, 679 f., 702, 741
Vol. 2: 71, 100, 116, 190, 197, 201 f., 211, 230, 243, 254, 257, 263, 265–267, 272, 313, 320, 355, 412 f., 600, 631, 737, **820–829,** 855, **860 f.,** 864, 871, 874, 877
Vol. 3: 149, 173, 216, 377 f., 402, 408, 454, 536 f., 547, 553, 686, 727–729, 746, 771, 783, 804, 810, 854, **952–958**
Needle **Vol. 1:** 116
Needy **Vol. 1:** 115, 218, 410, 570, 642
Vol. 2: 71, 194, 397, **820–829**
Vol. 3: 98, 206, 357, 980
Negation **Vol. 1:** 66
Vol. 2: 394
Vol. 3: 741
Negative **Vol. 1:** 352, 553, 561, 583
Vol. 2: 312
Negeb **Vol. 1:** 76
Vol. 2: 98, 319
Vol. 3: 606
Neglect **Vol. 1:** 460, 698, 713
Vol. 2: 43, 92, 150, 211
Vol. 3: 251, 583
Neglect duty **Vol. 3:** 574
Negligible **Vol. 1:** 561
Negotiate **Vol. 1:** 193
Vol. 3: 50, 820
Negotiator **Vol. 1:** 194, 373 f.
Nehemiah **Vol. 1:** 52 f., 98, 108, 196, 377
Vol. 2: 307, 439, 467
Vol. 3: 35, 250, 407, 451, 560, 853
Nehunya ben Kanah, Rabbi **Vol. 3:** 1162
Nehushtan **Vol. 1:** 509
Neighbour **Vol. 1:** 232, **254–260,** 334 f., 337, 386, 439, 455, 554, 556, 560, 667, 690 f., 720, 726, 730, 738
Vol. 2: 49, 63 f., 141, 143, 163, 177, 184, 203, 275, 287, 297, 418, 427, 435, 442, 449, 503, 540–545, 600, 611, 668, 739, 749, 779, 803, 813, 815, 857
Vol. 3: 136, 173, 183, 201, 346, 378, 529, 545, 547, 576, 593, 597 f., 810, 944, 979, 1057, 1079, 1155
Neo-Kantianism **Vol. 3:** 899 f.
Neo-Platonism **Vol. 1: 66,** 432, 522, 595
Vol. 2: 67
Vol. 3: 146, 501, 1084
Neo-Pythagoreans **Vol. 1:** 484, 494, 741
Neo-scholasticism **Vol. 1:** 65
Nephele **Vol. 3:** 1000
Nephew **Vol. 1:** 254
Neptune **Vol. 2:** 85
Neri **Vol. 3:** 654 f.
Nero **Vol. 1:** 113, 119, 126, 235, 606
Vol. 2: 511, 684, 898
Vol. 3: 203, 446, 571
Nero *redivivus* **Vol. 1:** 119, 126
Vol. 2: 288, 684
Vol. 3: 715
Nerva **Vol. 3:** 753
Nest **Vol. 2:** 586
Vol. 3: 734, 813
Nestorian Christ **Vol. 3:** 663
Net **Vol. 2:** 104, 714, 834
Vol. 3: 119, 350, 469, 543, 952
Neugebauer, F. **Vol. 3:** 85
Neutral **Vol. 1:** 373, 482, 739
Vol. 2: 325
Vol. 3: 1155
Never **Vol. 3:** 829
Never-failing **Vol. 3:** 987
New **Vol. 1:** 613, 620, 628, 634, 642 f., 661, 666, 678, 681, 686 f., 689, 699, 708, 713, 717, 721
Vol. 2: 120, 138, 156, 226, 328, 426, 641, **669–676,** 714–716, 754, 789
Vol. 3: 47, 493, 543, 906, 1154
New age **Vol. 1:** 86, 124, 219, 251, 317, 421, 513, 601
Vol. 2: 53, 131, 169, 228, 605, 698, 701, 714, 754, 892, 920
Vol. 3: 47, 56 f., 62, 82, 696, 698, 701, 779, 829–831, 922, 956, 1020
New birth **Vol. 1:** 178, 359
Vol. 2: 242, 625, 929
New commandment **Vol. 1:** 526
Vol. 2: 43, 671, 673, 779
New community **Vol. 3:** 868
New covenant **Vol. 1:** 185, 224, 304, 368, 374, 386, 408–411, 448, 593, 601, 666, 690, 700
Vol. 2: 71, 73, 77, 83, 155, 213, 240, 276, 306, 312, 320, 328, 356, 444, 446–448, 516, 524, 533, 591–593, 595, 661, 670 f., 673 f., 694, 716, 786, 797, 854, 867, 872
Vol. 3: 59, 69, 73 f., 107, 136, 143, 160, 183, 200, 227, 233, 243, 257, 327, 366, 433, 486, 546, 548, 576, 578, 729, 1014, 1074
New creation (→ Creation, New)
New creature **Vol. 1:** 702
Vol. 3: 529, 1154
New day **Vol. 2:** 364
New dispensation **Vol. 3:** 584
New earth **Vol. 1:** 56, 65, 185, 380, 518, 525
Vol. 2: 240, 245, 340, 420, 483, 670 f., 674, 692, 702, 779, 804, 836, 867
Vol. 3: 71, 180, 224, 371, 558, 829, 832, 1013
New era **Vol. 2:** 108 f., 374, 383, 676, 698
New existence **Vol. 1:** 272, 470, 643
New heart **Vol. 1:** 151, 354
Vol. 2: 155, 184, 867
New heaven **Vol. 1:** 56, 65, 185, 380, 518, 525
Vol. 2: 245, 340, 420, 482 f., 670 f., 674, 692, 702, 779, 836, 867
Vol. 3: 71, 180, 224, 371, 832, 1013
New hermeneutic **Vol. 3:** 1138 f.
New humanity **Vol. 3:** 363
New to the incense **Vol. 2: 294**
New Israel **Vol. 3:** 363, 393, 868, 871, 1007
New Jerusalem (→ Jerusalem, new)
New law **Vol. 1:** 586, 602, 689
Vol. 2: 123, 281, 451
Vol. 3: 221, 1163
New life **Vol. 1:** 359, 437, 439, 443, 469, 474, 486, 489, 675, 701 f.
Vol. 2: 102, 113, 217, 262, 349, 420, 453, 617–619, 671, 676, 716, 925
Vol. 3: 581, 886, 928, 931, 934, 1143, 1061
New man **Vol. 1:** 185, 311, 316, 359, 386, 402

New man (*cont'd*)
Vol. 2: 121, 163, 237, 251, 473, 566, 670 f., 674 f., 715
Vol. 3: 172, 186
New moon **Vol. 1:** 245, 626
Vol. 2: 128, 226
Vol. 3: 410, 426 f., 556, 733
New name **Vol. 2:** 649, 652 f., 671, **673 f.**, 754
New nature **Vol. 1:** 315, 654
New order **Vol. 1:** 73, 643
Vol. 2: 399
Vol. 3: 121, 180, **351 f.**, 524, 616, 913, 1093 f.
New people **Vol. 1:** 76, 380
Vol. 2: 83, 127, 242, 349, 573, 652, 722, 788, 800, 918
Vol. 3: 251 f., 363, 435, 568, 920
New relationship **Vol. 3:** 168
New sanctuary **Vol. 3:** 366
New song **Vol. 2:** 380, 670 f., 674
Vol. 3: 673
New spirit **Vol. 1:** 151, 354
Vol. 2: 155
New teaching **Vol. 3:** 769
New temple **Vol. 2:** 252, 326, 410, 612, 893
Vol. 3: 404, 787, 813
New wine **Vol. 3:** 921 f.
New world **Vol. 1:** 327, 630, 723
Vol. 2: 267
Vol. 3: 871
New year **Vol. 1:** 626, 628
Vol. 3: 233, 487
New year festival **Vol. 2:** 613, 644
Vol. 3: 269, 274
New year litany **Vol. 1:** 618
Newborn **Vol. 1:** 283 f., 360
Vol. 2: 270
Vol. 3: 346, 1118
Newly planted **Vol. 2:** **674–676**
Newness **Vol. 2:** **670–674**, 718, 781
News **Vol. 1:** 167, 298, 322, 529, 612, 741
Vol. 2: 107 f., 173, 175, 179
Vol. 3: 45, 48
Next **Vol. 1:** 665 f.
Next of Kin **Vol. 2:** 53
Nicea **Vol. 2:** 497, 506
Nicene creed **Vol. 1:** 178
Vol. 2: 84, 497
Niche **Vol. 1:** 264
Nickname **Vol. 1:** 271, 273
Vol. 2: 648
Nicodemus **Vol. 1:** 147, 179, 265 f., 284, 290, 420
Vol. 2: 295, 448, 625, 812
Vol. 3: 115, 767, 791, 1132
Nicolaitans **Vol. 1:** 407
Vol. 2: **676–678**, 763
Nicolas (Nicolaus) **Vol. 2:** **676–678**
Nicole, Roger R. **Vol. 3:** 153
Nicopolis **Vol. 3:** 453
Nida, E.A. **Vol. 3:** 1126 f., 1141
Niddah **Vol. 3:** 989
Nietzsche, Friedrich W. **Vol. 1:** 57
Vol. 3: 899
Night **Vol. 1:** 272, 323, 366, **420–425**, 450, 512 f., 559, 630, 634, 652, 731
Vol. 2: 232, 332, 368, 490 f., 493, 495 f., 528, 658, 887, 922
Vol. 3: 111, 200, 731, 733, 846, 849
Nightmare **Vol. 3:** 557
Nihilism **Vol. 1:** 381, 550 f.,
Nike **Vol. 2:** 849
Nile **Vol. 1:** 531
Vol. 2: 636 f.
Vol. 3: 985
Nilus **Vol. 1:** 318
Nimrod **Vol. 1:** 140
Nimrūd **Vol. 1:** 140
Nine **Vol. 2:** 697
Nineham, D.E. **Vol. 3:** 63
Nineveh **Vol. 1:** 140, 358
Vol. 2: 351, 365, 423, **678–681**, 831
Vol. 3: 52 f.
Ninevites **Vol. 2:** 350, **678–681**
Ninth hour **Vol. 2:** 685
Ninurta **Vol. 1:** 140
Niobe **Vol. 1:** 287
Nisan **Vol. 1:** 628 f., 632
No **Vol. 3:** 741
Noachian decrees (commandments) **Vol. 1:** 360, 691
Vol. 2: 309, 682
Vol. 3: 106, 158, 931
Noah **Vol. 1:** 72, 182, 366, 452, 691, 713
Vol. 2: 91, 300 f., 309, 382, 591, **681–683**, 692, 880
Vol. 3: 52 f., 106, 158, 203, 211, 215, 248, 264, 325, 365, 370, 418, 425, 468, 522, 578, 605, 626 f., 633, 642, 683, 841, 851, 906, 918 f., 991
Nob **Vol. 3:** 33 f., 426, 812
Nobility **Vol. 1:** 117, 717
Vol. 2: 788, 800
Noble **Vol. 1:** 187, 438, 665, 683, 715 f.
Vol. 2: 57, 98, 102, 290, 652
Vol. 3: 912
Noble-minded **Vol. 2:** 256
Nobleman **Vol. 1:** 165
Noetic **Vol. 2:** 493
Noise **Vol. 3:** **111–114**
Nomads **Vol. 1:** 519
Vol. 2: 305
Vol. 3: 564, 811
Nominate **Vol. 1:** 475
Nomism **Vol. 1:** 309
Non-believer **Vol. 3:** 1114
Non-Christian **Vol. 1:** 282, 506 f., 593, 601, 630
Vol. 2: 94, 127, 230, 250, 258, 271, 333 f., 349
Non-citizen **Vol. 1:** 690
Non-cultic **Vol. 1:** 292
Vol. 2: 233
Vol. 3: 154 f.
Non-elect **Vol. 2:** 156
Non-Israelite **Vol. 1:** 360, 690
Vol. 2: 49, 51, 53, 154, 790
Non-Jew **Vol. 1:** 360, 382, 385, 581, 623, 689
Vol. 2: 90, 381, 641, 660 f.
Non-Jewish **Vol. 1:** 360
Vol. 2: 285
Non-objective **Vol. 1:** 71
Non-reality **Vol. 2:** 402

Non-Semitic **Vol. 2:** 331
Non-violence **Vol. 3:** 971, 980
Nonentity **Vol. 1:** 551 f.
Vol. 2: 285
Noon **Vol. 3:** 731
Norm **Vol. 1:** 546, 602, 604
Vol. 2: 438–451
Vol. 3: 135, **399–404**, 583, 726, 833
Normal **Vol. 1:** 527, 664, 679
Vol. 3: 349
Normative **Vol. 1:** 333
Vol. 2: 442
Normative ethics (→ Ethics, Normative)
Northern kingdom **Vol. 1:** 543, 716 f.
Vol. 2: 38, **305 f.**, 325, 635, 916
Vol. 3: 33 f., 79, 94, 104, 426, 449–451
Nose **Vol. 1:** 108
Nostrils **Vol. 3:** 476, 691
Not standing test **Vol. 3: 808–810**
Not-my-people **Vol. 3:** 1103
Notch **Vol. 2:** 288
Note **Vol. 1:** 694
Nothing **Vol. 1:** 639, 678
Vol. 2: 41, 128, 239
Vol. 3: 1153
Nothingness **Vol. 1:** 446, 523, 546 f., 550 f.
Vol. 2: 286, 471
Vol. 3: 555, 690, 842
Notice **Vol. 1:** 484, 506, 693, 695
Vol. 2: 267, 392, 395, 398
Vol. 3: 122–130, 512 f., 516
Notification **Vol. 3: 68–74**
Notify **Vol. 3:** 45, **316 f.**
Notorious **Vol. 1:** 701
Nourish **Vol. 2:** 372, 837
Vol. 3: 423
Nourishment **Vol. 2:** 264, 462
Vol. 3: 678, 986
Novel **Vol. 2:** 670
Vol. 3: 903
Novice **Vol. 1:** 611
Vol. 2: 299, 676
Now **Vol. 2:** 242 f., 907, 930
Vol. 3: 826, **833–839**, 841, 844, 848
Null **Vol. 1:** 550
Vol. 2: 453
Nullify **Vol. 1: 73,** 462
Vol. 3: 1057
Number **Vol. 1:** 119, 126, 136, 165, 508, 625, 711, 728, 731–734, 739
Vol. 2: 37, 53, 63, 159, 207, 288, 299, 313, 352, 389, 428, 497, 653, **683–704**, 725, 734, 739, 763, 795, 809, 887, 892, 931
Vol. 3: 88, 179 f., 277, 349, 404, 417, 470 f., 500, 557, 680, 706, 715, 729 f., 734, 736, 841, 843, 846, 851, 855, 1085
Number of the beast **Vol. 1:** 126
Vol. 2: 574, **684**
Number of a man **Vol. 2: 684**
Numbers, book of **Vol. 1:** 65 f.
Numbers, problem of large **Vol. 2: 698**
Numerical structure of Matthew **Vol. 3:** 657
Numerical value **Vol. 2:** 683
Numerous **Vol. 1:** 729
Vol. 2: 130, 683
Numinous **Vol. 1:** 498
Vol. 2: 91
Vol. 3: 381
Numismatic emblem **Vol. 1:** 406
Nun **Vol. 2:** 331
Nunc Dimittis **Vol. 3:** 118, 674, 790
Nurse **Vol. 1:** 239 f., 282
Nursery **Vol. 1:** 285
Nuzi **Vol. 2:** 316 f.

Oak **Vol. 2:** 318
Vol. 3: 782, 866 f.
Oarsman **Vol. 1:** 408
Oasis **Vol. 1:** 252
Vol. 2: 266
Oath **Vol. 1:** 98, 344, 346, 356, 372, 374 f., 415, 494, 658 f., 731
Vol. 2: 134, 142, 149, 159, 190, 224, 226, 301, 307, 447, 472, 648, 650, 652, 797, **861–864, 867–875**
Vol. 3: 41, 74, 429, 560, 583, 650, **737–743**, 792, 882, 1018, **1038–1050**, 1052 f.
Oath of initiation **Vol. 3:** 740
Oath of innocence **Vol. 2:** 583
Oath of purification **Vol. 3:** 740
Oath of testimony **Vol. 3:** 740
Oath under pledge **Vol. 3:** 740
Obadiah **Vol. 1:** 66
Vol. 3: 250, 608
Obdurate **Vol. 2:** 153
Vol. 3: 1020
Obedience **Vol. 1:** 58, 67, 77, 79–81, 109, 123, 138, 166, 210, 211, 223, 236, 238, 244, 265, 286, 293 f., 296, 304, 332, 337, 347, 349 f., 358, 367 f., 372, 375, 389, 398 f., 401, 408, 456, 461, 463, 472, 480, 482, 484, 487 f., 491–493, 501 f., 506, 525, 537 f., 540, 542 f., 548 f., 552, 556, 571, 593, 598, 601 f., 604, 615 f., 618 f., 622, 626, 638 f., 655, 659, 679 f., 681, 703, 713, 722, 730
Vol. 2: 30 f., 42, 56, 70, 80, 91–95, 118, 122, 130, 132, 137, 156, 165, **172–180**, 182 f., 186, 199, 202–204, 228, 230, 241, 258, 267, 272, 278, 289, 301, 312, 336, 343, 361, 378, 386, 391, 395, 399, 401, 403 f., 426, 441–443, 445 f., 473, 479, 492, 500, 540 f., 566, 605, 608, 620, 636, 670, 682, 716, 724, 748, 775, 797, 810, 812, 816, 868, 892
Vol. 3: 73, 107, 139, 141, 165, 183, 194, 232, 235, 243, 352, 357 f., 363, 394, 427, 432, 434 f., 470, 486, 531 f., 550, 595–597, 613, 646 f., 724, 742, 750, 760 f., 766, 769, 776, 783, 785, 806, 824, 835–837, 869, 905, 927, 930 f., 934, 938, 954, 1022 f., 1025, 1028, 1067, 1148, 1150 f., 1155
Obedient **Vol. 2:** 184, 227, 259, 262, 478, 504, 509, 706, 721, 816, 856
Vol. 3: 54, 120, 136, 349, 529, 804, 810, 888, 1020
Obeisance **Vol. 2: 875–879**
Obey **Vol. 1:** 106, 219, 234, 339, 381, 481, 484, 588 f., 591–594, 674
Vol. 2: 132, 134 f., 158, 158, **172–180**, 259,

Obey (*cont'd*)
313, 394, 399, 439, 444, 449, 462, 514, 650, 817
Vol. 3: 113, 138, 233, 572, 685, 777, 800, 885, 1134
Object **Vol. 1:** 492, 525, 538, 567, 658, 687, 705, 709, 711
Vol. 3: 778
Objection **Vol. 1:** 596, 659, 701
Objective **Vol. 1:** 71, 436, 697
Vol. 2: 357
Vol. 3: 299
Obligation **Vol. 1:** 98, 120, 210, 270, 275, 310, 340, 401, 439, 471, 481, 499, 509, 536, 556, 595, 618–621, 639, 647, 687, 690 f., 698, 716, 734
Vol. 2: 43, 76, 92, 134, 174, 177, 223, 236 f., 265, 271, 286, 418, 549, 606, **662–669**, 842, 856, 858
Vol. 3: 134 f., 138, 142, 190, 353, 358, 536, 573, 583, 593, 800, 853, 930 f., 934, 1044, 1053
Obligatory **Vol. 1:** 601
Oblige **Vol. 2:** 115 f.
Vol. 3: 140
Obliterate **Vol. 1:** 471
Vol. 2: 287, 308
Obscenity **Vol. 1:** 501
Obscure **Vol. 2:** 214, 218, 316, 781
Obscurity **Vol. 1:** 420 f., 577, 581
Vol. 2: 313
Observable **Vol. 3:** 862
Observance **Vol. 1:** 592, 626
Vol. 2: 132, 135, 150, 268, 327, 442, 449
Vol. 3: 253, 410, 440, 584, 944, 1053
Observation **Vol. 2:** 132, 385
Vol. 3: 677, 693, 1087
Observe **Vol. 1:** 189, 333, 627, 632, 693
Vol. 2: 132, 135, 237, 270, 354, 363, 393, 395, 440
Vol. 3: 122–130, 511–518, 520
Observer **Vol. 1:** 585
Obsolete **Vol. 1:** 371
Vol. 2: 231, 669, 675, **713–716**
Vol. 3: 106, 183
Obstacle **Vol. 1:** 370
Vol. 2: 220, 223, 394, **705–708**
Vol. 3: 534
Obstinacy **Vol. 1:** 506
Vol. 2: 154
Obstinate **Vol. 2:** 106, 153
Obtain **Vol. 1:** 713
Vol. 2: 116, 298, 317, 361, 367, **838–840**
Obtain justice **Vol. 2:** 363
Obvious **Vol. 1:** 711
Occasion **Vol. 1:** 52
Vol. 2: 137
Occult **Vol. 1:** 420
Vol. 2: 557 f.
Occupation **Vol. 1:** 275, 625, 629, 633
Vol. 2: 254, 303, 331
Vol. 3: 545, 566, 673, 758, 799, 910, 965, 1147, **1155–1158**
Occupy **Vol. 1:** 728
Vol. 2: 247, 438
Ocean **Vol. 1:** 422, 522
Vol. 2: 188–190, 205
Vol. 3: 983
O'Collins, G. **Vol. 3: 298**
Octavian **Vol. 2:** 849
Vol. 3: 731
Ode **Vol. 3: 668–670, 672–675**
Odes of Solomon **Vol. 2:** 159
Vol. 3: 85, 674, 936
Odour **Vol. 3:** 238, 424 f.
Odysseus **Vol. 2:** 372, 552
Vol. 3: 839
Oedipus **Vol. 2:** 457
Vol. 3: 577, 720
Oehler, G.F. **Vol. 3:** 151
Oetinger, F.C. **Vol. 3:** 148
Offence **Vol. 1:** 345, 399, 414, 448, 473, 547, 555, 608, 684, 699, 733
Vol. 2: 93, 159, 161, 358, 364, 406, 429, 450, 625, **705–710**
Vol. 3: 98, 157, 363, 389, 394, 573 f., 577, 697, 810, 996, 1000, 1031
Offend **Vol. 1:** 514
Vol. 2: 63, 127, 363
Vol. 3: 420
Offended **Vol. 1:** 217
Vol. 2: 705–707
Vol. 3: 151
Offender **Vol. 1:** 415, 466, 471
Vol. 3: 97
Offensive **Vol. 1:** 386
Vol. 2: 268
Offer **Vol. 1:** 96, 115, 172, 224, 351 f., 405, 414, 455, 478, 482, 546, 628, 655, 702, 731
Vol. 2: 41, 78, 107, 147, 184, 233, 273, 286, 327 f., 350, 367, 386, 402, 440, 447
Vol. 3: 50, 57, 68, 173, 220, 838
Offer money **Vol. 2:** 28
Offer sacrifice **Vol. 2:** 235, 293, 718
Vol. 3: 33
Offering **Vol. 1:** 175, 234, 250, 294, 413, 479, 648, 654, 677, 731 f.
Vol. 2: 29, 39–43, 166, 230, 235, 238, 294, 297, 410–412, 447 f., 461, 815, 860, 862
Vol. 3: 159, 164, 196, 239, **415–436**, 600, 744 f., 790, 794, 852, 919
Offering brought **Vol. 3: 417–436**
Offering of sheaves **Vol. 1:** 628
Office **Vol. 1:** 95, 122, 128 f., 131 f., 134 f., 163, 178, 188, 190–193, 195, 197–200, 275, 300, 302, 315, 329, 371, 375, 405, 407, 461, 471 f., 474, 478, 514, 533, 536, 540, 560, 574, 666 f., 698
Vol. 2: 48–51, 114, 122 f., 149, 151 f., 164, 195, 233, **253–256**, 294, 334 f., 342, 373 f., 376, 380 f., 406, 415, 456, 500, 505, 607, 730
Vol. 3: 53, 84, 88, 97, 101, 147, 259, 322, 342, 478, 534, 548, 721, 747, 763 f., 768, 771, 924, 1075, 1152
Office-bearer **Vol. 2:** 362, 607
Officer **Vol. 1:** 190, 407, 462
Vol. 2: 368
Vol. 3: 115, 120, 355, 547, 966

Official **Vol. 1:** 189, 196, 255, 259, 274, 302, 330, 363, 373, 393, 402, 536 f., 560, 573 f., 579 f., 687
Vol. 2: 234, 254, 335, 363, 369, 376, 777
Vol. 3: 115, 134, 144, 160, 480, 738, 755, 905, 930, 957, 1028
Officious **Vol. 1:** 266
Offscouring **Vol. 1:** 479
Vol. 3: 102–108
Offspring **Vol. 1:** 239 f., 280, 287, 427, 721 f., 729
Vol. 2: 77, 85, 311, 571
Vol. 3: 521–524
Og **Vol. 3:** 960
Ogden, C.K. **Vol. 3:** 1129 f.
Oil **Vol. 1:** 118–121, 471, 498, 627, 648
Vol. 2: 226, 294, 334 f., **710–713**, 794, 875
Vol. 3: 159, 238, 422, 727, 852, 870, 917, 921 f., 989, 1053, 1060, 1162
Oil of gladness **Vol. 2:** 294, 354
Oil press **Vol. 2:** 710
Ointment **Vol. 1:** 119–121, 319
Vol. 2: 294 f., 710
Vol. 3: 243, 600
Old **Vol. 1:** 164, 167, 192 f., 197 f., 277, 339, 363, 386, 433, 448, 470, 512, 601, 613, 631, 634, 666, 701
Vol. 2: 49, 75, 669–676, **713–716**, 834
Vol. 3: 493, 543, 906, 921
Old aeon **Vol. 1:** 421
Old age **Vol. 1:** 86, 93, 124, 219, 227, 562
Vol. 2: 272
Old Latin **Vol. 1:** 71
Old man **Vol. 1:** 311, 386, 401, 616, 657, 702, 718
Vol. 2: 127, 250, 473, 675, 715
Old nature **Vol. 1:** 106, 168, 315, 402, 457, 469
Old-fashioned **Vol. 1:** 192
Oleaster **Vol. 2:** 712
Vol. 3: 869
Olive **Vol. 1:** 644, 648
Vol. 2: 660, **710–713**, 737, 794
Vol. 3: 227, 416, 866–870, 921
Olivet (→ Mount of Olives)
Olympia **Vol. 3:** 782
Olympus **Vol. 2:** 185, 232
Vol. 3: 845, 959, 1009
Omega **Vol. 2:** 59
Omens **Vol. 1:** 172
Vol. 2: 148, 233, 554, 626, 633
Vol. 3: 76
Ominous **Vol. 1:** 420 f.
Omit **Vol. 2:** 351
Omnipotence **Vol. 2:** 149, 509, 689, 877 f.
Vol. 3: 645
Omnipotent **Vol. 1:** 180, 548 f.
Omnipresence **Vol. 1:** 102, 548 f.
Vol. 2: 73, 146, 613, 862
Omniscience **Vol. 1:** 102, 106, 548 f., 565, 694
Vol. 2: 183
Omri **Vol. 1:** 543
Vol. 3: 449
Onan **Vol. 2:** 577
Once **Vol. 2:** 703, **716–725**
Once-for-all **Vol. 1:** 355
Vol. 2: 447, **716–725**
One **Vol. 1:** 94 f., 616, 636, 664 f., 667, 678 f., 738
Vol. 2: 70, 73, 79, 84, 124, 278, 288, 309, 377, 396, 408, 450, 564, 618, 703, **716–725**
Vol. 3: 82, 231, 314, 535, 539, 723, **908 f.**, 1062, 1082
One mind **Vol. 3: 908 f.**
One-sided **Vol. 1:** 365
One's own **Vol. 2: 838–840**
Oneness **Vol. 1:** 240
Vol. 2: 80, 204, 445, 926
Vol. 3: 572
Onesimus **Vol. 1:** 675
Vol. 2: 434, 550
Vol. 3: 596, 930
Onesiphorus **Vol. 3:** 686
Onkelos **Vol. 3:** 485
Onlooker **Vol. 1:** 530
Only **Vol. 1:** 664 f.
Vol. 2: 76, 81, 408, 703, **716–725**
Vol. 3: 54, 646
Only-begotten **Vol. 1:** 256, 575
Vol. 2: 75, **723–725**
Onomatopoeia **Vol. 3:** 1124
Onomatopoeic **Vol. 3:** 1051
Ontic **Vol. 1: 64**
Ontological **Vol. 1: 64**
Vol. 2: 396
Ontology **Vol. 1: 64 f.**, 491
Onyx **Vol. 3:** 236, 396
Open **Vol. 1:** 253, 486, 581, 667, 681, 687, 690, 692, 717, 719
Vol. 2: 31, 179, 194, 302, 401, 411, 560, 673, **726–734**, 795, 813, 897
Vol. 3: 97, 177, 188, 192, **317–324**, 384, 387 f., 394, 568, 623, 652, 693, 717, 763, 860, 916
Open air **Vol. 3:** 761
Open the ear **Vol. 3:** 311
Open space **Vol. 1:** 741
Opening **Vol. 2:** 29 f., **726–729**
Openly **Vol. 3:** 75, **317–324**
Openness **Vol. 1:** 328 f., 611, 660, 702, 715, 720
Vol. 2: 308 f., 311, **734–737**
Vol. 3: 74, 143, 886
Operate **Vol. 1:** 540 f., 720
Operation **Vol. 1:** 647, 694
Vol. 3: 1147–1152
Operative **Vol. 2:** 287
Ophites **Vol. 1:** 510
Vol. 2: 645
Ophrah **Vol. 3:** 425
Opinion **Vol. 1:** 130, 330, 350, 357, 481, 485, 594, 602
Vol. 2: 44 f., 169, 311, 362, 392 f., 398, 430, 719, 767
Vol. 3: 130, 543, **747–751**, 759, 761, **820 f.**, 822, 1042
Opponent **Vol. 1:** 125, 138, 199, 261, 281, 331, 335, 365, 413, 445, 468, 496, 515, 529, 553, 554, 598, 604, 623, 638, 644, 647, 671, 678, 710, 727, 731, 742
Vol. 2: 112, 140 f., 183, 263, 311 f., 315 f., 327,

Opponent (*cont'd*)
340, 378, 401, 431, 434, 437, 448, 460, 469, 473
Vol. 3: 439, 495, 801 f., 804, 868, 935, 963, 1018, 1031
Opportune **Vol. 3: 833–839**
Opportunist **Vol. 2:** 899
Opportunity **Vol. 1:** 268, 274, 335 f., 364, 385, 432, 438, 473, 533, 536
Vol. 2: 30, 101, 132, 137, 156, 351, 417, 728, 730, 770 f., 892
Vol. 3: 410, 596, 603, 818, 826, **833–839**, 842, 912, 1043
Oppose **Vol. 1:** 687, 693, 709, 740
Vol. 2: 314, 380, 385
Opposite **Vol. 1:** 424
Vol. 2: 198
Opposition **Vol. 1:** 102, 241, 244, 302, 328, 339, 364, 396, 399, 404, 424, 455, 501, 514, 525, 532, 535, 562 f., 565, 593, 597 f., 600, 609, 631, 638, 641, 647, 651, 675 f., 681, 699
Vol. 2: 129, 144, 202, 314, 372, 383, 435, 631, 676, 734, 764, 794
Vol. 3: 111, 136, 392, 504
Oppress **Vol. 2:** 260, 363, **807–809**, 822
Vol. 3: 192, 379, 574, 856
Oppressed **Vol. 2:** 257 f., 821
Vol. 3: 95, 206
Oppression **Vol. 1:** 408, 411, 612, 640, 644, 651, 679
Vol. 2: 100, 201, 206, 368, 424, 680, **807–809**
Vol. 3: 193, 357, 818, 1103
Oppressive **Vol. 1:** 482
Oppressor **Vol. 2:** 363
Vol. 3: 343, 366
Optimism **Vol. 2:** 430
Optimum **Vol. 1:** 679
Optional **Vol. 1:** 722
Oracle **Vol. 1:** 58, 62, 245 f., 426, 444, 519, 527, 574 f., 577, 594, 611, 730, 734
Vol. 2: 107 f., 296, 367, 879, 881, 890, 914
Vol. 3: 75, 78 f., 113, 124, 324, 403, 531, 720, 782, 1090, 1106, 1118, 1120
Oracle of God **Vol. 3:** 1098
Oracular spirit **Vol. 3:** 75
Oral instruction **Vol. 1:** 485
Vol. 2: 440
Oral tradition (→ Tradition, oral)
Oral transmission **Vol. 1:** 70
Oration **Vol. 2:** 369
Orator **Vol. 2:** 150
Vol. 3: 138, 346, 561, 1086
Oratory **Vol. 1:** 248
Vol. 3: 1083
Orchard **Vol. 3:** 918
Orcus **Vol. 2:** 85
Ordain **Vol. 1:** 259, 330, 445, 473, 612, 626, 695 f.
Vol. 2: 235, **438–451**
Vol. 3: 39, 481
Ordained theologian **Vol. 3:** 480
Ordeal **Vol. 1:** 646
Vol. 3: 110, 243
Order **Vol. 1:** 107, 109, 116, 197, 243, 269, 271 f., **330–343**, 369, 408, 476, 521 f., 524, 572, 595, 600, 625, 641, 654, 662, 664–667, 692, 696, 715, 718, 731
Vol. 2: 50, 57, 67, 101–103, 134, 142, 160–163, 189, 213, 254, 266, 300, 390, 392, 436, 439 f., 452, 459, 592, 603, 609, 633, 658–660, 698, 719, 776
Vol. 3: 49, 51, 56, 71, 84, 122, 210, 217, 483, 574, 577, 702, 807, 832, 1029, 1056, 1066, 1078, 1087
Order of widows **Vol. 3:** 1065
Orderliness **Vol. 2:** 95
Orderly **Vol. 2: 438–451**, 476
Vol. 3: 1082
Ordinal number **Vol. 1:** 665
Ordinance **Vol. 1:** 70, 109, 301, 308, 330–337, 370 f., 381, 386, 402, 496, 716, 734
Vol. 2: 92, 128, 132, 150, 160, 228, 236, **440**
Vol. 3: 41, 182, 186, 250, 354, 488, 584, 717, 760 f., 947
Ordinary **Vol. 1:** 62, 680
Ordination **Vol. 1:** 196 f., 478
Vol. 2: 151 f.
Vol. 3: 115, 424, 480, 767
Ordination of women **Vol. 3:** 1066
Organ **Vol. 1:** 230, 239, 350, 423, 451
Vol. 2: 180–182, **391**, 599
Vol. 3: 127
Organism **Vol. 1:** 232, 234, 237 f., 300, 302, 522
Vol. 2: 253
Vol. 3: 710
Organization **Vol. 1:** 300, 302–304, 521
Organized **Vol. 1:** 642
Orgiastic **Vol. 1:** 514
Vol. 2: 353
Orgy **Vol. 2:** 355
Oriental **Vol. 1:** 521 f.
Vol. 2: 336
Vol. 3: 827, 1055
Orientation **Vol. 1:** 583
Vol. 2: 404, 864
Origen **Vol. 1:** 49, 51, 104, 148, 251 f., 266, 315, 319, 535, 561, 636
Vol. 2: 81, 219, 506, 754 f., 869
Vol. 3: 148, 231, 291, 855
Origenists **Vol. 2:** 506 f.
Origin **Vol. 1:** 53, 56, 64, 95, **164–169**, 176, 179, 181, 426, 434, 440, 469, 498, 520 f., 561 f., 563, 576, 578, 616, 619, 624, 631, 654, 656, 669
Vol. 2: 35, 66, 76, 79, 124, 127, 129, 137 f., 157, 160, 217, 235, 305, 310 f., 334, 339 f., 394, 406, 656
Vol. 3: 646, 653, 657, 774, 803, 865, 868
Original **Vol. 1:** 664, 721, 737
Vol. 2: 287, 713
Original sin **Vol. 1:** 433, 721
Vol. 3: 581, 663
Original state **Vol. 1:** 654
Originate **Vol. 1:** 377
Originator **Vol. 1: 164–169**, 378, 736, 739
Vol. 2: 80, 128
Orion **Vol. 3:** 950
Ormazd **Vol. 3:** 693

Ornament **Vol. 1:** 241, 495, 521 f.
Vol. 2: 92, 159
Vol. 3: 483
Ornan **Vol. 3:** 426
Orphan **Vol. 1:** 191, 324, 477, 616, 691
Vol. 2: 71, 359, 540, **737 f.**, 823
Vol. 3: 357, 483, 852, 855, 1073–1075
Orpheans **Vol. 3:** 103
Orpheus Zeus **Vol. 1:** 665
Orphic **Vol. 1:** 182, 432, 528
Vol. 2: 158, 188
Vol. 3: 259, 929, 1085
Orphism **Vol. 1:** 616
Vol. 2: 643
Vol. 3: 231, 679
Orthodox **Vol. 1:** 549, 631, 669
Vol. 2: 126, 316, 718
Vol. 3: 180
Orthodoxy **Vol. 1:** 590
Vol. 2: 505, 864
Vol. 3: 770
Osiris **Vol. 1:** 184, 595
Vol. 2: 274, 556
Vol. 3: 388, 1085
Ossuary **Vol. 1:** 264, 393
Vol. 2: 573
Ostentatious **Vol. 1:** 613
Vol. 2: 136
Vol. 3: 32, 389, 874
Ostraca **Vol. 3:** 483
Ostracism **Vol. 2:** 772
Vol. 3: 361, 910
Ostracize **Vol. 3:** 913
Other **Vol. 1:** 666
Vol. 2: 404, **739–742**, 785 f.
Vol. 3: 166, **247–253**, 1080
Other-worldly **Vol. 2:** 357
Otherness **Vol. 1:** 679
Othniel **Vol. 3:** 557
Out of date **Vol. 2:** 443
Out of tune **Vol. 2:** 434
Outburst **Vol. 2:** 653
Outcast **Vol. 1:** 616, 685
Vol. 2: 57, 170
Vol. 3: 200, 560, 758, 1062
Outcome **Vol. 1:** 590, 741
Vol. 2: 55, 63, 364
Outcry **Vol. 1:** 410
Outflank **Vol. 1:** 728
Outgoing **Vol. 1:** 547
Outlaw **Vol. 1:** 616, 686
Vol. 3: 92, 183
Outline **Vol. 2:** 284, **291**
Outlook **Vol. 1:** 534, 540, 598, 602, 605, 643, 680 f., 686, 709
Vol. 2: 49, 313, 452, 723
Outpost **Vol. 1:** 710 f.
Outpouring **Vol. 1:** 549
Vol. 2: 230, 328
Outrage **Vol. 2:** 92
Vol. 3: 28
Outside **Vol. 1:** 300, 303, 534, 685
Vol. 2: 49, 445, 812
Outsider **Vol. 1:** 488, 581, 626
Vol. 2: 216, 343, 379, 402, 456 f., 748, 752
Outstanding **Vol. 1:** 729
Outward **Vol. 1:** 469, 552, 703–705, 708 f.
Vol. 2: 150, 217
Vol. 3: 244, 320, 903
Outward appearance **Vol. 2: 288 f.**
Outweigh **Vol. 2:** 357
Outwit **Vol. 1:** 137
Outworking **Vol. 1:** 723
Oven **Vol. 1:** 249
Over-shepherd **Vol. 3: 564–568**
Overcome **Vol. 1:** 85, 205, 328, 391, 424, 431 f., 437, 441, 443, 597, 623 f., 645, 650 f., 674, 700, 723
Vol. 2: 42, 136, 157 f., 221, 240, 243, 260, 282, 359, 419 f., 438, 446, 453, 763 f.
Vol. 3: 780, 810, 1012
Overcomer **Vol. 3:** 795
Overflow **Vol. 1:** 728 f., 731
Vol. 2: 121, 128, 130 f.
Vol. 3: 810
Overjoyed **Vol. 2: 352–354**, 436
Overlook **Vol. 2:** 266
Overlord **Vol. 2:** 158, 308
Overpassionate **Vol. 2: 587–589**
Overreaching **Vol. 2:** 201
Overripe **Vol. 2: 587–589**
Overrule **Vol. 2:** 299
Overseer **Vol. 1:** 188–190, 477
Vol. 2: 318, 777
Vol. 3: 478, 700, 930
Overshadow **Vol. 3: 553–556**
Oversight **Vol. 1:** 191
Vol. 2: 411, 777
Vol. 3: 585, 1065
Overstamp coins **Vol. 2:** 308
Overstep **Vol. 3: 583–585**
Overtake **Vol. 1:** 623
Overthrow **Vol. 1:** 599, 610
Vol. 2: 146
Overtones **Vol. 1:** 483, 604
Vol. 2: 315
Vol. 3: 217
Overturn **Vol. 3: 933–935**
Overweening **Vol. 2:** 130
Overwhelmingly strong **Vol. 2: 587–589**
Ovid **Vol. 3:** 861
Owe **Vol. 1:** 498
Vol. 2: 115, **666–668**
Owl **Vol. 3:** 672
Own **Vol. 1:** 684
Vol. 2: 413, 438, 456
Owner **Vol. 2:** 50, 297, **508–520**, 581, 833
Vol. 3: 416, 754, 920
Ownership **Vol. 1:** 299, 642
Vol. 2: 438, 572–574, 858
Vol. 3: 194, 594, 701, 853
Ox **Vol. 1:** 115
Vol. 3: 1160

P source **Vol. 1:** 57, 61, 66
Pace **Vol. 2:** 369
Pacific Christ, concept of **Vol. 3: 976 f.**

Pacify **Vol. 2:** 777
Vol. 3: 150, 152
Pack **Vol. 1:** 711
Paederast **Vol. 1:** 625
Paedophilia **Vol. 1:** 497 f.
Pagan **Vol. 1:** 109, 111 f., 139, 159, 208, 237, 282, 320, 327 f., 341, 360 f., 405, 407, 449, 453, 499, 501, 503 f., 551 f., 598, 628, 631 f., 639, 643, 717
Vol. 2: 71, 102, 124, 126 f., 177, 199, 211, 221, 235, 285 f., 309, 398, 516, 680, **790–795**, 885, 923, 928
Vol. 3: 81, 112, 162, 197 f., 426, 431, 498, 733, 785, 793, 802, 839, 862, 913, 1118, 1165
Paganism **Vol. 1:** 452, 481, 547, 598, 611
Vol. 2: 85, 173, 242, 309, 507, 576, 687, 720, 742
Vol. 3: 113, 346, 431
Pain **Vol. 1:** 187, 239 f., 260, 262, 288, 352 f., 392, 459, 461, 466, 471, 510, 564, 734
Vol. 2: 28, 181, 414, 416, **419–421**, 674, 807
Vol. 3: 111, 682, 829, 832, 848, 858, 1051
Pain of labour **Vol. 3: 857 f.**
Painful **Vol. 1:** 725
Vol. 2: 243
Paint **Vol. 1:** 121
Vol. 2: 334
Vol. 3: 483
Painting **Vol. 2:** 287
Pair **Vol. 2:** 575, 686
Vol. 3: 1160–1165
Palace **Vol. 2:** 190, 247, 254
Vol. 3: 782 f., 786 f., 794
Palate **Vol. 3:** 449
Palestine **Vol. 1:** 55, 72, 81, 117, 121, 166, 249, 363 f., 392, 394, 510, 544, 613, 615, 618, 620, 633, 642, 684, 691, 743
Vol. 2: 27, 125, 285, 327, 331, 791, 796, 823, 836, 847, 849
Vol. 3: 58, 84, 195, 269, 401, 407, 635, 756 f., 759, 785, 853 f., 991, 1001
Palestinian Christianity **Vol. 1:** 548, 601, 613
Vol. 2: 785
Palisade **Vol. 3: 948–952**
Pallas **Vol. 2:** 224
Pallas Athene **Vol. 3:** 759
Palm **Vol. 1:** 648
Palm Sunday **Vol. 1:** 623, 724 f.
Pangs **Vol. 2:** 157
Vol. 3: 858
Panic **Vol. 1:** 527, 621
Pannenberg, Wolfhart **Vol. 1:** 60
Vol. 2: 908 f.
Vol. 3: 301 f., 333, 900 f.
Panoply **Vol. 3: 959–967**
Pant **Vol. 3: 689–708**
Pantheism **Vol. 1:** 95, 636, 654, 692
Pantheistic **Vol. 1:** 734 f.
Vol. 2: 77, 919
Pantheon **Vol. 1:** 140
Vol. 2: 67, 85, 190, 375
Panticapaeum **Vol. 2:** 767
Papal infallibility **Vol. 3:** 386
Papal supremacy **Vol. 3: 384–388**
Papias **Vol. 1:** 51, 582
Vol. 3: 64
Papyrus **Vol. 1:** 243, 247
Vol. 3: 483
Parable **Vol. 1:** 57 f., 154, 430, 575, 577 f., 580, 582 f., 652, 689, 724, 737
Vol. 2: 217, 254, 279, 329, 382, 389, 401, 413, 462, 501 f., 619, 643, 660, 667, 736, **743–760**, 801, 803, 852, 889, 904 f., 916
Vol. 3: 131, 161, 173, 336, 348, 503, 510, 522, 532, 595, 762, 866, 868 f., 906, 916, 920 f., 951, 978, 1025, 1058 f., 1061, 1070, 1106, 1109, 1121, 1137, 1140, 1155, 1157, 1161, 1163
Parables of the Kingdom **Vol. 2:** 388
Parables in NT, List of **Vol. 2: 749–751**
Parabolic **Vol. 2:** 280 f., 529, 532, 630
Paraclete **Vol. 1: 88–92**, 324
Vol. 2: 84, 231, 709, 787, 878, 883
Vol. 3: 47, 242, 362, 704, 892 f., 1046
Paradigm **Vol. 3:** 336
Paradise **Vol. 1:** 103, 113 f., 389 f., 509
Vol. 2: 45, 191, 205, 208, 688 f., **760–764**, 920
Vol. 3: 36, 211, 241, 265, 271, 315, 602, 682, 687, 694, 986–988
Paradigm **Vol. 3:** 1135
Paradox **Vol. 1:** 375, 427, 643
Vol. 2: 327, 359, 433 f., 449, 884
Paraenesis **Vol. 1: 65**, 215, 502, 570, 604, 693
Vol. 2: 129, 890
Vol. 3: 30 f., 42, 59, 934, 988, 1026, 1150
Paraenetic **Vol. 3:** 930, 938, 1005, 1064
Parallelism **Vol. 1:** 117
Vol. 2: 870, 893, 919
Vol. 3: 170, 1132
Paralysis **Vol. 1:** 516
Vol. 3: 993–1000
Paralytic **Vol. 1:** 701
Vol. 2: 415
Vol. 3: 999 f.
Paralyzed **Vol. 3:** 912
Paraphrase **Vol. 1:** 69
Vol. 3: 487, 1181
Paraplegia **Vol. 3:** 1000
Parch **Vol. 3:** 422, 914
Parchment **Vol. 1:** 243
Vol. 3: 484
Pardon **Vol. 1:** 219, 697–699, 702
Vol. 2: 42, 115 f., 118–121, 131, 185, 865
Vol. 3: 152, **177–189**, 836
Parentage **Vol. 1:** 619
Vol. 2: 694
Parental power **Vol. 3:** 1070
Parenthood **Vol. 3:** 1068
Parents **Vol. 1:** 212, 219, 280, 285–289, 335, 423, 490, 497, 619, 622, 687, 739
Vol. 2: 43, 49 f., 92, 180, 224, 539, 739, 816, 834, 871
Vol. 3: 94 f., 775, 777, 779, 928–930, 1056
Parish **Vol. 1:** 690
Park **Vol. 2:** 760
Parmenides **Vol. 3:** 123, 875 f., **1082–1084**
Parody **Vol. 1:** 126
Vol. 2: 430

Paronomasia **Vol. 2:** 655, 831
Parousia **Vol. 1:** 50, 53, 59, **65**, 73, 247, 298, 303, 313, 315 f., 342, 410, 425, 449, 469 f., 496, 514, 571, 657, 668, 693
Vol. 2: 33, 48, 63, 192, 194, 196, 230, 243, 245, 252, 272, 354, 382 f., 387 f., 447, 486, 503, 517, 531, 534, 630, 653, 738, 771, 789, 846, 875, **886–935**
Vol. 3: 59, 63, 188, 199, 215, 245, 252, 305, 365, 378, 394, 505, 569, 618, 626, 628, 633, 642, 644, 659, 826, 830, 832, 839, 844, 847, 849, 863, 930, 1003, 1158
Parseeism **Vol. 1:** 452
Vol. 3: 827, 829
Parsees **Vol. 1:** 451
Parsley **Vol. 1:** 406
Part **Vol. 1:** 300, 534, 537, 689, 706, 740
Vol. 2: 295, 302, **303 f.**, 445, 452
Vol. 3: 192
Partake **Vol. 1:** 414
Vol. 2: **269–271**, 661, 718
Vol. 3: 706
Parthenon **Vol. 3:** 1071
Parthenos **Vol. 3:** 1071
Partiality **Vol. 1:** 585, 587
Vol. 2: 449, 625
Participant **Vol. 1:** 639, 733
Participate **Vol. 1:** 95, 329, 414, 483, 595, **635–644**, 651, 685, 687, 715, 740
Vol. 2: 288, 355
Vol. 3: 245, 511
Participation **Vol. 1:** 709, 736
Vol. 2: 40, 162, 268, 270, 273, 360, 446
Vol. 3: 646 f., 747, 832
Particularist **Vol. 2:** 350
Particularity **Vol. 2:** 307
Parting **Vol. 1:** 241
Vol. 2: 352, 356, 416
Partisan **Vol. 2:** 622
Partition **Vol. 1:** 676
Vol. 2: 722
Vol. 3: 795
Partition-wall **Vol. 3:** **948–950**
Partner **Vol. 1:** 366 f., 507, 587, 635, 639, 642, 644, 660
Vol. 2: 111, 221, 230, 250, 349, 520, 581, 667
Vol. 3: 1055
Parnership **Vol. 1:** 291, 367, 678
Vol. 2: 307, 742
Parturition **Vol. 3:** 858
Party **Vol. 1:** 533, 535, 645
Vol. 2: 116, 298, 303, 311, 343
Vol. 3: 439, 441
Party division **Vol. 3:** 1032
Pashhur **Vol. 3:** 1097
Pass **Vol. 1:** 320–322, 698, 718
Vol. 2: 29
Pass away **Vol. 1:** 421, 458, 518, 525, 566, 673, 709
Vol. 2: 193, 304, 396, 419, 714, 910
Pass by **Vol. 1:** 699
Vol. 2: 281, 600
Vol. 3: 583
Pass judgment **Vol. 2:** 365, 370, 429
Pass night **Vol. 3:** 178
Pass on **Vol. 2:** 101
Vol. 3: **772–775**
Pass over **Vol. 1:** 697, 701
Vol. 2: **184–187**, 438, 766
Vol. 3: 255
Past test **Vol. 3:** 224
Pass through **Vol. 3:** 799
Passing **Vol. 1:** 304, 470
Vol. 2: 213
Vol. 3: 555, **833–839**
Passion **Vol. 1:** 58, 63, 105–108, 162, 186, 198 f., 231, 233 f., 396, 401, 435, 445, 456, 458 f., 469, 495, 501, 528, 572, 630, 633, 654 f., 674, 715, 725
Vol. 2: 112, 116, 123, 179 f., 182, 216, 257, 274, 299, 311, 314, 327–329, 341, 368, 411, 434, 526, 644, 661, 787, 795, 808, 880
Vol. 3: 28, 35, 47, 109, 132, 210, 212, 218, 221, 225, 294, 340, 517, 536, 624, 627, 682, **719–725**, 844, 922, 963 f., 1061
Passionate **Vol. 1:** 107
Vol. 2: 149, 265
Passionate love **Vol. 2:** **538–547**
Passionless **Vol. 1:** 432
Passive **Vol. 2:** 846
Passover **Vol. 1:** 157, 205, 223, 240 f., 265, 294 f., 308, 360, 364, 384, 437, **624–635**, 641, 691, 699, 713
Vol. 2: 54, 185, 277, 355, 410 f., 437, 441, 461–463, 478, 521 f., 569, 637, 644, 676, 716, 783, 892
Vol. 3: 47, 101, 117 f., 120, 159, 194, 200, 237, 244, 417, 424, 430, 472, 550, 669 f., 796, 846, 886, 911, 919, 953, 1017, 1053
Passover liturgy **Vol. 2:** **522**
Past **Vol. 1:** 164, 493, 496, 597, 681, 702
Vol. 2: 295, 314, 353 f., 393, 396, 407, 714, 891, 905
Vol. 3: 79, 238, 826, 834, 836, 840
Past the peak **Vol. 2:** **587–589**
Pastor **Vol. 1:** 103, 303
Vol. 2: 114, 187
Pastoral **Vol. 1:** 191, 475
Vol. 2: 303, 411
Pastoral Epistles **Vol. 1:** 55, **65**, 198, 200, 487, 647, 690
Vol. 2: 93, 133, 135, 152, 164, 170 f.
Pasture **Vol. 1:** 632, 743
Vol. 2: 211, 412, 438, 586
Vol. 3: 564
Patch **Vol. 1:** 613
Vol. 3: 543
Paternal **Vol. 1:** 572
Paternal estate **Vol. 2:** 317
Path **Vol. 1:** 481, 605
Vol. 2: 407
Vol. 3: 350–352
Patience **Vol. 1:** 80, 99, 215, 217, 257, 339, 364, 496 f., 593, 639, 644, 646, 679, 712
Vol. 2: 49, 63, 79, 105, 183, 240, 243–245, 261, 264, 361, 366, 385, 410 f., 682, **764–776**, 782, 806, 809, 834, 901
Vol. 3: 52, 73, 143, 229, 364, 366, 505, 725,

Patience (*cont'd*)
810
Patient **Vol. 2:** 168, 245, 291, 301, 712, **772–776**
Vol. 3: 685, 691
Patina **Vol. 2:** 27
Patmos **Vol. 1:** 623
Vol. 2: 775
Vol. 3: 1049
Patriarchal **Vol. 1:** 56, 195, 539
Patriarchate **Vol. 3:** 1069
Patriarchs **Vol. 1: 65**, 66, 72, 76–78, 81, 165, 200, 327, 381, 541, 604, 615–617, 637, 675, 689–691, 713, 732
Vol. 2: 104, 297, 314, 317–319, 442, 635, 791, 803
Vol. 3: 70, 72, 263 f., 359, 416, 459, 465, 486, 564, 658 f., 734, 787, 811, 836, 851, 870, 1055
Patristic period **Vol. 1:** 61
Patroclus' ghost **Vol. 3:** 678
Patron **Vol. 3:** 598
Patronym **Vol. 3:** 653
Pattern **Vol. 1:** 71, 301, 304, 333, 366, 371, 380, 492, 512, 689 f., 716
Vol. 2: 51, 191, 284, **290 f.**, 501, 619, 775, 889
Vol. 3: 61, 120, 303, 332, 336, 513, 555, 569, 645, 724, 788, 909, 1135
Paul **Vol. 1:** 73, 78–81, 83 f., 86 f., 95 f., 98, 103, 106, 110–112, 114 f., 123, 129–136, 138, 144, 146 f., 150, 154, 157, 159 f., 163, 166, 168 f., 171, 173, 176, 179–183, 185, 191, 197, 205, 212–217, 220, 222, 228 f., 231 f., 234–238, 245, 247 f., 254, 256 f., 261–263, 266–269, 273–279, 281 f., 284, 286, 289, 298–301, 303, 305, 309–311, 313–318, 322, 324 f., 328–330, 334–337, 340 f., 343 f., 346, 350–352, 356, 359, 361, 365, 369–372, 374, 384–386, 389 f., 394, 397–403, 405–407, 410, 413–415, 417, 419–421, 424 f., 430 f., 435–442, 445 f., 448, 453, 455, 457 f., 460–462, 464–470, 472–483, 491 f., 495 f., 499–503, 507, 510–513, 519 f., 524, 528 f., 532, 539–541, 545, 547, 551 f., 554, 556, 558 f., 563 f., 567 f., 570 f., 582, 589–593, 599, 601 f., 604 f., 607, 610, 613, 615, 619 f., 623, 628, 630 f., 637–639, 641–643, 646–651, 657, 661–666, 674–676, 679–681, 684, 689–691, 693, 695, 697, 700–702, 704, 706–710, 712, 714, 717 f., 723, 727, 729–731, 737–742
Vol. 2: 28, 32 f., 38, 40, 42, 45–47, 54, 57 f., 61 f., 65, 73 f., 76–78, 80 f., 83–85, 94 f., 100–102, 104–106, 110–113, 118–123, 126 f., 129, 131, 135–137, 139, 141, 144 f., 147 f., 152, 155–162, 169, 171, 175–177, 179, 188, 192, 202 f., 211–214, 216–219, 221–223, 229 f., 235 f., 241, 243, 245, 249, 252 f., 255, 262 f., 267, 273, 276 f., 279, 282 f., 286, 288, 300–302, 304, 310, 312, 314 f., 319 f., 326, 328 f., 338–340, 343, 349, 354–357, 359–361, 365 f., 368–370, 378, 380, 387 f., 391, 397–403, 405–407, 420, 422–425, 428 f., 434 f., 437 f., 442–448, 450–452, 456 f., 459, 462 f., 480, 503, 523, 550, 557, 573, 580 f., 587, 596 f., 600, 604 f., 618–620, 623, 632, 641, 660 f., 671–673, 678, 682, 691, 695, 699, 702, 707, 713, 722, 728 f., 736, 740–742, 755 f., 762 f., 765, 768, 770 f., 773–775, 786, 789, 793–795, 800 f., 804, 806 f., 809, 815–819, 826–828, 834 f., 844, 847, 861, 868, 880, 882–885, 895, 899, 902 f., 905, 907, 913, 919–927
Vol. 3: 27 f., 31, 38, 40, 42, 46–48, 50, 52–55, 57 f., 60–66, 70–73, 81, 84–87, 96 f., 99, 101, 105–107, 112, 114, 117 f., 121 f., 125–132, 135, 137, 141 f., 144, 157, 163–165, 167–174, 180, 184 f., 188 f.,195, 197–199, 202 f., 211, 214 f., 220, 225–230, 243, 251 f., 257, 268, 274, 278, 280–286, 288, 290, 292 f., 296 f., 299, 301, 303–305, 312, 314 f., 318, 320–325, 332, 335 f., 346–349, 351, 359 f., 363, 365–370, 372 f., 377, 379 f., 383, 387, 389, 393, 397, 400 f., 403, 410, 412, 416 f., 428, 432 f., 436, 448, 456, 471, 475 f., 482, 489, 492–495, 499, 504 f., 518, 520 f., 523–525, 529, 531 f., 534–539, 541–544, 546–550 f., 552 f., 557, 560 f., 563, 568, 570–572, 575–577, 579–581, 584–586, 591 f., 595 f., 600–602, 604, 612 f., 632, 643–645, 651, 661 f., 671, 674, 683 f., 686 f., 694 f., 700–703, 705–707, 710 f., 714, 725, 727–729, 731 f., 742, 746, 749–752, 754 f., 759, 761, 764 f., 770 f., 773 f., 778–780, 784 f., 802, 808–810, 812–814, 818 f., 821 f., 824–826, 829–832, 837, 844, 847, 854, 857, 869, 872–874, 883–888, 903, 905 f., 909, 912, 914 f., 917, 921, 927, 932, 935, 940, 942, 944, 946–949, 951, 953–957, 962–967, 970, 994–996, 1008, 1018–1021, 1026, 1030–1032, 1036, 1042–1044, 1047, 1053 f., 1063–1067, 1070, 1072 f., 1075, 1079 f., 1110, 1112–1114, 1118 f., 1122 f., 1133, 1150–1152, 1158, 1164 f., 1167, 1176 f., 1179, 1181–1184, 1187 f., 1190–1195, 1196, 1199, 1201–1203, 1205–1208, 1211
Paul and James on justification **Vol. 3: 369 f.**
Paul of Samosata **Vol. 2:** 506
Paulus Fabius Maximus **Vol. 2:** 108
Paulus, H.E.G. **Vol. 3:** 292
Pauper **Vol. 1:** 479
Pausanias **Vol. 3:** 851
Pause **Vol. 1:** 594, 624
Vol. 3: 405
Pawnbroker **Vol. 1:** 373
Pay **Vol. 1:** 226, 248, 250, 377, 684, 734
Vol. 2: 62, 386
Vol. 3: 138–144, 192, 566, **752–755**
Pay attention **Vol. 1:** 591
Vol. 2: 132, 134, 175, 890
Vol. 3: 129, 515
Pay back **Vol. 3: 134–136**
Pay court **Vol. 2:** 30
Pay damages **Vol. 3:** 134
Pay debt **Vol. 3:** 135, 379
Pay tax **Vol. 2:** 621, 850
Pay tithe **Vol. 2: 693 f.**
Vol. 3: 851–855
Pay vow **Vol. 3:** 134, 424
Pay what is owed **Vol. 3: 755–759**
Payment **Vol. 1:** 484, 684, 687, 716
Vol. 2: 41, 43, 118, 898

Vol. 3: 69, **144 f.**, 189, 1156
Pax Romana **Vol. 1:** 959
Peace **Vol. 1:** 114, 118, 123, 141, 208, 210 f., 222, 224, 237, 239, 269, 275, 301, 321 f., 341, 348, 366 f., 402, 459, 469, 489, 543, 555, 585, 638, 648, 653, 730, 732 f.
Vol. 2: 72, 78, 83, 108 f., 113, 170, 183, 216, 230, 257, 268, 328, 357, 359, 363, 374, 388, 439, 482, 517, 521, 585, 590–593, 597, 617, 666, 720–723, **776–783**, 807, 817, 819, 866, 874, 899
Vol. 3: 50 f., 70, 84, 97, 111, 118, 128, 169, 171 f., 185 f., 212, 217, 219, 221, 239, 250, 255–258, 369, 422, 447 f., 525, 528, 592, 605, 648, 682, 692, 710, 748, 778, 823, 825, 842, 866, 959, 966, 978, 981, 986 f., 1178
Peace-offering **Vol. 2:** 461
Vol. 3: 422 f., 425 f., 873
Peaceable **Vol. 1:** 646
Peaceful **Vol. 2: 776–783**
Peacemaker **Vol. 1:** 290
Vol. 2: 776–783
Pearl **Vol. 1:** 117, 647
Vol. 2: 386, 502, 714, 833 f.
Vol. 3: 381–399, 532, 948
Peasant **Vol. 1:** 642
Vol. 2: 820, 822
Peculiar **Vol. 1:** 305
Vol. 2: 245, 310
Pedagogic **Vol. 3:** 1083
Pedantry **Vol. 2:** 448
Peddler **Vol. 1:** 138
Pederast **Vol. 2: 569–571**
Pedersen, J. **Vol. 3:** 1125
Pedigree **Vol. 3:** 872
Peitho **Vol. 1:** 588
Pelc, J. **Vol. 3:** 1130
Peloponnesian war **Vol. 2:** 802
Penal **Vol. 1:** 393 f., 396, 398, 429
Penalty **Vol. 1:** 61, 309, 364, 391, 394, 430, 433, 468, 500, 505, 572
Vol. 2: 48, 142, 449, 572, 858
Vol. 3: 95 f., 151, 199, 575
Penance **Vol. 1:** 51
Vol. 2: 208, 263 f., 666
Penetrate **Vol. 1:** 517
Vol. 2: 349
Peniel **Vol. 2:** 317
Peninnah **Vol. 3:** 1057
Penitence **Vol. 1:** 109 f., 145 f., 148, 333, 349, **353–362**, 466, 520, 572
Vol. 2: 157, 159, 183, 420, 864
Vol. 3: 102, 421, 427, 542, 589, 691, 793, 859
Penitent **Vol. 2:** 152, 817
Vol. 3: 241, 361, 588
Penitential prayers **Vol. 2:** 384
Penitential Psalms **Vol. 1:** 346
Vol. 3: 997
Penitential ritual **Vol. 2:** 157
Pentateuch **Vol. 1:** 54, 56 f., 61 f., **65**, 66–68, 70, 72, 243 f., 293, 296, 331, 378, 442, 581, 622, 689, 698
Vol. 2: 331, 357, 440, 442, 444, 638, 641
Vol. 3: 440, 485
Pentateuchal criticism **Vol. 1:** 66
Pentecost **Vol. 1:** 129, 148, 153, 157 f., 323, 340, 395, 528, 532, 632, 634, 738 f.
Vol. 2: 91, 176, 186, 252, 400, 426, 629, 699, 703, 732, 739 f., 768, **783–788**, 855, 916, 918
Vol. 3: 71, 86, 109–111, 229, 344, 417, 422 f., 695, 697 f., 700, 707 f., 732, 813, 922, 1065, 1079 f., 1143
Pentecostalism **Vol. 2:** 785
People **Vol. 1:** 431, 433, 520, 541, 690, 715, 731 f.
Vol. 2: 34 f., 38, 70, 92, 106, 124, 127, 131, 134, 151, 158, 185, 222, 224 f., 237, 241, 252, 254, 256, 306 f., 310, 312, 315, 319, 321, 326–328, 331 f., 334 f., 342 f., 349, 351, 363, 373, 399, 410, 412, 425, 438, 448, 457, 498, 539, 562, 642, **788–805**
Vol. 3: 49, 69, 106, 219, 252, 353, 454, 574
People of the eye **Vol. 3:** 513
People of God **Vol. 1:** 76, 125, 129, 146, 159, 180, 191, 223, 243, 255 f., 297, 299 f., 302–304, 311, 332, 369–373, 385, 410 f., 433, 462, 465, 489, 499, 508 f., 532, 535, 540 f., 543, 553, 604, 619, 634, 637, 650 f., 661, 663, 684 f., 687–689, 713, 716 f., 720, 732 f.
Vol. 2: 34, 38, 53, 56, 63 f., 69, 71, 73, 83, 86 f., 99 f., 105 f., 129, 134, 149, 154, 161–163, 175, 190, 194, 202, 215, 218, 226, 230, 236 f., 239 f., 242, 248 f., 255, 268, 275, 295, 297, 301, **306 f.**, 310, 315, 328–330, 337, 349 f., 353, 358, 363 f., 367 f., 374, 380, 385, 412 f., 425, 432, 442, 460, 512, 514, 541 f., 572 f., 577, 580 f., 583, 587, 628, 652, 670, 673, 680, 695 f., 698, 701, 712, 718, 722, 731 f., 738, 788–805, 810, 812, 835, 839–841, 873, 918, 927
Vol. 3: 37, 74, 93, 104, 117–119, 150, 181, 193, 196, 198, 201, 208, 210, 224, 227, 232, 236, 243, 245, 249, 251 f., 256 f., 263, 266, 268 f., 279, 300, 318, 320, 325, 351, 355 f., 363, 387, 390, 397, 411, 435 f., 445, 463, 470 f., 495, 500, 505, 531, 552, 565, 567 f., 600, 625, 629, 637, 654, 692, 722, 740, 742, 748, 776 f., 787, 789–793, 799, 801, 809, 811, 813, 817, 824, 841, 853, 869–871, 879 f., 890, 905, 913, 920, 927, 937 f., 944 f., 962, 970, 1006 f., 1068 f., 1166
People of the land **Vol. 2:** 801
Vol. 3: 105
People of Yahweh **Vol. 2:** 796
Peor **Vol. 2:** 638
Perceive **Vol. 1:** 106, 674, 692 f., 735
Vol. 2: 132, 172, 269, **392–406**
Vol. 3: 122–133, 511
Perception **Vol. 2:** 172, 391, **392–406**
Vol. 3: 125, 517, 677 f., 681, 1024
Perdiccas **Vol. 3:** 450
Perdition **Vol. 1:** 462–464, 467
Vol. 3: 830
Perea **Vol. 2:** 849
Vol. 3: 757
Perez **Vol. 3:** 950
Perfect **Vol. 1:** 163, 225, 231, 281, 304, 399, 467, 474, 521, 604, 623, 627, 668 f., 708, 720, 727, 740

Perfect (*cont'd*)
Vol. 2: 59, 61 f., 65, 98, 101, 144, 162, 229, 304, 354, 359, 366, 402, 415, 447–449, 477, 531, 563, 566, 592 f., 669, 681, 717, 781 f., 789, 824, 832
Vol. 3: 42, 215, 228, 315, 349 f., 502, 504, 645, 936, 1031
Perfecter **Vol. 1:** 168, 604
Vol. 2: 59 f., 64, 185, 331
Perfection **Vol. 1:** 282, 371 f., 475, 521, 647, 649, 694, 729
Vol. 2: 59–62, 64 f., 77, 96, 105, 143, 320, 411, 483, 546, 606, 690, 695, 741, 762, 908
Vol. 3: 357, 725, 736, 766, 927, 1032, 1166
Perfectionist **Vol. 3:** 278
Perform **Vol. 1:** 484, 600, 610
Vol. 2: 350
Perform oath **Vol. 3:** 135
Performance **Vol. 1:** 624
Vol. 2: 327, 351
Vol. 3: 1142
Performative theory of truth **Vol. 3: 897**
Perfume **Vol. 1:** 649 f., 683
Vol. 2: 294 f.
Pergamum (Pergamon) **Vol. 1:** 407, 640
Vol. 2: 233, 676, 678, 686
Vol. 3: 432, 765, 915, 1047
Pericope **Vol. 1: 65**, 576
Vol. 3: 62
Peridot **Vol. 3:** 395
Peril **Vol. 1:** 241, **419 f.**, 421, 510, 513
Vol. 3: 205
Period **Vol. 1:** 473, 612, 628 f., 735
Vol. 2: 61, 255, 887
Vol. 3: 826, **839–845**
Peripatetics **Vol. 1:** 711
Periphrasis **Vol. 2:** 426
Vol. 3: 1120
Perish **Vol. 1:** 203, 397, **462–471**, 500, 547, 603, 672, 725
Vol. 2: 159, 214, 269 f., 284, 394, 459, 705, 831
Vol. 3: 214, 323, 680, 826
Perishable **Vol. 1:** 390, 406, 468–470, 671
Vol. 2: 657, 659
Vol. 3: 267
Perizzites **Vol. 2:** 636
Perjured **Vol. 3: 737–743**
Perjurer **Vol. 3: 737–743**
Perjurious oath **Vol. 3:** 740
Perjury **Vol. 2:** 471
Vol. 3: 75 f., 95, **737–743**, 1049
Permanence **Vol. 1:** 207, 516, 609, 611, 661, 680, 711, 718
Vol. 2: 189
Permanent **Vol. 2:** 220, 305, 349
Vol. 3: 686, 730, 811, 1003
Permeate **Vol. 1:** 734
Vol. 2: 461
Permissible **Vol. 1:** 351
Vol. 2: 273
Permission **Vol. 1:** 657
Vol. 2: 607 f.
Permit **Vol. 1:** 467, 478, 500, 698
Vol. 2: 123, 732
Vol. 3: 183
Permitted **Vol. 2: 606–611**, 811
Perpetual **Vol. 1:** 705
Perpetuate **Vol. 3:** 812
Perplexity **Vol. 3:** 559
Persecute **Vol. 2: 805–809**
Vol. 3: 551
Persecution **Vol. 1:** 126, 166, 174, 183, 215, 233, 261, 263, 269, 278, 301, 303, 322, 347, 382, 394–396, 399, 403, 406, 455, 460, 462, 491, 493, 508, 540 f., 553, 559, 567, 571, 604, 607, 613, 639, 644, 651, 653
Vol. 2: 34, 37, 136, 196, 231, 258, 270, 309–311, 316, 358–361, 363, 368, 373, 381, 383, 460, 663 f., 700, 730, 736, 766, 774, 776, 781, 804, **805–809**, 840, 844, 904, 911–913, 915–918
Vol. 3: 27 f., 96, 240, 257, 291, 357, 382, 452, 481, 501, 603, 626 f., 686, 697, 705, 711, 801, 818, 845, 849, 857, 859, 942, 951, 998, 1048, 1113, 1167
Persecutor **Vol. 1:** 694
Vol. 2: 605, 806
Vol. 3: 97, 201, 343, 712, 757
Persephone **Vol. 2:** 729
Vol. 3: 739
Perseverance **Vol. 1:** 80, 494, 570, 712
Vol. 2: 240, 245, 736, **767 f.**, 868
Persevere **Vol. 2: 767 f., 772–776**
Vol. 3: 223–229
Persia **Vol. 1:** 141, 405
Vol. 2: 95
Vol. 3: 566, 788, 960
Persian **Vol. 1:** 64, 104, 124, 374, 393, 653, 656, 687
Vol. 2: 207, 306 f., 335 f., 811, 847, 850
Vol. 3: 270, 275, 829, 851, 1035
Persist **Vol. 2:** 154, **767 f.**
Persistence **Vol. 2:** 131, 462, **767 f.**
Vol. 3: 1059
Person **Vol. 1:** 71, 233–236, 240 f., 272, 274, 276, 324, 329, 338, 347, 358, 375, 426, 491, 501, 526 f., 563, 565, 585–587, 595, 662, 665, 672, 688, 705, 707, 709, 716, 732 f.
Vol. 2: 49, 146, 149, 157 f., 181 f., 217, 220, 233, 313, 341, 391 f., 534 f., 566–568, 648, 652, 864
Vol. 3: 52, 54 f., 237, 303, 531, 679
Person of Christ (→ Christ, Person of)
Personal **Vol. 1:** 244, 269, 336, 357, 360, 368, 483, 491, 499, 546, 553, 562 f., 566, 579, 586 f., 590, 592, 597, 603, 618, 636, 644, 650, 692 f., 698, 702, 739
Vol. 2: 67, 70, 99 f., 107, 121, 129, 148, 156, 158, 187, 215, 241–244, 288, 305, 332, 342, 377, 392, 395 f., 398 f., 403 f., 437, 444, 456, 511, 582, 863, 867
Vol. 3: 246, 493, 581
Personal truth **Vol. 3:** 894
Personality **Vol. 1:** 229, 233, 432, 453, 457, 485, 492, 643, 707
Vol. 2: 181 f., 568, 841
Vol. 3: 226, 474, 545, 677, 680, 683, 823

Personalize **Vol. 1:** 695
Personification **Vol. 1:** 125, 410, 431, 463, 501, 508, 561, 563, 566, 655
Vol. 2: 115, 190, 442, 444
Vol. 3: 357, 731, 1029
Personify **Vol. 3:** 487, 492, 1056, 1069, 1083
Perspective **Vol. 2:** 240, 360
Persuade **Vol. 1:** **587–606**, 733
Vol. 2: 350 f., 398
Vol. 3: 1123
Persuasion **Vol. 1:** 588 f.
Vol. 3: 711, 951
Persuasive **Vol. 1:** 588
Pervade **Vol. 1:** 616, 723
Perverse **Vol. 2:** 36, 72, 469
Perversion **Vol. 1:** 460 f., 677
Vol. 2: 51
Vol. 3: 344, 1103
Perversity **Vol. 1:** 725
Vol. 3: 574, 943
Pervert **Vol. 1:** 219, 397, 412 f.
Vol. 2: 221, 370, 566, 822
Vol. 3: 310
Pesher exegesis **Vol. 1:** **65 f.**, 67
Vol. 2: 187, 314, 754
Vol. 3: 268
Pesikta **Vol. 1:** 628
Pessimism **Vol. 1:** 262, 434, 459
Vol. 2: 241, 276
Pestilence **Vol. 1:** 109, 118, 716
Vol. 2: 349, 911
Vol. 3: 249, 268
Pet **Vol. 1:** 117
Peter **Vol. 1:** 52, 111, 130 f., 133, 135, 158, 160, 168, 171, 173, 175, 200–202, 302, 310, 313, 318, 321, 343 f., 359, 361, 390, 395, 404, 448, 455, 462, 473, 476–478, 493, 504, 512, 528, 572, 582, 623, 643, 690, 708, 739
Vol. 2: 28, 111, 114, 119, 136, 152, 194, 231, 252, 302 f., 319, 341, 354, 368, 404, 433 f., 469, 542, 557, 596 f., 618, 624 f., 641, 652 f., 689, 691, 708, 728, 731–733, 736, 754, 769, 786, 794 f., 840, 851, 858, 877, 895, 916
Vol. 3: 40, 64, 65 f., 71, 87, 98, 112 f., 115, 118, 121, 148, 160, 188, 213, 240 f., 282–284, 288, 294, 296, 317, 320, 325, 352, **381–388**, 394, 454, 481, 506, 509, 520, 529, 543, 555, 558 f., 568 f., 591, 699, 707, 711, 713, 717, 732, 742, 750 f., 753, 763, 793, 804, 807, 812, 822, 908, 985, 990, 1059, 1066, 1113, 1122, 1164, 1179
Peter's successor **Vol. 3:** 729
Petition **Vol. 1:** 410, 566 f.
Vol. 2: 117, **860 f.**, 878, **882–885**
Vol. 3: 97, 819
Petrify **Vol. 2:** 153
Petronius **Vol. 2:** 899
Phabi **Vol. 3:** 35
Phallus **Vol. 1:** 625
Phantom **Vol. 2:** 284
Phanuel **Vol. 3:** 81, 873
Pharaoh **Vol. 1:** 177, 195, 208, 330, 393, 452, 508, 560, 616
Vol. 2: 116, 154 f., 200, 265, 378, 557, 569, 636 f., 640, 796, 835
Vol. 3: 50, 279, 531, 550, 660, 866 f.
Pharisaic **Vol. 1:** 309, 630, 730
Vol. 2: 43, 136, 261, 281, 309, 314, 579, 864, 866
Vol. 3: 83
Pharisaism **Vol. 1:** 99
Vol. 2: 309, **810–814**
Vol. 3: 106
Pharisees **Vol. 1:** 72, 111, 116, 120, 153, 168, 174, 196, 199, 205, 220, 265, 267, 288 f., 337, 340, 346, 361, 363 f., 417, 427, 434, 487 f., 509, 516, 534 f., 539, 565, 567, 572, 612, 627, 630, 643, 680, 729 f.
Vol. 2: 101, 133, 138, 144, 147, 170, 203, 207, 211, 222, 254, 262, 272, 281, 303, 311, 313, 316, 321, 350, 382, 385, 399, 419, 434, 442 f., 448, 460, 462, 467–469, 474, 570, 584, 596, 610, 623 f., 640, 693 f., 708 f., 712, 730, 732, 785, 801, **810–814**, 823, 842 f., 865, 880, 921
Vol. 3: 39 f., 105, 108, 110, 115 f., 128, 141, 181, 183 f., 250, 253, 270, 313, 360 f., 378, 408 f., 428 f., 440–442, 445, 480–482, 486–488, 494 f., 507, 534, 538–540, 542, 566, 580, 584, 603 f., 649, 712, 741, 753, 757 f., 768 f., 785, 790, 792, 796, 804, 819, 854, 868, 883 f., 920, 942, 979, 1002, 1037, 1045, 1052 f., 1109, 1150, 1162 f., 1168
Pharnabazus **Vol. 2:** 848
Pharsalos **Vol. 2:** 124
Phases of moon **Vol. 3:** 733
Phenomenon **Vol. 1:** 680
Vol. 2: 137 f.
Phenomenological approach **Vol. 3:** 330
Pherecydes of Syros **Vol. 3:** 259
Philadelphia **Vol. 1:** 254, 257
Vol. 2: 399, 474, 550, 727, 775
Philemon **Vol. 1:** 247, 675, 690
Vol. 2: 122, 550, 600
Vol. 3: 596, 930
Philetus **Vol. 2:** 550
Vol. 3: 915
Philip, apostle **Vol. 2:** 334
Vol. 3: 728
Philip, evangelist **Vol. 2:** 114, 387, 550, 557, 728, 768
Vol. 3: 56, 65 f., 81, 87, 456 f., 548, 602, 609, 1067
Philip (guardian of Antiochus V) **Vol. 3:** 498
Philip Herod I **Vol. 2:** 550
Vol. 3: 540
Philip Herod II **Vol. 2:** 550
Philip of Macedon **Vol. 3:** 217
Philip II of Macedon **Vol. 2:** 550
Vol. 3: 550
Philippi **Vol. 1:** 168, 267, 278, 340, 361, 407, 592
Vol. 2: 136, 550, 707, 895, 899
Vol. 3: 81, 557, 559, 592, 670, 794, 955, 964, 987, 1063, 1065, 1067, 1112, 1157
Philippians **Vol. 1:** 229, 570, 623, 739, 741
Vol. 2: 131, 179, 218, 343, 354, 360, 550, 804, 816
Vol. 3: 431, 552, 600, 674, 955
Philistines **Vol. 1:** 170, 195, 393, 433
Vol. 2: 45, 98, 225, 260, 306, 308, 374, 637,

Philistines (*cont'd*)
742
Vol. 3: 250, 469, 782, 788
Phillips, J.B. **Vol. 3:** 1142
Philo **Vol. 1:** 49, 63, 77, 85, 87, 89, 92, 102, 108, 153, 175, 178, 184–186, 201–204, 216 f., 221, 227 f., 230, 243, 253, 259, 262, 277, 309, 313, 330, 334, 341 f., 349, 355, 360, 363, 368, 374, 377 f., 387, 409 f., 412, 428, 435, 442, 444, 450, 459 f., 465, 468 f., 495, 502 f., 509–514, 520, 523, 527, 533 f., 559, 563, 574 f., 577 f., 580 f., 598 f., 618, 627, 639, 641, 645 f., 648, 674, 683, 688, 691, 694 f., 700, 709, 720, 734, 742
Vol. 2: 33, 61, 72, 99, 109, 125, 128, 134, 137, 140, 150, 158, 169, 182, 187, 192, 222, 234 f., 241, 249, 266, 288–291, 310, 324, 332, 355, 357, 363, 373, 377, 462, 493, 512, 573, 579, 583, 590, 592 f., 607 f., 651, 658–660, 681, 690, 707, 738, 754, 756 f., 762, 779, 784 f., 798, 821, 878, 883
Vol. 3: 35–37, 41, 51, 98, 125 f., 129, 194, 210, 332, 377, 396, 407, 418, 451, 479, 486, 515, 522, 524, 526, 531, 545, 552, 554, 556, 570, 575, 595, 639, 669, 681, 684, 721, 740, 766, 769, 772, 789, 827, 842 f., 871, 875–877, 904, 938 f., 946, 989, 996, 1035, 1042, 1069, 1116, 1120, 1157, 1166
Philodemus of Gadara **Vol. 2:** 259
Philologus **Vol. 2:** 550
Philology **Vol. 1:** 57, 61, 68, 140
Philosopher **Vol. 1:** 443, 484, 616, 640
Vol. 2: 92, 265, 355, 372, 456, 550
Vol. 3: 103, 111, 217, 646, 748, 760, 766, 996, **1034–1036**, 1039, 1086, 1118
Philosopher king **Vol. 2:** 372
Philosophical **Vol. 1:** 230, 432, 481, 595, 598, 616, 660 f., 694, 711 f., 715
Vol. 2: 67, 124
Vol. 3: 123, 128, 778, 842, 865, 935, 938, 1081
Philosophical ethics (→ Ethics, Philosophical)
Philosophical schools **Vol. 1:** 68, 484, 488
Vol. 3: 1037
Philosophy **Vol. 1:** 57, 59, 64, 70, 127, 164, 268, 330, 460, 483, 485, 501, 604, 636, 654, 664 f., 687
Vol. 2: 103, 125, 170, 257, 269, 284, 377, 392 f., 418 f., 430 f., 439, 442, 453, 460, 538, 550, 648
Vol. 3: 50, 122, 127, 399, 402, 486, 501, 678, 681, 689, 694, 824, 827, 875, 877, 939, 1027, 1031, **1034–1036**, 1069, 1084, 1087, 1136, 1169
Philosophy, moral (→ Moral philosophy)
Philosophy of religion **Vol. 1:** 59
Phinehas **Vol. 1:** 544
Vol. 3: 159
Phoebe **Vol. 3:** 546, 1063, 1065 f., 1158
Phoebus **Vol. 2:** 85
Phoenicia **Vol. 2:** 847
Vol. 3: 458
Phoenician **Vol. 2:** 126, 848
Vol. 3: 787
Phoenix **Vol. 2:** 725
Photinus **Vol. 2:** 507
Phrygia **Vol. 1:** 344
Vol. 3: 261
Phrygian stone **Vol. 3:** 518
Phylacteries **Vol. 1:** 254
Vol. 2: 136
Vol. 3: 105, 487, 490, 559
Physical **Vol. 1:** 71, 138, 230, 234–236, 240 f., 308 f., 365, 436, 440–443, 447, 461 f., 466 f., 494 f., 518, 539, 560–563, 565, 595, 600, 616 f., 650, 667 f., 674 f., 677–681, 710, 726 f., 735
Vol. 2: 59, 164, 172, 180–182, 184, 193, 220, 263, 265, 267, 271, 274, 350–352, 415, 419 f., 422–424, 478, 539, 719, 920
Vol. 3: 102, 105, 212, 215, 244, 260, 301, 305, 349, 504, 539, **676–687**, 694, 716, 946, 993, 1147
Physical sciences **Vol. 3:** 1034
Physician **Vol. 2:** 164, **166–170**, 386
Vol. 3: 428, 723
Physics **Vol. 3:** 900
Physiological **Vol. 1:** 742
Vol. 3: 689
Physique **Vol. 1:** 183
Vol. 2: 129, 659
Piaget, J. **Vol. 3:** 1125
Pick out **Vol. 1:** 536
Pick up **Vol. 3:** 1081
Picture **Vol. 2:** 279, 281, 746, 927
Vol. 3: 904
Piece **Vol. 1:** 729
Vol. 2: 296
Pierce **Vol. 1:** 444
Pierce, C.S. **Vol. 3:** 896
Pierced ear **Vol. 3:** 594
Pietists **Vol. 3:** 108
Piety **Vol. 1:** 58, 102, 399, 451, 481, 539, 594 f., 597, 599, 604, 622, 694, 708
Vol. 2: 47, 75, 85, **90–95**, 100, 106, 160, 201, 216, 225, **236–238**, 275, 353, 355, 426, 469, 473, 588, 605, 863 f.
Vol. 3: 141, 210
Pig **Vol. 1:** 117, 119, 125, 226
Vol. 3: 1121
Pigeon **Vol. 1:** 172
Pilate **Vol. 1:** 83, 162, 168, 179, 222, 270, 395 f., 427, 512, 554, 556, 696
Vol. 2: 139, 150, 331, 339, 368 f., 378 f., 449, 451, 526 f., 549, 623 f., 799, 801, 849 f.
Vol. 3: 63, 173, 430, 441, 452, 558, 589, 592, 723, 893, 990, 977 f., 1017, 1045, 1047, 1121
Pilfer **Vol. 3:** 379
Pilgrim **Vol. 1:** 100, 173, 205, 305, 628, 632, 691
Vol. 2: 194, 437, 873
Vol. 3: 965
Pilgrim festivals **Vol. 2:** 311
Pilgrimage **Vol. 1:** 626, 661
Vol. 2: 326, 329, 376, 920
Vol. 3: 814
Pillar **Vol. 1:** 131, 302, 420, 523, 626, 656, 712
Vol. 2: 188 f., 249, 493, 827
Vol. 3: 391, **795**, 822, 1154
Pillar of cloud **Vol. 3:** 257

Pilot **Vol. 1:** 194
Pindar **Vol. 2:** 140
Pine **Vol. 1:** 509, 648, 723
Pinnacle **Vol. 2:** 235
Vol. 3: 805
Pioneer **Vol. 1:** 168, 604, 669
Vol. 2: 331, 669
Vol. 3: 215
Pious **Vol. 1:** 112, 218, 358, 416, 492, 527 f., 552, 562, 612, 614, 708
Vol. 2: 49, 57, 71 f., 91, 105, 125, 134, 176, 178, 216, 232, 237, 257, 288, 309, 335, 394, 432, 450, 565, 810, 817, 867
Vol. 3: **549–551**, 745, 799, 829
Pirate **Vol. 3:** 377
Pisces **Vol. 2:** 558
Pisgah **Vol. 2:** 638
Vol. 3: 806, 1009
Pishon **Vol. 3:** 986
Pisidian Antioch **Vol. 1:** 462
Vol. 2: 33, 300, 451
Vol. 3: 561
Pit **Vol. 1:** 470
Vol. 2: **205**, 351, 701
Vol. 3: 262, 498 f., 732
Pitch **Vol. 3:** 153
Pitch-fork **Vol. 1:** 685
Pith **Vol. 2:** 180
Pithom **Vol. 2:** 635 f.
Pitiless **Vol. 2:** 267, 594–598
Pitiful **Vol. 2:** **594–598**
Pity **Vol. 1:** 565, 569, 715
Vol. 2: 543, 581, 593, **594–600**, 738
Vol. 3: 1053
Pius IX **Vol. 3:** 663
Pivotal **Vol. 2:** 227
Placate **Vol. 1:** 479
Vol. 2: 860
Vol. 3: 152–154
Place **Vol. 1:** 275, 331, 413, 474 f., 477, 660 f., 666, 680, 684–686, 690, 696, 742
Vol. 2: 161, 276, 303
Vol. 3: 745, 932
Place of honour **Vol. 1:** 664
Vol. 3: **587–589**
Place of meeting **Vol. 1:** 69
Place of rest **Vol. 3:** **254–258**
Place of sacrifice **Vol. 3:** 418
Place under **Vol. 1:** 710
Vol. 2: 368
Plague **Vol. 1:** 114, 124, 162 f., 241, 380, 463, 465, 509, 568, 612, 651, 721, 743
Vol. 2: 58, 586, 625, 628, 637, 654, 711, 720, 889
Vol. 3: 192, 267, 590, 788, 846, 857, 984, 996
Plain **Vol. 1:** 577
Vol. 3: **316 f., 1004–1014**
Plan **Vol. 1:** 194, 244, 322, 329 f., 332, 346, 356, 380, 383, 430, 471–473, 476, 540 f., 552, 562, 662, 671, 692 f., 695–697, 730, 735–738
Vol. 2: 72 f., 77, 149, 156, 195, 198, 216, 220, **253–256**, 290, 298, 302, 336, 376, 666, 819, 912
Vol. 3: 69, 123, 125, 129, 189, 214, 220, 224, 279, 311, 502, 654, 691, 820, 823 f., 1017, 1033, 1149
Planet-gods **Vol. 1:** 631
Planets **Vol. 2:** 459, 509, 558
Vol. 3: 717, 735 f., 840
Planned procedure **Vol. 3:** **935–943**
Plant **Vol. 1:** 178, 187, 313, 380, 389, 406, 515 f., 560, 586, 625, 652, 721 f., 725 f., 743
Vol. 2: 27, 59, 129, 180, 185, 198, **210 f.**, 252 f., 312, 474, 476, 520, 565, 601, 657 f., 889
Vol. 3: 27, **521–527**, 554 f., 835, **865–870**, 986, 1002
Plantation **Vol. 2:** 248
Plaster **Vol. 1:** 471
Platform **Vol. 2:** 185, 369
Plato **Vol. 1:** 65 f., 232, 431 f., 483, 521, 533, 561 f., 573–575, 579, 616, 636, 640, 705
Vol. 2: 98 f., 103, 188, 259, 284, 372, 430, 439, 457, 498, 643, 648, 719, 772, 776
Vol. 3: 42, 75, 81, 98 f., 122–124, 138, 152 f., 217, 231, 259 f., 353, 402, 554, 593, 635, 679, 690, 775 f., 840 f., 875 f., 925–927, 1027, 1034, 1083, 1085 f., 1119, 1124, 1129, 1139
Platonic **Vol. 1:** 49, **66**, 491, 512, 595, 602, 636, 671, 734
Vol. 2: 72
Vol. 3: 210, 843, 889, 905, 926, 1117
Platonism **Vol. 2:** 919
Vol. 3: 684, 877, 900, 1156
Plausible **Vol. 1:** 592
Play **Vol. 1:** 267, 590, 708, 710
Vol. 2: 430, 436, 468
Vol. 3: 474, 521
Play at funerals **Vol. 2:** 418
Play on words **Vol. 1:** 592 f.
Vol. 2: **431 f.**, 434, 715, 766, 837
Vol. 3: 796, 805, 867, 950, 1096, 1162
Playfulness **Vol. 2:** 431
Plea **Vol. 1:** 410
Vol. 2: 215, 307, 383
Plead **Vol. 2:** **882–885**
Vol. 3: 677
Pleasant **Vol. 1:** 458
Vol. 2: 98, 103, 105, 116, 211, 271, 297, 475
Vol. 3: **744–746**, 817, **845–849**
Please **Vol. 1:** 349, 534, 544, 680, 687
Vol. 2: 116, 160, 241, 244, 357, 780, **814–820**, 858
Vol. 3: 219, 264, 925
Pleasing **Vol. 2:** 103, 432, 774, 789, **814–817**
Vol. 3: 264, 424, **744–746**
Pleasure **Vol. 1:** 431, **456–461**, 498, 530, 534, 537, 623, 630, 713
Vol. 2: 118, 138, 271, 273–275, 352, 356, 419, 458, 550, **814–820**
Vol. 3: 256, 270, 677, 902
Pleasure-loving **Vol. 2:** 475
Pledge **Vol. 1:** 369, 372, 375, 440, 594, 638, 663, 710, 713, 719
Vol. 2: **39–44**, 142, 667, 881
Vol. 3: 355, 484, 740, 1074
Plenary inspiration **Vol. 3:** 329
Plentiful **Vol. 2:** 128, 130

Plenty **Vol. 2:** 690
Pliable **Vol. 3:** 915
Pliny **Vol. 2:** 553, 556 f.
Vol. 3: 111
Plot **Vol. 1:** 363
Vol. 2: 296, 318, 430, 748, 757
Vol. 3: 125
Plotinus **Vol. 1:** 66, 522, 562, 636
Vol. 3: 1084
Plough **Vol. 1:** 115
Vol. 2: 385, 742
Vol. 3: 407, 543, 1160
Ploughman **Vol. 1:** 493
Pluck **Vol. 1:** 721
Vol. 2: 267
Vol. 3: 671, 792, 1163
Pluck out **Vol. 1:** 561, 727
Pluck up **Vol. 2:** 252
Plumbline **Vol. 2:** 239
Vol. 3: 392
Plunder **Vol. 1:** 508, 546
Vol. 3: 137, 377, **379**, 470, 472, 533, **601–605**, 943
Plunge **Vol. 1:** 611
Vol. 2: 150, 198
Plurality **Vol. 1:** 94
Plutarch **Vol. 2:** 259, 289 f.
Vol. 3: 81, 690, 739, 827
Pluto **Vol. 2:** 85, 729
Pneumatic **Vol. 1:** 133, 500, 502
Vol. 3: 571, 1029, 1032
Pneumatological **Vol. 1: 66**
Pneumatology **Vol. 1: 66**
Vol. 2: 388
Vol. 3: 704
Pneumatopsychosomatic **Vol. 2:** 567
Pod **Vol. 1:** 117
Poet **Vol. 1:** 579
Vol. 2: 85, 233, 326
Vol. 3: 76, 81
Poetic truth **Vol. 3:** 894
Poetry **Vol. 1:** 59, 582, 640
Vol. 3: 500, 564, 668, 672, 1081, 1086
Pogrom **Vol. 2:** 309
Poimandres **Vol. 1:** 60
Point **Vol. 1:** 574, 726, 731
Vol. 2: 354, 717
Vol. 3: 182
Point of time **Vol. 3: 833–839**, 841, **845–849**
Point out **Vol. 3:** 569
Pointless **Vol. 1:** 547
Poiseidon **Vol. 3:** 216
Poison **Vol. 1:** 108, 202, 459, 510, 563
Vol. 2: 27–29, 295, 334, 349, **552–562**, 661
Poisoner **Vol. 2: 552–562**
Poisonous **Vol. 3:** 866
Pole **Vol. 1:** 389
Polemic **Vol. 1:** 248, 302, 383, 672, 676
Vol. 2: 261, 263, 310–315, 403 f., 449
Vol. 3: 36, 495, 621
Police **Vol. 1:** 337, 396
Policy **Vol. 2:** 802
Vol. 3: 391
Polish **Vol. 1:** 471
Vol. 3: 395
Politarch **Vol. 2: 801–804**
Politeness **Vol. 2:** 513 f.
Political **Vol. 1:** 124, 267, 291,. 475–478, 492, 501, 517–519, 532, 534–536, 539, 545, 596, 606 f., 610, 624, 627, 640, 715–718, 720, 732
Vol. 2: 107, 110 f., 147, 257, 259, 306, 310 f., 325, 341, 372, 374, 376, 385, 438 f., 475, 497, 657, 777, 788, 802, 887, 903, 905, 921
Vol. 3: 33, 45, 49 f., 79, 146, 148, 193, 259, 346, 502, 551, 559, 598, 979
Political equality **Vol. 2:** 309
Political organization **Vol. 3:** 870
Politician **Vol. 3:** 389, 949
Politics **Vol. 1:** 645
Vol. 2: 306, 509
Vol. 3: 75, 111, 461, 574, 738, 886, 1069
Poll-tax **Vol. 1:** 269
Vol. 2: 850
Vol. 3: 752–755, 853, 979
Pollution **Vol. 1:** 265, 447, 449
Vol. 2: 286
Vol. 3: 102, 783
Polyandry **Vol. 2:** 575
Polybius **Vol. 2:** 290
Polycarp **Vol. 1:** 51, 154, 406
Vol. 3: 279
Polycrates' ring **Vol. 3:** 753
Polygamy **Vol. 2:** 564, 575 f., 578 f.
Vol. 3: 95, 1055, 1057, 1075
Polynesian tribes **Vol. 1:** 308
Polysemy (multiple meaning) **Vol. 3:** 878, 1124 f.
Polytheism **Vol. 2:** 66, 71, 284 f., 396, 507
Polytheistic **Vol. 2:** 278
Vol. 3: 662
Pommel **Vol. 1:** 647
Pomp **Vol. 2:** 44
Pompeii **Vol. 2:** 683
Vol. 3: 394
Pompey **Vol. 2:** 308
Vol. 3: 452, 598, 756, 788, 815
Pompous **Vol. 2:** 198
Pond **Vol. 3:** 982, 992
Ponder **Vol. 1:** 106
Vol. 3: 231, **820 f.**
Pontus **Vol. 2:** 34
Pool **Vol. 1:** 581, 637
Pool of reeds **Vol. 3:** 992
Poor **Vol. 1:** 216 f., 219, 249, 334 f., 358, 489, 542, 547, 555, 564 f., 642, 733
Vol. 2: 49 f., 56, 63, 71, 110, 118, 141, 200, 255, 257, 259–261, 263–267, 273, 275, 300 f., 329, 358, 363, 379, 386, 388, 396, 400, 429, 453, 499, 540, 543, 594, 596, **820–829**, 834, 842–844, 846 f., 852
Vol. 3: 70, 93, 95, 119, 145, 192 f., 202, 206, 241–243, 253, 313, 351, 357, 369, 423, 499, 525, 545 f., 548, 553, 572, 580, 696 f., 744, 752, 790, 810, 853–855, 953, 969, 994, 1043, 1059 f., 1074, 1103, 1105, 1110, 1158
Poor in spirit **Vol. 2: 824**
Pope **Vol. 3:** 385
Poplar **Vol. 3:** 866

Populace **Vol. 1:** 731, 733
Vol. 2: 788–790
Popular **Vol. 2:** 437
Popular asembly **Vol. 2: 788–790**
Popularity **Vol. 1:** 681
Popularize **Vol. 1:** 671
Populate **Vol. 1:** 518
Population **Vol. 1:** 519, 728, 731 f.
Vol. 2: 305, 788, 795, 801
Porch **Vol. 1:** 68
Vol. 2: 30
Vol. 3: 782, 787, 795
Porcupine **Vol. 1:** 725
Porphyry **Vol. 1:** 601
Portable **Vol. 3:** 782
Portent **Vol. 1:** 622
Vol. 2: 192, 629, **633**, 911
Vol. 3: 559
Porter **Vol. 2:** 254
Portico **Vol. 3:** 789
Portion **Vol. 1:** 640, 673
Vol. 2: 295–304, 791
Portrayal **Vol. 2:** 431
Pose **Vol. 3:** 821
Poseidon **Vol. 1:** 189
Vol. 2: 85, 233
Vol. 3: 556
Posidonius **Vol. 2:** 639
Position **Vol. 1:** 129, 188, 299, 471, 533, 538, 540, 610, 651, 667, 739
Vol. 2: 44, 48–50, 80, 102, 158, 198, 257, 259, 319, 325, 336, 373, 378, 446, 674, 862
Vol. 3: 128, 251, 420, 440, 584, 586, 779, 1055
Positive **Vol. 1:** 98, 496, 553, 583, 654, 678–680, 686
Vol. 2: 310, 312, 315, 451
Possess **Vol. 1:** 548, 557, 635 f., 659 f., 729, 739
Vol. 2: 200, 295–304, 311, 316 f., 364, 397, 438, 538
Vol. 3: 1064
Possessed **Vol. 1:** 428, 450, 453, 516, 528 f., 673, 734
Vol. 2: 691
Possession **Vol. 1:** 539, 615, 636, 637, 639, 661, 664, 688
Vol. 2: 49, 267, 297–303, 307, 310, 325, 335, 499, 649, 791, 794, 797, 800, 828
Vol. 3: 473, **474–476**, 734, 1057, 1074, 1080, 1158
Possession, right of **Vol. 3:** 716
Possessions **Vol. 1:** 137–139, 143, 272, 277, 292, 381, 456 f., 482, 495, 508, 514, 641 f., 644, 684, 717, 729, 743
Vol. 2: 51, 63, 99, 191, 255, 286, 302, 305, 308, 356, 428 f., 438, 501, 539, 549, 582, 596, 619, 800, 820, 824 f., **829–853**
Vol. 3: 140 f., 143, 145, 151, 184, 190, 193, 213, 225, 251, 253, 324, 340, 372, 381, 484, 497, 545, 547, 553, 560, 576, 595, 604, 638, 748, 751, 812, 853–855, 953, 994
Possible **Vol. 1:** 714, 730, 742
Vol. 2: 606–611
Vol. 3: 213
Possibility **Vol. 1:** 493, 600, 678, 681, 705, 738
Vol. 2: 399
Post **Vol. 1:** 314, 476
Post-apostolic **Vol. 1:** 602
Post-exilic **Vol. 2:** 309
Post-millenarianism **Vol. 2:** 389
Posterity **Vol. 1:** 209, 431, 721, 729
Postmillennialist **Vol. 1: 53**, 508
Vol. 2: 702
Posture **Vol. 1:** 609, 635
Vol. 2: 869
Pot **Vol. 1:** 252
Vol. 2: 349
Vol. 3: 910–917
Potency **Vol. 1:** 497, 625
Potentate **Vol. 1:** 406
Vol. 2: 70
Potiphar **Vol. 1:** 560
Vol. 2: 116
Vol. 3: 591
Potsherd **Vol. 3:** 483, 912–914
Potter **Vol. 1:** 93, 380, 387, 520
Vol. 2: 434, 609
Vol. 3: 910–917
Potter's field **Vol. 1:** 93, 520, 689
Vol. 3: 912
Potter's wheel **Vol. 3:** 916 f.
Pound **Vol. 2:** 838
Vol. 3: 752
Pour **Vol. 1:** 369, 520, 548, 648, 651, 653, 683, 702
Vol. 2: 785, 787, **853–855**
Vol. 3: 422
Pour out **Vol. 3:** 432
Poverty **Vol. 1:** 142, 172, 277, 313 f., 489, 547, 564, 731
Vol. 2: 197, 201, 267, **820–829**, 831, 882
Vol. 3: 377, 430, 608, 790 f., **952–956**, 994, 1055, 1074
Power **Vol. 1:** 100, 106, 111, 119, 122 f., 130, 141 f., 149, 151 f., 163–167, 171, 175, 180, 186, 190, 205, 207–209, 214, 219, 221, 223–225, 236, 241, 244, 250, 269, 271, 276, 299, 311, 315, 323, 329, 335 f., 344, 347, 369, 371, 378, 380 f., 383, 386 f., 398–401, 413–417, 421–424, 427, 429 f., 432, 434, 436–440, 443, 445, 451–454, 457–460, 466, 469, 473, 476, 485, 494, 496–498, 500, 504, 507 f., 511, 514 f., 525–528, 530, 543–547, 551, 555, 562–567, 579, 594 f., 597, 599 f., 602 f., 609 f., 612, 623, 647, 650–652, 655, 657, 669, 676, 688, 692, 694, 701 f., 706–709, 712, 718, 722 f., 727, 730 f., 739
Vol. 2: 30, 44, 46–48, 51, 61 f., 64, 68, 70–75, 78 f., 86, 94, 99, 111, 113, 119 f., 128, 142, 146–151, 159, 162, 165, 169, 177, 181–185, 191, 194 f., 198, 200, 204, 207, 210, 215, 223–225, 230, 232 f., 237, 243, 245, 271 f., 282, 287 f., 290, 303, 309, 318, 335 f., 358 f., 368, 372 f., 376, 380, 382, 384, 388, 398 f., 403, 411–413, 430, 433, 462, 508, 510–514, 516 f., **601–611**, 625, 648 f., 654, 660, 680, 693, 712, 716, 718, 783, 788, 834, 842 f., 868, 874, 877 f., 883, 916 f., 921, 918 f.

Power (*cont'd*)
Vol. 3: 27, 36, 56 f., 88, 97 f., 101, 103, 110, 147, 149, 193 f., 205 f., 214 f., 218, 230, 263, 266, 270, 276 f., 279 f., 281, 310, 315, 317, 323, 345, 347, 350, 359, 367, 372 f., 457, 469, 484, 498, 504, 523, 559, 621, 627, 632, 643, 686, 691, 693, 701, 703, 705, **711–718**, 728 f., 805, 861, 864, 886, 913, 935, 982, 993, 995, 1012, 1026, 1033, 1083, 1147, 1189
Power of attorney **Vol. 1:** 331
Vol. 2: 608
Power of darkness **Vol. 2:** 608
Power of language **Vol. 3:** 1123, 1142
Power of words **Vol. 3:** 1125
Powerful **Vol. 1:** 451, 610, 669
Vol. 2: 109, 425, **601–616**
Vol. 3: 317–324, 563, **712–714, 1147–1152**
Powerless **Vol. 1:** 209, 217, 277, 315, 336, 418, 420, 549, 552, 616
Vol. 2: 147, 259, 393, **601–616**
Vol. 3: 204, 363, 473, 585, 915, **993–996**
Powers **Vol. 1:** 95, 102 f., 113 f., 118, 120, 124, 127, 167, 169, 208 f., 222–224, 236, 238, 301–303, 315, 327, 343, 374, 389, 402, 413 f., 424, 438, 443, 449, 452, 454, 457, 459, 461 f., 467, 476, 509, 519, 525, 527, 564, 610, 631, 644, 647, 649–651, 657, 676, 701, 718 f.
Vol. 2: 67, 69, 73–75, 101, 165–167, 179, 195 f., 198–200, 213, 251, 270 f., 274, 284–286, 364, 393, 430, 457 f., 460 f., 485, 514, 518, 559, 602–606, 631, 645, 736, 868
Powers that be **Vol. 2: 609**
Practical **Vol. 1:** 601
Vol. 2: 390, 400
Practical virtues **Vol. 3:** 926
Practice **Vol. 1:** 70, 526, 613, 686–688
Vol. 2: 61, 147, 391, 437, 659
Vol. 3: 756, 891, 934, **1147–1152**, 1155
Practise **Vol. 1:** 481, 494 f., 733
Practise magic **Vol. 2: 552–562**
Praetor **Vol. 3: 958–967**
Praetorian guard **Vol. 3:** 320
Praetorium **Vol. 2:** 32, 378
Pragmatic theory of truth **Vol. 3: 896 f.**
Praise **Vol. 1:** 99–101, 103, 116, 200, 206, 208, 210, 212 f., 227, 257, 263, 281, 320, 344–346, 370 f., 379–382, 387, 409, 413, 444, 469, 508, 514, 521, 523, 597 f., 651, 689, 695, 703, 731 f.
Vol. 2: 44, 46 f., 49, 58, 80, 83, 100, 105, 128, 159, 173, 176, 190 f., 194, 201 f., 206, 243, 260 f., 265, 272, 290, 294, 302, 305, 319, 328, 353 f., 418, 422, 425 f., 436, 478, 516 f., 528, 540, 596, 602, 604, 625, 650, 724, 738, 744, 784, 797, 823, 841, 844, 855, 862, 865, 868, 874, 883, 893, 925
Vol. 3: 42, 48, 52, 113, 142, 199, 210, 224, 230, 237, 243, 245 f., 256, 262, 271, 428, 434, 558, 565, 592, 600, 671 f., 675, 728, 792, 810, **816–819**, 828, 842, 854, 879, 908 f., 923, 965, 1079 f., 1122, 1143, 1166
Praiseworthy **Vol. 1:** 456 f.
Vol. 2: 98
Vol. 3: 927, 933
Prattle **Vol. 1:** 550, 552
Prayer **Vol. 1:** 76, 98 f., 107, 109 f., 120 f., 128, 143, 151, 163, 207, 210 f., 223, 225, 227, 246 f., 251 f., 272, 274, 276, 278, 285, 320 f., 323, 332, 339, 345, 380–382, 409, 411, 420, 426, 433, 452, 459, 484, 487, 504, 509, 515, 528, 544, 562 f., 566 f., 569, 586, 592, 609 f., 612–620, 625, 627 f., 633, 637, 642, 646 f., 650, 704, 723, 727, 730, 732, 734, 740
Vol. 2: 32, 64, 71, 73 f., 77, 83, 118, 122, 152, 160 f., 166 f., 174 f., 178, 185, 190, 194, 212, 216, 221, 227, 229, 231, 235, 237, 239, 244, 259 f., 291, 294, 297, 299, 311, 313, 320, 325–327, 351, 353, 359 f., 366, 396, 400, 416, 424, 428, 469, 509, 512, 518, 521, 530, 561, 596, 619, 626, 650, 653 f., 666, 669, 721, 726, 730, 735–737, 768, 771, 774, 793, 797, 803, 807, 816–819, **855–886**, 927
Vol. 3: 30, 49, 70, 93, 105, 130, 149, 152, 160, 167, 169, 194, 197, 199, 203, 210 f., 219, 221, 230, 232, 235, 238, 242, 244–246, 268, 275, 319, 369, 378, 380, 389, 391, 402, 417, 427, 432, 436, 460, 470, 474, 476, 485, 487, 509, 528, 531, 533, 536, 550, 525 f., 565, 595, 608, 611, 614, 638–640, 649–651, 657, 669 f., 672, 675, 682, 687, 702, 705, 713, 722, 744, 783, 791, 802 f., 808, 817, 819, 847, 857, 861, 869, 873, 879, 908, 930, 967, 987, 990, 997, 1004, 1007, 1009–1012, 1022, 1032, 1065–1067, 1080, 1119 f., 1205
Prayer for the dead **Vol. 3:** 1206
Prayer of Azariah **Vol. 1:** 50
Prayer of Manasses **Vol. 1:** 50
Prayer of sanctification **Vol. 2:** 522
Prayer-bands **Vol. 2:** 136
Prayer-straps **Vol. 2:** 864
Praying in the Spirit **Vol. 2:** 873, 883
Preach **Vol. 2:** 107, 109, 126, 169, 367, 413, 447, 632, 816
Vol. 3: 44–68, 242, 286, 313, 352, 410, 763 f., 774, 821, 1054, 1092, 1110
Preacher **Vol. 1:** 131 f., 199, 211, 298, 662
Vol. 2: 113, 381
Vol. 3: 77, 469, 525, 616, 1050, 1118
Preaching **Vol. 1:** 54 f., 62, 95, 111, 121, 123, 129, 131, 158, 160, 168, 213 f., 216, 235, 238 f., 246, 263, 266, 289, 322, 324, 358 f., 396 f., 400, 445 f., 475, 486, 489, 496, 508, 519, 540, 543, 545, 547, 551, 558, 572, 589, 599, 601, 613, 619, 644, 660, 665, 675, 677, 684, 686, 689, 701 f., 727, 735, 738
Vol. 2: 73, 75 f., 85, 100 f., 111 f., 129, 152, 155, 169, 176, 179, 208, 221 f., 250, 255, 338–340, 342, 351 f., 358–360, 366, 377, 379, 382–388, 418, 443, 451, 543, 547, 603, 633, 654, 665, 676, 679 f., 709, 732, 740, 780, 782, 818, 844, 902, 904, 908, 916, 918
Vol. 3: 42, **48–57**, 66, 107, 127, 141, 144, 168, 214 f., 245, 277, 314 f., 322 f., 326, 328, 361, 365, 417, 521, 532, 558, 570, 580, 600, 619, 639, 661, 729, 760–762, 771, 785, 809, 838, 906, 919, 941, 944, 954, 1018, 1026, 1031 f.,

1059, 1067, 1080, 1091, 1112, 1114, 1157
Precaution **Vol. 3:** 446
Precedence **Vol. 1:** 78, 134, 533, 556, 729
Vol. 2: 57, 157, 427, 429
Vol. 3: 1022
Precedent **Vol. 2:** 373, 443
Precept **Vol. 1:** 332, 340, 525
Vol. 2: 261, 270
Vol. 3: 542
Precious **Vol. 1:** 260, 478, 480, 537, 596, 634, 665
Vol. 2: 49, 76, 541
Precious stones **Vol. 1:** 205, 380
Vol. 2: 674
Vol. 3: 381–399
Precious stones in the Apocalypse **Vol. 3: 395–398**
Preciousness **Vol. 3:** 989
Precipitation **Vol. 1:** 683
Preclude **Vol. 1:** 668, 730, 736
Preconceived **Vol. 2:** 363
Vol. 3: 533
Precondition **Vol. 3:** 309, 482, 619, 702
Vol. 2: 775
Vol. 3: 171, 212, 419
Predestination **Vol. 1:** 244, 378, 382, 471, 473, 478, **692–697**, 707
Vol. 2: 298, 397, 609
Vol. 3: 439, 529, 1017, 1019
Predetermination **Vol. 1:** 692
Vol. 3: 654
Predict **Vol. 1:** 692
Vol. 2: 320, 351
Vol. 3: 28, 74
Prediction **Vol. 1:** 198, 290, 381, 541, 545, 572, 737
Vol. 2: 339, 880
Vol. 3: 79, 82, 87, 241, 267, 276, 294, 624, 627, 1008, 1122
Pre-eminence **Vol. 1:** 135, 193, 666 f.
Pre-ethical **Vol. 2:** 230
Pre-existence **Vol. 1: 66**, 166, 178, 232, 522, 547, 549, 619, 668, 706
Vol. 2: 46, 828
Vol. 3: 463, 643, 724, 776, 1033
Pre-existent **Vol. 1:** 707
Vol. 2: 189, 289, 326, 329, 500, 504, 546, 565, 645, 652
Vol. 3: 82, 187, 516, 597, 1023
Preface **Vol. 1:** 247
Prefect **Vol. 1:** 270
Preference **Vol. 1:** 534, 536, 539, 587, 667
Vol. 2: 364
Prefiguration **Vol. 3:** 41
Prefigure **Vol. 1:** 619
Vol. 2: 191
Pregnancy **Vol. 1:** 176, 186, 288, 466, 506, 512
Vol. 2: 423, 587
Vol. 3: 1072
Pregnant with meaning **Vol. 3:** 816
Prehistory **Vol. 1:** 56
Vol. 2: 889
Preincarnate **Vol. 1:** 677
Prejudgment **Vol. 1:** 584
Prejudice **Vol. 2:** 363 f.
Premature **Vol. 1:** 183
Premillenarianism **Vol. 2:** 389
Premillennialist **Vol. 1: 52**, 508
Vol. 2: 701
Premises **Vol. 2:** 247
Premonition **Vol. 2:** 599, 624
Preoccupation **Vol. 1:** 400
Vol. 3: 533
Preordain **Vol. 1:** 695
Preparation **Vol. 1:** 411, 612, 625, 630, 633
Vol. 2: 54, 315, 334
Vol. 3: 116–118, 349–351, 405–411, 548, 663, 804, 844, 915, 917
Preparation for the Passover **Vol. 2:** 527
Prepare **Vol. 1:** 423, 475, 541, 543, 561, 611, 633, 646, 662, 722
Vol. 2: 229, 253, 382, 388
Vol. 3: 116–122, 349–351, 503, 873, 915
Prepare beforehand **Vol. 3: 116–118**
Preparedness **Vol. 2:** 165
Prerequisite **Vol. 1:** 600
Prerogative **Vol. 1:** 697
Vol. 2: 320
Vol. 3: 97, 917
Presage **Vol. 1:** 737
Presbyter **Vol. 1:** 136, **188–201**, 477
Vol. 2: 563
Vol. 3: 700
Presbyterate **Vol. 1:** 197
Presbyterian **Vol. 1:** 199
Prescience **Vol. 1:** 383
Prescribe **Vol. 1:** 54, 573
Vol. 3: 483, 759
Prescription **Vol. 2:** 813
Presence **Vol. 1:** 65, 90 f., 102–104, 175, 223, 232, 239, 250, 272, 276, 280, 299–301, 335, 346, 384, 409, 466, 474 f., 490, 525, 586, 607, 612, 629, 681, 723, 734
Vol. 2: 45, 47, 68, 70, 82, 86 f., 100, 129, 150, 160 f., 163, 165, 186, 215, 282, 326, 354, 356, 387, 463, 484, 489, 491, 493, 517, 523, 535 f., 585, 627, 650, 656 f., 718, 777 f., 782, 869, 881, 884, **886–935**
Vol. 3: 55, 98, 106, 227, 235, 266, 298, 310, 407, 449, 514, 543, 555 f., 602, 627, 640, 729, 784, 788–790, 794 f., 805, 812–814, 828, 844, 863, 1003, 1096, 1117, 1180
Present (gift) **Vol. 1:** 234, 406
Vol. 2: 96, 437
Vol. 3: 421, 744, 747
Present (time and place) **Vol. 1:** 234, 305, 319 f., 323, 327, 400, 425, 437, 466, 469, **471–478**, 491, 508, 525, 590, 603, 607, 638 f., 646, 671–673, 696, 701 f., 706 f., 713, 717, 719, 728, 736 f.
Vol. 2: 40 f., 54, 65, 110, 112, 122, 130, 186, 190, 192, 242, 246, 252, 266 f., 277, 282, 287 f., 298, 313, 315, 329, 343, 350, 353, 357, 359 f., 363, 367, 370, 382–389, 393, 396, 417, 420 f., 426, 447, 461, 496, 503, 515, 517–519, 527, 530 f., 536, 543, 606, 613, 630, 633, 654, 674–676, 703, 714, 749, 789 f., 798, 809, 844, 846, **886–935**

Present (time and place) (*cont'd*)
Vol. 3: 52, 55 f., 63, 79, 86, 99, 199, 214, 221, 238, 244 f., 252, 277, 279, 282, 305, 310, 315 f., 318 f., 320, 333, 349, 393, 412, 470, 505 f., 511, 603, 605, 617, 626, 732, 737, 793, 826, 831 f., 834, 838, 840, 842, 844, 849, 924, 962, 965, 981, 1001, 1075
Present (verb) **Vol. 1:** 235, 572, 647 f., 655, 657
Vol. 2: 354, 482
Vol. 3: 220, 432, 745, 925
Present age **Vol. 1:** 326, 524, 566, 677
Vol. 2: 245, 275, 383, 672, 843
Presentation **Vol. 1:** 474, 696
Vol. 3: 159, 1071
Presentation formula **Vol. 2: 279**
Presenting **Vol. 3:** 417
Preservation **Vol. 1:** 266, 498
Vol. 2: 123, 141, 364, 572, 781, 862, 868
Vol. 3: 205–216, 250, 527, 818, 1088, 1148
Preservative **Vol. 3:** 443, 445
Preserve **Vol. 1:** 333, 463, 479, 597, 631, 640, 657, 662, 685, 700, 715, 717
Vol. 2: 95, 99, 132, 134, 159, 295, **838–840**
Vol. 3: 177, **200–216**, 444, 686
Preserver **Vol. 3: 216–221**
Preside **Vol. 1:** 199
President **Vol. 1:** 190, 196, 666
Vol. 2: 158, 234
Press **Vol. 1:** 649
Press into **Vol. 3:** 712
Press upon **Vol. 2: 807–809**
Pressure **Vol. 1:** 568, 607, 678 f., 729, 733
Vol. 2: 306, 765, 808
Vol. 3: 759, 916
Prestige **Vol. 2:** 334
Vol. 3: 440
Prestigious **Vol. 3:** 589
Presume **Vol. 3:** 583, 687, 822
Presumption **Vol. 1:** 412, 551
Vol. 2: 834
Vol. 3: 799
Presumptuous **Vol. 2:** 130, 201
Vol. 3: 29 f., 32
Presupposition **Vol. 1:** 583, 598
Vol. 2: 340, 343, 393, 631
Vol. 3: 104, 327, 372, 640
Pretence **Vol. 1:** 587
Vol. 2: 49, **468–470**
Pretend **Vol. 2: 468–470**
Pretender **Vol. 1:** 629
Vol. 2: 34, 314, 338, 379, 430, **468–470**
Pretension **Vol. 2:** 462
Pretext **Vol. 1:** 334, 719
Prevail **Vol. 1:** 303, 731
Vol. 2: 305
Vol. 3: 712–714
Prevarication **Vol. 2:** 400
Prevent **Vol. 1:** 457, 497, 499, 560, 608, 676, 687, 715
Vol. 2: 220–223, 326, 394
Previously **Vol. 1:** 666, 695
Prey **Vol. 1:** 114, 172, 484, 550, 611, 709
Vol. 2: 421, 470
Price **Vol. 1:** 268, 432, 572
Vol. 2: 43, 48 f., 711
Vol. 3: 139, 142, 155, 166, 174, 180, 1057
Price of release **Vol. 3: 189–200**
Priceless **Vol. 2:** 480
Prick **Vol. 1:** 726
Vol. 2: 572
Prickle **Vol. 1:** 725
Pride **Vol. 1:** 113, 140, 227, 229, 259, 311, 381, 405 f., 458, 531, 644
Vol. 2: 120, 148, 162, 198 f., 243, 249, 259–261, 264, 352, 358, 403, 436, 442, 617 f., 661
Vol. 3: 27–32, 357, 544, 561, 734, 824, 1032, 1052, 1054
Pride of life **Vol. 2:** 475
Vol. 3: 32
Priest **Vol. 1:** 53, 80, 100, 122, 152, 190, 196, 198, 204, 208, 210–212, 214, 216, 219, 221, 255, 271 f., 294, 305, 322, 344, 360, 363, 373–375, 405, 414, 416, 474, 485, 499, 511, 537 f., 543, 574 f., 579, 586, 596, 617, 625, 628, 633, 687, 690, 699, 731, 733
Vol. 2: 53, 61, 63, 141, 154, 167, 223, 226–228, 231, **232–236**, 238, 240, 256, 287, 294, 296 f., 307, 311, 320 f., 335, 367, 380, 411, 415, 437, 440 f., 447, 456 f., 464–467, 569, 577, 590–594, 631, 649, 652, 693 f., 701, 711, 726, 795, 799, 811, 813, 823 f., 842, 863
Vol. 3: 32–44, 50, 76, 78, 89, 95, 103–105, 108, 149 f., 154 f., 164, 190, 207 f., 239, 250, 342, 347, 408, 415, 419, 421, 423, 432 f., 435 f., 439, 478, 550–553, 561, 582, 585, 588, 711, 715, 742, 745, 777, 781, 797, 815, 852 f., 1060, 1074, 1154
Priest, chief **Vol. 1:** 83, 199, 281, 337, 395, 413, 665
Vol. 2: 32, 167, 234, 339, 469, 623, 641
Vol. 3: 185, 211, 480, 792, 965
Priest, high **Vol. 1:** 122 f., 151, 168, 198, 205, 221, 321 f., 324, 327, 340 f., 351, 356 f., 363, 371, 375, 386, 405, 448, 472, 487, 544, 619, 637, 665, 685, 689
Vol. 2: 63, 80, 123, 178, 194 f., 1[illegible] 217, 226, 230 f., **232–236**, 238, 244, 282, 289, 293, 296, 327, 335–337, 368, 378 f., 447, 451, 577, 590–593, 598, 614, 625, 642, 651 f., 664, 669, 674, 717 f., 799
Vol. 3: 32–44, 120 f., 129, 161 f., 189, 198 f., 244, 313, 317, 323, 366, 396 f., 420, 424, 433, 441 f., 478, 483, 552, 582, 723, 742, 788 f., 794, 812, 815, 822, 853, 925, 941, 947, 966, 1074, 1113
Priest-king **Vol. 1:** 99, 619
Vol. 2: 335, 378, 590–593, 694
Priest-Logos **Vol. 3:** 36
Priestess **Vol. 3:** 1055
Priesthood **Vol. 1:** 61, 66, 80, 120, 305, 333, 405, 408, 619, 677, 731
Vol. 2: 64, 125, 225, 228, 230, **232–236**, 249, 320, 327, 380, 436, 448, 505, 574, 579, 590–593, 638, 693 f., 839, 899
Vol. 3: 32–44, 228, 336, 366, 435, 654, 782
Priesthood of believers **Vol. 3:** 435
Priestly **Vol. 1:** 426, 630, 699
Vol. 2: 53, 147, 149, 228, **232–236**

Priestly anointing **Vol. 1:** 123
Priestly code **Vol. 3:** 418
Priestly decision **Vol. 1:** 70
Priestly garment **Vol. 1:** 312
Priestly office **Vol. 2:** **232–236**, 447
Priestly oracle **Vol. 1:** 58
Vol. 2: 240
Priestly ordinances **Vol. 1:** 66
Priestly party **Vol. 3:** 440
Priestly people **Vol. 1:** 309
Priestly service **Vol. 2:** 195, **232–236**
Vol. 3: 785
Priestly tradition **Vol. 1:** 53
Priestly writing **Vol. 1:** 53, 65, **66**
Priests' court **Vol. 3:** 789
Primacy of Peter **Vol. 3:** 384
Primal **Vol. 1:** 654, 697
Vol. 2: 52, 205, 657
Primal man **Vol. 1:** 302
Vol. 2: 158, 162, 195, 249, 645 f.
Vol. 3: 617, 632
Primary **Vol. 1:** 664, 711
Prime numbers **Vol. 1:** 665
Primeval **Vol. 1:** 422, 507 f., 522, 640 f.
Vol. 2: 197, 394, 452, 889
Vol. 3: 35 f., 40
Primeval water **Vol. 3:** 983
Primitive **Vol. 1:** 99, 298, 303, 457, 473, 528, 545, 599, 613, 619, 634, 642, 645, 686
Vol. 2: 250, 337–339
Prince **Vol. 1:** 102, 164, 168, 293 f., 464, 648
Vol. 2: 70, 205, 307, 312, 372, 376, 562, 797
Vol. 3: 49, 51, 588, 714
Prince of demons **Vol. 1:** 452
Vol. 3: 472
Prince of evil **Vol. 1:** 452
Prince of gods **Vol. 2:** 71
Prince of light **Vol. 2:** 492
Prince of peace **Vol. 2:** 779
Prince of this world **Vol. 1:** 458, 525
Vol. 2: 365, 609 f.
Vol. 3: 469 f., 582, 705, 802
Principalities **Vol. 1:** 315, 424, 525, 647
Vol. 2: 162, 195 f., 559, 645, 736
Vol. 3: 172
Principle **Vol. 1:** 166, 230, 256, 271, 353, 483, 502, 542, 549, 561, 563, 565, 569, 578, 582 f., 619, 653 f., 675, 705, 715, 719
Vol. 2: 66, 157, 188, 289, 309, 314, 327, 366 f., 427, 436 f., 446 f., 452, 663
Vol. 3: 57, 524, 764, 1034
Principle of verification **Vol. 3:** 1135
Prior **Vol. 2:** 187
Priority **Vol. 1:** 334, 664, 666, 697
Vol. 2: 160, 314, 800
Priscilla **Vol. 2:** 847
Vol. 3: 89, 1063, 1065
Prison **Vol. 1:** 171, 229, 328, 340, 487, 522, 717
Vol. 2: 29 f., 132, 134, 136, 205, 393, 434, 736, 818
Vol. 3: 121, 227, 273, 359, 558 f., **591 f.**, 679, 794, 1157
Prison warder **Vol. 3:** **591 f.**
Prisoner **Vol. 1:** 191, 505, 649
Vol. 2: 121, 132, 168, 268, 295, 367, 517, 828
Vol. 3: 170, 189, 379, **589–599**, 713
Prisoner of war **Vol. 1:** 716
Vol. 3: **590 f.**, 601
Private **Vol. 1:** 535, 577–579, 582, 641–643, 647, 680
Vol. 2: 107, 273, 325, 438, 456, 838, 869
Private profit **Vol. 2:** 235
Privilege **Vol. 1:** 385, 480, 538 f., 621, 666, 716, 739
Vol. 2: 49, 81, 122, 247, 294, 307, 309, 317, 350
Vol. 3: 137, 381, 561, 954
Prize **Vol. 1:** 406, 470, **644–652**
Vol. 2: 62, 97, 807
Vol. 3: 49, 142, 261, **601–605**, 682
Probability **Vol. 1:** 60, 326
Probation **Vol. 2:** 696, 838
Vol. 3: 808
Problem **Vol. 1:** 500, 505, 532, 564, 577 f., 583 f., 592, 603, 716
Vol. 2: 123, 160, 235, 286, 314, 374, 442, 453
Vol. 3: 75
Procedure **Vol. 1:** 364, 535, 580
Vol. 2: 440
Vol. 3: **935–943**
Proceed **Vol. 1:** 320, 322
Vol. 2: 222
Proceedings **Vol. 1:** 364, 698
Proceeds **Vol. 2:** 847
Process **Vol. 1:** 432, 437, 484, 486, 541, 597, 600, 602, 625, 652, 654, 656, 666, 668 f., 711, 722, 736, 740–742
Vol. 2: 52, 62, 65, 128 f., 131, 269, 334, 364, 370, 383–385, 391
Vol. 3: 53, 574, 702, 1147
Procession **Vol. 1:** 492, 625 f., 629, 647
Vol. 3: 45, 873, 913
Procksch, O. **Vol. 3:** 1124
Proclaim **Vol. 1:** 89, 222, 245, 277, 338–340, 371, 402, 409, 423, 431, 436–438, 485, 489, 532, 544, 590, 594, 640, 662, 689, 708, 717, 729
Vol. 2: 68, 78, 83, 107, 114, 125, 154, 179, 212, 255, 263, 274, 328, 373, 382, 401, 404, 443, 622
Vol. 3: **44–68**, **68–74**, 77, 169, 232, 237, 245, 504, 764, 914, 1042, 1092, 1097, 1152
Proclaimer **Vol. 3:** **74–89**
Proclamation **Vol. 1:** 62 f., 95, 111, 127, 135, 146 f., 167, 179, 237, 248, 272, 297 f., 310, 340, 346, 355, 384, 397, 399, 409 f., 445, 454, 495, 523, 568, 572, 599, 647, 650, 662, 677, 688, 701 f., 716, 719
Vol. 2: 36, 54, 75, 77 f., 108 f., 111, 113 f., 121, 147, 175, 206, 221 f., 261 f., 269, 338 f., 343, 351, 357, 360, 375, 380 382, 384–387, 395, 536, 630–632, 654, 682, 740, 915, 928
Vol. 3: **44–68**, 85, 166, 170, 216, 232, 242–244, 247, 277, 285, 314 f., 322 f., 326, 330, 401, 430, 456, 462, 495, 504, 546, 548, 626, 696 f., 718, 766, 770, 774, 780, 837 f., 927, 942, 969, 1042, 1044, 1047, 1050, 1080, 1088, 1091, 1093, 1098, 1101, 1106, 1108–

Proclamation (*cont'd*)
1112, 1121, 1123
Proconsul **Vol. 1:** 270
Vol. 2: 369
Procreate **Vol. 2: 476–484**
Procreation **Vol. 1:** 79, 177, 497
Vol. 3: 678
Procurator **Vol. 1:** 166, 270
Vol. 2: 258, 308, 334
Vol. 3: 456
Procure **Vol. 1:** 374, 680
Vol. 3: 529
Prodigal **Vol. 1:** 110, 436, 446, 729
Vol. 2: 32, 170, 349, 386, 475, 600, 790
Vol. 3: 28, 278, 348, 674, 751, 954, 1061
Prodigy **Vol. 2: 633**
Produce **Vol. 1:** 176, 186, 378, 380, 383, 714, 722 f., 725
Vol. 2: 271
Produce of land **Vol. 3:** 852
Product **Vol. 1:** 165
Production **Vol. 1:** 642
Productivity **Vol. 3:** 444
Profane **Vol. 1:** 344, 379, 447 f., 467, 639, 641
Vol. 2: 223 f., 226 f., 230, 236, 650, 653
Vol. 3: 28, 104, 415
Profane language **Vol. 3:** 341
Profess **Vol. 2:** 669
Vol. 3: 68–74
Profession **Vol. 1:** 201
Vol. 3: 61, 70, 965
Professional **Vol. 1:** 512, 575
Professional mourners **Vol. 2:** 418
Profit **Vol. 1:** 546, 678
Vol. 2: 254
Vol. 3: 29, 134, **136–138**, 174, 1054
Profit-motive **Vol. 3:** 137
Profitable **Vol. 3:** 760
Profound **Vol. 1:** 707
Profuse **Vol. 1:** 728
Profusion **Vol. 1:** 729
Progenitor **Vol. 2:** 319
Programme **Vol. 2:** 308, 341
Progress **Vol. 1:** 164 f., 584, 742
Vol. 2: 128, 130, 221
Progression **Vol. 1:** 548
Vol. 3: 229
Progressive **Vol. 1:** 432
Prohibition **Vol. 1:** 226, 231, 340, 384, 426, 499 f., 625, 670, 688
Vol. 2: 268, 272, 281, 284, 286 f., 415, 554, 580, 732
Vol. 3: 105, 343, 740 f., 1066, 1153, 1160
Projections of altar **Vol. 3:** 715
Proletariat **Vol. 1:** 500
Prologue **Vol. 1:** 576, 628
Vol. 2: 927
Prometheus **Vol. 1:** 654
Vol. 2: 457, 490
Prominence **Vol. 1:** 680
Vol. 3: 481, 1059
Promiscuity **Vol. 1:** 497
Vol. 3: 1072
Promise **Vol. 1:** 53, 72–74, 76 f., 80 f., 98 f., 112, 123, 128, 141, 146, 148, 159, 173, 185, 208–211, 214 f, 217–219, 224, 237 f., 262, 271, 276, 286, 296, 305, 308, 311, 317, 324, 327 f., 339, 344, 346 f., 350, 358 f., 367–372, 374 f., 385, 407, 410, 412, 422, 426 f., 439, 445 f., 458, 460 f., 466, 483 f., 489 f., 504 f., 518, 531 f., 537, 541, 545, 551, 556 f., 571, 581, 587–589, 595 f., 598, 600, 603 f., 609, 615, 617, 633, 637 f., 640, 644, 651, 658–660, 663, 678, 681, 685, 688–691, 697, 701, 713 f., 717, 719, 731 f., 733, 737, 744
Vol. 2: 39, 54, 65, 68, 70, 73, 76 f., 86, 100, 102, 107 f., 111, 120, 122, 129 f., 142, 152, 155 f., 159, 170, 176, 202 f., 238–240, 242 f., 244 f., 250, 252, 258, 260–263, 265–267, 271, 276, 278, 282, 295, 297, 300–302, 310, 314, 317–319, 328, 330, 332, 342, 358 f., 380, 386, 388, 395 f., 399, 402, 415, 417, 419–421, 429, 435, 444 f., 447–449, 453, 472, 474, 478, 543, 570, 605, 617, 626, 631, 636, 641, 648 f., 653, 661, 695, 709, 716, 727 f., 763, 775, 778 f., 786 f., 797, 823, 825, 835, 854, 856 f., 863, 881, 897, 909, 916, 923
Vol. 3: 42, 48, 55, **68–74**, 101, 117, 129, 143, 145, 171 f., 198, 202, 211, 228 f., 235, 257, 264, 268, 314, 350, 366, 371, 382, 389, 404, 456, 485 f., 495, 516, 523 f., 560, 582, 590, 606, 620, 637 f., 648–651, 686, 692 f., 697, 699, 733, 740, 742 f., 749, 762, 783 f., 786, 795, 805–807, 816, 828, 839, 844, 847, 849, 852, 865, 905, 911, 928, 944 f., 954, 960, 987, 1012, 1014, 1018, 1074, 1087 f., 1100 f., 1103, 1105 f., 1112, 1113, 1120, 1143, 1150, 1154
Promise-breaking **Vol. 1:** 74
Promised land **Vol. 1:** 321, 682, 684, 691, 723
Vol. 2: 258, **295–304**, 331, 638
Vol. 3: 69, 95, 135, 256, 434, 740, 777, 806 f., 814, 872, 954, 970, 988, 1009
Promissory **Vol. 1:** 319
Promissory history **Vol. 3:** 968
Promissory oath **Vol. 3:** 738 f.
Promote **Vol. 1:** 499
Prompt **Vol. 1:** 719
Vol. 3: 846
Promulgate **Vol. 3:** 1113
Pronounce **Vol. 1:** 208, 216 f., 414, 447, 466, 581, 603, 699, 702
Vol. 2: 69, 147, 362, 370
Pronounce as righteous **Vol. 3: 352–377**
Pronouncement **Vol. 2:** 370, 395
Proof **Vol. 1:** 65, 398, 417, 547, 588, 594, 714, 736 f.
Vol. 2: 77, 140, 165, 282, 284, **290 f.**, 338, 359, 379, 546, 631, 653, 743, 858
Vol. 3: 249, 326, 331, 334, 485, 488, 494, **569–571**, 763 f., 769, 841, **1038–1050**
Proof-texts **Vol. 3:** 82, 487
Propaganda **Vol. 1:** 688, 708
Vol. 2: 438
Vol. 3: 900
Propagate **Vol. 1:** 451
Proper **Vol. 2:** 105, **606–611**, 668
Property **Vol. 1:** 360, 373, 398, 505, 639–641,

643, 688, 710, 716
Vol. 2: 134, 235, 247, 257, 296–298, 436, 438, 462, 552, 582, 820 f., 824, 829–835, **836–847**, 898
Vol. 3: 193 f., 200, 227, 256, **324 f.**, 372, 498, 594, 641, 701, 756, 913, 978
Property law **Vol. 2:** 511
Prophecy **Vol. 1:** 73, 117, 124, 135, 170, 185, 199, 290, 320, 329, 339, 411, 429, 512, 519, 527, 529, 545, 554, 578 f., 623, 657, 735, 737, 739
Vol. 2: 37, 86, 121, 165, 168, 228, 250, 252, 258, 314, 329, 367, 374, 379, 389, 410, 443, 487, 490, 545, 677, 680, 741, 797, 909 f., 915
Vol. 3: 33, 39, **74–89**, 110, 147 f., 198, 234, 269, 362, 454, 495, 500, 557, 629, 696, 699, 703, 791, 826, 1013, 1073, 1080, 1121 f., 1161, 1183
Prophesy **Vol. 2:** 161, 212, 470, 599
Vol. 3: 492, 533, 691, 700, 1066
Prophet **Vol. 1:** 58, **66**, 67, 76, 116, 121, 125, 128 f., 131 f., 135, 146, 163, 167, 174, 191 f., 198, 200, 208, 210, 222, 248, 265, 273, 328, 335, 358, 373–375, 394 f., 403, 423, 474, 482, 485, 492, 512, 527, 530, 543, 548, 556, 569 f., 574, 578 f., 581 f., 590, 595–597, 612, 617, 626, 641, 643, 662, 686, 717, 720, 729 f., 735 f., 738, 740
Vol. 2: 114, 129, 152, 154, 167, 174, 176, 187, 216 f., 226, 228, 240, 252 f., 257, 306 f., 312 f., 320, 326, 328, 337, 341, 352, 358, 367, 380, 432, 440, 442–444, 448, 453, 461, 472, 542, 559, 573, 626 f., 629, 633, 636, 638, 641, 665, 686, 711, 715, 724, 730, 737, 744, 786, 791, 803, 806, 827, 863, 913–915
Vol. 3: 42, 45, 50 f., 53, 55, 60, 69 f., 73, **74–89**, 99, 103, 110 f., 140, 147, 163, 181, 183, 195, 215, 221, 311, 313, 317, 329 f., 357, 360, 387, 390, 393, 407, 460, 479, 481, 485, 487, 502, 505, 513, 532, 548, 554, 565, 608, 610, 659, 691, 711, 721, 724, 762, 768, 780 f., 797, 806, 836, 875, 920, 960, 1042 f., 1053, 1058, **1088–1105**, 1118
Prophetess **Vol. 3:** **74–89**, 1057, 1067
Prophetic **Vol. 1:** 202, 208, 246, 326, 328, 332, 334 f., 358, 371, 409 f., 414, 429, 445, 527–529, 574, 597, 619, 638, 659, 693, 699
Vol. 2: 174, 228, 276, 311 f., 432, 441
Vol. 3: 347, 462, 750, 967, 1007, 1091
Prophetic perspective **Vol. 2:** 910
Propitiate **Vol. 3:** **145–176**
Propitiation **Vol. 1:** 89, 349, 398, 438, 694, 697, 700
Vol. 2: 766
Vol. 3: **145–176**, 198, 364
Propitiation and expiation **Vol. 3:** **151–160**
Propitiatory **Vol. 1:** 437, 700
Vol. 3: 199, 239, 366
Propitiatory sacrifice **Vol. 3:** **148–166**
Propitious **Vol. 1:** 516
Vol. 2: 318
Proportion **Vol. 3:** 404, 752
Proposal **Vol. 1:** 61, 325
Propose **Vol. 1:** 692, 696
Proposition **Vol. 1:** 664
Vol. 3: 876, 1086
Propositional revelation **Vol. 3:** 336
Propriety **Vol. 1:** 501, 628, 684
Vol. 2: 160 f., 235
Vol. 3: **100–102**
Prorogative **Vol. 1:** 557
Proscribe **Vol. 3:** 183
Prosecute **Vol. 1:** 415
Vol. 2: 805
Prosecution **Vol. 2:** 450
Prosecutor **Vol. 1:** 349, 475, 558
Proselyte **Vol. 1:** 77 f., 145, 149 f., 154–159, 180, 255, 258, **353–362**, 555, 560, 688 f.
Vol. 2: 54, 85, 126, 311, 377, 438, 442, 457, 652, 732, 740, 792, 866
Vol. 3: 82, 228, 869, 872, 931, 1052
Proselyte baptism **Vol. 1:** **145**, 154 f.
Proselyte catechism **Vol. 3:** 928 f., 931
Proselytizing **Vol. 1:** 228, 516
Vol. 2: 792
Vol. 3: 480, 951
Prospect **Vol. 1:** 623, 643
Vol. 2: 267, 319
Prospective **Vol. 1:** 601
Prosper **Vol. 2:** 128, 452, 817
Vol. 3: 854, 943
Prosperity **Vol. 1:** 210, 216, 354, 682, 724
Vol. 2: 49, 478 f., 711, 776 f.
Vol. 3: 217, 262, 523, 672, 807, 866, 986
Prostitute **Vol. 1:** 117, 231 f., **494–503**, 507
Vol. 2: 212, 325, 517, 541, **582–584**
Vol. 3: 475, 535, 1059, 1062
Prostitution **Vol. 1:** 497, 499 f., 560, 625
Vol. 2: 576
Vol. 3: 1055
Prostrate **Vol. 2:** 862, **875–879**
Protagoras **Vol. 3:** 876
Protect **Vol. 1:** 212, 221, 277, 332, 340, 451, 468, 510, 542, 617, 632, 662, 688, 716, 740
Vol. 2: 133–135, 244, 254, 265, 314, 438, 653, 822
Vol. 3: 120 f., 200, 205, 212, 263, 497 f., 500, 949
Protection **Vol. 1:** 96, 101, 122, 151, 211, 218, 269, 272, 280 f., 316, 360, 367, 411, 541, 562, 595 f., 607, 625, 653, 686–691, 717
Vol. 2: 70, 83, 135 f., 149, 194, 213, 224, 247, 368, 412 f., 429, 460, 521, 572–574, 626, 649, 660, 713, 821–823, 844, 860
Vol. 3: 57, 95, 200, 469, 501, 554, 608, 692, 727, 729, 733, 797, 805, 807, 868 f., 948, 950, 952, 978
Protector **Vol. 1:** 654
Vol. 2: 821–823
Vol. 3: 193, 216, 263
Protector of Israel **Vol. 1:** 104
Protest **Vol. 1:** 284, 410
Prototype **Vol. 1:** 81, 266
Vol. 2: 58
Vol. 3: 303, 568, 592, **903–906**, 990
Proud **Vol. 1:** 709, 742
Vol. 2: 34, **198–200**, 201, 262, 468, 617 f.
Vol. 3: **27–32**, 127, 691 f., 718

Prove **Vol. 1:** 303, 542, 571, 598, 604, 622, 656, 659, 708, 713, 731
Vol. 2: 245, 252, 318, 355, 361, 883
Vol. 3: 492, **569–571**
Provender **Vol. 1:** 743
Proverb **Vol. 1:** 139, 580
Vol. 2: 433, 462, **743–760**, 881, 890
Vol. 3: 78, 606, 777, 816, 888, 948
Proverbial **Vol. 1:** 218
Proverbs, Book of **Vol. 1:** 58, 412
Vol. 2: 261, 745
Provide **Vol. 1:** 683, 693 f., 731
Vol. 2: 201, 411, 846
Vol. 3: 728
Providence **Vol. 1:** 173, 203, 278, 377, 383, 450, 467, 471, 478 f., 562, **692–697**
Vol. 2: 117 f., 223, 236, 663 f., 828
Vol. 3: 117 f., 157, 317, 720, 762, 865
Providential **Vol. 1:** 462, 523, 670
Vol. 2: 628
Province **Vol. 1:** 392, 466
Vol. 2: 320, 324, 788
Provincial **Vol. 2:** 234
Provision **Vol. 1:** 143, 252, 276–278, 425, 512, 531, 670, 693–695, 716
Vol. 2: 265, 318, 587, 737, 825, 832
Vol. 3: 121, 145, 1074
Provisional **Vol. 2:** 580
Provocation **Vol. 1:** 107
Vol. 2: 259
Provoke **Vol. 1:** 107, 202
Vol. 2: 131, 308, 447, 450, 516
Vol. 3: 1123
Proximity **Vol. 2:** 53, 382, 384
Proxy **Vol. 1:** 128
Prudence **Vol. 1:** 412, **494–503**, 536
Vol. 3: 354, 925, 1025
Prudent **Vol. 2:** 216, **616–620**
Prune **Vol. 3:** 227
Prytaneis **Vol. 1:** 291
Psalm titles **Vol. 3:** 669, 673
Psalms **Vol. 1:** 58, 244, 409, 538, 736, 744
Vol. 2: 240, 297, 375, 444, 530, 864, 874
Vol. 3: 233, 236, 407, 479, 494, **668–676**
Psalms of lament **Vol. 3:** 720
Psalms of Solomon **Vol. 1:** 66
Vol. 2: 241, 823, 867
Vol. 3: 650, 669
Pseudepigrapha **Vol. 1:** 50, **66**, 67, 452, 618
Vol. 2: 191, 222
Vol. 3: 492
Pseudo-apostle **Vol. 1:** 710
Pseudo-Hippocrates **Vol. 2:** 690
Pseudo-king **Vol. 2:** 339
Pseudo-messiah **Vol. 2:** 339, 633
Pseudo-pregnancy **Vol. 3:** 474
Pseudo-spirituality **Vol. 3:** 963
Pseudonym **Vol. 2:** 86
Pseudonymity **Vol. 1:** 247
Vol. 2: 37
Vol. 3: 80
Pseudonymous **Vol. 1:** 66
Psoriasia **Vol. 2:** 464
Psyche **Vol. 3:** 1017
Psychic **Vol. 2:** 359, 556
Psychological **Vol. 1:** 507, 583, 678 f.
Vol. 2: 169, 182, 204, 220, 288, 422, 437
Psychological illness **Vol. 2:** 166
Psychological pressure **Vol. 3:** 886
Psychological schools **Vol. 2:** 567–569
Psychology **Vol. 3:** 900, 1081
Psychology of memory **Vol. 3:** 234
Psychology and NT **Vol. 2:** **567–569**
Psychosomatic **Vol. 2:** 567
Ptah **Vol. 1:** 616
Vol. 3: 1088
Ptolemaic period **Vol. 1:** 665
Vol. 2: 898
Ptolemy **Vol. 2:** 849
Vol. 3: 634
Ptolemy Epiphanes **Vol. 3:** 635
Ptolemy II Philadelphus **Vol. 3:** 756
Ptolemy Philometor **Vol. 3:** 766
Puberty **Vol. 1:** 308
Vol. 2: 437
Vol. 3: 1071
Public **Vol. 1:** 330, 346 f., 390–392, 402, 407, 410, 501, 535 f., 582, 590, 613, 639, 649, 689, 696, 715, 738
Vol. 2: 150, 159 f., 212, 352 f., 493, 736, **788–790**, 800
Public crier **Vol. 3:** 51
Public figure **Vol. 3:** 479
Public life **Vol. 3:** 738
Public opinion **Vol. 2:** 308
Vol. 3: 481, 757
Public speaker **Vol. 2:** 369
Publican **Vol. 3:** 253, 361
Publication **Vol. 3:** 311
Publicly **Vol. 3:** 75
Publish **Vol. 1:** 71, 572
Vol. 2: 108
Publius **Vol. 1:** 690
Puffed up **Vol. 1:** 107
Vol. 2: 253, 422
Vol. 3: 1119
Pun **Vol. 2:** **432**
Vol. 3: 1096
Punctilious **Vol. 3:** 1053
Punish **Vol. 1:** 189, 332, 381, 509, 568, 688, 735
Vol. 2: 101, 140 f., 155, 189, 226, 266, 363, 510
Vol. 3: 76, **92–100**, 165, 342, 354, 358, 740, 839, 847, 1151, 1054
Punishment **Vol. 1:** 85, 107, 109, 113, 125, 141, 162 f., 190 f., 195, 219, 241, 264, 288, 308, 329, 333, 345, 354, 380, 391 f., 394, 396, 398, 403, 414–416, 418, 432–434, 436, 438, 444, 448, 450 f., 465 f., 529, 537, 555, 562, 564, 568 f., 572, 586, 607, 623, 655–657, 686–688, 698–700, 721, 734
Vol. 2: 29, 117, 136, 138, 141–143, 149, 157, 192, 206–209, 212, 265 f., 272, 275, 285, **362–367**, 370, 415, 428, 439, 458 f., 478, 481, 570, 572, 630, 667, 775, 779, 792 f., 807, 823
Vol. 3: **92–100**, 110, 134–136, 138–140, 145, 149 f., 156, 190, 214, 257, 260, 273, 305, 353, 357, 377, 381, 394, 439, 448, 502, 527,

573 f., 578, 583, 590 f., 594, 714, 719, 721, 751, 809, 836, 842, 856 f., 905, 932, 936, 1008, 1149
Punitive **Vol. 1:** 414
Vol. 2: 167, 201
Vol. 3: 999
Puny **Vol. 1:** 673
Pupil **Vol. 1:** 69, 280, 282, 285, 287, 480–487, 492, 617
Vol. 2: 151, 291, 428, 445
Vol. 3: **759–765, 771 f.**
Purchase **Vol. 1:** 93, 606
Purchaser **Vol. 1:** 120
Pure **Vol. 1:** 143, 205, 220, 223–225, 284, 351, 368, 447, 469, 495, 502, 512, 521, 542, 544 f., 552, 604, 640
Vol. 2: 102, 144, 178, 183, 224 f., 227, 237 f., 249, 270, 357, 810
Vol. 3: **100–108**, 125, 167, 207, 220, 261, 348, 470, 932, 989 f., 992, 997, 1053
Purgatory **Vol. 1:** 656
Vol. 2: 208
Purge **Vol. 1:** 151, 537
Vol. 3: 97, 104, 419
Purge away **Vol. 3:** 152
Purification **Vol. 1:** 119, 143, 145, 149–151, 153 f., 221, 223, 225, 371, 432, 612, 654 f., 677
Vol. 2: 149, 225, 228, 307, 336, 472, 485, 623, 690
Vol. 3: **100–102**, 695, 740, 784, 793, 823, 842, 982, 986, 1053, 1058, 1085, 1154
Purificatory **Vol. 2:** 811, 854
Vol. 3: 149, 579
Purify **Vol. 1:** 116, 154, 204, 221, 224, 543, 654, 657
Vol. 2: 230, 235, 266, 289, 307, 326, 360, 423, 675, 717
Vol. 3: **100–108**, 149, 152, 167, 315, 419, 572, 809, 912
Purim **Vol. 1:** 626
Vol. 3: 237
Puritanical **Vol. 1:** 687
Purity **Vol. 1:** 152, 204, 284, 294, 360, 413, 448, 499, 653
Vol. 2: 51, 95, 143 f., 183, 244, 311, 503, 596, 742
Vol. 3: 35, **100–108**, 431, 886, 926, 988, 1055
Purple **Vol. 1:** 205, 317, 361
Purpose **Vol. 1:** 69, 74, 80 f., 87, 99, 127, 219, 243, 275, 278, 355, 357, 383, 392, 426, 459, 474 f., 483, 506, 510, 536–538, 540 f., 543, 550, 562, 569, 577, 597, 612, 625, 632, 638, 654 f., 668 f., 696 f., 737
Vol. 2: 52, 79, 92, 94, 106, 121 f., 139, 145, 154, 218, 231, 251, 287, 294, 299, 362, 384, 396, 403, 420, 434, 477, 487, 546, 610, 668, 718, 721, 818 f., 926
Vol. 3: 168, 172, 181, 212, 214, 228, 236, 251 f., 293, 316, 323, 332, 389, 468, 502–504, 542, 645, 656, 728, 779, 820, 824 f., 911, 916, 925, 1000 f., 1016 f., 1183
Purposeful **Vol. 1:** 533, 692, 694
Purposelessness **Vol. 2:** 569
Purse **Vol. 1:** 142
Vol. 3: 120, 498 f., 954
Pursue **Vol. 1:** 481, 648 f., 681
Vol. 2: 317, **805–807**
Put asunder **Vol. 3:** 542
Put away **Vol. 1:** 202, 479, 505 f., 606, 662, 731
Put forward **Vol. 1:** 696
Put in charge **Vol. 1:** 471
Put in motion **Vol. 1:** 697
Put in order **Vol. 1:** 521, 524
Vol. 3: **349–351**
Put in prison **Vol. 3:** **590 f.**
Put off **Vol. 1:** 311, 314 f., 469, 676
Vol. 2: 318
Vol. 3: 815, 839, 1158
Put on **Vol. 1:** 158, 311, 314–316, 386, 470, 674
Vol. 2: 127, 264, 587, 925
Vol. 3: 120
Put on oath **Vol. 3:** 737–743
Put on trial **Vol. 3:** **798–808**
Put out **Vol. 3:** 109
Put to death **Vol. 2:** 441
Vol. 3: 1158
Put to shame **Vol. 3:** 98, **562–564**
Put to silence **Vol. 3:** 1026
Put to the test **Vol. 3:** **798–808**
Putrefaction **Vol. 3:** 444 f.
Pyrrhus **Vol. 1:** 205, 656
Pythagoras **Vol. 3:** 635
Pythagorean **Vol. 1:** 432, 484, 640, 642
Vol. 3: 103, 259, 678, 739, 843, 929, 1085
Pythia **Vol. 3:** 75 f.
Pythian priestess **Vol. 1:** 734
Python **Vol. 1:** 508
Vol. 2: **552–562**

Q source **Vol. 1:** 62 f., 67, 402
Vol. 2: 341, 872
Qerioth **Vol. 2:** 321
Qoheleth **Vol. 1:** 512
Quack **Vol. 3:** 32
Quadratus **Vol. 3:** 40
Quail **Vol. 1:** 173, 195, 252, 460, 672
Vol. 2: 32, 628, 637
Vol. 3: 427, 508, 804, 1001
Qualification **Vol. 1:** 198, 297, 500, 538 f., 597
Vol. 2: 299, 424, 440
Vol. 3: 49, 393, 750, 765, 924, 1044
Qualificatory formula **Vol. 2:** **279**
Qualified **Vol. 3:** **728–730**
Qualifier **Vol. 3:** 99, 1133
Qualify **Vol. 1:** 648, 715
Vol. 2: 228
Vol. 3: **728–730**
Qualitative **Vol. 2:** 424, 670, 739, 891
Quality **Vol. 1:** 272, 284, 314 f., 459, 485, 491, 525, 538, 557, 596, 603, 617, 658, 711, 722, 739
Vol. 2: 101, 120, 128, 151 f., 197, 200, 235, 237, 256, 398, 657, 661, 683, 685, 774
Vol. 3: 351, 354, 444 f., 572, 681, 832, 925
Quantitative **Vol. 2:** 424, 891
Quantity **Vol. 1:** 728
Vol. 2: 128, 130 f., 683, 685, 801

Quarantine **Vol. 2:** 465
Quarrel **Vol. 1:** 106, 108, 377, 503 f., 535, 644–646, 654
Vol. 2: 140, 363, 429, 447, 587, 645
Vol. 3: 346, 448, 532
Quarrelsome **Vol. 2:** 550
Vol. 3: 821
Quart **Vol. 2:** 711
Quarter **Vol. 2:** 689
Quarterly **Vol. 1:** 627
Quartodecimans **Vol. 1:** 634
Quartz **Vol. 3:** 396
Quasi-egalitarian **Vol. 1:** 641
Quasi-divine claim **Vol. 2:** 380
Quasi-personal **Vol. 1:** 437
Queen **Vol. 2:** **372–389**, 511
Queen of heaven **Vol. 3:** 1070
Queen of the South **Vol. 2:** 381, 680
Vol. 3: 1030
Quell **Vol. 3:** **109–111**
Quench **Vol. 2:** 275
Vol. 3: **109–111**, 966, 988
Question **Vol. 1:** 413, 540, 577, 583 f., 725
Vol. 2: 101, 141, 144, 235, 266, 270, 334, 342, 362, 364, 374, 379, 382, 384, 387, 393 f., 396 f., 399, 426, 430, 434, 469, 707, 857, **879–881**
Vol. 3: 75, 97, 531, 556, 657, 777, 821, 1066
Questionable **Vol. 2:** 266
Questioner **Vol. 3:** 275
Quick at apprehending **Vol. 3:** **130–133**
Quicken **Vol. 3:** 163
Quiet **Vol. 1:** 210, 420, 469, 529, 630, 681
Vol. 2: 218
Vol. 3: **111–114**, 254 f., 1078
Quieten **Vol. 2:** 260
Quintessence **Vol. 3:** 690
Quirinius **Vol. 2:** 320
Quiver **Vol. 2:** 422
Vol. 3: 379, 557
Qumran **Vol. 1:** 50, 54, 65, **67**, 89, 96, 98, 102 f., 109, 144 f., 152, 178, 190, 197, 212, 219, 225, 233, 255, 258 f., 273, 280, 288, 296, 305, 309, 321 f., 333 f., 345, 355, 357, 360, 367 f., 374, 382, 394, 407, 412, 416, 423, 444, 450, 452, 463, 465, 481, 499, 523, 539, 544, 554, 556, 563, 578, 598 f., 607, 618 f., 627, 629 f., 641, 646, 656, 661, 673, 676, 700, 732, 735
Vol. 2: 45, 53 f., 56, 58, 61, 71 f., 100, 105, 117 f., 134, 141 f., 158, 161, 174, 194, 197, 199, 216, 227 f., 237, 241, 248 f., 257 f., 261, 263, 279, 285, 298 f., 302, 312–314, 335, 337, 353, 357, 364, 397, 459, 471 f., 480 f., 492, 512, 522, 542, 558, 565, 591, 595, 602, 609, 614, 640, 651, 667, 672, 696, 699, 707, 738, 779, 792 f., 798, 818, 824, 836, 851, 893, 897, 899
Vol. 3: 28, 30 f., 34, 39, 52, 80, 82, 88, 96, 105, 160 f., 169, 187, 193–195, 197, 210, 218, 233, 250, 265, 268, 272 f., 359, 367, 382, 384, 392, 398, 428, 465, 469–472, 479, 484–486, 489 f., 492, 495, 499, 503, 508, 510, 531, 533, 545, 566, 610, 614–616, 637, 647, 650, 652, 669, 671, 680, 692 f., 695, 722, 735, 761, 766, 783 f., 801 f., 823, 828, 831, 836, 842, 871 f., 874, 882–885, 926, 928 f., 933, 939, 941–943, 949, 961, 963, 1006, 1016, 1020, 1029, 1068, 1107, 1120, 1149, 1165, 1167
Qumran calendar **Vol. 1:** 627
Qumran canon **Vol. 3:** **486 f.**
Quotation **Vol. 1:** 736 f.
Vol. 2: 186, 444
Vol. 3: 48, 52, 82, 188, 202, 393, 488, 563, 611, 650 f., 718, 732, 764, 790, 805, 826, 887, 1011, **1038–1050**, 1090

Ra'amses **Vol. 2:** **635 f.**
Rabbi **Vol. 1:** **67**, 69, 213, 259, 360, 368, 370, 409, 442, 451, 486, 488, 491, 527, 560, 581, 656, 688 f., 691
Vol. 2: 47, 125, 159, 174, 191, 208, 241, 261, 266, 327, 337, 358, 399, 432, 448, 514, 544, 549, 580, 629, 640, 652, 665, 721, 757, 818
Vol. 3: 51, 59, 80, 87, 113, **115 f.**, 188, 194, 358, 377, 408, 480–482, 657, 696, 748, 761 f., 765–767, 774, 780, 805, 853, 867, 872 f., 949, 997, 1042, 1058, 1063, 1116, 1121, 1152, 1163
Rabbinic **Vol. 1:** 371, 599
Vol. 2: 100, 192 f., 204, 227, 250, 261, 287, 353, 355, 357, 893
Vol. 3: 45, 194, 218, 429, 740, 779, 1066
Rabbinic formula **Vol. 3:** 429
Rabbinic parables **Vol. 2:** 433
Rabbinic schools **Vol. 3:** 777
Rabbinic theology **Vol. 1:** **67**, 321, 619
Vol. 2: 426, 791, 824, 864
Rabbinical oath **Vol. 3:** 740
Rabbinism **Vol. 1:** 64, **67**, 69
Vol. 2: 671
Rabble-rouser **Vol. 1:** 267
Rabshakeh **Vol. 3:** 202
Race **Vol. 1:** 176, 541, 548, 637, 647, 649, 662, 684 f.
Vol. 2: 35, 195, 221, 247, 411
Vol. 3: 142, 635, 865, **945–947**
Rachel **Vol. 1:** 170
Vol. 2: 317 f., 578
Vol. 3: 113, 233, 872, 1057
Racial **Vol. 2:** 309
Racial differences **Vol. 2:** 83
Radiance **Vol. 2:** 44, 46, 213, 284, **289 f.**
Vol. 3: 398, 862, 864
Radiant **Vol. 2:** **484–486**
Radiate **Vol. 2:** 44, 355, 484
Radiate heat **Vol. 3:** 689
Radical **Vol. 1:** 598, 730
Vol. 2: 427
Rag-picker **Vol. 3:** 525
Rage **Vol. 1:** 105 f., 108, 528, 543, 608
Vol. 2: 421, 652
Vol. 3: 76, 908
Rahab **Vol. 1:** 523, 593, 713
Vol. 2: 142
Vol. 3: 30, 369 f., 656 f., 1062, 1067
Rahner, K. **Vol. 3:** 900 f.

Raider **Vol. 3:** 377
Rail at **Vol. 3: 345 f.**
Railer **Vol. 3: 345 f.**
Railing **Vol. 3: 345 f.**
Raiment **Vol. 1:** 204, 319, 708
Rain **Vol. 1:** 187, 209, 416, 498, 513, 517, 543, 597, 614, 653, 743
Vol. 2: 154, 188 f., 191, 193, 211, 265, 274, 866
Vol. 3: 117, 267, 269, 360, 692, 835, 846, 982, **1000–1004**
Rainbow **Vol. 2:** 626
Vol. 3: 398, **1000–1004**
Raise **Vol. 1:** 103, 125, 234, 236, 261, 265, 346, 384, 399–401, 430, 437, 439, 443, 445, 470, 592, 643, 653, 668, 673, 718
Vol. 2: 78, 80, 91, 190, 192, **200–204**, 206, 217, 252, 312, 358, 363, 388, 399, 446, 481, 631, 641, 718, 865
Vol. 3: 113, **259–281**, 715
Raise hand **Vol. 3:** 738
Raise voice **Vol. 2:** 201
Ram **Vol. 1:** 677
Vol. 3: 155 f., 191, 421, 425
Ramah **Vol. 3:** 426
Ramoth-gilead **Vol. 2:** 754
Ramp **Vol. 2:** 185
Rampart **Vol. 3: 951 f.**
Ram's horn **Vol. 3:** 873
Ramsey, F.P. **Vol. 3:** 897
Ramsey, I.T. **Vol. 3:** 99, 336, 1133 f.
Rank **Vol. 1:** 123, 165, 192 f., 197, 200, 272 f., 532, 664–669, 687
Vol. 2: 55, 57, 59, 158, 234, 298, 424, 436, 451, 720, 800
Vol. 3: 120, 630, 653, 717
Ransom **Vol. 1:** 96 f., 223, 308, 322, 438, 479
Vol. 2: 42, 367, 795
Vol. 3: 153, 157, 174, **177–221**, 267, 429, 435, 547, 612, 623, 673, 682, 935, 1180
Ransom money **Vol. 3:** 167, 752
Ransom price **Vol. 3:** 166
Rapacious **Vol. 3: 601–605**
Rapacity **Vol. 1:** 495
Vol. 3: 601–605
Rape **Vol. 1:** 505
Vol. 2: 260, 577
Vol. 3: 95, 601, 711, 872
Raphael **Vol. 1:** 102
Rapid **Vol. 1:** 610
Rapt **Vol. 1:** 529
Rapture **Vol. 1:** 545, 673
Vol. 2: 352, 359, 482, 862
Vol. 3: 601–605
Ras Shamra **Vol. 3:** 267, 269, 427
Rash **Vol. 1:** 364
Ratification **Vol. 2:** 59, 374
Ratify **Vol. 1:** 664
Vol. 2: 659, 673
Vol. 3: 739
Ration money **Vol. 3:** 379
Rational **Vol. 1:** 353, 481, 521, 582, 676, 680, 692
Vol. 2: 181, 230, 287, 339, 390 f., 659
Vol. 3: 434, 681, 1081–1119
Rationalism **Vol. 1:** 694
Vol. 3: 898
Rationalist **Vol. 3:** 305
Rationality **Vol. 3:** 1034
Rationalize **Vol. 2:** 67
Rations **Vol. 3:** 134
Rave **Vol. 1:** 528
Vol. 3: 230
Raven **Vol. 1:** 173, 408 f.
Ravenous **Vol. 3: 601–605**
Ravish **Vol. 3:** 601
Razis **Vol. 3:** 271
Re **Vol. 2:** 200, 279
Reach **Vol. 1:** 730
Vol. 3: 727
Reach decisions **Vol. 3:** 880
Reaction **Vol. 1:** 528, 530, 561, 585, 603, 688
Vol. 2: 125, 373, 416, 422, 434 f., 568, 621
Vol. 3: 479
Read **Vol. 1:** 245, 247, 536, 628
Vol. 2: 213, 218, 309, 357, 369
Vol. 3: 489, 492, 761, 1058
Reader **Vol. 1:** 685
Vol. 3: 766
Readily **Vol. 3: 116–118**
Readiness **Vol. 1:** 514, 634, 646, 699, 702
Vol. 2: 105, 122, 307, 386, 433, 448, 654, 668, 717, 880
Readmission **Vol. 2:** 152
Ready **Vol. 1:** 358, 475, 482 f., 489, 516, 546, 612, 690, 700, 712
Vol. 2: 244, 366
Vol. 3: 116–122, 352, 605, 628, 1059
Ready-made **Vol. 2:** 442
Reaffirm **Vol. 1:** 664
Real **Vol. 1:** 80, 711 f.
Vol. 2: 135, 194 f., 280, 286, 393
Vol. 3: 874–901
Real presence **Vol. 3:** 244, 245
Reality **Vol. 1:** 436, 461, 551, 563, 601, 620, 629, 640, 662, 673, 679, 703 f., 707–709, 711, 714, 719
Vol. 2: 120 f., 166, 186, 281 f., 284, 287, 291, 308, 311, 314 f., 366, 375, 382, 395, 404 f., 430, 448, 663
Vol. 3: 234, 461, 631, 693, 726, 776, 839, 841, 846, **874–901**, 1034, 1139 f.
Realization **Vol. 1:** 597, 697, 699, 703, 711, 713, 740
• **Vol. 2:** 59, 65, 240, 300, 313, 382 f., 385, 389, 406, 446
Realized eschatology (→ Eschatology, realized)
Realm **Vol. 1:** 707, 718, 738
Vol. 2: 74
Reanimation **Vol. 1:** 184
Vol. 3: 303
Reap **Vol. 1:** 469, 681, 719
Vol. 2: 34
Vol. 3: 189, **525–527**
Reaper **Vol. 1:** 204, 453
Vol. 2: 32
Vol. 3: 143, **525–527**
Rear **Vol. 1:** 287, 492

Re-arrange **Vol. 1:** 576
Reason **Vol. 1:** 63, 68, 107, 232, 281, 355 f., 413, 432, 450, 460, 481, 507, 521, 527, 529, 547, 562, 595, 636, 650, 654, 671, 674, 693, 708
Vol. 2: 67, 130, 137–139, 141, 143 f., 157, 179 f., 182, 259, 356, 374, 408, 476, 493, 565, 567, 590, 657, 722
Vol. 3: 35, 76, 98, **122–133**, 337, 572, 677 f., 681, 684, 687, 776, **820 f.**, 823 f., 826, 899, 1026, 1034, 1036
Reasonable **Vol. 1:** 501 f.
Vol. 2: 476
Vol. 3: **1081–1119**
Reasoning **Vol. 3:** **820 f.**
Reassurance **Vol. 1:** 104, 590
Rebekah **Vol. 1:** 81
Vol. 2: 316 f., 587
Vol. 3: 879, 1057, 1069
Rebel **Vol. 1:** 202, 294, 438, 537, 606
Vol. 2: 174
Vol. 3: 357, 916
Rebellion **Vol. 1:** 51, 142, 203, 270, 436, 468, 535, 606 f., 680, 741
Vol. 2: 227, 311, 396, 432, 435, 566, 617, 638, 702, 722
Vol. 3: 218, 275, 363, 577, 585, 642, 954, 1025
Rebellious **Vol. 1:** 372, 385
Vol. 2: 448
Rebirth **Vol. 1:** 176, 178, 181, 184 f., 187, 284, 290, 521
Vol. 2: 113, 202, 242, 244, 394, 604
Vol. 3: 703, 722, 791
Rebuild **Vol. 1:** 734
Vol. 2: 252
Vol. 3: 469
Rebuke **Vol. 1:** 340, 425, **567–573**
Vol. 2: 140 f.
Vol. 3: 344
Recalcitrant **Vol. 3:** 916
Recall **Vol. 1:** 683
Vol. 2: 32
Vol. 3: **230–247**, 515
Recapitulate **Vol. 2:** 156, 163
Receipt **Vol. 2:** 433
Receive **Vol. 1:** 123, 185, 285, 300, 487, 597, 601, 605, 607, 620, 639, 668, 673, 675, 677, 689 f., 702, 722, 730 f., 742
Vol. 2: 83, 116, 123, 131, 146, 156, 186, 194, 221, 231, 238, **244–246**, 255, 268, 300, 302, 329, 358, 369, 381 f., 385, 388, 403, 406 f., 440, 447, 775, 843, 868, 929
Vol. 3: 61, 326, 541, **744–751**, 759, 806
Receive share **Vol. 3:** **747–751**
Received text **Vol. 1:** 70
Receiver **Vol. 3:** 417
Receiving **Vol. 3:** **747–751**
Receptacle **Vol. 3:** 744
Reception **Vol. 1:** 534, 599 f., 737
Vol. 3: 744–751
Receptive **Vol. 3:** 758
Receptivity **Vol. 2:** 178, 269
Rechabites **Vol. 3:** 565, 811, 919, 1005
Recipient **Vol. 1:** 739
Vol. 2: 435
Reciprocal **Vol. 2:** 51
Reciprocity **Vol. 3:** 829
Recitation **Vol. 2:** 174
Recite **Vol. 3:** 668
Reckless **Vol. 1:** 715
Recklessness **Vol. 1:** 710
Vol. 3: 776
Reckon **Vol. 1:** 311, 472, 596, 600, 627, 630, 675
Vol. 2: 427, 445, 458
Vol. 3: 136, 369, **820–826**
Reclaim **Vol. 2:** 858
Recline **Vol. 1:** 471, 633
Vol. 3: 588 f.
Recognition **Vol. 1:** 245, 347, 486–488, 516, 522, 529, 541, 543, 568, 588, 594 f., 603, 607, 616, 620, 631, 643, 731, 742
Vol. 2: 44, 48, 118, 147, 244, 335, **392–406**, 407, 815–817, 859
Vol. 3: 401, 675, 817, 911, 1043
Recognition formula **Vol. 2:** **279**
Recognize **Vol. 1:** 708, 722, 728
Vol. 2: 127, 155, 160 f., 282, 289, 300, 314, 328, 352, 363, 365, 378, **392–407**, 438, 443, 448, 739
Vol. 3: 118, 232, 511, 582, 717, 749, 822, 844
Recoil **Vol. 1:** 606
Recollection **Vol. 1:** 483
Vol. 3: 1038, 1043
Recommend **Vol. 1:** 65, 246, 248, 690
Vol. 2: 263, 743
Recommendation **Vol. 3:** 499
Recompense **Vol. 1:** 217, 240, 648
Vol. 2: 41, 115
Vol. 3: **92–97**, **134–145**, 190, 1149
Reconcile **Vol. 3:** **145–176**, 227
Reconciliation **Vol. 1:** 89, 97, 107, 113, 167, 197, 222–224, 237, 275, 279, 298, 304, 385, 398, 401 f., 415, 430, 437, 477, 521, 525, 544, 666, 694, 697, 699–703, 740
Vol. 2: 42, 83, 137, 195, 318, 366, 370, 545, 585, 604, 614, 781 f., 827, 875
Vol. 3: **145–176**, 180, 186, 188, 190, 192 f., 195 f., 198 f., 221, 228, 320, 363 f., 372, 374, 419, 423, 425, 428, 431, 435 f., 535, 547, 575, 579, 581, 586, 611, 680, 720, 723, 725, 751, 781, 788, 797, 812, 815, 824 f., 956
Reconnoitre **Vol. 1:** 481
Reconsecration **Vol. 1:** 626
Reconstitute **Vol. 1:** 698
Reconstitution **Vol. 3:** 275
Record **Vol. 1:** 242, 544, 582
Vol. 3: 236, **482–495**, 757
Recording angel **Vol. 1:** 104
Recount **Vol. 1:** 574
Vol. 3: 1081
Recover **Vol. 1:** 446
Vol. 3: 254
Recovery **Vol. 1:** 611
Vol. 2: 163
Vol. 3: 279, 357, 997
Recreate **Vol. 2:** 193

Recreation **Vol. 1:** 147, 175
Vol. 3: 254
Red **Vol. 1:** 84, **203–206**, 224, 653, 656 f.
Vol. 2: 496
Vol. 3: 40, 143, 347, 349, 360, 362, 396
Red heifer **Vol. 2:** 32
Vol. 3: 104, 989
Red Sea **Vol. 1:** 149, 373, 381, 516
Vol. 2: 134, 637
Vol. 3: 77, 238, 674, 983 f., 986, 990
Redaction **Vol. 1:** 57, **67**, 68
Redaction criticism **Vol. 1:** 57, **67**
Vol. 3: 58, 63
Redaktionsgeschichte **Vol. 1: 67**
Rededication **Vol. 3:** 165
Redeem **Vol. 1:** 267, 282, 317, 413, 438, 468, 518, 525, 617, 634, 668, 678, 694, 697, 738
Vol. 2: 60, 79, 226, 274, 358, 394, 405, 411, 441, 675, 865
Vol. 3: 158, **177–221**, 625, 407, 784, 939
Redeemer **Vol. 1:** 54, 133, 148, 152, 187, 214, 227, 230, 253, 320, 434, 438, 455, 526, 547, 669, 672
Vol. 2: 60, 111 f., 158, 195, 202, 209, 242, 249, 280, 330, 453, 640 f., 645 f., 655, 865, 867, 877
Vol. 3: 178, **189–200**, 202, 231 f., 582, 598, 642, 936, 940, 1116
Redeemer-myth **Vol. 2:** 645 f.
Vol. 3: 643
Redemption **Vol. 1:** 53, 57 f., 64, 123, 125, 142, 145–148, 150, 158, 191, 210, 214, 219, 223 f., 230, 233, 238, 268, 301, 313 f., 320, 371 f., 380 f., 385, 397 f., 409, 417, 436, 438, 440, 464, 470, 518, 525, 538 f., 541, 545, 552, 596, 611, 617 f., 629, 631, 633 f., 638, 669, 697, 701, 703, 716, 722, 730
Vol. 2: 37, 39, 42 f., 54, 78 f., 101, 111, 120, 122, 145, 158, 195, 202, 204, 229 f., 243, 302, 307, 343, 388, 425, 435, 509, 521, 565, 601, 611, 631, 777, 780, 798, 819, 866, 877, 883 f., 912
Vol. 3: 163, 174, **177–221**, 228, 235, 253, 261, 277, 320, 329, 355, 372, 374, 412, 417, 420, 429, 435 f., 462, 484, 491 f., 502, 529, 537, 544, 546, 575, 586, 588, 596, 611, 682, 723, 725, 781, 795, 797, 836, 956, 1006, 1135
Redemptive **Vol. 1:** 496, 651
Vol. 2: 355, 445, 672, 713
Vol. 3: 105, 232, 235–238, 318, 721, 724
Redirect **Vol. 1:** 480, 485, 568
Reduce **Vol. 2:** 308
Redundancy theory of truth **Vol. 3: 897**
Reed **Vol. 3:** 110, 399, 559
Re-establish **Vol. 1:** 627, 664
Vol. 2: 313
Vol. 3: 146–148
Refashion **Vol. 3:** 912
Referee **Vol. 2:** 362
Reference **Vol. 1:** 680
Refine **Vol. 1:** 146
Vol. 2: 96, 419, 490
Reflect **Vol. 1:** 105 f., 712
Vol. 2: 75, 284, 390
Vol. 3: 231, 398, 512
Reflection **Vol. 1:** 105 f., 353, 540, 583 f., 612, 699, 707, 719
Vol. 2: 103, 284, **289 f.**, 392, 923
Vol. 3: 122, 126, 508, 531, 554, 1083
Reflective **Vol. 1:** 502
Reflex **Vol. 2:** 568
Reform **Vol. 1:** 427, 632, 687
Vol. 3: 1096
Reformation **Vol. 1:** 200, 603
Vol. 2: 823
Vol. 3: 351 f., 371
Reformed faith **Vol. 3:** 783
Reforms of Hezekiah **Vol. 3:** 853
Refrain **Vol. 1:** 587, 727, 734
Vol. 2: 286, 312
Refresh **Vol. 3:** 254 f., 686
Refreshment **Vol. 1:** 420, 441, 513, 729
Vol. 2: 274, 281, 355, 590, 600
Vol. 3: 682
Refuge **Vol. 1:** 174, 327, 531 f., 559, 589, 653, 687
Vol. 2: 91, 215, 240, 307, 471, 602, 779, 801
Vol. 3: 380 f., 389, 1009, 1011
Refusal **Vol. 2:** 155, 223
Vol. 3: 57
Refuse **Vol. 1:** 272, 308, 324, 400, 414, 419, 424, 454 f., **479 f.**, 545, 600, 629, 684, 688 f., 696
Vol. 2: 86, 126, 175, 179, 222, 296, 314, 340, 351, 358, 400, 405 f., 781, **855–859**
Vol. 3: 102–108, 325, 758, 1014, 1019
Refuse to listen **Vol. 3:** 950
Refute **Vol. 1:** 199, 504, 545, 688
Vol. 2: 140, 152
Regain **Vol. 2:** 123
Regard **Vol. 1:** 675, 710
Vol. 2: 261, 286, 310, 364, 438
Vol. 3: 126, **561 f.**
Regard favourably **Vol. 2: 817–820**
Regeneration **Vol. 1:** 147, 153 f., 158, 160, **176–188**, 290, 616
Vol. 2: 836
Vol. 3: 220, 705, 1178
Region **Vol. 1:** 472, 742
Register **Vol. 1:** 243, 544
Registrar **Vol. 3:** 477
Regret **Vol. 1:** 356, 357, 467, 741
Vol. 2: 420, 598
Regularity **Vol. 3:** 1086
Regularize **Vol. 2:** 439
Regulate **Vol. 1:** 365
Vol. 2: 254, 366, 436, 442, 447, 447, 452
Regulation **Vol. 1:** 327, 330, 367, 370, 401, 439, 457, 521, 525, 677, 687, 689
Vol. 2: 123, 134, 259, 270, 298, 447 f., 453, 461, 659, 666
Vol. 3: 106, **352–377**
Rehabilitation **Vol. 3:** 51
Rehoboam **Vol. 1:** 170, 195, 510
Vol. 3: 788
Rehoboth-Ir **Vol. 1:** 140
Reign **Vol. 1:** 234, 440, 467, 640, 643, 653
Vol. 2: 64, 109, 147, 240, 248, 308, 326,

Reign (*cont'd*)
372–389, 701, 775, 832
Vol. 3: 45, 143, 259
Reign of Christ **Vol. 1:** 52, 649
Vol. 2: 62, 98
Vol. 3: 204
Reign of God **Vol. 1:** 121, 185, 489
Vol. 2: 54, 326, 871
Reign of sin **Vol. 1:** 457
Reimarus, H.S. **Vol. 2:** 902 f.
Vol. 3: 291, 977
Reincarnation **Vol. 3:** 146
Reinstate **Vol. 3:** 147
Reinterpretation **Vol. 2:** 276, 339
Reisenfeld, H. **Vol. 3:** 59
Reiterate **Vol. 2:** 317
Reject **Vol. 1: 73 f.**, 239, 336, 356, 359, 370, 372, 375, 386, 399, 424 f., 453–455, 462, 464, 486, 499, 504, 532, 538–542, 544, 554–557, 569, 590, 610, 625, 631, 638, 643 f., 646, 666, 678, 681, 693, 715, 730, 733
Vol. 2: 82 f., 147, 229, 272, 309, 327, 368, 377, 400, 407, 417, 438, 449, 585, 622 f., 629, 709, 712, 794, 917
Vol. 3: 136, 202, 252, 344, 388, 390, 393, 430, 468, 533, 560, 624, 642, 723, 751, 807, **808–810**, 821, 1043–1045, 1096
Rejection **Vol. 2:** 135, 155, 159, 270, 291, 315, 374, 385, 407, 600, 680, 843 f., 916
Vol. 3: 168, 251, 580, 586, 628, 745, 790, 908, 920
Rejoice **Vol. 1:** 741
Vol. 2: 243, **352–361**, 420, 436, 517
Vol. 3: 128, 257, 955
Rejoicing **Vol. 1:** 99, 227, 625
Rejuvenate **Vol. 3:** 869
Relate **Vol. 1:** 573, 576
Vol. 2: 280
Vol. 3: 45
Relationship **Vol. 1:** 84 f., 192, 236, 240, 254–259, 269–271, 280, 282, 285–287, 289, 300–302, 316, 332, 343 f., 349, 357 f., 365–369, 371, 373 f., 384 f., 409, 420, 433 f., 442, 455, 459, 469, 472, 480–482, 484–486, 488, 491, 496, 498 f., 501, 522 f., 525, 528, 535, 547, 549, 551, 553, 583, 585, 587 f., 595–597, 601, 604, 606 f., 615–618, 620, 622, 624, 636–640, 643, 662, 667, 672 f., 675, 678, 680 f., 686, 690, 693, 698, 701, 704, 707, 709, 711, 714 f., 730
Vol. 2: 44, 50 f., 71, 75 f., 80, 84, 94, 99 f., 117, 121, 131, 133, 135, 160, 162, 178, 184 f., 200, 206, 217, 220, 222 f., 230, 237, 242, 256, 260, 268, 272, 275 f., 287, 289, 295 f., 298, 301, 307, 317 f., 334, 336, 340, 349, 366, 391–393, 395 f., 398, 400, 404, 413, 430, 432, 438 f., 458, 479, 481, 503, 510 f., 516–518, 534 f., 539–543, 545 f., 548, 569 f., 579–590, 593, 605, 612, 619, 626, 648, 667, 707, 735, 738, 742, 772, 777, 779, 781 f., 786, 794, 798, 806, 812, 832, 834, 843, 858, 862, 871, 873, 877, 919 f., 928
Vol. 3: 27, 31, 33, 42, 72, 79, 98, 118, 136, 138, 140, 144 f., 153, 157, 162, 166, 168, 187, 191, 199, 212–214, 219, 224–226, 235, 237, 253, 268, 300, 335 f., 340, 348, 351, 268, 300, 335 f., 340, 348, 351, 355–357, 372 f., 377, 400, 407, 411, 415, 417, 430, 444 f., 454, 459, 468, 472, 505, 512, 517, 524, 527, 531, **535–543**, 550, 552, 562 f., 567, 572, 574 f., 578, 584, 586, **589–599**, 607–664, 678, 680, 684 f., 695, 701, 759, 761, 767, 777, 783, 793, 803, 824, 828, 836, 838, 847, 859, 861, 864, 870, 873, 887, **903–906**, 913, 917, 928, 944, 980, 1056 f., 1062–1065, 1067 f., 1070 f., 1078 f., 1081 f., 1085, 1158, 1161, 1167, 1185, 1204 f.
Relative **Vol. 2:** 43, 53, 225, 418, 538, **547–550**, 737
Relativism **Vol. 1:** 60, 550
Vol. 3: 895, 899, 901, 1143
Relativization **Vol. 2:** 439
Relax **Vol. 1:** 513, 527, 698
Vol. 3: 111, 178, 183, 254
Relearn **Vol. 1:** 708
Release **Vol. 1:** 173, 429, 431, 438, 505, 508, 576–578, 613, 697 f., 701
Vol. 2: 121, 149, 378, 457, 858
Vol. 3: 158, **166–174, 177–221,** 227, 256, 424, 592, 677
Release life **Vol. 3:** 424
Relevant **Vol. 1:** 681
Reliable **Vol. 1:** 99, 595, 658–660
Vol. 2: 626
Vol. 3: 862, 880
Reliance **Vol. 1:** 372, 461, 546, 680, 713
Vol. 2: 340
Relief **Vol. 1:** 473
Vol. 2: 107, 600, 681
Vol. 3: 111, 206, 255, 874, 904
Relieve **Vol. 3:** 119
Religion **Vol. 1:** 450, 453, 552, 686
Vol. 2: 85, 91, 103, 124, 453, 669
Vol. 3: 50, 75, 113, **549–551**
Religiosity **Vol. 2:** 340
Religious **Vol. 1:** 69, 643, 688
Vol. 2: 85, 90–92, 234, 237–239, 259, 287, 315, 325, 349 f., 353, 438 f., 659, 738, 887
Vol. 3: 349
Religious formula **Vol. 2:** 278
Relinquish **Vol. 1:** 505
Reluctance **Vol. 2:** 156, 829, 856
Reluctant **Vol. 1:** 459
Vol. 2: 435
Rely **Vol. 1:** 588 f., 596 f., 730
Vol. 2: 226, 240
Rely on **Vol. 3: 254–258**
Remain **Vol. 1:** 676, 686, 713, 738
Vol. 2: 297, 328, 546, 764, 772
Vol. 3: 223–230, 258, 537, 543, 588
Remain in **Vol. 3: 223–230**
Remain longer **Vol. 3: 224–229**
Remainder **Vol. 3:** 248
Remaining **Vol. 3: 247–253**
Remarkable **Vol. 2: 621–626**
Remarriage **Vol. 1:** 500, 506 f.
Vol. 2: 563 f., 583
Vol. 3: 95, 173, **535–543,** 1074 f.

(*also* → Second marriage)
Remedy **Vol. 2: 552–562**
Remember **Vol. 1:** 582, 679
Vol. 2: 206, 318, 533, 649, 871
Vol. 3: 173, 221, **230–247,** 405, 423, 780, 800
Remembrance **Vol. 1:** 247, 333, 370, 612
Vol. 2: 149, 177, 892
Vol. 3: 230–247, 866
Remind **Vol. 1:** 487, 542, 567 f., 578, 633
Vol. 2: 359, 361, 431, 863
Vol. 3: 47, **230–247,** 489
Reminder **Vol. 3:** 107, 407, 484
Reminiscence **Vol. 3:** 64
Remission **Vol. 1:** 154, 156, 698, 702
Vol. 2: 118, 351, 386, 667
Vol. 3: 1184
Remit **Vol. 1:** 697, 700
Vol. 2: 116
Remnant **Vol. 1:** 296, 302, 305, 368, 370, 452, 541, 545
Vol. 2: 100, 228, 301, 306, 308, 312 f., 315, 471, 572, 691, 699, 798
Vol. 3: 247–253, 325, 436, 608, 616, 651, 792, 867
Remonstrate **Vol. 1:** 626
Remorse **Vol. 1:** 357
Vol. 2: 416 f., 421 f.
Vol. 3: 340
Remote **Vol. 3:** 838
Remould **Vol. 1:** 491
Removal **Vol. 1:** 314 f., 699
Vol. 2: 151, 404
Remove **Vol. 1:** 466, 526, 587, 602, 606, 667, 700, 719, 722 f., 738
Vol. 2: 213, 244, 309, 315, 360, 363, 460
Vol. 3: 153, 166, 243, 825, 1012
Remuneration **Vol. 2:** 50
Vol. 3: 140, 144
Renaissance **Vol. 1:** 59
Rend **Vol. 1:** 672
Vol. 2: 190
Vol. 3: 543
Render **Vol. 1:** 477
Vol. 3: 134
Render service **Vol. 3: 544–549**
Renew **Vol. 1:** 106, 185, 221, 223, 509, 518, 626, 703, 716
Vol. 2: 122, 129 f., 307, 313 f., 326, **670–676**
Vol. 3: 267
Renewal **Vol. 1:** 143, 147 f., 153, 176, 184 f., 290, 332, 367, 371, 416, 452, 708, 724
Vol. 2: 163, 183, **670–674,** 737, 786, 885, 892
Vol. 3: 146, 148, 686, 705
Renounce **Vol. 1:** 414, 454 f., 561, 641
Vol. 2: 244, 309, 340
Vol. 3: 323
Renovation **Vol. 3:** 146
Renown **Vol. 1:** 296
Rent **Vol. 3: 138–144**
Renunciation **Vol. 1:** 186, 309, 358, 398, 400, 403, 455, 488 f., 495, 599, 604, 647, 675
Vol. 2: 117, 244, 307, 332, 429, 534, 824, 846
Vol. 3: 603, 679
Repair **Vol. 1:** 663
Vol. 3: 259, 350
Reparation **Vol. 3:** 151, 856, 1053
Repay **Vol. 2:** 157 f., 230, 254, 667, 825
Vol. 3: 134–136, 141, 420
Repayment **Vol. 3: 134–136**
Repeat **Vol. 1:** 58, 64
Vol. 2: 447, 717
Repentance **Vol. 1:** 77, 110, 144, 146 f., 150, 152, 154, 156 f., 159, 163, 167, 189, 308, 316, 319, 322, 339 f., 345 f., **353–362,** 356–359, 422 f., 464 f., 467, 476, 509, 545, 559, 564, 599 f., 607, 700, 702 f., 716, 722, 725, 742
Vol. 2: 61, 70, 101, 106, 157, 270, 276, 285 f., 290, 307, 312, 318, 326, 350–352, 358 f., 366, 383 f., 408, 418–420, 422, 487, 566, 584, 680, 700, 717 f., 720, 737, 749, 770 f., 843, 859, 865, 867
Vol. 3: 50, 52 f., 55, 79, 82, 135, 155, 167, 173 f., 207, 211, 240, 251, 361, 419, 428, 529, 567, 580, 616, 634, 638, 644, 686, 695, 721 f., 779, 809, 836, 842, 869, 938, 940, 1167
Repercussion **Vol. 1:** 680
Repetition **Vol. 1:** 64, 632
Rephidim **Vol. 2:** 637
Replace **Vol. 1:** 741
Vol. 3: 192
Replacement **Vol. 2:** 273
Replica **Vol. 2:** 284
Report **Vol. 1:** 57, 574, 585
Vol. 2: 172
Vol. 3: 44–48, 54, **112–114,** 483, 894, 1106
Repose **Vol. 2:** 200
Vol. 3: 254 f.
Reprehensible **Vol. 1:** 565
Vol. 2: 349
Vol. 3: 808–810, 1149
Represent **Vol. 1:** 680
Vol. 2: 80, 158, 287, 313 f., 316, 320, 341, 376
Representation **Vol. 1:** 360, 489, 491, 654, 670, 712, 724
Vol. 2: 284, 287, **288 f.**
Vol. 3: 232, 899, 1196
Representative **Vol. 1:** 85, 102, 121, 127 f., 134, 177, 193, 195 f., 198 f., 285, 294, 296, 372–374, 385, 398, 423, 472, 478, 538, 628, 633, 666, 741
Vol. 2: 57, 127, 200, 313, 327, 336
Vol. 3: 41, 150, 171, 194–196, 239, 278, 619 f., 631, 637, 643, 670, 1044, 1112
Repress **Vol. 1:** 572
Repression **Vol. 2:** 568
Reproach **Vol. 1:** 215, 341, 453, 637, 704
Vol. 2: 140, 143, 835
Vol. 3: 340, 346, **923–928,** 1074
Reprobation **Vol. 1:** 378
Vol. 3: 265
Reproduction **Vol. 1:** 492
Vol. 2: 288 f.
Reproof **Vol. 2:** 140 f.
Reprove **Vol. 1:** 349
Reptile **Vol. 1:** 175

Reptile (*cont'd*)
Vol. 2: 661
Repudiation **Vol. 1:** 529, 604
Vol. 2: 813, 819
Vol. 3: 809, 1094
Repugnant **Vol. 1:** 694
Repulse **Vol. 3:** 903
Repulsive **Vol. 1:** 480
Reputation **Vol. 1:** 546, 558, 565, 590
Vol. 2: 652, 683
Vol. 3: 137, 141, 261, 1081
Repute **Vol. 1:** 546
Vol. 2: 44, 46, 367
Request **Vol. 1:** 278, 425, 511, 569 f., 609
Vol. 2: 116, 175, 179, 388, **855–864, 867–875, 879–881**
Vol. 3: 114, 348
Require **Vol. 1:** 730
Vol. 2: 236, 244, 307, 318, 446
Requirement **Vol. 1:** 714, 729, 738
Vol. 2: 211, 440, 443, 447
Vol. 3: 204, **352–377**
Requisition **Vol. 1:** 536
Requital **Vol. 1:** 598
Requite **Vol. 1:** 324
Vol. 2: 735
Vol. 3: 134–136, 342, 621
Rescue **Vol. 1:** 464, 544, 547, 713
Vol. 2: 82, 126, 260, 630
Vol. 3: 177, **205–216,** 318, 370, 379, 407, 528, 532, 802
Research **Vol. 1:** 504
Resemblance **Vol. 2:** 343, **500–508**
Vol. 3: 1056
Resent **Vol. 1:** 547, 553
Reservation **Vol. 1:** 482
Reserve **Vol. 2: 829–836**
Reserved **Vol. 1:** 721
Vol. 2: 332
Resident **Vol. 1:** 687, 689 f.
Resident alien **Vol. 1:** 690 f.
Vol. 2: 804
Residue **Vol. 1:** 711
Vol. 3: 247
Resignation **Vol. 1:** 262, 551
Vol. 2: 360, 769, 772
Resin **Vol. 1:** 723
Resist **Vol. 1:** 354, 446, 458, 515, 550, 559, 710
Vol. 2: 80
Vol. 3: 755, 778
Resistance **Vol. 1:** 392, 539, 568, 686, 710
Vol. 2: 764
Vol. 3: 978
Resistance movement **Vol. 2:** 307
Resolution **Vol. 1:** 293, 475, 534, 692
Vol. 3: 116, 799, 1016
Resolve **Vol. 1:** 363, 533, 540, 696 f., 737
Vol. 2: 364, 818
Vol. 3: 122, **1015–1018**
Resources **Vol. 1:** 319
Vol. 2: 34, **601–616**
Respect **Vol. 1:** 192, 206, 288, 301, 462, 491 f., 498, 512, 542, 572, 586, 614, 617 f., 621, 686
Vol. 2: 48, 90, 92, 124, 128, 134, 203, 225, 328, 336, 438, 446, 549, 810
Vol. 3: 115, 219, **561–564,** 755, 779, 823, 930
Respectable **Vol. 1:** 520, 524
Vol. 2: 447
Vol. 3: 923
Respectful **Vol. 1:** 585, 615 f.
Vol. 2: 90, 103, 310
Respond **Vol. 2:** 156, 270, 740
Response **Vol. 1:** 319, 324, 335, 460, 476, 482, 508, 525, 538, 540, 578, 595, 603, 699, 726
Vol. 2: 196, 224, 350 f, 395, 568, 718, 826 f., 904
Vol. 3: 60, 236, 246, 336, 522, 758, 769, 791, 793, 1046, 1052
Responsibility **Vol. 1:** 54, 104, 131, 191, 261, 276, 285, 288, 302, 317, 353, 373, 395, 415, 452, 525, 529, 536, 552, 614, 619, 660, 679
Vol. 2: 137–139, 145, 150, 156, 159, 163, 181 f., 275, 295, 313, 335, 337, 562 f., 663, 667 f., 790, 819
Vol. 3: 134, 260, 474, 481, 523, 525, 529, 545, 560, 568, 579, 582, 595, 677, 720, 741, 838, 853, 930, 1020, 1052 f., 1074, 1169
Responsibility in using language **Vol. 3:** 1142 f.
Responsible **Vol. 1:** 562, 610, 617
Vol. 2: 137 f., 327, 336, 372, 737
Vol. 3: 135, 185, 439, 802, 854, 933
Responsive **Vol. 2:** 680, 825
Vol. 3: 693, 912, 916
Rest **Vol. 1:** 95, 115, 239, 263, 280, 321, 327, 335, 372, 521, 595, 600, 626, 675, 688, 727
Vol. 2: 156, 262, 281, 363, 586 f., 681, 729, 777, 794, 809, 889 f.
Vol. 3: 73, **111–114,** 120, 405 f., 433, 530, 639, 742, 835, 954, 1113, 1148, 1162
Rest of heart **Vol. 3:** 411
Restate **Vol. 2:** 315
Resting **Vol. 3: 254–258**
Resting place **Vol. 2:** 207
Vol. 3: 254–258
Restitution **Vol. 1:** 545
Vol. 3: 95, 155 f., 997
Restive **Vol. 3:** 27
Restless **Vol 1:** 239
Vol. 2: 661, 724
Vol. 3: 559
Restoration **Vol. 1:** 109, 113, 184–186, 225, 385, 467, 486, 508, 521, 531, 544, 545, 701 f.
Vol. 2: 163, 252, 298, 307, 628, 687, 692, 893, 920
Vol. 3: 145–176, 240, 269, 349, 351, 657, 692, 812
Restore **Vol. 2:** 161, **166–169,** 270, 363, 433, 480, 717 f., 921
Vol. 3: 145–176, 209, **349–351,** 420, 950
Restrain **Vol. 2: 221–223**
Restraint **Vol. 1:** 422, 494, 501, 574, 679
Vol. 2: 135, 161, 459, 462, **765–767**
Vol. 3: 1080
Restriction **Vol. 1:** 331, 365, 495, 651, 681, 688, 742
Vol. 2: 257
Vol. 3: 551
Result **Vol. 1:** 165, 436, 437, 542, 546, 562,

580, 590, 592, 607, 609, 611, 697, 721, 723
Vol. 2: 132, 139, 155, 230, 310, 352, 400, 415, 420, 460
Vol. 3: 728
Resurrection **Vol. 1:** 53 f., 56 f., 65, 73, 78, 86 f., 131 f., 134, 136, 142, 144, 147 f., 150, 158, 167, 179–185, 224, 233, 236, 239, 242, 265 f., 290, 298, 303, 310, 313 f., 323–325, 351, 365, 375, 393, 399 f., 419, 427, 433–435, 437, 440, 442–446, 469 f., 473, 478, 511, 544, 551, 560, 564, 601 f., 630 f., 634, 638, 643, 649, 651, 668 f., 672, 695, 702, 707, 719, 740
Vol. 2: 48, 58, 79, 111, 159, 178, 187, 203, 208, 216, 218, 230, 238, 241–243, 245, 252, 271, 280, 282, 295, 299, 304, 319, 327 f., 340 f., 343, 351, 354, 356, 370, 380, 386–388, 402 f., 419, 429, 444, 479–481, 483, 489, 504, 514, 526, 545, 550, 559, 568, 580, 603–606, 625, 632 f., 640, 645, 655, 665, 672, 675, 680, 687, 691 f., 696, 701 f., 718, 728, 738 f., 746, 762, 764, 785–787, 799, 811, 866 f., 882, 893 f., 900 f., 903, 905, 908 f., 911, 918–920, 924–926, 928 f.
Vol. 3: 48, 55–57, 62, 65, 99, 168, 178 f., 185, 198, 200, 202, 211, 215, 225, 231, 243, 247, **259–309,** 290, 296, 312, 314, 328, 333, 361, 365, 372, 390, 412, 417, 433, 439 f., 453, 482, 489, 501, 505 f., 510, 515, 517 f., 524 f., 557 f., 567, 579 f., 584, 602, 628, 631 f., 643, 651, 677 f., 682–684, 686 f., 692, 698, 703 f., 706, 722, 724 f., 763, 772, 774, 785, 793, 812 f., 825, 830–832, 858, 861, 874, 936, 942, 970, 1035, 1044, 1047, 1060, 1067, 1073, 1100, 1110 f.
Resurrection body **Vol. 1:** 87, 114, 236, 241, 313, 316
Vol. 2: 245, 597, 739
Vol. 3: 298, 301, 305, 417, 449, 504, 684, 706, 731, 734, 814
Resurrection in contemporary theology **Vol. 3: 281–305**
Resurrection, general **Vol. 2:** 387 f.
Resurrection and immortality **Vol. 3:** 302
Resuscitation **Vol. 1:** 470
Vol. 3: 281, 297, 684
Retain **Vol. 1:** 467, 703
Vol. 2: 286
Retention of sins **Vol. 2:** 787
Rethink **Vol. 1:** 699
Reticence **Vol. 1:** 375, 528
Retract **Vol. 2:** 159
Retreat **Vol. 2:** 220
Retribution **Vol. 1:** 392, 410, 659, 683
Vol. 2: 169, 276, 364, 366
Vol. 3: 94, 98, 140, 209, 260, 526, 720
Return **Vol. 1:** 184, 262, 354 f., 359, 410, 523, 543 f., 607, 611 f., 667, 671, 673, 678, 685 f., 720, 737, 741
Vol. 2: 54, 115, 154, 244, 250, 266, 308, 316 f., 321, 351, 356, 358, 360, 394, 447, 517, 546, 584, 604, 675, 713, 787, 887, 889, 909, 930
Vol. 3: 69, **134–136,** 146, 250, 255, 364, 474, 823, 848, 1104
Return of Christ **Vol. 1:** 229, 244, 315, 386, 607, 634, 649, 651
Vol. 2: 46, 83, 95, 187, 245, 353 f., 488
Vol. 3: 71, 277, 830, 838
Return of exiles **Vol. 2:** 307
Return property **Vol. 3:** 379
Reuben **Vol. 2:** 317
Vol. 3: 872
Reubenites **Vol. 2:** 638
Reunion **Vol. 2:** 309
Revaluation **Vol. 2:** 427
Reveal **Vol. 1:** 103, 106, 112, 305, 313, 324, 327, 338, 400, 472, 474, 484, 487, 541, 543, 575, 598, 620, 629, 638, 649, 680, 719, 726, 730, 735 f., 738
Vol. 2: 56, 73, 75, 141, 177 f., 183, 198, 212, 216–218, 296, 299, 328, 335, 350, 354, 359, 366 f., 369, 379, 382, 396 f., 404, 407, 447 f., **488–490,** 517, 819, 863
Vol. 3: 310–324, 462, 848, 1006
Revealer **Vol. 1:** 85, 250, 253, 303, 337, 423, 556, 678
Vol. 2: 79, 119, 133, 135, 185, 204, 472 f., 494, 636, 640, 642, 646, 722, 724
Vol. 3: 782, 838, 1022, 1045, 1150
Revealing word **Vol. 3:** 892
Revel **Vol. 1:** 458, 460, 628
Vol. 2: 636
Revelation **Vol. 1:** 50, 52, 62, 70, 78, 90, 101, 103, 111 f., 127, 146 f., 180, 222, 244, 250, 272, 282, 294, 304, 336, 373 f., 385, 387, 412, 427 f., 441, 483, 486 f., 504, 511, 528, 530, 535, 550 f., 559, 566, 575 f., 587, 594 f., 598, 605, 610, 619, 627, 666, 727, 737, 740
Vol. 2: 45, 48, 67, 70–72, 74 f., 83, 94, 106, 122 f., 127, 141, 162, 173 f., 176, 178, 191, 193, 198, 201 f., 212, 215–220, 229, 240, 244, 250, 273, 278 f., 289 f., 308, 315, 340, 350, 359, 367, 383, 393 f., 396–398, 400, 403–408, 448 f., 461, 482, 494, 503, 518, 548 f., 637, 650, 653, 762, 806, 834 f., 900, 908 f.
Vol. 3: 54, 55, 72, **74–89,** 117, 131, 205, 216, 220, 246, 264, 286, 301, **309–340,** 381, 384, 404, 482, 492, 495, 500, 502, 504–506, 513, 515 f., 521, 528, 569, 571, 610, 630 f., 639 f., 645, 705 f., 710, 728, 733, 749, 751, 773, 777, 783, 790 f., 793, 806, 831, 844, 881, 885, 887, 890–893, 898, 906, 1004 f., 1017, 1020, 1029, 1045, 1085, 1087, 1091, 1118, 1121, 1143
Revelation, book of **Vol. 3:** 312
Revelation in contemporary theology **Vol. 3: 325–337**
Revelation, structure of book of **Vol. 2: 691, 702**
Revelry **Vol. 2: 274–277,** 356, 586
Revenge **Vol. 1:** 555
Vol. 2: 157 f.
Vol. 3: 680
Revenue **Vol. 3:** 183, 417, 753 f., **755–759**
Revere **Vol. 1:** 653
Vol. 2: 232, 352
Reverence **Vol. 1:** 71, 239, 450, 609, 621–623,

Reverence (*cont'd*)
687
Vol. 2: 85, 90–93, 229, 331, 439, **875–879**
Vol. 3: 424, **561 f.,** 583, 1064
Reversal **Vol. 2:** 843 f.
Reversed values **Vol. 2:** 420
Review **Vol. 1:** 189
Revile **Vol. 1:** 415
Vol. 2: 143, 406, 661, 775
Vol. 3: 340–347, 364, 696, 743
Reviler **Vol. 3: 346 f.**
Revival **Vol. 1:** 185
Vol. 3: 692
Revive **Vol. 1:** 437
Vol. 2: 181
Revoke **Vol. 1:** 207, 367
Revolt **Vol. 1:** 459, 535, 606, 688
Vol. 2: 34, 291
Vol. 3: 259, 279, 756
Revolution **Vol. 1:** 275, 543, 640
Vol. 2: 343
Revolutionary **Vol. 1:** 643
Vol. 2: 308 f.
Vol. 3: 377–379
Revolutionize **Vol. 2:** 386
Reward **Vol. 1:** 98, 111, 367, 406, 432, 450, 489, 537, 598, 648, 651, 688, 716, 734
Vol. 2: 47, 57, 104, 107 f., 117–120, 157 f., 165, 192 f., 203, 206 f., 216, 261, 297 f., 302, 319, 353, 358, 366, 370, 426, 428 f., 433, 449, 498 f., 738, 772, 792 f., 813, 825, 830, 834 f., 844 f., 866 f., 929
Vol. 3: 134–145, 167, 348, 357, 360, 389, 439, 525 f., 544, 751, 802, 832, 839, 871, 980, 1054, 1149, 1151, 1158
Rewarding **Vol. 1:** 647
Rework **Vol. 3:** 916
Rezon **Vol. 3:** 468
Rhadamanthys **Vol. 3:** 739
Rhetoric **Vol. 1:** 574
Vol. 2: 93, 743
Vol. 3: 65, 1031, 1081, **1085–1087**
Rhetorical **Vol. 2:** 334, 685
Rhodes **Vol. 1:** 189
Vol. 2: 291
Vol. 3: 149
Rhyme **Vol. 2:** 870
Rhythm **Vol. 1:** 628
Vol. 2: 870
Rhythm of life **Vol. 1:** 624
Rib **Vol. 1:** 672
Vol. 3: 1056
Rich **Vol. 1:** 109, 116, 319, 341, 466, 515, 547, 571, 587, 596, 688, 722, 730, 732 f., 735
Vol. 2: 28, 57, 79, 130, 133, 263, 267, 273, 285, 301, 416, 499, 660, 811, 820–822, 824, 826, 828, 833, 838, **840–845**
Vol. 3: 99, 143, 253, 369, 682 f., 749, 758, 791, 856, 1017, 1053, 1061
Richards, I.A. **Vol. 3:** 1129 f.
Richardson, Alan **Vol. 3: 289 f.**
Riches **Vol. 1:** 142, 457, 684, 726, 730
Vol. 2: 78 f., 243, 245, 255, 349, 388, 460, 597, 794, 828 f., 837, **840–845**
Vol. 3: 324, 469, 978
Rickets **Vol. 2:** 414
Riddle **Vol. 1:** 657
Vol. 2: 743–760
Ride **Vol. 2:** 190
Rider **Vol. 1:** 118, 203, 205, 317, 430, 657
Vol. 3: 266
Ridicule **Vol. 1:** 455
Vol. 2: 343, 429, 431–433, 436
Vol. 3: 340 f., 521, 563
Rigaux, B. **Vol. 3:** 300
Right **Vol. 1:** 56, 193, 200, 219, 295, 299, 329, 336, 352, 360, 368, 375, 392, 400, 413, 460, 475, 484 f., 500, 555, 571 f., 639–641, 648, 668 f., 679, 684, 686 f., 690 f., 700, 715, 717, 720
Vol. 2: 49 f., 99, 120, 183, 201, 221, 247, 250, 256–258, 285, 302, 316 f., 336, 363, 370, 378, 440, 446, 497, 540, 582, **606–611,** 716, 737 f., 815, 857
Vol. 3: 142, 145, **347–352,** 577, 730, 765, 887, 938, 964, 1028, 1073
Right hand **Vol. 1:** 167, 384, 643, 663
Vol. 2: 80, **146–153,** 188, 194, 196, 199, 204, 245, 380, 385, 475, 614, 883
Vol. 3: 62, 219, 244, 303, 500, 588, 614, 627, 633, 735, 749
Right moment **Vol. 3: 833–839**
Right time **Vol. 3: 845–849**
Righteous **Vol. 1:** 110, 115, 174, 216, 222, 274, 278, 288, 356, 358, 371, 381–383, 390, 395, 398, 408, 410 f., 422, 434, 444, 472, 554, 556, 564, 586, 597 f., 605, 627, 650, 706 f., 713, 721, 738
Vol. 2: 47, 51, 56, 66, 72, 82, 91 f., 94 f., 144, 149, 155, 179, 191, 201–204, 206 f., 215, 228, 237, 259, 272, 276, 298, 313, 326, 370, 431, 434, 479, 481, 486, 659, 681, 707, 724, 735 f., 761, 798, 808, 824, 832, 837, 861, 866 f., 899
Vol. 3: 144, 157, 162, 195, 199, 204, 224, 226, 242, 265, 272, 313, 350, **352–377,** 428, 469, 498, 527, 610, 616, 624, 626, 638, 680, 684, 713, 722, 732, 832, 847, 856, 866, 946, 997, 1050
Righteous deed **Vol. 3: 352–377**
Righteousness **Vol. 1:** 78 f., 86, 89, 96, 107 f., 110, 112, 115, 118, 147, 181, 185, 217, 231, 234, 273, 278, 311, 314, 317, 321, 332, 339, 346, 358, 370 f., 382, 386, 390, 397 f., 438, 446, 475, 495, 501, 515, 519, 559, 581, 591, 598, 601, 607, 639, 649, 673, 675, 680 f., 700–702, 710, 714, 720, 723, 729 f., 738 f.
Vol. 2: 42, 48, 53, 72 f., 78, 93, 101, 111, 119, 121, 128, 133, 136 f., 141, 148, 179, 229, 236, 242, 245, 258, 267 f., 275, 287, 299 f., 307, 363, 366, 370, 374, 387 f., 396, 442, 444, 453, 469, 482 f., 492, 494, 497, 499, 539 f., 543 f., 546, 590–593, 595, 600, 641, 669, 676, 682, 723, 742, 777, 779, 781 f., 794, 806, 817 f., 835, 842 f., 864, 884, 899
Vol. 3: 30, 45, 52, 70, 72, 82, 92 f., 98 f., 117, 121, 130, 136–138, 140–142, 145, 160 f., 163, 165–170, 181, 184, 188, 207 f., 211,

224 f., 233, 268, 278, 311, 315, 321, 352, 383, 388 f., 427, 436, 471, 525, 532, 546 f., 549, 551, 569, 573, 575 f., 581, 583, 585 f., 597, 637, 647–650, 657, 682, 692 f., 725, 730, 734, 748 f., 763, 766, 783, 790, 823–826, 831, 836, 879, 919, 932 f., 939, 942, 966, 986, 1041, 1043, 1095, 1148–1152, 1155, 1158, 1181
Rightly **Vol. 3: 351 f.**
Rightly handle **Vol. 3: 351 f.**
Rights **Vol. 3:** 93, 381, 576, 583, 645
Rights of a citizen **Vol. 2: 801–804**
Rigid **Vol. 2:** 153, 812
Rigidity **Vol. 1:** 516
Rigour **Vol. 2:** 270
Rimmon **Vol. 3:** 156
Ring **Vol. 1:** 683
Vol. 3: 497
Ringgren, H. **Vol. 3:** 1125
Ringleader **Vol. 1:** 535
Rinse **Vol. 1:** 144, 152 f., 224
Riot **Vol. 1:** 419
Vol. 2: 623
Vol. 3: 203
Ripe **Vol. 1:** 204, 516, 682
Vol. 3: 845–849
Ripen **Vol. 1:** 722
Vol. 2: 675
Rise **Vol. 1:** 495, 497, 591, 625, 692
Vol. 2: 63, 242, 327
Vol. 3: 200, 259, 731
Risen **Vol. 1:** 86 f., 130, 168, 174, 178, 183, 204, 213, 266, 300, 303, 328, 399, 437, 476, 517, 551, 592, 601, 643, 668, 677, 708
Vol. 2: 58, 81, 83, 113 f., 176, 186, 194, 196, 207, 242, 282, 302, 332, 340, 342, 354, 358–361, 388, 399, 488, 624, 785, 787, 902, 915
Vol. 3: 48, 55 f., 58, 60, 71, 114, 132, 244, 314, 516, 571, 1060
Rising **Vol. 1:** 145, 147, 225, 359
Vol. 2: 367, 644
Vol. 3: 205, 227
Risk **Vol. 1:** 364 f., **419–420,** 592, 658, 710
Vol. 2: 104, 159, 350, 368
Vol. 3: 158, 799
Rite **Vol. 1:** 115 f., 123, 158 f., 237, 288 f., 309, 426, 432, 497 f., 611 f., 625 f., 630, 654, 699 f., 702, 705, 716
Vol. 2: 59, 152, 228, 233, 236, 252
Vol. 3: 103, 149–151, 157, 205
Ritschl, A.B. **Vol. 1:** 65
Ritual **Vol. 1:** 53, 70, 121 f., 177, 308, 316, 448, 525, 611, 625 f., 701
Vol. 2: 86, 151, 157, 199, 223, 236, 268, 272, 326 f., 336, 415, 556
Vol. 3: 38, 94 f., 100 f., 103–107, 119, 162, 198, 243, 323, 356, 366, 407, 409, 415, 421, 426–428, 434, 996, 1053, 1149
Ritual anointing **Vol. 1:** 122
Vol. 2: 711
Ritual bath **Vol. 1:** 144 f., 152 f.
Vol. 2: 652
Vol. 3: 1168
Ritual cleansing **Vol. 1:** 149, 447, 654
Vol. 2: 285
Ritual institutions **Vol. 1:** 66
Ritual law **Vol. 1:** 61
Ritual purification **Vol. 1:** 225
Ritual washing **Vol. 1:** 152–154
Vol. 2: 150
Ritualistic **Vol. 2:** 225
Rival **Vol. 1:** 269, 486, 558
Vol. 2: 372, 374
Rivalry **Vol. 1:** 650
Vol. 2: 818
River **Vol. 1:** 165, 654, 682 f.
Vol. 2: 130, 157, 232, 274
Vol. 3: 117, 21 , 695, 813, 902, **982–992**
River of life **Vol. 1:** 390
River-bed **Vol. 3:** 985
Road **Vol. 1:** 254, 520
Vol. 2: 220
Vol. 3: 146, 229, 352, 747, 902, **935–943,** 1006
Roam **Vol. 1:** 519
Vol. 2: 457
Roar **Vol. 2:** 421, 423
Vol. 3: 112, 324
Roast **Vol. 1:** 249
Rob **Vol. 1:** 439, 705
Vol. 2: 361
Vol. 3: 377–381, 788, 853
Rob temples **Vol. 2: 232–236**
Robber **Vol. 1:** 419
Vol. 2: 236
Vol. 3: 377–379, 430, **601–605,** 756
Robbery **Vol. 3:** 95, 137, 448, **601–605,** 1053
Robe **Vol. 1:** 122, 315, 317
Vol. 2: 412
Vol. 3: 120 f., 470, 789
Robins, R.H. **Vol. 3:** 1129
Robust **Vol. 1:** 727
Rock **Vol. 1:** 80, 240, 382, 610, 636, 662, 673, 683
Vol. 2: 30, 129, 159, 177, 218, 220, 249, 253, 277, 313, 433, 619, 623, 652, 705 f., 709 f., 731–734, 754 f.
Vol. 3: 84, 363, **381–399,** 435, 446, 504, 508, 543, 554, 558 f., 568, 623, 706 f., 782, 784, 795, 797, 809, 986, 1001, 1013, 1108
Rock of stumbling **Vol. 2:** 706
Vol. 3: 382, 389–391
Rod **Vol. 1:** 51, 111, 161 f., 164, **405–408**
Vol. 2: 378
Vol. 3: 870, 913
Rod of iron **Vol. 2:** 570, 795
Rod of Jesse **Vol. 1:** 407
Role **Vol. 1:** 134, 302, 373, 549, 641, 687, 708, 717, 727, 737
Vol. 2: 147 f., 158, 160 f., 231, 447
Vol. 3: 49, 78, 80, 85, 88
Role valuations **Vol. 3:** 1063
Roll **Vol. 1:** 53
Vol. 2: 157, 418
Vol. 3: 497
Roll up **Vol. 3:** 399, 735–737
Roll of widows **Vol. 3:** 1075
Rolling **Vol. 3:** 558–560

Roman **Vol. 1:** 72, 75, 119, 125, 140, 142, 162, 175, 199, 205, 220, 299, 309, 363, 392, 394–396, 403, 407, 431, 506, 518 f., 574, 591, 606, 624, 633
Vol. 2: 32, 85, 125, 222, 233, 324, 373, 378–381, 383, 430, 438, 451, 461, 572, 608, 802, 849–851, 899, 922
Vol. 3: 138, 203, 217, 230, 441, 480, 558, 635, 715, 731, 736, 739, 756, 758, 788, 791, 868, 915, 952, 960 f., 964–967, 976 f., 1147, 1168
Roman citizen **Vol. 2:** 331, 804
Roman colony **Vol. 2:** 308
Roman empire **Vol. 1:** 55, 59, 519
Vol. 2: 125
Roman procurator **Vol. 2:** 334
Vol. 3: 456
Romans **Vol. 1:** 61 f., 264, 348, 364, 392, 395 f., 403, 407 f., 435, 627, 687 f.
Vol. 2: 139, 234, 308
Vol. 3: 39 f., 97, 109, 142, 361, 440, 452, 538, 603, 706, 752 f., 840, 949, 979
Romanticism **Vol. 1:** 694
Rome **Vol. 1:** 108, 127, 141 f., 264, 79, 395, 476, 501, 532, 559, 569, 616, 631, 687
Vol. 2: 130, 221 f., 311, 316, 451, 640, 792, 804, 816, 847, 850, 884, 918
Vol. 3: 65, 132, 164, 180, 203, 211, 226, 240, 261, 296, 385 f., 388, 446, 452 f., 598, 789, 851, 976 f., 995, 1008, 1013, 1114
Roof **Vol. 1:** 632
Vol. 3: 796
Roof tile **Vol. 3: 910–913**
Rook **Vol. 3:** 525
Room **Vol. 1:** 718, 741 f.
Vol. 3: 224–229
Root **Vol. 1:** 118, 138, 202, 427, 459, 516, 563, 652, 660, 680, 730
Vol. 2: 253, 312, 315, 406
Vol. 3: 416, 736, **865–870**
Root of bitterness **Vol. 2:** 782
Vol. 3: 869
Root and branch **Vol. 3:** 866
Root of David **Vol. 3:** 180
Root and fruit **Vol. 3:** 866
Root up **Vol. 3:** 523
Rope **Vol. 3:** 120
Rosetta Stone **Vol. 3:** 635
Rostrum **Vol. 2:** 369
Rot **Vol. 1:** 463, 683
Rotten **Vol. 1:** 722
Rough **Vol. 2:** 153, 155, 464
Vol. 3: 709
Rouse **Vol. 2:** 136
Vol. 3: 279–281
Route **Vol. 2:** 266
Row **Vol. 2:** 451
Rower **Vol. 1:** 408, 521
Vol. 3: 546
Royal **Vol. 2: 372–389**
Royal anointing **Vol. 1:** 123
Royal cult **Vol. 1:** 426
Royal family **Vol. 2:** 437
Royal household **Vol. 2:** 249
Royal priesthood **Vol. 1:** 305
Vol. 2: 228, 380, 839
Royal Psalms **Vol. 1:** 288
Vol. 2: 374
Vol. 3: 649
Royal rite **Vol. 1:** 640
Royal road **Vol. 3:** 939
Royal sanctuaries **Vol. 2: 225**
Royal way **Vol. 3:** 946
Royalty **Vol. 1:** 405 f., 469
Vol. 2: 96
Rub **Vol. 1:** 479
Vol. 2: 334
Vol. 3: 840
Rubbish **Vol. 1:** 479 f.
Ruby **Vol. 3:** 396
Rudder **Vol. 1:** 118
Vol. 2: 435
Rude **Vol. 3:** 439
Rudiments **Vol. 2: 451–453**
Rue **Vol. 2: 210 f.**
Ruin **Vol. 1:** 106, 451, **462–471,** 561, 562, 608, 610 f., 693
Vol. 2: 149, 308, 328, 367, 583, 609, 629
Vol. 3: 573, 996, 1005
Rule **Vol. 1:** 51, 59, 95, 99, 121, 135, 142, 163, **164–169,** 192, 235, 243, 300 f., 330, 333, 358, 387, 395 f., 408, 423, 426, 435, 449, 457, 459, 509, 518 f., 524 f., 533, 543, 580, 582, 607, 614, 619, 648, 651, 707, 715, 729
Vol. 2: 73, 76, 83, 95, 120, 123, 129, 183, 189, 213, 240, 242, 257 f., 261 f., 305, 308, 311, 326 f., 335, 337, 360, 363, 365, **372–389,** 394, 396, 436, **438–452,** 499, **510–520,** 548, 603, 631, 781, 877
Vol. 3: 57, 107, 204, **399–404,** 430, 436, 439, 485, 493, 495, 518, 555, 677, 692, **716–718,** 730, 734, 774, 780, 981, 985 f., 998, 1064
Rule the household **Vol. 2: 508–510**
Rule out **Vol. 1:** 639
Ruler **Vol. 1:** 95, 109, 111, 123, **164–169,** 170, 194, 198, 246, 269 f., 273 f., 325, 335, 365, 378, 407, 422, 450, 482, 495, 508, 512, 593, 610, 622, 647–649, 651, 665, 686, 718
Vol. 2: 57, 70 f., 105, 133, 135, 158, 160, 202, 257, 265, 288, 301, 337, **372–389,** 412, 456, 512, 514, 519, 539, 568, **601–616,** 637, 641, 674, 693, 777, 792, 796, 832, 840, 844, 898
Vol. 3: 45, 148, 217, 220, 243, 310, 318, 377, 379, 391, 549, 566, 633, 635, 649, 735, 739, 746, 866, 871, 1063, 1152
Ruler of the world **Vol. 3: 716–718**
Ruling **Vol. 3:** 188, 384
Ruling class **Vol. 2:** 315
Ruling power **Vol. 2: 606–611**
Ruling principle **Vol. 3:** 122
Rumbling **Vol. 3:** 557
Rumour **Vol. 2:** 172, 457
Vol. 3: 112, 1106
Rumours of wars **Vol. 3:** 962
Run **Vol. 1:** 262, 648, 682
Vol. 3: 933–947
Run after **Vol. 2: 805–807**
Runner **Vol. 1:** 493

Vol. 2: 807
Running before **Vol. 3: 945–947**
Rupture **Vol. 1:** 640
Russell, Bertrand **Vol. 3:** 1124, 1129, 1135 f.
Rust **Vol. 1:** 463
Vol. 2: 27 f., 831, 836
Rustling **Vol. 3:** 678
Ruth **Vol. 1:** 53, 58 f., 170
Vol. 2: 116, 577, 888
Vol. 3: 191, 555, 656 f., 867, 1055, 1057, 1062, 1069

Sabaoth **Vol. 2:** 556
Sabarin **Vol. 3:** 453
Sabbath **Vol. 1:** 83, 115, 245, 310, 335, 360, 384, 625–628, 630 f., 634, 654, 688, 691, 699
Vol. 2: 133, 165, 174, 226, 267, 396, 426, 499, 514, 518 f., 625 f., 665, 692, 697, 754, 800, 811, 871, 880, 887, 889, 931
Vol. 3: 37, 74, 94, 120, 128, 180, 186 f., 235, 239, 258, **405–415,** 423, 427, 429, 441 f., 488, 508, 542, 556, 608, 623, 717, 792, 814, 849, 996, 1149, 1163, 1168
Sabbath-breaker **Vol. 1:** 294
Vol. 2: 499
Sabbath-day's journey **Vol. 3:** 940
Sabbath-observance **Vol. 3:** 255, 440
Sabbath-offering **Vol. 2:** 410
Sabbath-rest **Vol. 3:** 255 f., 594
Sabbatical year **Vol. 1:** 691
Vol. 2: 298, 822
Vol. 3: 191, 194
Sabellianism **Vol. 2:** 507
Sabellius **Vol. 2:** 507
Sack **Vol. 3:** 498
Sackcloth **Vol. 1:** 203, 672
Vol. 2: 418
Vol. 3: 589, 732
Sacral **Vol. 1:** 211, 267, 374
Vol. 2: 189, 206, 274, 306, 326, 334, 336
Vol. 3: 33
Sacral kingship **Vol. 2:** 644
Sacral manumission **Vol. 3:** 597
Sacrament **Vol. 1:** 58, 149, 285, 358, 466, 629
Vol. 2: 534 f.
Vol. 3: 82, 675, 1137
Sacramental **Vol. 1:** 123, 145, 282, 288, 344, 445 f.
Vol. 2: 271, 273
Vol. 3: 232, 489, 647
Sacramentalism **Vol. 1:** 54
Vol. 2: 393, 535, 906
Sacred **Vol. 1:** 61, 172, 414, 498, 560, 573 f., 588, 625
Vol. 2: 224–232, 233–235, 270, 309, 373
Vol. 3: 45, 415, 424, 860
Sacred marriage **Vol. 2: 576,** 584
Sacred number **Vol. 3:** 851
Sacred poles **Vol. 3:** 865
Sacred scribe **Vol. 3:** 480
Sacred song **Vol. 3: 670–672**
Sacred time **Vol. 2:** 891
Sacrifice **Vol. 1:** 57, 61, 74 f., 107, 113–116, 122, 125, 145, 151 f., 166, 172, 211, 219–226, 230, 234 f., 239, 250, 252, 261, 292–294, 308, 320, 325, 350–352, 360, 371 f., 375, 398 f., 402, 405, 414, 426, 437, 451, 475, 479, 488, 497, 538, 546, 625–627, 629, 639, 642 f., 649, 655, 666, 669, 673, 685, 699 f., 702 f., 713, 732
Vol. 2: 39–43, 49, 59, 63 f., 74, 78, 94, 97, 102, 107 f., 116, 118 f., 132, 147, 151, 199, 208, 211, 223, 225, 228, 230, **232–236,** 237 f., 244, 249, 259, 272 f., 285 f., 293, 327 f., 386, 410–414, 447, 449, 461, 463, 521, 525, 535 f., 555 f., 559, 569, 593, 610, 618, 638, 650, 652, 664, 676, 689, 692 f., 711, 713, 717 f., 720, 803, 816–818, 854 f., 860, 885
Vol. 3: 35, 38, 41 f., 45, 49, 78, 84, 89, 103, 106–108, 110, 117, 120, 138, **148–166,** 171, 173 f., 181, 190, 194 f., 198, 200, 215, 221, 238 f., 243 f., 246, 258, 261, 277, 303, 323, 356, 366, 407, **415–436,** 443, 445–447, 495, 543, 547, 552 f., 575, 579, 582, 586, 600 f., 608, 624, 676, 686, 701, 715, 722 f., 728, 739, 744–746, 756 f., 781–783, 787, 791, 797, 812, 814 f., 817, 847, 852, 855 f., 919, 941, 953, 965, 996, 1010, 1023, 1118f., 1143, 1148, 1165
Sacrifice of Isaac (→ Isaac, Sacrifice of)
Sacrifice of praise **Vol. 3:** 817
Sacrificed to idols **Vol. 3: 417–436**
Sacrificer **Vol. 2:** 151, 234
Sacrif cial **Vol. 1:** 398, 468, 474 f., 552, 630, 634, 648, 653, 655, 691
Vol. 2: 74, 164, 174, 225, 234, 286, 288, 326 f., 355, 440 f., 447, 533, 549, 599, 604, 674, 854
Vol. 3: 94, 102, 242, 349, 364, 372
Sacrilege **Vol. 1:** 125, 212
Vol. 2: 233, 235
Sacrosanct **Vol. 1:** 122
Sad **Vol. 1:** 565
Vol. 2: 386, **419–423**
Saddle **Vol. 1:** 317
Vol. 2: 317
Sadducees **Vol. 1:** 101, 196, 364, 434, 487, 534 f., 627
Vol. 2: 207, 303, 311, 321, 462, 578, 580, 584, 640, 691, 785, 810–813, 880
Vol. 3: 40, 184, 263 f., 270, 273 f., 277, **439–443,** 480, 488, 753, 769, 1002, 1035
Sadness **Vol. 2:** 180, 357, 359
Safe **Vol. 1:** 660, 663
Vol. 2: 134, 240, 244
Vol. 3: 565, 713
Safe return **Vol. 3:** 205
Safeguard **Vol. 1:** 663
Vol. 2: 136, 738
Safety **Vol. 1:** 483, 501
Vol. 2: 297, 364, 777
Vol. 3: 217, 419
Sagacious **Vol. 3:** 445
Sage **Vol. 1:** 574
Vol. 2: 377
Vol. 3: 480
Sail **Vol. 1:** 698
Vol. 3: 913

Sailor **Vol. 1:** 559
Saints **Vol. 1:** 78, 204, 222, 266, 275, 300, 302, 305, 321, 514, 642, 689, 691, 731
Vol. 2: 83, 217, **223–238,** 243, 294, 298, 302, 380, 389, 401, 429, 489, 600, 604, 613, 625, 642, 669, 702, 718, 731, 776, 798, 826, 868, 882
Vol. 3: 84, 350, 436, 558, 614, 819, 854, 962, 1047, 1161
Saints of the Most High **Vol. 2:** 376, 607, 610
Sake **Vol. 2:** 115, 387
Salamis **Vol. 1:** 624
Salary **Vol. 2:** 433
Vol. 3: 134, 144, 444
Sale **Vol. 1:** 505
Vol. 2: 273
Salem **Vol. 2:** 324, 378, **590–593,** 694
Vol. 3: 36
Salim **Vol. 2:** 592
Sallustius **Vol. 1:** 176
Salome **Vol. 3:** 1060
Salt **Vol. 1:** 657, 670
Vol. 2: 746
Vol. 3: 422, 436, **443–449,** 713, 1012, 1025
Salt pits **Vol. 3:** 444
Salt Sea **Vol. 3:** 444
Salt springs **Vol. 3:** 988
Salt water **Vol. 3:** 992
Saltless **Vol. 3: 443–449**
Salty **Vol. 3: 443–449**
Salutary **Vol. 2:** 419
Salutation **Vol. 2:** 780 f.
Salute **Vol. 2:** 358, 795
Salvation **Vol. 1:** 54, 68, 73, 77 f., 80, 87, 100, 112 f., 123, 141, 148–150, 157 f., 168, 184, 186, 190 f., 208–210, 214, 217 f., 239, 246, 248, 251 f., 257, 284, 289, 297, 299 f., 310, 314, 316 f., 322, 330 f., 346 f., 356 f., 359, 367 f., 370, 373–375, 379, 382–384, 397, 399–401, 410, 414 f., 420–422, 424, 436 f., 440 f., 455, 461, 464 f., 467, 469, 472 f., 477, 484, 489, 492, 499, 510, 519, 523, 525, 534, 541, 544, 554, 557, 560, 564, 572, 585, 594–597, 600 f., 603 f., 607, 609–613, 620, 623, 626, 629, 632, 636–638, 641, 647, 660, 669, 696, 719, 723, 732, 735–738, 740
Vol. 2: 31, 37, 40, 45, 47, 50, 53–56, 58, 61, 63, 72–75, 77 f., 80, 83, 99–101, 106, 108 f., 111–114, 116, 119, 122, 134 f., 138, 141, 147, 149, 156, 160, 168, 170, 174, 176, 178 f., 189, 193–195, 198, 200, 203, 213, 216, 226, 239–243, 245, 255 f., 258, 265–268, 270f., 275, 277 f., 280, 300–303, 306–309, 313–315, 331 f., 335, 337, 342 f., 353–355, 357 f., 363 f., 388, 393–397, 400, 402–407, 411, 420, 431, 433, 441, 444–446, 451, 458, 470, 480, 484, 490–493, 498 f., 532, 535 f., 545, 548, 566, 581, 585, 597 f., 603–605, 627, 629–633, 649, 664–666, 668–671, 675 f., 690, 699, 705 f., 708 f., 714 f., 717 f., 722 f., 737, 741, 746, 770 f., 773, 777–781, 791–794, 808 f., 819, 825, 830, 838 f., 844, 859, 863 f., 873, 878 f., 881, 887–891, 900, 908, 918, 925, 928
Vol. 3: 34, 38, 42, 46, 50 f., 53, 56, 70, 72–74, 78 f., 82 f., 117 f., 123, 127–129, 132, 135, 140, 142–144, 147 f., 162, 168, 171 f., **177–221,** 224, 226, 228 f., 239, 250 f., 264, 270, 277, 287, 311, 315 f., 342, 349 f., 355, 357, 366 f., 371, 388, 391, 393, 400, 402, 409, 460–462, 470, 475, 492, 501, 515, 529, 547 f., 550, 567, 584 f., 592, 630–633, 637, 640, 644 f., 649, 651 f., 659, 671, 685 f., 692, 702, 714 f., 723, 732, 746, 749, 751, 762 f., 779, 785, 818, 824, 829, 831 f., 837 f., 844, 860, 886, 905, 938, 940, 942, 949, 954, 965, 974, 988, 997, 1005 f., 1011, 1018 f., 1022, 1031, 1035 f., 1043, 1052, 1058, 1079, 1093, 1095, 1102, 1104–1106, 1112, 1114, 1117 f., 1135, 1142, 1148, 1151
Salvation history **Vol. 1: 59,** 186, 286, 289, 296, 303, 367, 375, 438, 604
Vol. 2: 45, 47, 75, 80, 84, 111, 119, 123, 130, 135, 255, 298, 300, 303, 314, 364, 396, 408, 443, 527, 570, 663–665, 691, 695, 787, 807, **907 f.,** 917, 920
Vol. 3: 66, 291, 333, 633, 836, 843, 906, 986
Salvation of Israel **Vol. 2: 308,** 899
Salvation of Zion **Vol. 2: 308**
Samareitikon **Vol. 3:** 453
Samaria **Vol. 1:** 52, **67,** 116, 166, 269, 303, 629
Vol. 2: 74, 86, 306, 387, 557, 849, 878, 918, 921
Vol. 3: 56, 94, 427, **449–466,** 483, 890, 980, 1059, 1114, 1132
Samaritan **Vol. 1:** 52, **67,** 114, 148, 257 f., 335, 599, 657, 685
Vol. 2: 104, 177, 301, 306, 321, 339, 427, 467, 544, 550, 591, 596, 600, 698, 742, 749, 784 f., 793, 805, 878, 927
Vol. 3: 37, 106, 143, 147, 173, 216, 219, 378, 439, **449–466,** 539, 633, 635, 699, 752, 781, 789, 891, 980, 987, 1046
Samaritan Pentateuch **Vol. 1: 67**
Vol. 3: 464–466
Samaritanisms **Vol. 3:** 465
Same **Vol. 3:** 839
Sammael **Vol. 1:** 125
Sample **Vol. 1:** 577
Vol. 2: 290
Samson **Vol. 2:** 225, 228, 458
Vol. 3: 235, 591 f.
Samuel **Vol. 1:** 50, 53, 66, 68, 195, 273, 425 f., 511, 538
Vol. 2: 374, 432, 554
Vol. 3: 73, 218, 263, 270, 311, 427, 827, 841, 1041, 1057, 1090 f., 1120
Sanballat **Vol. 3:** 451
Sanctification **Vol. 1:** 122, 152, 222, 223, 231, 371 f., 475, 564, 722, 730, 739
Vol. 2: 64, 78, 144, **223–238,** 781, 819
Vol. 3: 107, 163, 199, 215, 226, 701, 779, 892, 1023, 1064 f.
Sanctifier **Vol. 1:** 669
Sanctify **Vol. 1:** 211, 221, 275, 305, 462, 542, 552, 669
Vol. 2: 63, 75, **223–238,** 302, 326, 800
Vol. 3: 72, 105, 152–154, 214, 434, 1165

Sanction **Vol. 2:** 161, 236
Vol. 3: 816
Sanctuary **Vol. 1:** 55, 115, 122, 151, 174, 224, 250, 272, 280, 294, 308, 320, 351, 372, 408, 497 f., 500, 511, 523, 586 f., 627, 648, 668
Vol. 2: 45, 53, 64, 91, 184 f., 194, 199, 228, **232–236,** 244, 247 f., 250, 306, 324 f., 374 f., 410, 415, 466, 478, 614, 642, 673, 675, 706, 817, 864
Vol. 3: 33 f., 42, 78, 101, 159, 163, 192, 317, 366, 415, 423, 430, 552, 560, 634, 650, 752, **781–785,** 805, 814 f., 852 f., 905, 941, 947 f., 965, 1060
Sand **Vol. 3:** 559, 707, 1001
Sandal **Vol. 1:** 674
Vol. 3: 560
Sanhedrin **Vol. 1:** 51, 83, 168, 195–199, 341, **362–364,** 394 f.
Vol. 2: 50, 176, 194, 282, 341, 379, 448, 526, 850, 880
Vol. 3: 35, 39 f., 401, 407, 480 f., 544, 742, 822, 1157
Sap **Vol. 1:** 252, 743
Sapir **Vol. 3:** 1127
Sapphira **Vol. 1:** 446, 466 f., 642
Vol. 2: 846
Vol. 3: 387
Sapphire **Vol. 3:** 396, 398
Sarah **Vol. 1:** 78, **80,** 189, 284, 378, 411, 444 f., 452, 531 f., 650
Vol. 2: 431, 627 f., 847
Vol. 3: 73, 1057, 1067, 1069, 1072
Sarai **Vol. 1:** 80
Sarapis **Vol. 2:** 520
Sarcasm **Vol. 2:** 432
Sardis **Vol. 2:** 830
Sardius **Vol. 3:** 396
Sardonyx **Vol. 3:** 396
Sarepta **Vol. 3:** 558
Sargon **Vol. 1:** 140
Sariel **Vol. 1:** 102
Sarkic **Vol. 1:** 500
Satan **Vol. 1:** 53, 83–85, 89, 103 f., 124 f., 163, 168 f., 205, 254, 297, 355, 424, 436, 449–454, 458, 466 f., 496, 508–510, 524, 554, 563, 566 f., 572, 610, 637, 645, 657, 710, 718, 727, 739
Vol. 2: 74, 136, 191, 193, 196, 198, 205, 208–210, 214, 221, 229, 314, 368, 370, 381–383, 401, 432, 458, 460, 471, 473 f., 495, 510, 560 f., 574 f., 609 f., 618, 631, 633, 642, 665, 674, 677, 692, 701 f., 706, 708, 733, 781, 795, 809, 811, 858, 877, 901
Vol. 3: 128, 179 f., 197, 203, 232, 342, 344, 389, 409, **468–476,** 507, 509, 522 f., 536, 579, 586, 603, 628, 693–696, 713, 725, 738, 779, 797, 800–807, 809 f., 831, 839, 856, 864, 872, 903, 943, 961 f., 1001, 1152, 1163
Satan-Sammael **Vol. 3:** 469
Satanic powers **Vol. 1:** 111, 423, 519
Vol. 2: 74, 165
Vol. 3: 985
Satanic trinity **Vol. 1:** 114
Sate **Vol. 1:** 743
Satire **Vol. 2:** 430, 432
Satisfaction **Vol. 1:** 741, 743
Vol. 2: 48, 115, 264, 272, 351, 817
Vol. 3: 154, 179, 532
Satisfactory **Vol. 1:** 610
Satisfy **Vol. 1:** 217, 459 f., 673, 731, 733–735, 743 f.
Vol. 2: 123, 237, 266 f., 274
Vol. 3: 726–730
Satrap **Vol. 3:** 851
Satrapy **Vol. 2:** 234
Saturn **Vol. 2:** 558
Vol. 3: 735
Satyr **Vol. 1:** 451
Sauce **Vol. 1:** 633
Saul **Vol. 1:** 53, 61, 195, 264, 393, 433, 478, 538, 574, 709, 716
Vol. 2: 116, 296, 306, 374, 554
Vol. 3: 77, 117, 154, 159, 195, 270, 426 f., 474, 531, 560, 608, 812, 872, 994, 1057, 1091
Saul of Tarsus **Vol. 2:** 91, 136, 320
Vol. 3: 519, 708, 912, 948
Saussure, F. de **Vol. 3:** 1123, 1126, 1131, 1140–1142
Savage **Vol. 1:** 261, 520
Vol. 3: 709
Save **Vol. 1:** 100, 185 f., 223, 228, 322 f., 345, 359, 371, 380, 390, 395, 414, 464, 466, 483, 509 f., 525, 531, 547, 571, 593–595, 599, 601, 604, 713, 730 f., 740
Vol. 2: 60, 86, 122, 194, 228, 278, 280, 312 f., 315, 329, 331 f., 354, 387, 446, 510, 610, 799, 818, **838–840**
Vol. 3: 46, **177–221,** 228, 250, 369, 646, 682, 1177
Save up **Vol. 2: 829–836**
Saving **Vol. 3:** 65, 107, **216–221,** 336, 344
Saving act **Vol. 1:** 77, 181, 185, 224, 239, 319, 346 f., 422, 484, 524, 598, 600, 605, 640, 713, 717
Vol. 2: 56, 78, 87, 119, 129, 149, 202, 241, 300, 388, 396, 509, 627, 665 f., 671, 717
Vol. 3: 120, 161, 772, 846, 940, 1151
Saving event **Vol. 1:** 62, 345, 401, 601, 603
Vol. 2: 112, 276
Vol. 3: 151, 648
Saving grace **Vol. 2:** 78
Saving plan **Vol. 1:** 697
Saving power **Vol. 1:** 336, 532
Vol. 2: 78, 492, 627, 806
Saving presence **Vol. 1:** 324
Vol. 2: 86
Saving proclamation **Vol. 1:** 397
Saving purpose **Vol. 2:** 79, 119, 353, 408
Vol. 3: 790, 801
Saving truth **Vol. 1:** 86
Saving work **Vol. 1:** 68, 221, 224, 326, 331, 600, 669, 730
Vol. 2: 42, 78 f., 141, 158, 193, 196, 208, 354, 357, 367, 413, 419, 516, 544, 653, 655, 665, 670, 717
Vol. 3: 999
Saviour **Vol. 1:** 77, 127, 168, 320, 323, 396, 509,

Saviour (*cont'd*)
519, 567, 636
Vol. 2: 78, 82, 108, 167, 215, 243, 245, 262, 265, 307, 332, 335, 337, 343, 349, 358, 363, 366 f., 404, 518, 584, 645, 804, 922
Vol. 3: 71, **177–221,** 232, 279, 318 f., 363, 462, 1022
Saviour-king **Vol. 2:** 111, 330, 341
Sawyer, J.F.A. **Vol. 3:** 1141
Say **Vol. 2:** 281, 443, 488
Vol. 3: 54, 74, 345, 348, 821, **1081–1119**
Saying **Vol. 1:** 62, 68, 70, 575, 582
Vol. 2: 109, 155, 385, 751, 757, 929
Vol. 3: 74 → 89, 236, **1081**–1119
Sayings of Jesus **Vol. 1:** 57 f., 68, 600, 619
Vol. 2: 449 (*also* → Word of Jesus)
Scabby **Vol. 2:** 464
Scaffold **Vol. 1:** 393
Scale of values **Vol. 3:** 400
Scales of Kronos **Vol. 2:** 23
Scaly **Vol. 2:** 464
Scandal **Vol. 1:** 439
Vol. 2: 705–710
Scandal-monger **Vol. 3:** 903
Scandalous **Vol. 1:** 397, 546
Scanty **Vol. 2:** 821
Scapegoat **Vol. 1:** 479
Vol. 2: 151
Vol. 3: 150, 159, 1005
Scar **Vol. 1:** 235
Vol. 2: 288, 573
Vol. 3: 904
Scaraboid **Vol. 3:** 497
Scarcity **Vol. 3:** 1162
Scarlet **Vol. 1:** 205
Scarlet beast **Vol. 3:** 396
Scatter **Vol. 1:** 55, 109, 629, 686
Vol. 2: 31–35, 38, 226, 412 f.
Vol. 3: 718
Scattered **Vol. 1:** 685
Vol. 2: 380, 854
Scavenger **Vol. 1:** 117
Scent **Vol. 3: 599–601**
Sceptic **Vol. 1:** 70
Sceptical **Vol. 2:** 101
Scepticism **Vol. 1:** 59, 211, 512, 550 f., 595
Vol. 2: 100, 341, 384, 431
Vol. 3: 83, 506, 899, 901
Sceptre **Vol. 1:** 162 f., **405–408,** 648 f.
Vol. 2: 98
Vol. 3: 49, 650, 867, 870
Sceva **Vol. 2:** 519
Vol. 3: 476
Schaeffer, F. **Vol. 3:** 899
Schematization in Luke **Vol. 3:** 698
Scheming **Vol. 3: 935–943**
Schism **Vol. 1:** 238
Vol. 2: 618
Schizophrenic **Vol. 3:** 474
Schleiermacher, Friedrich **Vol. 1:** 59, 582 f.
Vol. 3: 148, 1138
Schmidt, K.L. **Vol. 3:** 62
Schmithals, W. **Vol. 3:** 58
Scholar **Vol. 1:** 69, 486
Vol. 3: 477
Scholarly **Vol. 3:** 1106
Schonfield, H. **Vol. 3:** 292
School **Vol. 1:** 486–488, 533, 535, 627, 631, 671
Vol. 2: 311, 445
Vol. 3: 488, 777 f.
School of Hillel **Vol. 1: 67,** 69, 155, 506
Vol. 2: 43, 811
Vol. 3: 534, 538, 980
School of philosophy **Vol. 1:** 533 f.
School of Shammai **Vol. 1: 67,** 69, 155, 500, 506
Vol. 2: 43, 811
Vol. 3: 534, 538
Schoolmaster **Vol. 1:** 568
Schopenhauer, A. **Vol. 3:** 899
Schulz, S. **Vol. 3:** 58
Schweitzer, Albert **Vol. 2:** 902 f.
Vol. 3: 506
Schweizer, E. **Vol. 3:** 618
Science **Vol. 3:** 1081
Scientific criticism (→ Criticism, scientific)
Scoff **Vol. 1:** 296
Vol. 2: 432, 843
Vol. 3: 29, 235
Scoffer **Vol. 2:** 58, 479
Vol. 3: 844, 868
Scold **Vol. 1:** 626
Vol. 2: 144
Scorching **Vol. 1:** 515, 652 f.
Scorn **Vol. 1:** 418, 607, 642
Vol. 2: 49, 356, 394, 399, 429, 431–433, 448
Vol. 3: 29
Scornful **Vol. 2:** 149, 417, 433
Scorpio **Vol. 2:** 688
Scorpion **Vol. 1:** 464, **507–511**
Vol. 2: 29
Vol. 3: 944
Scourge **Vol. 1: 161–164,** 364, 393, 395, 657
Vol. 3: 96, 109, 778, 996
Scratch **Vol. 2:** 288
Scratch letters **Vol. 3:** 478
Scratch on **Vol. 3:** 483
Scream **Vol. 1:** 94
Scribes **Vol. 1:** 64, 174, 196, 199 f., 205, 248, 265, 281, 311, 363 f., 395, 413, 427, 451, 487 f., 509, 544 f., 567, 574, 617, 631, 729
Vol. 2: 32, 43, 101, 147, 170, 174, 177, 222, 227, 262, 281, 327 f., 368, 399, 467, 469, 584, 610, 640 f., 714 f., 730, 799, 801, 811, 830, 834
Vol. 3: 39, 115 f., 181–185, 211, 313, 342, 344, 360, 378, 429, 445–447, **477–482,** 485, 622, 628, 741, 757, 763, 769, 780, 792, 796, 804, 854, 861, 911, 953, 1020, 1052, 1096, 1109, 1121, 1162
Script **Vol. 2:** 308 f.
Vol. 3: 483
Scripture **Vol. 1:** 167, 245 f., 248, 437, 485, 544, 577–579, 584, 641, 662, 680, 695, 735–738
Vol. 2: 62 f., 114, 126, 186, 219, 227 f., 235, 291, 307, 312–315, 327, 342, 380, 432, 443 f., 448, 505, 624, 641, 665 f., 681, 714 f., 774, 811, 834, 927
Vol. 3: 34, 48, 62, 70, 82, 87–89, 112, 127–

129, 132, 185 f., 188, 196, 215, 252, 275, 310 f., **325–337,** 365, 401, 404, 429, 465, 478, 480, **482–495,** 533, 690, 702, 705, 708, 761, 763, 771, 780, 892, 943, 1023, 1033, 1045, 1048, 1050, 1052, 1106, 1143
Scroll **Vol. 1:** 53, 58, 118, 202, 243 f.
Vol. 2: 189, 727
Vol. 3: 180, 478, 500, 673, 735 f., 1097–1099
Scruples **Vol. 1:** 449
Vol. 2: 223, 402
Scrupulosity **Vol. 1:** 265
Vol. 2: 150, 385
Vol. 3: 432, 1053
Scrutinize **Vol. 1:** 189, 241
Scrutiny **Vol. 2:** 370
Vol. 3: 810
Scum **Vol. 1:** 479
Scutum **Vol. 3:** 109, 966
Scythians **Vol. 2:** 127, 679
Vol. 3: 915
Scythopolis **Vol. 2:** 592
Vol. 3: 453, 818
Sea **Vol. 1:** 144, 240, 382 f., 387, 419, 508, 515, 517, 617, 698, 734 f.
Vol. 2: 130, 187, 197, 281, 421, 615, 623, 625, 642, 657, 661, 691, 840
Vol. 3: 112, 398, 443, 558–560, 735, 950, **982–992**
Sea of glass **Vol. 3:** 984
Sea-captain **Vol. 3:** 115
Sea-creature **Vol. 1:** 670
Sea-dragon **Vol. 2:** 200
Sea-monster **Vol. 1:** 670 f.
Vol. 3: 983
Sea-snake **Vol. 1:** 507
Seal **Vol. 1:** 79, 118, 123, 225, 244, 308 f., 311, 393, 403, 658, 660
Vol. 2: 40, 146, 158, 269, 411, 691, 695, 700, 727
Vol. 3: 73, 82, 180, 199, 344, 362, 368, **497–501,** 557, 673, 701, 732, 734, 736, 740, 904, 1001
Sealed book **Vol. 2:** 194
Sear **Vol. 1:** 350, 352
Search **Vol. 1:** 737
Vol. 2: 182 f., 386, 424, 834
Vol. 3: 532 f., 1034
Search for **Vol. 2: 805–807**
Vol. 3: 530–532
Search out **Vol. 1:** 64, 503
Vol. 3: 532 f.
Season with salt **Vol. 3: 443–449**
Seasonable **Vol. 3: 845–849**
Seasoning **Vol. 2:** 211
Vol. 3: 1025
Seasons **Vol. 1:** 624, 724, 737
Vol. 2: 193, 270, 375, 688, 921
Vol. 3: 349, 445, 833, 835, 841 f., 845
Seat **Vol. 1:** 521, 661, 666, 710
Vol. 2: 245, 325, 369, 388, **611–615**
Vol. 3: 587–589
Seat of government **Vol. 2:** 601
Seat of honour **Vol. 1:** 664, 666
Vol. 2: 612
Seba **Vol. 2:** 367
Sebaste **Vol. 3:** 450, 456 f.
Sebastos **Vol. 3:** 457
Seclusion **Vol. 1:** 421, 641
Second **Vol. 1:** 54 f., 666
Vol. 3: 952
Second Adam **Vol. 3:** 659
Second coming **Vol. 1:** 52, 56, 235, 315, 319 f., 323 f., 425, 508, 514
Vol. 2: 38, 461, 713, **886–935**
Vol. 3: 118, 121, 323, 367, 505 (*also* → Parousia)
Second death **Vol. 1:** 441, 501
Vol. 2: 304, 701
Second man (→ Man, second)
Second marriage **Vol. 3:** 1075 (*also* → Remarriage)
Second sight **Vol. 2:** 559
Second Temple (→ Temple, second)
Secondary **Vol. 1:** 664
Secondary authority **Vol. 2:** 446
Secrecy **Vol. 1:** 421
Vol. 3: 377, 748
Secret **Vol. 1:** 50, 129, 167, 175, 244, 370, 375, 452, 466, 529, 539 f., 574, 578, 613, 625, 628, 722, 729, 737
Vol. 2: 71, 75, 182, 211 f., **214–220,** 255, 279, 317, 353, 365, 379, 397, 401, 408, 469, 488, 493, 560, 652, 727, 753, 758, 762, 794, 835, 899, 903
Vol. 3: 45, 54, 77, 80, 129, 131–133, 141, 310 f., 314, 316, 476, 497–500, **501–510,** 523, 527, 717, 844, 950, 955, 1036, 1109, 1113
Secret royal line **Vol. 3:** 655
Secretary **Vol. 1:** 248, 582
Vol. 3: 477–482
Secretly **Vol. 1:** 120, 424
Secrets of Enoch **Vol. 3:** 265
Sect **Vol. 1:** 510, 533–535, 554
Vol. 2: 676
Vol. 3: 108, 439
Sectarian **Vol. 1:** 294, 644
Vol. 2: 438
Section **Vol. 1:** 65
Secular **Vol. 1:** 209, 211, 497, 574, 583, 588, 614, 618, 643, 675, 717
Vol. 2: 230, 239 f., 273, 334, 373, 376, 670
Secular time **Vol. 2:** 891
Secularists **Vol. 3:** 440
Secularization **Vol. 1:** 367, 500
Secure **Vol. 1:** 464, 651, 658, 660–663, 680 f.
Vol. 2: 203, 244, 295
Security **Vol. 1:** 95, 97, 208, 277, 392, 426, 440, 466, 483, 596, 599, 623, 663, 713
Vol. 2: 149, 239, 297, 777, 843 f., 846
Vol. 3: 252, 555, 559, 692, 807, 822, 865, 948 (*also* → False security)
Sedar **Vol. 1:** 64
Sedative **Vol. 2:** 28
Sedentary **Vol. 1:** 661
Sediment **Vol. 1:** 711
Sedition **Vol. 3:** 448
Seduce **Vol. 1:** 468, 555
Vol. 2: 458, 582, 629

Seduce (*cont'd*)
Vol. 3: 1054
Seduction **Vol. 3:** 95, 770
Seductive **Vol. 1:** 526
Vol. 2: 460
See **Vol. 1:** 230, 261, 421, 444, 603 f., 613, 667, 672, 677, 692, 694, 708, 712 f., 727, 735, 740, 743
Vol. 2: 45, 77, 110, 134, 154, 173, 176, 180, 183, 211 f., 214 f., 230, 243 f., 270, 279, 282, 285, 289, 358, 379, 387, 393, 395, 403 f., 488, 494, 496, 633, 710, 857
Vol. 3: 106, 126, 129, 179, 285, 310 f., 313 f., **511–521,** 572, 806
See again **Vol. 3: 519**
See God **Vol. 3:** 890
Seed **Vol. 1:** 159, 173 f., 186, 226, 236, 377 f., 469 f., 517, 560, 653, 686, 722
Vol. 2: 35, 104, 131 f., 177, 180, 211, 364, 514, 586, 662, 843, 861
Vol. 3: 73, 143, 251, 278, 304, 382, **521–527,** 684, 701, 704, 870, 922
Seed of Abraham **Vol. 1:** 159
Vol. 2: 899
Seed of David **Vol. 1:** 177
Vol. 3: 650 f., 653, 661, 1073
Seed-time **Vol. 1:** 624
Seedling **Vol. 1:** 281
Seek **Vol. 1:** 266, 322, 397, 430, 464, 473, 603, 630, 666, 681, 687, 735
Vol. 2: 116, 127, 164, 257, 271, 275, 327, 351, 355, 361, 381, 386 f., 806, 832, 857
Vol. 3: 54, 93, 360, **527–533, 116 –1169**
Seek help **Vol. 2:** 201
Seem **Vol. 1: 55**
Vol. 2: 286
Vol. 3: 821 f.
Seemly **Vol. 2: 668 f.**
Seer **Vol. 1:** 208, 582
Vol. 2: 193, 625, 633
Vol. 3: 33, 77, 513
Segregation **Vol. 1:** 688
Vol. 3: 1058
Sehetepibre **Vol. 3:** 259
Seir **Vol. 3:** 1013
Seize **Vol. 1:** 343, 533
Vol. 3: 601–605, 641, **716–718, 747–751**
Select **Vol. 2:** 362
Vol. 3: 513
Selection **Vol. 1:** 191, 536 f., 540, 629
Vol. 2: 362
Selene **Vol. 3:** 733
Seleucids **Vol. 1:** 62, 196, 627
Vol. 2: 234, 810, 849
Vol. 3: 35, 217, 452 f., 479, 756, 788, 961
Seleucus IV **Vol. 1:** 694
Self **Vol. 1:** 235, 236, 240, 335 f., 386, 401, 455, 460, 466 f., 475, 680, 716
Vol. 2: 49, 394, 566, 818, 919
Vol. 3: 127, 680, 710
Self-abandonment **Vol. 3:** 174
Self-abasement **Vol. 1:** 609
Vol. 2: 202, 263, 270, 618
Vol. 3: 597, 608
Self-adjustment **Vol. 1:** 602
Self-assertion **Vol. 1:** 531, 676
Vol. 2: 202
Vol. 3: 532
Self-assurance **Vol. 1:** 386
Vol. 2: 416
Self-attesting **Vol. 3:** 326
Self-authenticating **Vol. 3:** 625
Self-awareness **Vol. 1:** 604
Vol. 3: 772
Self-castration **Vol. 1:** 560 f.
Self-centred **Vol. 3:** 137, 1053 f.
Self-chosen **Vol. 2:** 825
Vol. 3: 938
Self-communication **Vol. 3:** 1078
Self-conceit **Vol. 3:** 707
Self-condemnation **Vol. 3:** 249
Self-condemned **Vol. 2:** 363, 365
Self-confidence **Vol. 1:** 228, 499, 592, 736
Vol. 2: 430, 844
Vol. 3: 82, 240, 581, 673, 1092
Self-consciousness **Vol. 1:** 322, 349, 427, 529
Vol. 2: 308 f., 312, 341 f., 567
Vol. 3: 618
Self-consecration **Vol. 2:** 225
Self-contained **Vol. 1:** 355
Self-contradictory **Vol. 1:** 473
Vol. 3: 891
Self-contrived **Vol. 2:** 843
Self-control **Vol. 1:** 398, 459, 494–496, 501 f., 515, 623, 645, 647, 675, 681
Vol. 3: 184, 225, 253, 815 f.,
Self-correction **Vol. 1:** 491
Self-critical **Vol. 1:** 602
Self-deception **Vol. 1:** 400, 587
Vol. 2: 470
Vol. 3: 283, 822, 881
Self-denial **Vol. 1:** 470, 475, 483
Vol. 2: 117, 386
Self-deprecating **Vol. 2:** 305
Self-description **Vol. 3:** 914
Self-designation **Vol. 2:** 109, 228, 237, 310, 312, 378
Vol. 3: 619, 623, 648
Self-destruction **Vol. 1:** 460
Self-determination **Vol. 2:** 121
Self-determined **Vol. 1:** 722
Self-direction **Vol. 1:** 601
Self-discipline **Vol. 1:** 163, 459
Vol. 2: 102 f.
Self-disclosure **Vol. 2:** 79
Vol. 3: 330, 337, 1102
Self-effacing **Vol. 2:** 259, 428 f.
Self-emptying **Vol. 1:** 548
Vol. 2: 262, 828, 844
Vol. 3: 645
Self-esteem **Vol. 1:** 112, 540
Vol. 3: 561
Self-evident **Vol. 2:** 447, 709
Vol. 3: 334, 967, 1108
Self-exaltation **Vol. 2:** 201, **202**
Vol. 3: 1031
Self-examination **Vol. 1:** 415
Vol. 2: 392

Self-explanatory **Vol. 1:** 577
Self-expression **Vol. 1:** 460
Vol. 2: 256
Vol. 3: 691
Self-fulfilment **Vol. 3:** 225
Self-giving **Vol. 1:** 338, 492
Vol. 3: 198, 931, 1064
Self-glorification **Vol. 1:** 228
Vol. 3: 771, 848, 1032, 1045
Self-governing **Vol. 2:** 788
Self-gratification **Vol. 1:** 496
Vol. 2: 202
Self-humbling **Vol. 2:** 262
Self-humiliation **Vol. 1:** 399
Vol. 2: 262 f.
Self-identification **Vol. 2:** 83, 823
Self-immolation **Vol. 1:** 235
Vol. 2: 307
Self-important **Vol. 2:** 399
Self-indulgence **Vol. 1:** 448, 495
Vol. 2: 275, 712
Self-interest **Vol. 1:** 420
Vol. 2: 568
Self-involving language **Vol. 3:** 1139
Self-irony **Vol. 2:** 432
Self-justification **Vol. 1:** 675 f.
Vol. 2: 448
Vol. 3: 140
Self-knowledge **Vol. 1:** 590
Vol. 2: 402, 404
Vol. 3: 640
Self-love **Vol. 1:** 228
Vol. 2: 659
Self-manifestation **Vol. 2:** 491
Vol. 3: 334
Self-offering **Vol. 2:** 230, 535 f.
Self-perfection **Vol. 2:** 103
Vol. 3: 778, 1169
Self-perpetuating **Vol. 1:** 364
Self-pity **Vol. 3:** 1054
Self-possession **Vol. 2:** 539
Self-praise **Vol. 1:** 227 f.
Vol. 2: 844
Vol. 3: 817
Self-preparation **Vol. 3:** 117 f.
Self-presentation **Vol. 2:** 278
Self-preservation **Vol. 3:** 137, 530
Self-projection **Vol. 3:** 236
Self-realization **Vol. 1:** 497
Vol. 3: 589
Self-reformation **Vol. 2:** 407
Vol. 3: 256
Self-reliance **Vol. 1:** 681
Self-renunciation **Vol. 1:** 403
Self-reproachful **Vol. 2:** 431
Self-respect **Vol. 1:** 679
Self-restraint **Vol. 1:** 494
Self-revealing **Vol. 2:** 197
Self-revelation **Vol. 1:** 222, 384
Vol. 2: 45, 80, 229, 281, 343, 395, 442, 633
Vol. 3: 314, 776
Self-righteous **Vol. 2:** 106, 416, 434, 443
Vol. 3: 370, 580 f., 603
Self-righteousness **Vol. 1:** 439, 680
Vol. 2: 155, 170, 267, 584
Self-sacrifice **Vol. 1:** 474, 539, 731
Vol. 2: 339, 546, 563, 615, 673, 833
Vol. 3: 41 f., 905, 954, 1019, 1064, 1168
Self-salvation **Vol. 2:** 394
Vol. 3: 168
Self-satisfaction **Vol. 2:** 404, 443
Vol. 3: 819
Self-security **Vol. 1:** 730
Vol. 2: 435
Self-seeking **Vol. 1:** 398, 400, 638
Vol. 3: 568, 945
Self-sufficiency **Vol. 1:** 319, 661, 680
Vol. 2: 295, 657, 820
Vol. 3: 391, **727 f.,** 1052–1054
Self-supporting **Vol. 3:** 727
Self-surrender **Vol. 1:** 397, 548
Vol. 2: 532 f., 864
Vol. 3: 55
Self-trust **Vol. 2:** 815
Self-understanding **Vol. 1:** 59, 488
Vol. 2: 342
Vol. 3: 328, 561, 697, 928, 1139
Self-will **Vol. 1:** 365, 532, 608
Vol. 3: 1066
Selfish **Vol. 1:** 106, 381, 384, 547, 681
Vol. 2: 32, 221, 518, 550, 844
Vol. 3: 137, 804, 1054
Selfless **Vol. 2:** 563
Sell **Vol. 1:** 118, **267 f.,** 288, 352, 497, 688, 691
Vol. 2: 32, 63, 832, 846
Vol. 3: 190, 243, 253, 590, 954
Seller **Vol. 1:** 120
Semantic **Vol. 3:** 206
Semantic theory of truth **Vol. 3: 897**
Semantic triangle **Vol. 3:** 1129
Semantics **Vol. 1: 68**
Semblance **Vol. 1:** 709
Vol. 2: 287
Semi-political **Vol. 2:** 307
Semite **Vol. 1: 68,** 308
Vol. 2: 898
Semitic **Vol. 1: 68,** 603
Vol. 2: 920
Vol. 3: 185, 640
Semitisms **Vol. 1:** 272
Vol. 2: 149, 403, 427, 526, 530, 680, 727, 880
Vol. 3: 65, 509
Send **Vol. 1:** 126–129, 131, 133 f., 136, 246, 332, 453, 510, 526, 581, 603, 637, 689, 698, 704 f., 738
Vol. 2: 79, 152, 351, 404 f., 426, 610, 632, 819
Send away **Vol. 3:** 177
Seneca **Vol. 1:** 51, 68, 349, 679
Vol. 2: 77, 239, 542, 792
Seniority **Vol. 1:** 193
Sennacherib **Vol. 1:** 104, 673
Vol. 2: 679
Vol. 3: 484
Sensation **Vol. 3:** 684, 899
Sensationalism **Vol. 2:** 168
Sense **Vol. 1:** 546, 681, 700
Vol. 2: 172 f., 175 f., 327, 390–392, 395, 416,

Sense (*cont'd*)
434, 568, 591
Sense perception **Vol. 3:** 899
Senseless **Vol. 1:** 424, 546
Vol. 3: 124, 126, 130, **1023–1026**
Senses **Vol. 1:** 56, 432, 443 f., 458 f., 523, 527, 530, 652
Vol. 3: 689, 694
Sensible **Vol. 1:** 501
Vol. 2: 169, **616–620**
Sensitive **Vol. 1:** 352
Vol. 3: 694, 916
Sensory **Vol. 3:** 123
Sensual **Vol. 2:** 138, 265, 539
Vol. 3: 231
Sensuality **Vol. 1:** 494, 498, 680
Vol. 3: 1054, 1075
Sensuous **Vol. 1:** 676
Sent **Vol. 3:** 313
Sentence **Vol. 1:** 86, 364, 393, 395, 415, 479, 597, 630, 677
Vol. 2: 139, 143, 178, 309, 368, 370, 419, 434, 505
Vol. 3: 354, 484, 617, 1049, 1119
Sentence analysis **Vol. 3:** 1085
Sentence of death **Vol. 3:** 156, 342
Sentiment **Vol. 2:** 435
Sentinel **Vol. 2:** 136
Sentry **Vol. 1:** 314
Separate **Vol. 1:** 413, 419, 422, 441, 444, 455, 459, 472 f., 503 f., 506 f., 525, 533, 539, 545, 556, 564, 566, 606–608, 625, 653, 677f., 707, 718 f., 741
Vol. 2: 83, 199 f., 267, 273, 282, 307, 359, **362–367,** 413, 442, 720, 809 f.
Vol. 3: 98, 172 f., 188 f., 468, **534–544,** 565, 567, 680, 941, 1057, 1064, 1070, 1072, 1075, 1164
Separated **Vol. 3: 534–543**
Separation **Vol. 1:** 60, 115, 145, 155, 239 f., 289, 360, 405, 433, 488, 500, 503 f., 522, 537, 565, 607, 674
Vol. 2: 54, 197, 224, 226, 307, 309–312, 316 f., 362, 393, 517, 629, 707, 709, 715, 742, 813, 825
Vol. 3: 173, 277, 360, 362, 392, 404, 444, 470, 526 f., **535–543,** 597, 621, 647, 949, 1005, 1149, 1165
Sepphoris **Vol. 3:** 441 f.
Septimius Severus **Vol. 3:** 635
Septuagint **Vol. 1:** 50, 53–55, 57, 62, 65, **68,** 71
Vol. 2: 125, 219, 338, 690, 697
Vol. 3: 486
Sepulchre **Vol. 1:** 264 f.
Sequence **Vol. 1:** 473
Vol. 2: 387
Seraph **Vol. 1:** 101, 239, 279 f., 509
Vol. 2: 173, 212
Serapis **Vol. 1:** 64
Vol. 2: 224
Vol. 3: 138, 160, 216, 859
Serene **Vol. 3:** 673
Serfdom **Vol. 1:** 707
Sergius Paulus **Vol. 1:** 530
Vol. 2: 557
Seriousness **Vol. 1:** 627
Vol. 2: 95, 276
Vol. 3: 1065, 1169
Sermon **Vol. 1:** 58, 245
Sermon on the mount **Vol. 1:** 110, 120, 217, 231, 277 f., 335, 339, 384, 702, 738
Vol. 2: 43, 118, 133, 177, **281,** 443, 449, 469, 543 f., 580, 825, 831 f., 871 f., 893
Vol. 3: 181, 382, 402, 428 f., 445, 540, 580, 584, 742, 763, 770, 805, 940, 1009, 1011 f., 1107, 1109, 1110
Sermon on the plain **Vol. 1:** 217, 277
Vol. 2: 598
Serpent **Vol. 1:** 86 f., 168, 175, 413, 465, 468, **507–511,** 523, 562, 565, 568, 653, 705
Vol. 2: 29, 132, 458, 619, 638, 642, 701
Vol. 3: 472, 944
Serpent-charming **Vol. 2:** 554
Servant **Vol. 1:** 177, 219, 226, 272, **280–291,** 311, 404, 426, 474, 477, 479, 481, 485, 492, 513, 538 f., 547, 549, 565, 569, 598, 617, 646, 655, 667, 702 f., 706, 709 f., 720, 729, 741
Vol. 2: 129, 136, 152, 164, 167, 192, 249, 262, 301, 305, 307, 313, 328, 336, 364, 382, 411, 413, 467, 508 f., 511, 596, 600, 610, 642, 667, 833, 838, 866, 888, 917
Vol. 3: 34, 62, 110, 118, 121, 134, 173, 195 f., 319, **544–549, 551–553, 589–599, 607–664,** 732, 748, 758, 856, 864, 951, 998 f., 1064, 1157, 1163
Servant of God **Vol. 1:** 96 f., 102, 111, 281, 290, 385, 587, 597, 699
Vol. 2: 165, 336, 411, 540, 731, 768, 816, 854
Vol. 3: 578, **607–664,** 765, 867
Servant of the Lord **Vol. 1:** 262, 283, 409, 544, 707
Vol. 2: 49, 165, 410, 492
Vol. 3: 692, 825
Servant of Yahweh **Vol. 1:** 373–375
Vol. 2: 309, 368
Vol. 3: 218, 258, 420
Servant Songs **Vol. 1:** 273, 651
Vol. 2: 279, 337
Vol. 3: 69, 269, **609, 611,** 1041
Serve **Vol. 1:** 101 f., 116, 129, 136, 173, 191 f., 198, 200, 212, 231, 305, 307, 335, 351, 381, 469, 474, 481, 486, 551 f., 676, 718–720, 741
Vol. 2: 63, 77, 83, 94, 147, 152, 160, 164, 238, 253, 256, 262, 266, 282, 284, 286, 319, 349, 427, 429, 447, 466, 518, 671, 675, 715, 809, 816, 823, 840, 847, 876, 885
Vol. 3: 27, 69, 171, 195, 233, 269, 420, 432, 435 f., **544–553,** 590, **592–598,** 625, 673, 724, 755, 806, 1001, 1065 f., 1152
Serve as deacon **Vol. 3: 544–549**
Serve as soldier **Vol. 3: 958–967**
Service **Vol. 1:** 96, 99, 115 f., 127, 129, 135, 143, 190 f., 235, 238 f., 245–248, 259, 273, 275, 283, 285, 293, 304, 319, 336, 382, 384, 386, 421, 474–476, 482, 489 f., 493, 505, 513, 536–538, 542, 600, 619, 625, 630 f., 646, 659, 674, 720, 731, 740

Vol. 2: 50 f., 68, 92, 121, 152, 164, 174, 203, 211, 222, 229, 233, 242, 255, 263, 269–271, 285, 291, 293, 305, 327–329, 339, 399, 403, 429, 451, 475, 517, 547, 559, 566, 611, 615, 650, 652, 655, 736, 765, 774
Vol. 3: 32–44, 51, 101, 117, 121, 134, 140 f., 145, 162, 197, 215, 225, 227, 373, 489, **544–549, 551–553,** 584, 590, 613, 752, 789, 793, 804, 810, 827, 854, 1075
Service of God **Vol. 3: 549–551**
Serviceable **Vol. 2:** 98
Servile **Vol. 1:** 485
Vol. 2: 259
Servility **Vol. 2:** 859
Serving **Vol. 3: 551–553**
Servitude **Vol. 1:** 209, 531, 674, 707, 719
Vol. 3: 1162
Session **Vol. 2:** 147, 369
Set **Vol. 1:** 314, 413, 471, 477, 494, 518, 523, 604, 609, 696
Set about **Vol. 3:** 860
Set apart **Vol. 1:** 336, 472–474, 537
Vol. 2: 232
Set aside **Vol. 1:** 74, 337, 719
Set at naught **Vol. 1:** 74
Set at variance **Vol. 3:** 468
Set forth **Vol. 3:** 316
Set forth publicly **Vol. 3: 482–495**
Set free **Vol. 1:** 437, 505, 698, 715 f.
Vol. 2: 91, 116, 150
Vol. 3: 166–174, 177–189, 196, 201, **352–377,** 537, 713, 1164
Set mind on **Vol. 2: 616–620**
Set prayers **Vol. 2:** 869
Set up **Vol. 1:** 474, 476
Vol. 3: 117
Set up again **Vol. 3: 351 f.**
Set upon **Vol. 2:** 150
Seth **Vol. 2:** 556
Vol. 3: 388
Setting **Vol. 2:** 327
Vol. 3: 234
Settle **Vol. 1:** 576, 578
Vol. 2: 247–251, 305, 365
Vol. 3: 167
Settle down **Vol. 3:** 255
Settled **Vol. 1:** 518 f., 543
Vol. 2: 711
Settlement **Vol. 1:** 685
Vol. 2: 131, 296, 333, 373
Vol. 3: 1106
Seven **Vol. 1:** 129, 361
Vol. 2: 114, 152, 550, 625, 651, 667, 685, 687 f., **690–692,** 693, 697 f., 700, 756, 769, 784, 827, 931
Vol. 3: 88, 490, 500, 548, 657, 715, 731, 736, 739, 851, 958, 1066 f., 1075
Seven churches **Vol. 1:** 304
Vol. 2: 487, 685, 691
Vol. 3: 85, 88, 490, 505 f., 706, 736
Seven lampstands **Vol. 1:** 304
Vol. 2: 487
Vol. 3: 736
Seven rules of Hillel **Vol. 1:** 580
Seven sages **Vol. 3:** 1027
Seven seals **Vol. 3:** 490
Seven stars **Vol. 3:** 735 f.
Seven thousand **Vol. 3:** 248
Seven years **Vol. 2:** 317
Seven-branched lampstand **Vol. 2:** 485, 487
Sevenfold **Vol. 2:** 690
Seventh day **Vol. 1:** 211
Vol. 3: 257, **405–415**
Seventy **Vol. 1:** 142, 195, 282, 489
Vol. 2: 358, 638, 641, 690, **696 f.,** 754, 769, 784, 920
Vol. 3: 470, 569, 944
Sever **Vol. 1:** 74, 515
Vol. 2: 120
Severance **Vol. 1:** 713
Severe **Vol. 2:** 360 f.
Severity **Vol. 1:** 568, 611, 727, 731
Vol. 2: 270
Sex **Vol. 1:** 85 f., 233, 235, 285, 459, 497
Sex cell **Vol. 3:** 663
Sexes **Vol. 1:** 87
Vol. 2: 160, 660
Sexual **Vol. 1:** 137, 169, 420, 441, 448 f., 457, 461, 494–502, 509, 612, 625, 656
Vol. 2: 161, 260, 350, 540 f., 599
Vol. 3: 100, 102–104, 310, 534–543, 563 f., 925, 989, 997, 1024, 1157, 1165
Sexual deviations **Vol. 2:** 660
Sexual ethics **Vol. 3:** 1064
Sexual needs **Vol. 3:** 1065
Sexual offences **Vol. 2:** 579
Vol. 3: 96, 535
Sexual relations **Vol. 1:** 138, 151, 232, 322, 448, 451, 498–502, 637, 678
Vol. 2: 224, 349 f., 392, 395, 398, 570, 575–580, 638, 659 f., 668, 722, 923
Vol. 3: 534–543, 859–861, 1072, 1121
Shaalbin **Vol. 3:** 453
Shade **Vol. 1:** 431, 433, 653, 705
Vol. 2: 284
Vol. 3: 553–556
Shades **Vol. 2:** 206, 555
Vol. 3: 268
Shadow **Vol. 1:** 327, 371, 435, 559
Vol. 2: 194, 275, 288, 291, 447, 451, 475, 717, 804
Vol. 3: 42, **553–556,** 660, 840, 1158
Shadowy existence **Vol. 2:** 206
Shadrach **Vol. 2:** 628
Vol. 3: 110
Shaft **Vol. 2:** 97
Shake **Vol. 1:** 540
Vol. 3: 317, **556–561,** 736
Shake down **Vol. 3: 556–558**
Shake head **Vol. 2:** 159
Shake off **Vol. 3: 560 f.**
Shake off dust **Vol. 3:** 1043
Shake out **Vol. 3: 560 f.**
Shake together **Vol. 3: 709 f.**
Shaking **Vol. 3: 556–558**
Shaliah **Vol. 3:** 746
Shallow **Vol. 1:** 546
Shalmaneser I **Vol. 2:** 679

Sham **Vol. 1:** 709
Vol. 2: 632
Shamash **Vol. 3:** 730
Shame **Vol. 1:** 85, 113, 314, 349, 390, 399–401, 461, 559, 608, 649, 723
Vol. 2: 48 f., 51, 91, 157, 159, 217, 262, 359, 361, 385, 417, 442, 478, 709, 737
Vol. 3: 96, **561–564,** 601, 714, 731, 856, 918
Shameful **Vol. 2:** 50, 182, 260, 291, 368
Vol. 3: **562–564**
Shameless **Vol. 2:** 356
Vol. 3: 1024
Shammai **Vol. 1:** 67, 69, 153, 155, 485, 500, 506
Vol. 2: 311, 579, 811
Vol. 3: 184, 534, 538
Shammaites **Vol. 1:** 627
Vol. 2: 309
Shamshi-Adad I **Vol. 2:** 679
Shape **Vol. 1:** 383, 705, 708
Vol. 2: 95, 159, 290, 424, 501
Vol. 3: 119, 352, 915, 1153
Shaphan **Vol. 3:** 478
Share **Vol. 1:** 123, 158, 316, 359 f., 375, 468, 478, 489, 492 f., 526, 534, 558, 571, 615, 618, **635–644,** 669, 671, 676, 691, 696, 702, 707, 712, 723
Vol. 2: 40, 42, 46, 64, 83, 101, 120, 151, 163, 165, 230, 262, 271 f., 276 f., 287, 295–298, 300, 302, **303 f.,** 311, 314 f., 328, 350, 358, 360, 380, 405 f., 475, 498, 520, 532, 534, 777, 787, 841, 846, 888
Vol. 3: 258, 278, 316, 356, 422, 433, 504, 588, 648, 702, 705, 724, 756, 778, 819, 855, 908, 913, 990
Share rule **Vol. 2:** **372–389**
Shared life **Vol. 2:** 579
Sharing **Vol. 3:** **747–751**
Sharp **Vol. 1:** 726
Sharpen **Vol. 2:** 288, 573
Vol. 3: 951
Shatter **Vol. 1:** 610
Vol. 3: 166, 913
Shave **Vol. 2:** 417
Shaven **Vol. 2:** 157, 160
Shealtiel **Vol. 2:** 691
Vol. 3: 654 f., 659
Shear-jashub **Vol. 3:** 249
Shearer **Vol. 2:** 410
Sheaves **Vol. 2:** 737
Vol. 3: 591
Sheba **Vol. 1:** 577
Vol. 2: 381, 680
Vol. 3: 606
Shechem **Vol. 1:** 195, 367
Vol. 2: 67, 318, 591, 796
Vol. 3: 450, 452, 458 f., 464, 786 f.
Shechemites **Vol. 2:** 521
Vol. 3: 450, 455 f.
Shed **Vol. 1:** 97, 152, 220–223, 369, 654
Vol. 2: 525
Shed blood **Vol. 2:** **853–855**
Vol. 3: 103, 158, 160, 164, 582
Sheep **Vol. 1:** 114–116, 118 f., 190, 299, 319, 453, 463 f., 503, 559, 684
Vol. 2: 31, 34, 148, 177, 280, 314, 358, 386, **410–414,** 458 f., 461, 543, 599, 695, 728, 839
Vol. 3: 98, 170, 454, **564–568,** 628, 683, 717, 920
Sheep's clothing **Vol. 1:** 118 f.
Sheep-shearing **Vol. 1:** 626
Sheepfold **Vol. 2:** 586
Sheet **Vol. 2:** 95, 689
Shekel **Vol. 3:** 192, **752–755**
Shekel (Tyrian) **Vol. 2:** 851
Shekel of Israel **Vol. 2:** 308, 852
Shekalim **Vol. 3:** 752
Shekinah **Vol. 2:** 628, 899
Vol. 3: 555, 634, 697, 788, 792
Shell **Vol. 1:** 704, 706, 709
Shell-fish **Vol. 1:** 205
Shell-shock **Vol. 3:** 474
Shelter **Vol. 1:** 653
Vol. 3: 109, 381, 547, 554 f., 813, 867, 948
Shem **Vol. 1:** 68, 182
Vol. 2: 591
Vol. 3: 36
Shema **Vol. 2:** 73, 173 f., 177, 313, 721, 864, 867
Vol. 3: 105, 559, 806, 1120, 1161
Sheol **Vol. 1:** 433
Vol. 2: 29, 32, 351 f., 432, 491, 924
Vol. 3: 178, 180, 201, 237, 262 f., 267 f., 270, 272, 274, 602, 880, 946
Shepherd **Vol. 1:** 65, 163, 190–192, 303, 305, 407, 453, 464, 483, 559, 625, 684
Vol. 2: 31, 34, 101, 104, 136, 176, 279 f., 305, 332, 386, 412 f., 458–461, 599, 624, 652, 696, 721, 723, 728, 757, 928
Vol. 3: 88, 219, 323, 335, 378, 446, 529, 531, **564–568,** 628, 649, 683, 685, 811, 873, 913, 1007, 1071
Shepherd of Hermas **Vol. 1:** 52, 577
Vol. 2: 219
Vol. 3: 312, 402
Shepherd of Israel **Vol. 1:** 598
Vol. 3: 565
Shepherd-gods **Vol. 2:** 104
Shepherdless **Vol. 3:** 567
Sherlock, Thomas **Vol. 3:** 291
Shield **Vol. 1:** 103, 648, 656, 689
Vol. 2: 237, 297, 865
Vol. 3: 109, 112, 731, **959–967**
Shield of faith **Vol. 3:** 966
Shift **Vol. 1:** 504, 680
Shiloh **Vol. 1:** 511, 543
Vol. 3: 33 f., 426, 782, 786 f., 812
Shimei **Vol. 3:** 78
Shine **Vol. 1:** 211, 424, 585–587
Vol. 2: 46, 289 f., **484–496**
Vol. 3: 270, 318, 731 f., 734, 867
Shining **Vol. 2:** 96, **484–486, 490–496**
Ship **Vol. 1:** 118, 476, 537, 645, 694, 698, 734, 743
Vol. 2: 212, 244
Vol. 3: 119, 180, 558, 711, 757, 935
Ship's cabin **Vol. 3:** 811
Shipwreck **Vol. 1:** 608
Vol. 3: 211, 1002

Shishak **Vol. 3:** 788
Shock **Vol. 1:** 530
Vol. 3: 681, 709 f.
Shoe **Vol. 1:** 241
Shoot **Vol. 1:** 426
Vol. 2: 333, 340
Shoot of David **Vol. 3:** 637, 651
Shoot forth **Vol. 3: 865–870**
Short **Vol. 2:** 692
Short-lived **Vol. 2:** 211
Shortcoming **Vol. 3:** 952
Shorthand **Vol. 3:** 757
Shortness of life **Vol. 1:** 433, 609, 743 f.
Shortsighted **Vol. 2:** 153
Shoulder **Vol. 1:** 241, 391, 403
Shout **Vol. 1:** 94, 271, 342, 408–411
Vol. 2: 144, 352, 433, 855, 862, 924
Vol. 3: 816
Show **Vol. 1:** 574, 649 f., 720, 722, 724
Vol. 3: 316, **317–324, 569–671**
Show kindness **Vol. 3: 1147–1152**
Show mercy **Vol. 2: 594–598**
Vol. 3: 164
Show pity **Vol. 2: 594–598**
Showbread **Vol. 1:** 586, 696 f.
Vol. 2: 293
Vol. 3: 117, 423, 787–789, 812, 814
Shrewd **Vol. 2:** 169, 254
Vol. 3: 1029
Shrine **Vol. 2:** 67, 74, 85, 199, 224, 235, 635
Vol. 3: 781–785
Shrink **Vol. 2:** 91, 775, 818
Shrivel **Vol. 3:** 999
Shroud **Vol. 3:** 296
Shun **Vol. 1:** 558, 564
Shunammite **Vol. 2:** 225
Vol. 3: 261, 558
Shut **Vol. 1:** 545, 694
Vol. 2: 31, 154, 193, 727, **729–734**
Vol. 3: 501
Sibyl **Vol. 1:** 529
Vol. 2: 744
Sibylline oracles **Vol. 1:** 155 f.
Sicarii **Vol. 3:** 1167
Sicily **Vol. 1:** 322
Sick **Vol. 1:** 118, 120, 356, 411, 446, 450, 564 f., 599 f., 674
Vol. 2: 259, 386, 543, 813
Vol. 3: 123, 146 f., 211, 216, 359, 547, 555, 713, 748, 750, 758, 856, 859–861, 980, **993–1000**
Sick bed **Vol. 2:** 586
Sickle **Vol. 1:** 204
Sickness **Vol. 1:** 84, 108, 151, 163, 346, 348, 433, 443, 452 f., 463, 635, 673 f., 679, 727
Vol. 2: 163–172, 206, 221, 320, 362, 419, 478, 663, 855, 875, 893, 924
Vol. 3: 202, 205, 224, 279, 470, 474 f., 558, 579, 778 f., 860, **993–1000,** 1005
Siddim **Vol. 3:** 444
Side of boat **Vol. 2:** 303
Sidereal hour **Vol. 1:** 710
Sidon **Vol. 2:** 226, 767, 789, 848
Vol. 3: 446, 908, 1052, 1062
Sidon, Mount **Vol. 3:** 444
Sidonians **Vol. 3:** 450
Siege **Vol. 3:** 756, 959
Siege-engine **Vol. 3:** 963
Siege-mound **Vol. 3:** 951
Siegeworks **Vol. 3:** 952
Sieve **Vol. 1:** 480
Sift **Vol. 2:** 362, 364
Vol. 3: 804
Sigh **Vol. 1:** 385, 552
Vol. 2: 215, 420, **423 f.,** 862, 865, 884
Sight **Vol. 1:** 219, 424, 703 f.
Vol. 2: 211, 218, 392
Vol. 3: 511–518, 602, 945
Sign **Vol. 1:** 119, 124 f., 129, 219 f., 275, 309, 311, 347, 358, 386, 391, 397, 399, 403, 415, 454, 474, 492, 503, 508, 525, 527, 603, 622, 626, 641, 648, 652, 655–657, 659, 686, 692, 702, 723, 733
Vol. 2: 116, 133, 149–151, 157, 194, 259, 261, 272, 286, 307, 310 f., 315, 338, 350–352, 381, 385, 396, 422, 435, 546, 569, 572, 574, 584, **620–635,** 708 f., 741, 858, 892, 901, 912, 921
Vol. 3: 52, 56, 189, 216, 246, 257, 277, 310, 406 f., 430, 481, 483, 497 f., 559 f., 569 f., 633 f., 649, 663, 732, 735 f., 763, 777, 793, 844, 848, 1002, 1057, 1079 f., 1088, 1098
Signal **Vol. 1:** 341 f., 408, 410
Vol. 3: 873, 911, 1009
Signature **Vol. 3:** 497
Signet **Vol. 3: 497–501**
Significance **Vol. 1:** 219, 302, 399, 605, 624, 628, 631, 651, 675, 694, 723
Vol. 2: 87, 109, 147, 149, 161, 268, 276, 281, 327, 330, 333, 337, 353, 379, 443 f., 462, 621, 683–702, 749, 910, 916
Vol. 3: 182, 235, 630, 701, 704 f., 783, 807, 1045 f.
Significant **Vol. 1:** 68, 290, 727, 737
Vol. 2: 307, 332, 340
Vol. 3: 1057
Signs of the times **Vol. 3:** 844, 848, 867, 1002
Signs and wonders **Vol. 2:** 626 f.
Sihon **Vol. 3:** 960
Silas **Vol. 1:** 130, 160, 168, 330, 340, 570 f.
Vol. 2: 136, 302, 321, 550
Vol. 3: 87 f., 475, 557, 670, 794, 908
Silence **Vol. 1:** 340, 543, 609, 619
Vol. 2: 312, 393, 446, 867, 878, 880
Vol. 3: 84, **111–114,** 270, 506, 583, 721, 951, 1058, 1063
Silly **Vol. 3:** 572
Silly women **Vol. 3: 1055–1068**
Siloam **Vol. 1:** 581
Vol. 3: 173, 483, 814, 976
Silvanus (→ Silas)
Silver **Vol. 1:** 93, 498, 537, 648
Vol. 2: 28, 44, **95–98,** 225, 235, 836, 844
Vol. 3: 200, 391 f., 752, 784, 793, 873, 912–915
Silver age **Vol. 2:** 96
Silversmith **Vol. 2:** 74, 623
Simein **Vol. 3:** 658
Simeon **Vol. 2:** 91, 245, 317, 624

Simeon (*cont'd*)
Vol. 3: 84, 118, 276, 313, 324, 361, 455 f., 658, 674, 790, 873, 1059, 1122
Simeon, Rabbi **Vol. 3:** 1056
Simeon ben Kosebah **Vol. 3:** 510
Similar **Vol. 2:** 286, **500–508,** 744
Simile **Vol. 1:** 577
Vol. 2: 211, 279, 287, 435, 743–760
Vol. 3: 734
Similitude **Vol. 2:** 743–760
Similitudes of Enoch **Vol. 3:** 265, 272, 614–616
Simlai, Rabbi **Vol. 3:** 367
Simon **Vol. 2:** 321, 817
Simon the Cananean **Vol. 3:** 1167
Simon of Cyrene **Vol. 2:** 740
Simon bar Giora **Vol. 3:** 1168
Simon the Just **Vol. 2:** 652
Simon the leper **Vol. 2:** 464
Vol. 3: 1060 f.
Simon Magus **Vol. 1:** 202
Vol. 2: 28, 152, 302, 557f., 768, 847
Vol. 3: 457, 463, 635
Simon (Peter) **Vol. 1:** 344
Vol. 3: 383
Simon the Pharisee **Vol. 3:** 1059, 1061
Simon, Rabbi **Vol. 2:** 672
Simonians **Vol. 2:** 557
Simonides **Vol. 3:** 1119
Simple **Vol. 2:** 458
Vol. 3: 571 f., 1024
Simple one of God **Vol. 3:** 640
Simple-minded **Vol. 1:** 563
Simpleton **Vol. 2:** 412
Simplicity **Vol. 1:** 280–282, 504
Vol. 2: 868
Vol. 3: 571 f., 811
Simultaneous **Vol. 3:** 819
Sin **Vol. 1:** 57, 77, 78, 85–87, 89, 96 f., 108, 111–113, 115, 125 f., 138, 144, 146–148, 150–152, 154, 156, 163, 166, 181, 187, 202, 204, 216, 221–225, 228 f., 231, 234–236, 268, 277, 294, 301, 303, 320, 324 f., 328, 336, 343, 345 f., 349, 355, 357, 359, 370–372, 374, 390 f., 398 f., 401 f., 417 f., 420, 423 f., 430, 433 f., 436–441, 446, 451, 459, 461, 465 f., 469–471, 474 f., 496, 499, 501, 504, 524 f., 532, 551, 554, 556, 562–565, 567, 569, 606–609, 611, 639, 641, 643 f., 651, 653, 673–677, 685, 698–703, 717–719, 721, 723, 725, 730, 733–735, 738, 740, 742
Vol. 2: 28, 42, 51, 71 f., 78, 80, 83, 86, 92–94, 101–103, 105 f., 117–120, 131, 137, 141, 143, 145, 151, 155 f., 166, 168–170, 182, 197, 204, 212, 214 f., 225, 237 f., 251, 258, 261, 263, 269 f., 282, 285–289, 302 f., 332, 349 f., 366, 368, 380, 385 f., 398, 400 f., 403 f., 406 f., 415, 422, 445–449, 457, 459 f., 470, 478, 483, 488–490, 494, 504 f., 519, 523, 533, 536, 565 f., 579, 588, 605 f., 617f., 653, 655, 667 f., 675, 677, 699, 705, 707–710, 714, 716–718, 723, 737, 761, 767, 769 f., 787, 791, 799 f., 860, 865, 867 f., 875, 879
Vol. 3: 27, 35, 41, 48, 52, 55 f., 62, 71, 73, 79, 93, 101 f., 105, 107 f., 127, 135–138, 143, 145 f., 150–152, 160–165, 167, 169 f., 172, 174, 177, 180 f., 188, 193, 196, 199–201, 204, 209, 212 f., 221, 227, 234, 236, 241, 243, 269, 277 f., 315, 320, 323, 332, 343, 347, 362 f., 366, 374, 377, 394, 419, 421, 425, 436, 444, 448, 472 f., 498, 518, 524, 535, 544, 546, 549, 560, 564, **573–586,** 596 f., 624, 628, 641, 701, 705, 721–725, 750, 778 f., 783, 802, 809 f., 824 f., 829, 832, 856, 882, 905, 929, 956, 964, 974, 997 f., 1019, 1021, 1025, 1053 f., 1079, 1109, 1117, 1149 f., 1155
Sin (*moon-god*) **Vol. 1:** 616
Sin-bearing **Vol. 1:** 266
Sin-offering **Vol. 1:** 114, 172, 225, 294
Vol. 2: 293, 339
Vol. 3: 156, 170 f., 423, 428, 582, 723, 815
Sinai **Vol. 1:** 78, 81, 103 f., 159, 195, 222, 224 f., 252, 293, 308, 367 f., 370, 373, 411, 585, 626, 659
Vol. 2: 48, 98, 145, 186, 190, 212, 215, 281, 313, 315 f., 452, 485, 521, 533, 635, 637, 640, 642, 670 f., 755, 784 f., 854, 871 f.
Vol. 3: 33, 117, 143, 186, 246, 324, 433, 557, 631, 763, 772, 788, 860 f., 949, 1005, 1009, 1011, **1013 f.,** 1070, 1113, 1120 f.
Sinaiticus **Vol. 1:** 53
Sincere **Vol. 3:** 127, **571 f., 874–901**
Sincerity **Vol. 1:** 351, 469, 552, 604, 631, 695, 710
Vol. 2: 463, 676, 716
Vol. 3: 100–102, 571 f., 886, 891
Sinew **Vol. 1:** 671 f.
Sinful **Vol. 1:** 168, 401 f., 416 f., 466, 468, 488, 518, 562, 585, 677, 696, 701, 718, 723
Vol. 2: 78, 145, 179, 187, 215, 226, 859, 893, 918
Vol. 3: 577–583, 1149
Sinfulness **Vol. 2:** 36, 565
Vol. 3: 41, 403
Sing **Vol. 1:** 344, 411, 574, 633, 651
Vol. 2: 353 f., 416 f., 436, 862, 874
Vol. 3: 268, **668–676,** 816, 865
Singer **Vol. 1:** 53, 200, 665
Vol. 2: 578
Single **Vol. 1:** 705
Vol. 2: 87, 487
Vol. 3: 172 f., 537, **571 f.,** 1055
Sinister **Vol. 1:** 203, 550, 686, 699
Sink **Vol. 3:** 750
Sinless **Vol. 3:** 194, 645
Sinless perfection **Vol. 1:** 186
Sinlessness **Vol. 1:** 284, 434, 544
Vol. 2: 411, 449, 504, 892
Vol. 3: 170, 534, 579, 663
Sinner **Vol. 1:** 109, 141, 147, 171, 239, 274, 322, 333, 343, 349, 358 f., 379, 381, 399, 417, 436, 439, 451, 465, 472, 501, 680 f., 699, 701 f., 706, 733 f.
Vol. 2: 94, 101, 106, 120, 141, 152, 209, 214, 271 f., 276, 282, 332, 358, 386, 388, 411, 422, 432, 470, 499, 523, 543, 545 f., 549, 566, 584, 604, 630, 660, 669, 790, 798, 813, 882, 884, 888
Vol. 3: 106, 145, 160, 169, 214, 265, 314, 346,

349, 358, 361, 428, 529, 566, **577–583,** 603, 656, 757, 883, 938, 969, 980, 994, 1100
Sion (→ Zion)
Sip **Vol. 2:** 270
Sippar **Vol. 3:** 264
Sirach (→ Ecclesiasticus)
Siricius **Vol. 3:** 453
Sisera **Vol. 3:** 1057
Sister **Vol. 1:** 254–256, 556
Vol. 2: 250, 549
Vol. 3: 1062, 1070, 1163
Sit **Vol. 1:** 363, 474, 482, 658, 661
Vol. 2: 123, 147, 276, 363, 370, 380, 612, 917
Vol. 3: 254, **587–589,** 629, 633, 761
Site **Vol. 2:** 317
Situation **Vol. 1:** 271, 603, 625, 686, 702 f.
Vol. 2: 367, 392, 659
Vol. 3: 76
Situational theology **Vol. 3:** 974
Sitz im Leben **Vol. 1:** 57 f., **68**
Vol. 2: 905
Vol. 3: 60
Six **Vol. 2:** 692
Sixth hour **Vol. 2:** 685
Size **Vol. 1:** 93, 522, 671
Vol. 2: 800
Skeleton **Vol. 1:** 431, 444
Sketch out **Vol. 3:** 483
Skilful **Vol. 2:** 146
Skilful in teaching **Vol. 3: 759–765**
Skill **Vol. 1:** 239, 412, 512
Vol. 2: 40
Vol. 3: 31, 760, 766, 911
Skilled **Vol. 1:** 735
Skin **Vol. 1:** 114, 162, 671 f.
Vol. 2: 464–466
Vol. 3: 269, 483
Skinflint **Vol. 2:** 211
Skotos **Vol. 1:** 421
Skull **Vol. 1:** 581
Sky **Vol. 1:** 517, 545, 587
Vol. 2: 184, 187 f.
Vol. 3: 112, 730, 736 f.
Slacken **Vol. 1:** 698
Slain **Vol. 1:** 118, 164, 264, 438, 444, 532
Vol. 2: 32, 147, 411
Slander **Vol. 1:** 110, 413, 561, 654
Vol. 2: 270, 449, 469, 653
Vol. 3: 340–347, 532, 1025, 1119
Slanderer **Vol. 3: 345 f., 468–476,** 935, 1065
Slanderous **Vol. 3: 341–345, 468–476**
Slaughter **Vol. 1:** 205, 482, 629, 737
Vol. 2: 234 f., 410, 674, 893
Vol. 3: 417–436
Slave **Vol. 1:** 120, 234, 256, 261, 268, 275, 280, 283 f., 299, 308, 360, 366, 371, 392, 457–459, 462, 498 f., 513, 587, 609 f., 637 f., 650, 667, 675, 680, 684, 698, 703, 715–718, 720
Vol. 2: 49–51, 57, 143, 183, 250, 254, 258, 262, 298, 393, 412, 434, 445, 453, 467, 499, 508–511, 513, 517, 534, 562, 564, 572 f., 652 f., 735, 775, 816 f., 828, 841, 859
Vol. 3: 94–96, 121, 190 f., 193 f., 211, 225, 256, 364, 406 f., 497, 544 f., 548, 550, 553, 572, 582 f., **589–599,** 608 f., 634, 685, 756, 771, 775, 779, 827, 854, 928–930, 932, 1058, 1062, 1152, 1165, 1168
Slave-dealer **Vol. 3: 380**
Slave-girl **Vol. 2:** 581
Slave-market **Vol. 1:** 268
Slave-owner **Vol. 1:** 366
Vol. 2: 438
Slave-wife **Vol. 1:** 453
Slavery **Vol. 1:** 222, 412, 438, 498, 629, 633, 647, 716
Vol. 2: 188, 226, 394, 424, 452, 521, 772
Vol. 3: 235, 311, 379, **592–598,** 1162
Slavish outlook **Vol. 2:** 259
Slavonic Enoch **Vol. 3:** 265
Slay **Vol. 1:** 509
Vol. 2: 234
Sleep **Vol. 1:** 93, 261, 382, 420, 425, **429–447,** 672
Vol. 2: 55, 486, 777, 922, 924 f., 927
Vol. 3: 259, 270 f., 275, 279, 845, 860
Sleeper **Vol. 1:** 421
Sleepless **Vol. 2:** 134, 137
Slide **Vol. 3:** 559
Slip away **Vol. 3:** 206, 209
Slip through **Vol. 3:** 209
Slogan **Vol. 2:** 611, 620
Vol. 3: 57
Sluggish **Vol. 3:** 1024
Sly **Vol. 1:** 412, 509
Sly calculation **Vol. 3:** 820
Small **Vol. 1:** 118, 597, 600, 670, 732
Vol. 2: 259, **424–429,** 443, 675, 709
Smaller **Vol. 2: 427–429,** 675
Smash **Vol. 3:** 914
Smear **Vol. 1:** 121
Vol. 2: 334, 410
Smell **Vol. 2:** 211
Vol. 3: 599–601
Smelting **Vol. 1:** 711
Vol. 2: 97, 628
Smelting crucible **Vol. 2:** 98
Smile **Vol. 2:** 431
Smite **Vol. 1:** 163 f.
Vol. 2: 159
Smith **Vol. 1:** 279
Vol. 2: 689
Smitten **Vol. 1:** 683
Vol. 2: 414
Smoke **Vol. 1:** 449, 657
Vol. 2: 293 f., 484
Vol. 3: 75, 417, 601, 676, 732
Smother **Vol. 3:** 109
Smuggle **Vol. 1:** 453
Smyrna **Vol. 1:** 406
Vol. 2: 136, 692 f., 826, 844
Snake **Vol. 1:** 507–510
Vol. 2: 27, 586
Vol. 3: 96, 561, 1079
Snare **Vol. 1:** 343, 433, 531 f., 609
Vol. 2: 705, 707
Vol. 3: 201
Snatch **Vol. 2:** 34
Vol. 3: 201, 377, 381, 567, **601–605,** 712

Snatch away **Vol. 3:** 192
Sneer **Vol. 2:** 430
Sniff out **Vol. 3:** 532
Snow **Vol. 1:** 204, 682, 708
Vol. 2: 189, 830
Vol. 3: **1000–1004,** 1105
Soak **Vol. 2:** 274
Sober **Vol. 1:** 425, 501, **513–515,** 528 f.
Vol. 2: 137, 169, 458, 925
Social **Vol. 1:** 289, 312, 496, 566, 640, 716
Vol. 2: 93, 259, 263, 777, 822
Vol. 3: 346, **993–1000,** 1055, 1066, 1123
Social class **Vol. 2:** 303
Vol. 3: 756
Social duties **Vol. 3:** 931
Social egalitarianism **Vol. 3:** 932
Social habit **Vol. 3:** 1124
Social implications **Vol. 3:** 929, 979
Social life **Vol. 2:** 310, 364, 436, 820–829
Social order **Vol. 3:** 353, 1162
Social pleasantries **Vol. 3:** 1143
Social standing **Vol. 2:** 305
Socialist society **Vol. 3:** 971
Society **Vol. 1:** 138, 209, 255, 269, 280, 287, 479, 506, 521, 536, 640, 642, 686, 715, 717
Vol. 2: 50, 90, 160–162, 263, 383, 415, 430, 462 f., 466, 497, 569, 700, 810, 820–829, 840
Vol. 3: 49 f., 353, 562, **589–599,** 654, 756, 758, 852, 979, 981, 1057
Sociological **Vol. 2:** 310
Socrates **Vol. 1:** 483, 561 f., 705
Vol. 2: 92, 103, 430, 439, 666, 719
Vol. 3: 138, 260, 678, 727, 766, 775, 1027, 1034, 1039, 1083
Socrates (*church historian*) **Vol. 2:** 507
Socratic dialogue **Vol. 3:** 1086
Sodom **Vol. 1:** 394, 532, 657, 677
Vol. 2: 216, 329, 366, 682, 767
Vol. 3: 93, 96, 203, 240, 344, 444, 455, 560, 628, 856, 1002
Sodomite **Vol. 1:** 255
Vol. 2: **569–571**
Sodomy **Vol. 2:** 142
Vol. 3: 95
Soft **Vol. 2:** 98
Vol. 3: 915
Softness **Vol. 3:** 996, **999**
Soil **Vol. 1:** 381, 517, 520, 691, 722 f.
Vol. 2: 197, 297
Vol. 3: 444 f., 522, 809, 866, 868
Sojourn **Vol. 1:** 360, 531, 685
Sojourner **Vol. 1:** 683 f., 686, 690 f., 713 f.
Vol. 2: 636, 737, **788–790,** 803
Vol. 3: 406, 852, 855, 1074
Sol Invictus **Vol. 3:** 730
Solar year **Vol. 1:** 627
Vol. 3: 264
Soldier **Vol. 1:** 259, 359, 396, 406, 650, 652
Vol. 2: 222, 290, 295, 299, 378 f., 572, 689, 737, 816
Vol. 3: 49, 134, 138, 144, 377, 558, 608
Soldier's pay **Vol. 3:** 379
Solemn **Vol. 2:** 149, 234
Solemnity **Vol. 1:** 622
Solemnize **Vol. 3:** 232
Solicit **Vol. 2:** 587
Solicitude **Vol. 1:** 695
Solid **Vol. 1:** 660, 682
Solidarity **Vol. 1:** 146, 641
Vol. 2: 243, 827, 920
Vol. 3: 597
Solitary **Vol. 3:** **1004–1008,** 1056
Solitude **Vol. 2:** 724
Vol. 3: 111
Solomon **Vol. 1:** 50, 52 f., 61, 122, 153, 195, 209 f., 280, 332, 426, 451, 511, 531, 577, 688
Vol. 2: 97, 215, 248, 306, 329, 336, 349, 381, 428, 556, 576, 680, 745, 848
Vol. 3: 86, 157, 207, 418, 426, 439, 465, 476, **605–607,** 649, 651, 653 f., 752, 782 f., 787–789, 812, 873, 879, 950, 1010, 1028 f., 1030, 1055, 1120, 1163
Solomon's portico **Vol. 2:** 236
Vol. 3: 789, 795 f.
Solomon's temple **Vol. 3:** **787 f.,** 795, 815, 836
Solon **Vol. 1:** 529
Vol. 2: 657, 690, 820
Solstice **Vol. 1:** 631
Solution **Vol. 1:** 65, 531
Vol. 2: 314
Solve **Vol. 1:** 532, 576–578
Vol. 3: 177
Somalia **Vol. 2:** 293 f.
Son **Vol. 1:** 123, 177, 209, 255 f., 273, **280–291,** 337 f., 374 f., 408, 410, 430, 440, 473, 487, 500, 509, 511, 525 f., 532, 549, 556, 595, 603, 614 f., 619–621, 637, 643, 655, 667–669, 676, 684, 693, 703, 707, 719, 729, 737 f.
Vol. 2: 42, 58, 81, 84, 119, 147, 170, 179, 183, 185 f., 194, 200, 202, 216, 231, 249, 289, 301–303, 305, 307, 313, 318, 326, 336, 341, 343, 354, 356, 358, 363, 374, 403–405, 411, 428, 437, 447 f., 450, 500, 506 f., 543, 546, 548 f., 566, 571, 588, 595, 604, 609 f., 625, 630, 635, 642, 653 f., 656, 717, 720, 781, 824, 828, 856, 884, 904, 917, 928 f.
Vol. 3: 41, 55, 204 f., 281, 300, 403, 510, 580, 590, 593, 597, **607–664,** 753, 776, 810, 843, 863, 869, 920, 1003, 1017, 1058, 1075, 1085, 1113, 1118, 1133, 1154, 1178, 1186
Son of Abraham **Vol. 1:** 182, 286, 288 f.
Vol. 3: 656, 970
Son of Belial **Vol. 1:** 288
Son of consolation **Vol. 1:** 571
Son of corruption **Vol. 1:** 288
Son of the covenant **Vol. 1:** 288
Son of darkness **Vol. 1:** 102, 287 f., 554, 556, 646
Vol. 2: 71, 261, 298, 312, 314, 492, 565, 696, 779, 893
Vol. 3: 233, 272, 469, 503, 647, 961
Son of David **Vol. 1:** 63, 100, 122, 182, 288, 290, 427 f., 675
Vol. 2: 147, 341, 376, 378, 515, 595, 614
Vol. 3: 244, 508, **607–664,** 792, 1105, 1163
Son of the day **Vol. 1:** 425
Son of destruction **Vol. 1:** 289
Son of the devil **Vol. 1:** 289
Son of disobedience **Vol. 1:** 110, 289, 593

Son of encouragement **Vol. 1:** 289
Son of evil **Vol. 3:** 503
Son of the evil one **Vol. 1:** 289
Son of favour **Vol. 3:** 637
Son of God **Vol. 1:** 63, 85, 93, 96, 101 f., 117, 177, 240, 256, 272, 274, 276, 281, 283, 287–290, 323, 325, 373, 385, 397, 448, 473, 522 f., 531, 538, 597, 616, 619, 638, 669, 684, 740
Vol. 2: 79 f., 82, 87, 111 f., 178, 203, 213, 228 f., 231, 267, 270, 289, 313, 337, 343, 368, 370, 374, 376, 378, 380, 403, 449, 458, 503, 505, 514, 519, 544, 598, 607, 694, 706, 718, 724, 800, 835, 873, 877, 900, 928 f.
Vol. 3: 28, 42, 56, 62, 114, 132, 147, 186 f., 216, 225, 313, 315 f., 321, 403, 503, 508, **607–664,** 698, 721, 742, 754, 791, 800, 807, 965, 1046, 1048, 1110
Son of God's good pleasure **Vol. 1:** 288
Vol. 2: 818
Son of grace **Vol. 1:** 288
Vol. 3: 637
Son of heaven **Vol. 1:** 102, 225, 288
Son of hell **Vol. 1:** 289
Son of light **Vol. 3:** 161, 233, 272, 503, 637, 647, 839, 961
Son of iniquity **Vol. 1:** 288
Son of Israel **Vol. 1:** 294
Vol. 2: 49, **305,** 314, 791
Son of Jerusalem **Vol. 2:** 324
Son of Joseph **Vol. 2:** 333
Son of the kingdom **Vol. 1:** 77, 289
Vol. 2: 382, 385
Son of lies **Vol. 2:** 339
Son of light **Vol. 1:** 102–104, 287–290, 423, 452, 554, 556, 593, 646
Vol. 2: 71 f., 298, 353, 364, 492–494, 565, 619, 696, 708, 779, 793, 837, 893, 925
Son of his love **Vol. 1:** 424
Son of man **Vol. 1:** 62 f., 84, 96, 113, 118, 185, 204, 290, 321–323, 326 f., 410, 489, 510, 725
Vol. 2: 32, 37 f., 54, 80, 112, 146 f., 185, 190, 194 f., 202, 204, 216, 252, 269, 271, 276, 282, 313, 337, 339, 351, 364, 369, 376, 380, 382, 387, 433, 482, 503, 514, 527, 535, 604, 607, 610, 614, 630, 652, 680, 682, 709, 731, 739, 782, 808, 835, 888, 894, 901, 905, 910–912, 916 f., 928 f.
Vol. 3: 37, 113, 135, 147, 195–197, 213, 265, 272, 293, 343 f., 455, 489 f., 499, 506, 509 f., 527, 530, 532, 547, 559 f., 563, 604 f., **607–664,** 699, 792, 809, 831, 847, 868, 1001, 1109
Son of Mary **Vol. 2:** 333
Son of mischief **Vol. 1:** 288
Son of the Most High **Vol. 1:** 274
Vol. 3: 187
Son of Noah **Vol. 2:** 309
Son of peace **Vol. 3:** 258
Son of perdition **Vol. 1:** 125, 463 f.
Son of perversity **Vol. 3:** 944
Son of prophecy **Vol. 3:** 87
Son of the prophets **Vol. 1:** 288
Son of the resurrection **Vol. 1:** 288, 290
Vol. 2: 920
Son of righteousness **Vol. 1:** 288
Vol. 3: 359, 503, 944
Son of a star **Vol. 2:** 308, 339, 495
Vol. 3: 735
Son of thunder **Vol. 1:** 289, 572
Son of truth **Vol. 1:** 288
Vol. 2: 71, 471
Son of unrighteousness **Vol. 1:** 288
Son of wickedness **Vol. 2:** 100, 105
Vol. 3: 944
Son of the world **Vol. 1:** 288
Son of this world **Vol. 2:** 619, 837
Song **Vol. 1:** 58, 103, 213, 344, 381, 440, 469, 580, 625
Vol. 2: 58, 191, 233, 260 f., 353, 380, 418, 724, 819, 864, 874, 885
Vol. 3: 245, 321, **668–676,** 706, 835
Song of Deborah **Vol. 2:** 796
Song of faith **Vol. 1:** 598
Song of the Lamb **Vol. 2:** 625
Vol. 3: 674
Song of Moses **Vol. 2:** 36, 625, 638
Vol. 3: 77, 263, 674, 1041
Song of praise **Vol. 3: 668–670,** 816
Song of Solomon **Vol. 1:** 59
Vol. 3: 385, 606, 673
Song of Songs (→ Song of Solomon)
Song of the Three Children **Vol. 1:** 50
Song of triumph **Vol. 3:** 984
Sonship **Vol. 1:** 188, 286, 385, 417, 619, 623, 637, 639, 675, 696
Vol. 2: 245, 445, 653, 775
Vol. 3: 72, 189, 314, 698, 701, 704, 778 f., 864, 1019, 1059, 1073
Soothe **Vol. 1:** 328
Soothsayer **Vol. 1:** 208, 575
Vol. 2: 234, 554
Vol. 3: 33, 76, 79
Soothsayer priest **Vol. 3:** 1028
Soothsaying **Vol. 2:** 142
Vol. 3: 81
Sophism **Vol. 1:** 477
Vol. 2: 439, 648, 656, 719
Sophists **Vol. 1:** 484
Vol. 3: 28, 593, 775 f., 875 f., 1027, 1034, 1082 f., 1086
Sophocles **Vol. 2:** 239
Vol. 3: 739
Sorcerer **Vol. 2: 552–562**
Sorceress **Vol. 2:** 555
Sorcery **Vol. 1:** 420, 452, 499
Vol. 2: 286, **552–562,** 795
Sore **Vol. 1:** 117
Vol. 2: 466
Sorrow **Vol. 1:** 162, 217, 240 f., 316 f., 356 f., 456, 467, 569, 741
Vol. 2: 149, 236, 360 f., **416–424,** 475, 522, 594, 632, 865
Vol. 3: 236, 683, 731, 1052
Sorrowful **Vol. 3:** 980
Sorry **Vol. 3:** 149
Sort **Vol. 2:** 501
Sosthenes **Vol. 2:** 369
Soteriological **Vol. 1: 68,** 386, 396, 402, 523, 617, 668

Soteriological (*cont'd*)
Vol. 2: 192, 202, 300, 380, 504, 827, 844, 889, 903
Vol. 3: 39, 167, 211 f., 256, 630, 645, 723
Soteriology **Vol. 1:** 53, **68,** 220, 401, 620
Vol. 2: 388, 397
Vol. 3: 319, 432, 1105, 1151
Soul **Vol. 1:** 66, 79, 103, 106, 191, 221, 229 f., 232, 233, 235 f., 250, 312, 422, 431–436, 442–444, 446, 450, 459 f., 463 f, 480, 483, 495, 501, 512, 522, 544, 555, 562, 611 f., 621, 623, 636, 653, 665, 671–674, 677, 682, 687, 705, 711, 713, 724, 731
Vol. 2: 40, 99, 103, 125, 137, 157, 181 f., 191, 197, 202, 207 f., 225, 241, 249, 261, 266, 288, 391, 393 f., 406, 458, 476 f., 480, 483 f., 525, 564 f., 567–569, 571, 584, 590, 648, 658, 830, 838 f., 854, 919, 926
Vol. 3: 35 f., 99, 122, 124, 146, 151, 158, 174, 205, 210, 218, 231, 234, 245, 260 f., 263, 272 f., 277, 279, 303 f., 471, 522, 534, 568, 572, 602, 675, **676–687,** 689, 692, 694, 706, 710, 719, 789, 811, 827, 865, 876, 927, 936, 989
Sound **Vol. 1:** 501
Vol. 2: 60, 102, 169–172, 361, 487
Vol. 3: **111–114, 349–351,** 422, 671, 770, 1078
Sound mind **Vol. 1:** 501 f.
Vol. 2: 169
Sound a trumpet **Vol. 3:** **873 f.**
Soundness **Vol. 1:** 604
Vol. 2: 102
Sour **Vol. 2:** 461
Source **Vol. 1:** 55 f., 62 f., 66–68, 70, 433, 435, 441, 561, 563, 566, 598, 710, 723, 736
Vol. 2: 138, 147, 157 f., 160, 287, 290, 341, 357, 359, 656
Vol. 3: 58, 60, 65, 215, 868, **985–988,** 1063, 1178
Source criticism **Vol. 1:** **68**
South **Vol. 3:** 1003
South wind **Vol. 3:** 1000–1004
Southern kingdom **Vol. 1:** 716 f.
Vol. 2: **305 f.,** 319, 325
Vol. 3: 34, 79, 249, 426, 451, 1104
Souvenir **Vol. 2:** 85
Sovereign **Vol. 1:** 614 f., 734
Vol. 2: 70, 74, 77, 185, 203, 240, 262, 335, 366, 372, 411, 413, **601–616,** 624, 650, 819, 877
Vol. 3: 140 f., 143, 167, 578, 912, 920, 1017
Sovereignty **Vol. 1:** 80, 95, 243, 358, 413, 477, 538, 543, 562, 594, 715
Vol. 2: 145, 160, 199 f., 233, 274, 319, 327, 368, 426, 587, 819, 859
Vol. 3: 392, 523, 565, 736, 831, 917, 960
Sow **Vol. 1:** 299, 313, 377, 468–470, 612, 627, 681, 686
Vol. 2: 34, 129, 177, 359, 826
Vol. 3: 134, 382, **521–525,** 684, 868
Sower **Vol. 1:** 173, 278, 459, 516 f., 578
Vol. 2: 129, 714, 773, 834
Vol. 3: 143, 382, 470, 522, 526, 868
Space **Vol. 1:** 102, 236, 521, 728
Vol. 2: 70, 198, 397, 404, 424, 497, 658
Vol. 3: 301, 830, 899
Spacious **Vol. 3:** 255
Spain **Vol. 2:** 826
Span **Vol. 3:** 1161
Span of life **Vol. 2:** 428
Spare **Vol. 1:** 390, 414, 632 f., 725, 727, 729, 734
Vol. 2: 411, 660
Vol. 3: 136
Spark **Vol. 1:** 422, 616
Sparkle **Vol. 3:** 395 f.
Sparrow **Vol. 1:** 173
Sparta **Vol. 1:** 193, 287, 498, 687
Vol. 2: 500
Vol. 3: 775, 1055
Spartan **Vol. 3:** 1119
Spatial **Vol. 1:** 692
Vol. 2: 184 f., 195, 197–199, 210, 459
Speak **Vol. 1:** 206, 271, 332, 340, 429, 579, 598, 729, 739 f.
Vol. 2: 72, 74, 109, 129, 154, 363
Vol. 3: 45, 275, 324, 341, 345, **1081–1119,** 1157
Speak against **Vol. 2:** 450
Speak allegorically **Vol. 2:** **743–756**
Speak boldly **Vol. 2:** **734–737**
Speak evil **Vol. 1:** 415
Vol. 3: **345 f.**
Speak ill **Vol. 2:** 364, 450
Speak openly **Vol. 2:** **734–737**
Speak to **Vol. 3:** 1059
Speak in tongues (→ Tongues, speaking in)
Speak the truth **Vol. 3:** **874–901**
Speak out **Vol. 2:** **734–737**
Speak well **Vol. 2:** 416
Speaker **Vol. 2:** 85, 369, 434
Vol. 3: 75
Speaking a foreign language **Vol. 3:** **1078–1081**
Spear **Vol. 3:** 556, 590
Spear-point **Vol. 1:** 656
Special **Vol. 1:** 540, 620, 666–668
Species **Vol. 1:** 670, 722
Vol. 2: 158, 501, 657
Specific **Vol. 2:** 863, 867
Specify **Vol. 1:** 581
Vol. 2: 648
Speck **Vol. 3:** 129
Spectacle **Vol. 1:** 649
Vol. 2: 291, 434
Vol. 3: 512, **520 f.**
Spectators **Vol. 1:** 646
Speculation **Vol. 1:** 71, 641, 707, 740
Vol. 2: 191, 314, 393, 397, 402, 405, 644 f., 921
Vol. 3: 35, 40, 532, 632, 646, 654 f., 678, 804, 1005 f., 1032, 1121
Speculative **Vol. 1:** 601–603, 607, 694
Vol. 2: 392, 396
Vol. 3: 42, 639 f., 1035
Speculative thought **Vol. 3:** 1081
Speech **Vol. 1:** 66, 69 f., 206, 212, 421, 428, 528, 571, 574 f., 578 f., 582, 587–589, 715
Vol. 2: 49, 78, 108 f., 157, 260, 290, 591, 643, 659, 899

Vol. 3: 64, 111, 113, 311, 316, 351, 448 f., 689, 699, 703, 741 f., 886, 914, **1078–1081**
Speech for the defence **Vol. 2:** 594
Speeches in Acts **Vol. 3:** 62–67
Spell **Vol. 1:** 450, 477
Vol. 2: 115, 552, 560
Vol. 3: 476, 1087, 1100
Spend **Vol. 1:** 551
Spend the night **Vol. 3:** 255, 449
Spend time **Vol. 3: 839–845**
Sperm **Vol. 1:** 498
Sphere **Vol. 2:** 303
Spherical **Vol. 1:** 521
Spices **Vol. 1:** 121, 264–266, 743
Vol. 2: 295
Spider **Vol. 1:** 490, 510
Spike **Vol. 3:** 865
Spill **Vol. 2:** 854
Spin **Vol. 1:** 490
Spinoza, B. de **Vol. 3:** 896
Spirit **Vol. 1:** 55, 58, 66, 91, 105, 108, 138, 144, 146–148, 152 f., 160, 171, 179, 200, 217, 225, 230, 232, 234–237, 246, 248, 279, 286, 289 f., 300, 303–305, 311, 318, 322, 324, 327, 329, 335 f., 340, 349, 368 f., 379, 410, 414, 424, 428, 430, 440, 443, 446, 449, 452, 458, 466 f., 470, 473, 490, 496, 498, 500 f., 504, 514 f., 557 f., 562–565, 570, 578 f., 595, 601 f., 605, 609, 615, 623, 625, 631, 637, 642, 649, 654, 657, 662, 665–667, 672 f., 675–679, 682 f., 700, 705, 711, 717, 719, 722 f., 729, 734 f., 737–739
Vol. 2: 42, 58, 66, 71, 75 f., 78, 83, 100, 106, 117, 121, 123, 129, 136, 147, 150 f., 155 f., 162, 169, 178, 182 f., 185 f., 189, 199, 213 f., 218, 260 f., 265, 275, 277, 282 f., 311 f., 314, 343, 350, 353, 364, 368, 382, 398, 402 f., 418, 424, 439, 446 f., 452, 481, 491, 499, 513, 519, 545 f., 558, 561, 565 f., 571, 602, 611, 615, 617, 619, 625, 641, 670–672, 675, 712, 715, 719, 721, 728, 738, 762, 771, 775, 778, 781, 784–787, 806, 816, 828, 831, 839, 854 f., 873, 878, 882–884, 898 f., 916, 919, 921, 927–929
Vol. 3: 28, 47, 77 f., 82, 85–88, 102, 109–113, 125, 129 f., 138, 147, 172, 174, 199, 204, 244, 256–258, 263, 266, 269, 280, 300, 313, 317, 322 f., 336, 344, 401, 403, 417, 432, 435, 440, 444, 458 f., 471, 473–475, 493, 504, 513, 523–525, 533, 547 f., 551, 571, 581, 594, 597, 602, 604, 628, 637, 639 f., 647–649, 651, 671 f., 674, 680 f., 683, 687, **689–708,** 718, 734, 742, 748, 789, 804, 808, 849, 854, 922, 927, 939, 944, 967, 987–990, 994 f., 1020 f., 1023, 1030, 1032, 1036, 1046, 1061, 1067, 1080, 1089, 1100, 1122, 1143, 1163, 1167, 1178, **1199 f.**
Spirit, Holy **Vol. 1:** 52, 66, 90 f., 95, 106, 116, 122, 128 f., 146, 148, 155, 158, 160, 168 f., 175 f., 185 f, 202, 232, 235, 248, 355, 372, 375, 414, 417, 491, 511, 526–528, 530, 535, 584, 592, 598, 623, 628 f., 643, 656, 660, 679–681, 704, 719, 723, 730, 735, 738 f.
Vol. 2: 28, 39 f., 48, 79, 84, 86 f., 122, 127, 143, 152, 193 f., 227–231, 242 f., 245, 249, 251, 259, 268, 270, 300, 328, 359 f., 388, 424, 445, 448, 473, 507, 516, 557, 596 f., 603–605, 632 f., 645, 653 f., 718, 722 f., 736, 739 f., 768, 774, 783, 794, 817, 838, 842, 847, 855, 857, 868, 874, 881, 893, 911, 918, 921
Vol. 3: 38, 63, 71–73, 80, 83 f., 171, 198, 214–216, 220, 225, 228, 242, 257, 314, 317, 324, 327, 329, 343, 380, 412, 431, 456, 461, 472–474, 488, 493, 499, 570, 660, 663 f., **689–708,** 713 f., 732, 742, 749, 763 f., 790, 807, 810, 813 f., 855, 891, 921, 991, 1018, 1048, 1079, 1152, 1178
Spirit of darkness **Vol. 3:** 469
Spirit of divination **Vol. 1:** 340
Vol. 2: 552–562
Spirit of glory **Vol. 3:** 257
Spirit of God **Vol. 2:** 122, 150, 168, 218, 223, 250
Spirit of holiness **Vol. 2:** 79
Vol. 3: 651
Spirit of light **Vol. 1:** 452
Vol. 2: 105
Vol. 3: 469
Spirit of prophecy **Vol. 3: 699 f.,** 705 f.
Spirit and truth **Vol. 3:** 891
Spirit of truth **Vol. 1:** 89 f., 123
Vol. 3: 892
Spirit–baptism **Vol. 3:** 55
Spirits **Vol. 1:** 102, 118, 123, 166, 167, 347, 382, 401, 411, 450–453, 463, 504, 556, 563, 621, 674
Vol. 2: 69, 121, 184, 207, 209, 298, 391, 417, 458, 553 f., 691, 707, 828
Spirits in prison **Vol. 2:** 136, 208
Vol. 3: 947
Spiritual **Vol. 1:** 71, 75, 183, 290, 311, 336, 338, 398 f., 406, 416, 435, 444, 449, 455, 482, 484, 492, 528, 531, 539, 563, 566, 569, 595, 616 f., 619, 628, 638 f., 642, 647, 650, 662, 665, 674, 678–681, 725–727, 742
Vol. 2: 121, 180–182, 187, 189, 193, 196, 230, **249,** 264–267, 276, 316, 325, 327 f., 339, 351, 355, 364, 398, 438, 539, 619, 842, 861
Vol. 3: 106, 208, 231, 281, 301, 305, 410, 434, 504, 551, **689–708,** 946, 963 f., **993–1000, 1081–1119**
Spiritual anointing **Vol. 1:** 123
Spiritual armour **Vol. 1:** 316, 647, 656
Vol. 3: 802
Spiritual body **Vol. 1:** 236
Vol. 2: 567, 924
Vol. 3: 303
Spiritual building **Vol. 2: 250 f.**
Vol. 3: 391
Spiritual death **Vol. 1:** 406, 431, 436, 440
Spiritual drink **Vol. 3:** 383
Spiritual evil **Vol. 1:** 429
Spiritual fire **Vol. 3:** 689
Spiritual food **Vol. 3:** 383
Spiritual fornication **Vol. 2:** 587
Spiritual gifts **Vol. 1:** 129, 535
Vol. 2: 44, 79, **115–124,** 169, 255, 360, 391, 828, 868
Vol. 3: 707
Spiritual house **Vol. 1:** 305

Spiritual house (*cont'd*)
Vol. 2: 230, 249
Vol. 3: 383, 387, 393
Spiritual inheritance **Vol. 2:** 295
Spiritual Israel **Vol. 2: 316**
Spiritual life **Vol. 1:** 70, 138, 249
Vol. 2: 446
Spiritual man **Vol. 1:** 85, 127, 133
Vol. 2: 75
Vol. 3: 684, 707
Spiritual marriage **Vol. 2:** 581, 588
Spiritual milk **Vol. 1:** 284
Vol. 2: 270
Vol. 3: 1118
Spiritual party **Vol. 3:** 1030
Spiritual poverty **Vol. 1:** 313, 358
Spiritual power **Vol. 1:** 424
Spiritual priesthood **Vol. 2:** 249
Spiritual reality **Vol. 2:** 249
Spiritual riches **Vol. 2:** 299
Spiritual rock **Vol. 3:** 383
Spiritual sacrifices **Vol. 2:** 249
Vol. 3: 35, 37, 383, 435, 706
Spiritual songs **Vol. 3:** 674 f., 706
Spiritual stones **Vol. 2:** 249
Vol. 3: 706
Spiritual understanding **Vol. 3:** 706
Spiritual worship **Vol. 3:** 1119
Spiritualist **Vol. 2:** 559
Spirituality **Vol. 1:** 352
Vol. 2: 884
Vol. 3: 705
Spiritualization **Vol. 1:** 625, 650
Vol. 2: 67, 339
Vol. 3: 57, 104, 380
Spittle **Vol. 2:** 167 f.
Vol. 3: 916
Splendid **Vol. 3: 317–324**
Splendour **Vol. 1:** 474, 552, 650, 730
Vol. 2: 46, 289, 339, 425 f., **484–486,** 779
Vol. 3: 514
Splinter **Vol. 1:** 116, 453, 667, 726
Split **Vol. 1:** 535
Vol. 2: 306
Vol. 3: 543 f.
Spoil **Vol. 1:** 467, 565
Vol. 2: 99, 182, 590, 693 f.,
Vol. 3: 713, 851 f.
Spoken word **Vol. 1:** 416, 679, 736
Spokesman **Vol. 1:** 194, 373, 579 f.
Vol. 3: 49
Spontaneous **Vol. 1:** 500
Vol. 2: 607, 694
Sport **Vol. 1:** 470, 625, 644 f., 648
Vol. 2: 710
Spot **Vol. 1:** 634
Vol. 2: 411
Vol. 3: 200
Spotless **Vol. 2:** 290
Vol. 3: 923–928
Spotted **Vol. 1:** 556
Spouse **Vol. 2:** 59, 798
Spread **Vol. 1:** 457, 647–649, 653, 733, 741 f.
Vol. 2: 34, **334–343,** 360
Spring **Vol. 1:** 195, 201, 319, 441, 513, 632, 743
Vol. 3: 449, 459, 709, 845, 982, **985–988**
Sprinkle **Vol. 1:** 114, 144, 151, **220–226,** 304, 351, 369, 633
Vol. 2: 853–855
Vol. 3: 164, 435
Sprout **Vol. 2:** 211
Vol. 3: 865–870
Spur on **Vol. 2:** 244
Spurious **Vol. 1:** 187, 590
Vol. 2: 338
Spurn **Vol. 1:** 448
Vol. 2: 817
Vol. 3: 341
Spy **Vol. 1:** 294
Vol. 2: 142, 318, 469
Vol. 3: 126, 875
Squander **Vol. 1:** 464
Vol. 2: 34
Square number **Vol. 2:** 700
Stability **Vol. 1:** 661, 675, 711
Vol. 2: 374
Stable **Vol. 1:** 661
Vol. 3: 228, 911
Stadium **Vol. 1:** 645 f.
Vol. 3: 946
Staff **Vol. 1:** 161 f., 407
Vol. 2: 642
Vol. 3: 49, 404, 737, 870
Stage **Vol. 1:** 282, 540, 549
Vol. 2: 748
Vol. 3: 811
Stage of life **Vol. 3:** 845
Stagger **Vol. 1:** 514, 673
Vol. 2: 458
Vol. 3: 994
Stain **Vol. 1:** 447, 641
Stake **Vol. 1:** 389, 391–394, 726
Vol. 3: 713, 951
Stalk of grain **Vol. 3:** 399
Stamp **Vol. 1:** 712
Vol. 2: 75, 284, **288 f., 573 f.,** 657
Vol. 3: 904
Stand **Vol. 1:** 51, 411, 474, 543, 651, 658, 660, 672, 685, 719
Vol. 2: 156, 369, 773, 861, 869
Vol. 3: 224, 228, 259, 635, 761, 825
Stand in awe **Vol. 2:** 224
Vol. 3: 100
Stand before **Vol. 1:** 474, 622
Stand between **Vol. 1:** 739
Stand by **Vol. 1:** 474
Vol. 2: 310
Vol. 3: 203
Stand firm **Vol. 2:** 517, 764
Stand in line **Vol. 2: 451–453**
Stand on rights **Vol. 3:** 576
Stand still **Vol. 3:** 731
Stand test **Vol. 3:** 319
Stand under **Vol. 1:** 710
Stand up **Vol. 3:** 279
Standard **Vol. 1:** 51, 175, 220, 273, 396, 443, 460, 542, 546, 604, 675, 729
Vol. 2: 267, 361, 366, 374, 390, 399, 415, 427,

452, 499
Vol. 3: 353, 355 f., 358, **399–404,** 562, 586, 726, 728 f., **903–906,** 949, 1050
Standing **Vol. 1:** 351, 430, 472, 536, 544, 610, 659
Vol. 2: 123, 144, 148, 182, 259, 426, 497, 821, 839
Vol. 3: 563
Stanton, G.N. **Vol. 3:** 60
Star **Vol. 1:** 102, 124, 272, 380, 407, 451, 508, 522 f., 610, 621, 627, 657, 740
Vol. 2: 27–29, 46, 69, 188 f., 192, 196, 198, 270, 313, 337, 459, 488, 490 f., 495 f., 555, 557 f., 622, 649, 691, 695, 916
Vol. 3: 224, 397, 498, 557, 583, 650, 718, **730–737,** 950, 1102
Star of Jacob **Vol. 3:** 649
Start **Vol. 1:** 600, 741
Vol. 2: 327
Vol. 3: 259
Starting point **Vol. 1:** 710
Vol. 3: 522
Startle **Vol. 2:** 358
Starvation **Vol. 1:** 328, 611
Starve **Vol. 3:** 1025
State **Vol. 1:** 168, 189, 232, 275, 392, 468, 501, 508, 519, 549, 565, 611, 617, 639 f., 678, 687, 715, 723–725
Vol. 2: 49, 234, 253, 306, 309, 373, 375, 420, 439, 456, 511, 657, 737, 775, 791, 796, **801–804,** 922
Vol. 3: 79, 96 f., 217, 353, 553, 756, 775 f., 783, 930, 1156
Stateless **Vol. 2:** 306
Statement **Vol. 1:** 573 f., 588
Vol. 2: 407
Vol. 3: 69
Stater **Vol. 2:** 851
Vol. 3: 752–755, 985
Statesman **Vol. 1:** 193
Vol. 3: 217
Statesmanship **Vol. 3:** 606
Station **Vol. 1:** 275, 476
Vol. 3: 1055
Station code **Vol. 3:** 929
Statue **Vol. 2:** 27, 158, 287
Vol. 3: 259
Stature **Vol. 1: 92 f.,** 183, 277, 740
Vol. 2: 428 f., 588
Vol. 3: 350, 403
Status **Vol. 1:** 131, 268, 275, 324, 364, 385, 398, 432, 439, 538 f., 549, 615, 618–620, 664, 694
Vol. 2: 160 f., 170, 218, 262, 334, 338, 342, 351 f., 373, 386, 427, 439, 442, 563, 619
Vol. 3: 32, 49, 593, 654, 888, 1055, 1058, 1066 f., 1073
Statute **Vol. 1:** 330, 332, 335, 350, 677
Vol. 2: 363, 441
Vol. 3: 354, 550
Statutory **Vol. 1:** 578
Stave **Vol. 1:** 390
Stay **Vol. 1:** 690
Vol. 2: 772
Vol. 3: 223–229
Stay on **Vol. 3: 223–229**
Stay with **Vol. 3: 224–229,** 449
Staying **Vol. 3: 224–229**
Steadfast **Vol. 1:** 217, 494, 602, 607, 660, 662 f., 674, 710
Vol. 2: 117, 611, **764–776**
Vol. 3: 228, 691
Steadfast love **Vol. 2:** 227
Vol. 3: 879
Steadfastness **Vol. 2: 764–776,** 858
Vol. 3: 73, 818
Steady **Vol. 1:** 658
Vol. 3: 878
Steal **Vol. 1:** 208
Vol. 2: 871
Vol. 3: 54, **377–381,** 602
Stealth **Vol. 3:** 377
Steam **Vol. 3:** 689
Steamed **Vol. 1:** 226
Steep **Vol. 2:** 349
Steer **Vol. 1:** 694
Step **Vol. 1:** 600
Vol. 2: 369
Vol. 3: 350
Step-mother **Vol. 1:** 500
Stephanas **Vol. 1:** 741
Vol. 2: 899
Vol. 3: 416, 574
Stephen **Vol. 1:** 174, 297, 440, 739
Vol. 2: 91, 119, 135, 148, 155, 178, 248, 318, 418, 421, 437, 450, 636, 641, 729
Vol. 3: 65 f., 199, 257 f., 320, 431, 464 f., 481, 548, 607, 633, 700, 714, 736, 773, 785, 793, 815, 964, 1014, 1030, 1043 f., 1067, 1122
Stephen, Pope **Vol. 3:** 385
Steppes **Vol. 2:** 305
Vol. 3: 1004
Stereotype **Vol. 3:** 1063
Stern, G. **Vol. 3:** 1129
Steward **Vol. 1:** 684
Vol. 2: 123, **247–256,** 619, 714
Vol. 3: 49, 468, 489, 504, 529, 576, 701, 854
Stewardship **Vol. 2:** 832
Stewed **Vol. 1:** 226
Stick **Vol. 1:** 161 f., 657, 726
Stick to **Vol. 2: 348–350**
Stiffnecked **Vol. 2:** 153
Stigma **Vol. 2:** 835
Stigmata **Vol. 2: 572 f.**
Still **Vol. 1:** 384, 419
Vol. 2: 240, 396, 630 f.
Vol. 3: 111, 211, 1002
Still birth **Vol. 1:** 183
Stimulate **Vol. 3:** 489, 1123
Stimulating **Vol. 3:** 445
Sting **Vol. 1:** 436, **507–511,** 719, 738
Vol. 2: 29
Vol. 3: 267 f., 865
Stinginess **Vol. 1:** 214
Stipulation **Vol. 2:** 320
Stir **Vol. 1:** 563
Vol. 2: 136, 366
Stir up **Vol. 3: 556–558, 709 f.**
Stoa **Vol. 1:** 68, 277, 349, 643

Stoa (*cont'd*)
Vol. 3: 577, 635, 1084
Stock **Vol. 1:** 427, 710, 721
Vol. 3: 865
Stock of Jesse **Vol. 3:** 649
Stoic **Vol. 1:** 63, 108, 137, 164, 178, 184 f., 232, 255, 271, 334, 432, 444, 446, 450, 459 f., 481, 493, 498, 501, 512, 521, 537, 616, 640, 645, 654, 656, 692, 694, 715, 718, 734
Vol. 2: 49–51, 72, 128, 130, 141, 188, 265, 289, 396, 406 f., 419, 439, 449, 459, 476 f., 481, 497, 565, 648, 651, 657 f., 660 f., 719, 723, 765, 769, 776, 783, 807, 836, 841, 919
Vol. 3: 31–33, 35, 50 f., 54, 205, 257, 525, 562, 571, 593, 635, 678 f., 690, 719, 727, 739 f., 764, 776, 778, 827, 835, 924, 926 f., 930 f., 1027, 1034, 1036, 1039, 1084–1086, 1116 f., 1129, 1157, 1169
Stoicism **Vol. 1:** 59, **68 f.,** 127, 253, 351, 432, 502, 595
Vol. 2: 140
Vol. 3: 123, 146, 149, 331, 689, 727, 928
Stolen **Vol. 2:** 858
Stomach **Vol. 1: 169,** 202, 500, 611, 742
Vol. 2: 266
Stone **Vol. 1:** 74, 77, 140, 205, 240, 248, 294, 308, 332, 377, 390, 393 f., 409, 463, 477, 496, 610, 660, 662, 682, 724
Vol. 2: 29, 129, 217, 231, 249, 288, 296, 418, 450, 582, 622 f., 705 f., 708 f., 711, 800
Vol. 3: 146, 227, 281, **381–399,** 418, 483, 490, 493, 497, 499, 557, 714, 739, 796, 805, 1062
Stone of offence **Vol. 2:** 705
Vol. 3: 382, 389–391, 393
Stones crying out **Vol. 3:** 393
Stoning **Vol. 3:** 94 f., 538
Stop **Vol. 3: 254–258, 950 f.**
Store **Vol. 2:** 134, 318
Store up **Vol. 2: 829–836**
Storehouse **Vol. 2:** 189, 191, **829–836**
Storeroom **Vol. 2: 829–836**
Stores **Vol. 2:** 32
Storm **Vol. 1:** 384, 419, 572
Vol. 2: 623, 630 f.
Vol. 3: 211, 266, 514, 557, 559, 707, **1000–1004,** 1091
Storm-tossed **Vol. 3:** 560
Story **Vol. 1:** 575
Vol. 2: 643–647
Vol. 3: 816
Strabo **Vol. 1:** 319, 497
Vol. 2: 324, 679
Straight **Vol. 2:** 144
Vol. 3: 351 f., 834, 903, 942, 1028
Straightforward **Vol. 3: 351 f.**
Strain **Vol. 3:** 858
Strain out **Vol. 1:** 116
Straits **Vol. 2:** 29, **807–809**
Strange **Vol. 1:** 509, 671, 683 f., 686, 688–690, 728
Vol. 2: 367, **739–742**
Stranger **Vol. 1:** 180, 203, 221, 255, 258, 265, 305, 346, 360, 528, **683–692,** 717
Vol. 2: 34, 251, 326, 404, 541, **788–790,** 803
Vol. 3: 545, 567, 815, 1073
Strangled **Vol. 1: 220–226,** 261
Strangulation **Vol. 1:** 391 f.
Strata **Vol. 1:** 68
Strategy **Vol. 2:** 329
Strauss, D.F. **Vol. 1:** 54
Vol. 3: 1138
Straw **Vol. 1:** 390
Strawson, P.F. **Vol. 3: 895–897**
Stray **Vol. 1:** 115, 239
Vol. 2: 413, 710
Straying cattle **Vol. 3:** 95
Stream **Vol. 1:** 652 f., 655, 682 f.
Vol. 2: 232
Vol. 3: 985–988
Street crossing **Vol. 3:** 940
Strength **Vol. 1:** 106, 119, 122, 173, 229, 239, 314, 329, 343, 436, 445, 467, 531, 551, 564, 607, 636, 650, 667, 680, 686, 710, 732, 736
Vol. 2: 78, 98 f., 148, 177, 180, 202, 215, 240, 244 f., 263, 273, 360, 540, **601–616,** 767, 806, 817
Vol. 3: 31, 121, 381, 544, 557, 677, **711–718,** 730, 925
Strengthen **Vol. 1:** 99, 463, 492, 570, 604, 639, 658
Vol. 2: 183, 357, **601–616**
Vol. 3: 88, 226, **716–718**
Strenuous work **Vol. 3: 858 f.**
Stress **Vol. 1:** 420, 597, 638, 720, 739
Vol. 2: 663, 748
Stretch **Vol. 1:** 478, 649
Vol. 3: 399
Stretch out **Vol. 1:** 127, 460
Vol. 2: 150, 200 f., 239
Vol. 3: 870
Stretch out hand **Vol. 3:** 750, 860
Strew **Vol. 2:** 157
Strict **Vol. 1:** 500, 568, 688
Strictness **Vol. 2:** 351
Stride **Vol. 2:** 369
Strife **Vol. 1:** 380, 535, 555, 558, 638, 681
Vol. 2: 263, 282 f., 808, 911
Vol. 3: 532, **958–967**
Strike **Vol. 1:** 161–163, 376, 585, 653
Vol. 2: 157, 220, 413, 416, **417–419,** 451, **705–707**
Vol. 3: 903
Strike down **Vol. 3:** 396
Strike fire **Vol. 3:** 396
Strike with fist **Vol. 3: 857**
Strike out **Vol. 1:** 529
Strip **Vol. 1:** 313 f., 393, 564
Vol. 3: 310, 867
Strip off **Vol. 3:** 379
Stripes **Vol. 2:** 696
Strive **Vol. 1:** 80, 456, 460 f., 469, 637, 645 f., 673, 723, 731
Vol. 2: 103, 230, 244 f., 266, 305, 426, 617, 806, 814–817
Vol. 3: 346, 775, 799, 820, 1168
Strive after **Vol. 3:** 231
Strive for **Vol. 3: 530–532**
Stroke **Vol. 1:** 161, 241, 260

Stroll **Vol. 3:** 943
Strong **Vol. 1:** 103, 352, 366, 475, 504, 508, 650 f., 727, 731
Vol. 2: 102, 155, 169 f., 244, 269, 517, **601–616,** 657, 764, **767 f.,** 815
Vol. 3: 432, **712–714, 716–718, 993–996,** 998
Strong ones **Vol. 1:** 101
Strong-box **Vol. 2:** 830
Stronger **Vol. 2:** 382
Stronger One **Vol. 3:** 55, 473
Strongest **Vol. 2:** 435
Stronghold **Vol. 2:** 324
Structuralism **Vol. 3:** 1142
Structure **Vol. 1:** 390
Vol. 2: 249, 288, 427
Struggle **Vol. 1:** 336, 503, 539, 564, 595, 602, 604, 626, 644–647, 649, 651, 687, 716–718
Vol. 2: 65, 165, 273, 307 f., 311
Vol. 3: 838
Stubborn **Vol. 1:** 152, 241, 308, 424, 426, 554
Vol. 2: 97, 153, 312
Vol. 3: 94, 715
Student **Vol. 1:** 484, 486
Vol. 3: 115
Study **Vol. 1:** 219, 459, 485 f., 580, 641, 656, 662, 735
Vol. 2: 381, 442
Vol. 3: 478, 480 f., 1162
Stumble **Vol. 1:** 610, 663
Vol. 2: 429, **705–707**
Vol. 3: 382, 433, 446, 573, 922, 994
Stumbling-block **Vol. 1:** 535
Vol. 2: 705–710
Vol. 3: 994, 996, 1020
Stump **Vol. 2:** 333
Vol. 3: 866
Stunt **Vol. 2:** 222
Stupid **Vol. 2:** 412
Vol. 3: 130, 577, **1023–1026**
Stupify **Vol. 2:** 154
Style **Vol. 2:** 288
Vol. 3: 65, 904
Stylistic variation **Vol. 3:** 1176
Stylus **Vol. 3:** 865
Subdue **Vol. 1:** 336, 647, 671
Vol. 2: 260, 777
Vol. 3: 109
Subject **Vol. 1:** 235, 360, 366, 385, 436 f., 444, 446, 457 f., 470, 492, 538, 542 f., 548, 552, 583, 595, 603, 610, 660, 685, 687, 692, 707, 716, 720
Vol. 2: 110, 139, 142, 162, 244, 263, 265, 286, 298, 377, 399, 418, 609, 790
Vol. 3: 204, 268, 470, **592–598,** 695, 756, 1064
Subject to suffering **Vol. 3: 719–725**
Subjection **Vol. 1:** 439, 509, 524 f., 586, 591, 609, 676, 718
Vol. 2: 51, 374
Vol. 3: 545, 548, 581, 589, 595, 1161
Subjective **Vol. 1:** 284
Vol. 2: 239–241, 243, 352, 355, 357
Vol. 3: 283, 285
Subjectivity **Vol. 1:** 583 f.
Subjugate **510–520**
Sublimation **Vol. 2:** 336
Sublime **Vol. 2:** 92–94
Submerge **Vol. 1:** 144
Submission **Vol. 1:** 81, 239, 281, 330, 347, 401, 415, 439, 475, 600, 647
Vol. 2: 179, 218, 240, 244, 343, 615, 764, 859, 864, 888
Vol. 3: 84, 250, 745, 929
Submissive **Vol. 1:** 364, 593
Vol. 2: 262
Vol. 3: 243, 691, 930 f., 1067
Submit **Vol. 1:** 602
Vol. 2: 180, 203, 261, 270, 363, 378
Vol. 3: 360
Subordinate **Vol. 1:** 283, 452, 481, 485, 501, 508, 523, 599, 605, 712
Vol. 2: 160, 372, 404
Vol. 3: 758, 1066
Subordination **Vol. 1:** 190, 386, 492
Vol. 2: 80, 84, 162
Vol. 3: 593, 636, 929, 1063
Subordinationism **Vol. 3:** 1064
Suborn **Vol. 2:** 686
Subservience **Vol. 1:** 670
Subservient **Vol. 1:** 492
Subsistence **Vol. 2:** 845–847
Substance **Vol. 1:** 327, 605, 679, **703–714**
Vol. 2: 243, 284, 289, 452, 497, **845–847**
Substantial **Vol. 1:** 710 f.
Vol. 2: 291
Substantiate **Vol. 2:** 321
Vol. 3: 1041
Substitute **Vol. 1:** 319, 504, 629, 681
Vol. 2: 42, 199
Vol. 3: 159, 171, 194, 427, 750, 1150
Substitution **Vol. 1:** 398, 417, 426, 437 f.
Vol. 3: 1179, 1196
Substitutionary **Vol. 3:** 103, 196, 723
Substitutionary death **Vol. 2:** 123, 530, 532 f., 535 f.
Subterfuge **Vol. 2:** 317, 630
Subterranean **Vol. 1:** 509
Vol. 2: 205
Subversive **Vol. 2:** 645
Subvert **Vol. 2:** 370
Succeed **Vol. 2:** 452
Vol. 3: 943
Success **Vol. 1:** 412, 557, 611 f., 688, 741
Vol. 2: 119, 146, 237, 478, 778
Vol. 3: 322
Succession **Vol. 1:** 200, 301, 426, 664 f.
Vol. 2: 152, 389, 428, 433
Vol. 3: 481
Successor **Vol. 2:** 151, 331, 374
Vol. 3: 648
Succoth **Vol. 1:** 195
Succumb **Vol. 1:** 467
Vol. 2: 285, 307
Suck **Vol. 3:** 1062
Suckling **Vol. 1:** 281
Sudden **Vol. 1:** 609
Vol. 2: 382, 384, 894, 900, 910
Vol. 3: 379, 394, 1001
Sue **Vol. 3:** 576
Suffer **Vol. 1:** 55, 191, 239 f., 260, 395, 483, 489, 553, 612

Suffer (*cont'd*)
Vol. 2: 29, 122, 139, 258, 267, 289, 307, 327, 339, 358, 370, 806, 809, 835
Vol. 3: 128, 142 f., 147, 194, 243, 371, 513, 643, **719–725**
Suffer damage **Vol. 3: 136–138**
Suffer evil **Vol. 3: 719–725**
Suffer loss **Vol. 3: 136–138**
Suffer together **Vol. 3: 719–725**
Sufferer **Vol. 3:** 588
Suffering **Vol. 1:** 68, 108, 123, 129, 163, 165, 173, 211, 214, 219, 223, 227, 261, 273, 276, 301, 305, 326–328, 374 f., 385 f., 389, 391, 395 f., 400 f., 404, 406, 411, 432, 440 f., 444 f., 455, 460, 462, 482 f., 487, 489, 491, 493, 510, 519, 539, 541, 545, 561 f., 564 f., 571, 598, 623, 625, 628, 632, 638 f., 643–649, 651–653, 656 f., 669, 675, 677, 679, 689, 700, 707, 720, 726 f., 731, 741
Vol. 2: 48, 51, 63, 75, 104, 112, 123, 149, 179, 199, 203 f., 228, 231, 245, 276, 291, 303, 310, 313 f., 340, 354, 359–361, 363, 368, 403, 410 f., 413, 416 f., 419–421, 423, 434, 498, 501, 510, 540, 544, 619, 622, 631, 640–642, 654, 665, 669, 674 f., 688, 708, 713, 765, 771, 774, 776, 782, 808, 825, 840, 844, 883, 888, 911, 924
Vol. 3: 28, 132, 140, 157, 186, 194–197, 202, 215, 218, 239, 257 f., 271, 278, 293, 316 f., 322, 349, 446, 470, 489, 494, 503, 528, 552, 571, 576 f., 579, 582, 592, 602, 610–612, 617 f., 622, 624, 644, 670, 672, 697, 705, **719–725,** 735, 778, 825, 837 f., 848, **858 f.,** 864, 905, 955 f., 980, 995, 997, 1023, 1042, 1044, 1054, 1095–1097, 1099, 1102, 1109, 1113, 1122
Suffice **Vol. 2:** 342, 820
Vol. 3: 726–730
Sufficiency **Vol. 2:** 429
Vol. 3: 727 f.
Sufficient **Vol. 1:** 163, 248, 727 f.
Vol. 2: 162, 238, 341
Vol. 3: 315, **726–730,** 857
Suffocation **Vol. 1:** 393, 395
Suggestion **Vol. 1:** 61, 510, 544
Vol. 2: 166
Suicide **Vol. 1:** 93, 432 f.
Vol. 2: 659
Suit **Vol. 1:** 478, 536
Suitability **Vol. 1:** 536 f.
Suitable **Vol. 2:** 102, 105, **668 f.**
Vol. 3: 349–351
Suitably **Vol. 3: 348 f.**
Sukkah **Vol. 3:** 812
Sully **Vol. 1:** 447
Sulphur **Vol. 1:** 657
Sum **Vol. 1:** 521, 598
Vol. 2: 157
Sum up **Vol. 2:** 156 f., 163
Sumerian **Vol. 1:** 140
Vol. 3: 782, 786
Sumerian king-lists **Vol. 3:** 564
Sumerian law **Vol. 3:** 95
Summer **Vol. 1:** 627, 724
Vol. 2: 382
Vol. 3: 269, 845
Summit **Vol. 1:** 165
Summon **Vol. 1:** 88, 270 f., 292 f., 295, 308, 331, 340, 342, 489, 492, 569, 570, 600, 638, 689, 719
Vol. 2: 354, 358, 405
Vol. 3: 68, **113 f.,** 1029
Sumptuous **Vol. 2: 484–486**
Sun **Vol. 1:** 124, 203, 252, 314, 420, 425, 449, 451, 515 f., 586 f., 627, 652 f., 728
Vol. 2: 128, 191 f., 265, 289 f., 484, 487 f., 491, 493, 495 f., 622, 628, 690 f., 695, 889, 916
Vol. 3: 443, **730–737,** 862, 1067 f.
Sun of righteousness **Vol. 3:** 731
Sun-cult **Vol. 1:** 631
Sun-god **Vol. 2:** 200
Vol. 3: 264, 617
Sun-myth **Vol. 3:** 266
Sun-worship **Vol. 3:** 397
Sun-worshippers **Vol. 1:** 631
Sunburn **Vol. 1:** 652
Sunday **Vol. 1:** 631, 634
Vol. 3: 412, 855
Sundial **Vol. 2:** 451, 628
Vol. 3: 553, 846
Sunlight **Vol. 2:** 490
Sunrise **Vol. 1:** 665
Vol. 3: 514
Sunset **Vol. 1:** 633
Superabundance **Vol. 1:** 729
Vol. 2: 119
Vol. 3: 918
Supererogation **Vol. 3:** 1053
Superficial **Vol. 3:** 105, 820
Superfluous **Vol. 1:** 266, 371, 728 f., 731
Vol. 2: 487
Vol. 3: 728
Superhuman **Vol. 1:** 450
Vol. 3: 636
Superintend **Vol. 1:** 189
Superior **Vol. 1:** 588, 644, 659
Vol. 2: 157, 160, 164, 166, 196, 267, 401, 433, 442, 510, 513, 533, 856, 859 f., 862, 877
Vol. 3: 712, 714, 1063
Superiority **Vol. 1:** 301, 337, 356, 371, 386, 408 f., 427, 539, 650 f.
Vol. 2: 158, 394, 431, 435, 447, 612, 694, 824
Vol. 3: 474
Supernatural **Vol. 1:** 60, 104, 113, 122, 167, 413, 424, 504, 511, 607, 609, 647, 718
Vol. 2: 166, 189, 268, 274, 326, 335, 364, 386, 477, 491, 556, 601, 603, 607
Vol. 3: 103, 149, 328, 512–514, 516, 602, 640, 647, 691, 698, 706, 862, 965, 1073
Supernova **Vol. 2:** 558
Vol. 3: 735
Superscription **Vol. 1:** 132, 392, 396
Vol. 2: 289
Vol. 3: 482–495
Supersede **Vol. 1:** 601, 631, 666
Vol. 2: 447
Vol. 3: 815
Superstition **Vol. 1:** 450, 453
Vol. 2: 85, 560
Superstitious **Vol. 2:** 85

Supervise **Vol. 1:** 450
Vol. 2: 327, 445
Supervisor **Vol. 2:** 191
Supper **Vol. 2:** **520–538**
Vol. 3: 732
Supper, great **Vol. 1:** 324
Vol. 2: 358
Supper of God **Vol. 2:** 33
Supplant **Vol. 2:** 431
Supplement **Vol. 1:** 70
Suppliant **Vol. 1:** 612, 687
Vol. 2: 74, 856–860, 863
Vol. 3: 588
Supplication **Vol. 1:** 239, 320, 600
Vol. 2: 91, 117, 149, 768, 855 f., **860–863,** 868
Vol. 3: 211
Supply **Vol. 1:** 318, 731
Vol. 2: 117
Vol. 3: 771
Support **Vol. 1:** 115, 261, 288, 328, 474, 554, 614, 636, 658
Vol. 2: 99, 146, 237, 263, 272, 311, 446, 448, 460, 834, 837
Vol. 3: 144, 255, **544–549, 795,** 853, 964, 1053
Suppose **Vol. 1:** 61, 330, 475, 670
Vol. 2: 44, 239
Vol. 3: **821 f.**
Suppress **Vol. 1:** 494, 502, 718
Vol. 3: 1161
Suppress truth **Vol. 3:** 885
Supratemporal **Vol. 3:** 827
Supreme **Vol. 1:** 616, 668
Vol. 2: 426
Vol. 3: 716
Sure **Vol. 1:** 365, 591, 594, 596, 658–660, 663, 729
Vol. 2: 243
Surety **Vol. 1:** 372, 374, 669
Vol. 2: 40
Surface **Vol. 1:** 585, 587
Surmount **Vol. 1:** 71
Surname **Vol. 2:** **648–656**
Surpass **Vol. 1:** 137, 650, 730, 740
Surplus **Vol. 1:** 728, 731
Vol. 2: 130
Vol. 3: 137
Surprise **Vol. 1:** 425, 466, 540
Vol. 2: 382, 432, **621–626**
Vol. 3: 624, 750
Surrender **Vol. 1:** 70, 223, 309, 335, 355, 417, 435, 455, 486, 499, 525, 561, 709, 715
Vol. 2: 146, 198, 394, 405
Vol. 3: 106, 164, 183, 196, 551, 572, 705
Surround **Vol. 1:** 405
Vol. 3: 948, 950, 952
Surround with light **Vol. 2:** **484–486**
Survival **Vol. 1:** 540, 592, 596, 687
Vol. 3: 231, 274, 302
Survive **Vol. 2:** 83, 274, 309, 383, 412, 772
Vol. 3: 247, 251, 253, 263
Survivor **Vol. 3:** 248–250
Susanna **Vol. 3:** 1059
Susceptibility **Vol. 2:** 675
Suspect **Vol. 1:** 414
Suspend **Vol. 1:** 523
Suspicion **Vol. 1:** 563
Vol. 3: 820, 1119
Sustain **Vol. 1:** 549, 616
Vol. 2: 101, 162, 866
Vol. 3: 172, 1102
Sustainer **Vol. 2:** 74, 76
Sustenance **Vol. 1:** 84, 173, 249 f., 711
Vol. 2: 264
Vol. 3: 807
Swallow **Vol. 1:** 116, 173, 440, 470, 490, 651
Vol. 2: 274
Vol. 3: 267, 1112
Swamp **Vol. 1:** 688
Vol. 3: 992
Swear **Vol. 1:** 203, 344, 346, 554, 659
Vol. 2: 159, 301, 614, 650
Vol. 3: 70, 183, 347, 429, 474, **737–743,** 785, 792, 840, 1018, 1038, 1053, 1113, 1163
Swear falsely **Vol. 3:** **737–743**
Sweep **Vol. 3:** 102
Sweet **Vol. 1:** 202, 458, 480, 513
Vol. 2: 211, 273, 293
Swell **Vol. 1:** 94, 107, 240
Vol. 2: 462
Swift **Vol. 1:** 280
Swim **Vol. 2:** 412
Swindler **Vol. 3:** **601–605**
Swine **Vol. 1:** 117, 672
Vol. 3: 475, 985, 1011
Swineherd **Vol. 1:** 559
Swollen **Vol. 2:** 465
Swoon theory **Vol. 3:** 292
Sword **Vol. 1:** 109, 118, 272, 322, 377, 380, 407, 464, 513, 559, 655, 716
Vol. 2: 98, 189, 367, 686, 795
Vol. 3: 96, 590, 729, 747, **958–967,** 978, 1079, 1102, 1113
Sword of the Spirit **Vol. 3:** 966
Sycamine **Vol. 3:** 1012
Sychar **Vol. 3:** 457 f.
Syllable **Vol. 2:** 452
Syllogism **Vol. 3:** 1086
Symbol **Vol. 1:** 87, 115 f., 119–122, 126, 146, 148 f., 152, 156, 158 f., 171, 175, 185, 201, 203–205, 209, 225, 238 f., 241, 252, 254, 266, 280, 284, 294, 297, 316 f., 321, 351, 377, 389, 391, 420, 422, 448, 470, 489, 497, 507, 509 f., 512, 514, 516, 531 f., 577, 625, 629 f., 650, 652, 655, 724–726
Vol. 2: 37, 96–98, 148 f., 151, 214, 270, 276, 294, 372, 376, 426, 482, 485, 495, 504, 539, 573 f., 580, 582, 585, 597, 607, 612, 626, 630, 632, 637, 648 f., 655, 679, 685–703, 711 f., 714, 738, 745 f., 804, 909, 916–918
Vol. 3: 35, 47, 80, 104, 149, 159, 164, 211, 226, 237, 260, 266, 269, 334–336, 392, 397, 430, 433, 436, 444 f., 448, 459, 484, 486, 499, 501 f., 505, 522, 557, 559, 561, 581, 600, 620, 630, 634 f., 695, 706, 715, 718, 733, 736, 783, 788, 793, 795, 807, 851, 868, 918 f., 947, 961, 963, 965, 967, 987, 990, 1002 f., 1008 f., 1011, 1013 f., 1054, 1067 f., 1093, 1099, 1130, 1137, 1161 f.
Symbolic **Vol. 3:** 79, 87, 203, 922
Symbolize **Vol. 2:** 272 f., 275, 415

Symbolize (*cont'd*)
Vol. 3: 948
Symmachus **Vol. 1:** 379, 382, 387
Vol. 2: 141, 707
Vol. 3: 453, 486
Symmetry **Vol. 1:** 206
Vol. 2: 102
Sympathize **Vol. 2:** 123, 361, 594
Vol. 3: **719–725**
Sympathy **Vol. 1:** 220, 329
Vol. 2: 117, 424, **598–600**
Vol. 3: 235, 758
Symptom **Vol. 1:** 445
Synagogue **Vol. 1:** 59, 67, **69,** 128, 163, 166, 168, 181, 194, 196, 199, 219, 245, 257, **291–307,** 321, 334, 347, 360 f., 395, 414, 453, 589 f., 607, 623 f., 628, 666, 738
Vol. 2: 90, 118, 126, 155, 158–161, 174, 229, 308, 311, 316, 333, 368, 437, 451, 590, 641, 740, 799, 823, 825, 864 f.
Vol. 3: 51, 56, 83, 87, 115, 179, 188, 220, 228, 250, 348, 389, 396, 407, 409 f., 428, 441 f., 452, 458, 520, 545, 552, 589, 598 f., 671, 756, 761, 785, 821, 867, 1020, 1058, 1168
Synagogue of the Olive Tree **Vol. 3:** 868
Synagogue of Satan **Vol. 2:** 314, 474
Synchronic linguistics **Vol. 3:** 1140
Synchrony **Vol. 3:** 1142
Syncretism **Vol. 1:** 58–61, **69,** 487, 500, 595, 640
Vol. 2: 201, 269, 306, 393 f., 453, 515, 895
Vol. 3: 123, 827, 928, 1091
Synecdoche **Vol. 1:** 239 f.
Synergism **Vol. 2:** 119
Synod **Vol. 1:** 52
Synonym **Vol. 2:** 388
Synoptic criticism **Vol. 1:** 62
Synoptic Gospels **Vol. 1:** 67 f., **69**
Syntyche **Vol. 1:** 344
Vol. 3: 1164
Syracuse **Vol. 1:** 640
Syria **Vol. 1:** 121, 125, 133, 143, 189, 243, 634
Vol. 2: 86, 125 f., 308, 372
Vol. 3: 40, 84, 266, 635, 756
Syrian Antioch (→ Antioch)
Syrian church **Vol. 2:** 333
Syrians **Vol. 3:** 756
Syro-Canaanite **Vol. 2:** 375
Syro-Palestine **Vol. 2:** 320
Syrophoenician **Vol. 1:** 117
Vol. 2: 126
Vol. 3: 475, 980, 1059
System **Vol. 1:** 660, 700
Vol. 2: 436
Systematization **Vol. 3:** 1078
Systematized doctrine **Vol. 1:** 702

Taber, C.R. **Vol. 3:** 1141
Taberah **Vol. 2:** 638
Tabernacle **Vol. 1:** 66, 114, 122, 252, 280, 380, 735
Vol. 2: 96 f., 189, 290, 294, 487, 637 f., 711, 746, 889
Vol. 3: 120, 156, 164 f., 317, 323, 397, 402, 407, 418, 433 f., 436, 465, 550, 556, 593, 691, 781, 786 f., 792, 794 f., **811–815,** 851, 888, 1011, 1040
Tabitha **Vol. 2:** 596
Vol. 3: 1065 f.
Table **Vol. 1:** 252, 586, 641
Vol. 2: 272 f., 275 f., 516, **520–538,** 556
Vol. 3: 399, 424, 488, 588
Table of demons **Vol. 2:** 520
Vol. 3: 1165
Table of the Lord **Vol. 2:** 522
Table of the presence **Vol. 3:** 812
Table of showbread **Vol. 3:** 814
Table-fellowship **Vol. 2:** **521 f.**
Tables of stone **Vol. 3:** 815
Tablet **Vol. 1:** 243, 248
Vol. 2: 192
Vol. 3: 493, 702, 811, 1013, 1040, 1094
Tablets of destiny **Vol. 2:** 553
Taboo **Vol. 2:** 223 f., 236, 268, 270, 461, 552
Vol. 3: 100
Tabor **Vol. 3:** 1010, 1012
Taheb **Vol. 3:** 147, 462
Tail **Vol. 1:** 508, 510
Vol. 2: 158
Taint **Vol. 1:** 265, 641
Vol. 2: 28
Vol. 3: 756, 758
Take **Vol. 1:** 343, 533, 587
Vol. 3: 253, 605, **744–751**
Take advantage **Vol. 3:** 377
Take along **Vol. 3:** **747–751**
Take apart **Vol. 1:** 533
Take aside **Vol. 3:** 747
Take away **Vol. 1:** 115, 225, 701 f.
Vol. 2: 225, 359, 411, 606
Vol. 3: 151, 489, **601–605**
Take breath **Vol. 3:** 255
Take captive **Vol. 3:** **590 f.**
Take care **Vol. 1:** 189
Vol. 2: 90
Take counsel **Vol. 2:** 744
Take dimensions **Vol. 3:** **402–404**
Take heart **Vol. 1:** 327
Vol. 2: 360
Take heed **Vol. 2:** 178
Take hold **Vol. 3:** 859
Take in **Vol. 3:** **744–746**
Take in vain **Vol. 3:** 342, 344
Take issue **Vol. 1:** 504
Take a long journey **Vol. 2:** **788–790**
Take offence **Vol. 1:** 653
Vol. 3: 516
Take on board **Vol. 3:** 749
Take out **Vol. 1:** 453
Take over **Vol. 3:** **747–751**
Take pleasure in **Vol. 3:** **1018–1023**
Take possession **Vol. 1:** 534, 635
Vol. 2: 352
Vol. 3: 633, **726–718, 747–751**
Take prisoner **Vol. 3:** 824, 960
Take rest **Vol. 3:** **254–258**
Take root **Vol. 3:** **865–870**
Take seriously **Vol. 3:** 824
Take sides **Vol. 1:** 585
Vol. 2: 617

Take time **Vol. 3: 839–845**
Take up **Vol. 2:** 238
Vol. 3: 266, **744–751**
Take up cross **Vol. 1:** 455, 482
Vol. 2: 420
Vol. 3: 349
Take a wife **Vol. 2:** 578
Take with **Vol. 3: 747–751**
Taken up **Vol. 1:** 677
Vol. 2: 203
Taking an oath **Vol. 3: 737–743**
Tale-bearer **Vol. 3:** 346
Tale-bearing **Vol. 3:** 346
Talent **Vol. 2:** 155, 216, 790, 838
Vol. 3: 138, 141, 526, 703, 756
Talk **Vol. 1:** 550, 574
Vol. 3: 1081–1119
Talmud **Vol. 1:** 58 f., 64, 67, **69,** 414
Vol. 2: 125 f., 174, 309, 312, 583
Vol. 3: 439
Talmud, Babylonian **Vol. 1:** 64, **69**
Vol. 2: 43, 350
Talmud, Jerusalem (Palestinian) **Vol. 1:** 64, **69**
Vol. 2: 308
Talmudic Judaism (→ Judaism, Talmudic)
Tamar **Vol. 2:** 212, 577
Vol. 3: 356, 656, 1062
Tamarisk **Vol. 1:** 252
Tame **Vol. 1:** 495
Vol. 2: 256, 412, 661, 899
Tammuz **Vol. 2:** 166
Vol. 3: 104, 274 f.
Tamper **Vol. 3:** 886
Tangible **Vol. 1:** 679
Tannaim **Vol. 1:** 49, 67, **69**
Tannaitic **Vol. 1:** 51
Tares **Vol. 2:** 33, 488, 714, 834
Vol. 3: 470, 523, 527, 627, 831
Targum **Vol. 1:** 51, 63, **69**
Vol. 2: 309
Vol. 3: 485–487, 494, 524, 610
Tarnish **Vol. 2:** 28
Tarquin **Vol. 1:** 314
Tarry **Vol. 2:** 773
Tarrying **Vol. 3: 224–229**
Tarshish **Vol. 3:** 1001
Tarski, A. **Vol. 3:** 897
Tarsus **Vol. 2:** 320, 328, 804, 848, 895
Tartarus **Vol. 2:** 682
Vol. 3: 260
Task **Vol. 1:** 273, 331, 412, 476, 522, 533, 536, 544, 568 f., 583, 602, 610, 617, 624, 626, 650
Vol. 2: 101, 121, 254, 263, 366, 668
Vol. 3: 799, **1155–1158**
Taskmaster **Vol. 3:** 779
Taste **Vol. 1:** 201 f., 439, 458 f.
Vol. 2: 27, 29, 194, **264–277,** 293, 718
Vol. 3: 445, 809, 1078
Taste death **Vol. 2: 271,** 382
Tat son of Hermes **Vol. 3:** 1085
Tattoo **Vol. 2:** 572
Vol. 3: 594
Tau **Vol. 2:** 572
Taught **Vol. 3: 759–765**
Taunt **Vol. 2:** 82, 263, 434
Vol. 3: 202
Taurus **Vol. 2:** 688
Tawny **Vol. 1:** 205
Tax **Vol. 1:** 269 f., 537, 684, 687
Vol. 2: 40, 62, 311, 326, 329, 624, 667, 728, 737, 813, 830, 850–852, 898
Vol. 3: 192, 415, 444, 446, **751–759,** 851, 853, 855, 943, 979, 985, 1156, 1168, 1179
Tax census **Vol. 2:** 320
Tax-collector **Vol. 1:** 356, 488, 499
Vol. 2: 272, 386, 417, 523, 549, 790, 795, 851
Vol. 3: 106, 160 f., 361, 428, 558, 580, 603, 657, **751–759,** 790, 883, 920, 969, 980, 1062, 1157
Tax evasion **Vol. 2:** 222
Tax farmer **Vol. 3: 755–759**
Tax office **Vol. 3: 755–759**
Tax official **Vol. 3:** 756
Taxation **Vol. 3:** 606
Teach **Vol. 1:** 87, 164, 191, 197, 248, 340 f., 485 f., 488, 494, 502, 535, 568, 598 f., 620, 628
Vol. 2: 113 f., 137, 140, 362, 367 f., 445, 453, 461, 472, 485, 608, 669, 719, 758
Vol. 3: 54–56, 67, 79, 86, 112, 163, 228, 310, 493, 495, 501, 580, 675, 729, **759–780,** 791, 914, 935, **1026–1034,** 1058, 1063
Teach different (heretical) doctrine **Vol. 3: 766–768**
Teacher **Vol. 1:** 69, 90, 123, 132, 191 f., 198–200, 259, 280, 282, 287, 333, 480–482, 484–486, 490, 492, 515, 530, 533, 548, 572, 581, 598, 614, 617, 684, 708
Vol. 2: 113 f., 151 f., 187, 262, 281, 309, 313 f., 358, 406, 430, 432, 440, 444, 535, 595, 669, 715, 721, 731
Vol. 3: 44, 57, 59, 84, 88, 112, 115 f., 188, 447, 531, 588, 616, 629, **759–768, 771 f., 775–780,** 903, 1029, 1118 f., 1152
Teacher of the law **Vol. 2:** 49, **438–451**
Vol. 3: 477–482, 765–768
Teacher of righteousness **Vol. 1:** 96, 598
Vol. 3: 34, 80, 359, 367, 494, 503, 510, 610, 1120
Teaching **Vol. 1:** 55, 62, 69, 166, 171, 192, 220, 261, 263, 292, 305, 331, 335, 339, 347, 386, 400, 483, 486–488, 490 f., 495, 506, 530, 533 f., 539, 548, 558, 563, 566–568, 572, 577, 579, 589 f., 595, 599–604, 607, 623, 640, 642, 662, 669, 689, 702, 708 f., 720, 722, 730 f., 742
Vol. 2: 36, 112, 118, 121, 123, 125, 132, 135, 147, 152, 155, 158 f., 164 f., 172, 177, 185, 235, 258, 280, 296, 315 f., 319, 327, 383, 406, 413, 432, 435, 437, 443 f., 462, 467, 550, 610, 623, 629, 640 f., 652, 671, 677, 708, 713, 718 f., 736, 743–760, 766, 768, 801, 833 f., 836, 843, 870–873, 879, 883, 889 f., 903–905, 908, 910 f., 914–917, 921, 930
Vol. 3: 31, 56–61, 65, 85, 107, 123, 131, 181, 183, 185, 215, 224, 481, 509, 540–542, 632, 700, 704, 740, 748, **759–780,** 785, 791, 813, 820 f., 854, 867 f., 905, 930, 942, 987, 1020,

Teaching (*cont'd*)
1052, 1063, 1065–1067, 1081, 1106, 1109, 1162 f.
Teaching office **Vol. 3:** 768
Teaching in parables **Vol. 3:** 507
Teaching what is good **Vol. 3: 765–768**
Team **Vol. 1:** 648
Tear **Vol. 1:** 533
Vol. 2: 189, 328
Vol. 3: 543 f., 795
Tear clothes **Vol. 1:** 317
Tears **Vol. 1:** 471, 683
Vol. 2: 178, 263, 416, 418, 631, 674
Vol. 3: 268, 680, 1002
Tease **Vol. 2:** 432
Technical **Vol. 1:** 495, 722
Technical term **Vol. 2:** 363, 368, 457, 727, 743, 764, 766, 783, 854, 862
Vol. 3: 77, 102, 115, 146, 218, 317, 342, 366, 373, 378, 501, 530 f., 534, 583, 603, 668, 717, 746, 771, 794, 808, 854, 869, 871, 999, 1081, 1087
Technique **Vol. 1:** 723
Tegea **Vol. 2:** 898
Tekel **Vol. 3:** 1160
Tekoa **Vol. 3:** 1092
Telchines **Vol. 2:** 552
Telemachus **Vol. 2:** 233
Teleological **Vol. 2:** 780
Vol. 3: 331
Teleology **Vol. 1: 69**
Tell **Vol. 1:** 57, **573–584**
Vol. 2: 108, 488, 648
Vol. 3: 56
Tell el-Yehudieh **Vol. 2:** 331
Tell Nebi Yunus **Vol. 2:** 680
Tell Quyunjiq **Vol. 2:** 679
Telmessian oracle **Vol. 1:** 573
Temper **Vol. 1:** 107, 202
Temperament **Vol. 1:** 107, 540
Vol. 2: 259
Temperance **Vol. 1:** 501
Vol. 3: 354, 926
Temperate **Vol. 1:** 513 f., 671
Vol. 3: 1065
Temperature **Vol. 1:** 318
Tempest **Vol. 1:** 653
Vol. 3: 266
Tempestuous wind **Vol. 3:** 1000–1004
Temple **Vol. 1:** 53, 73, 75, 125, 174, 195, 210, 221, 234 f., 245, 256, 269, 272, 274, 280, 293, 295, 314, 321, 344, 360, 395 f., 413 f., 429, 448, 467 f., 478, 497, 500, 530, 537, 555, 586 f., 607, 626 f., 629, 632 f., 652, 661, 684, 687 f., 700, 725, 735
Vol. 2: 29 f., 38, 43, 77, 83, 96 f., 126, 173 f., 185, 190, 194, 199, 215, 217, 225 f., 228, 230 f., **232–236,** 238, 247–249, 251, 253, 256, **284–286,** 290, 294, 296, 311 f., 321, 325–329, 373, 379, 426, 437, 450, 467, 485, 487, 527, 610, 624, 650 f., 698, 711, 713, 727, 730, 732, 742, 754, 763, 768, 793, 795, 799 f., 830, 851, 864, 866, 880, 885, 887, 904, 914–918, 920, 927
Vol. 3: 34–37, 39, 42, 78, 82, 101–104, 106 f., 116 f., 156 f., 160, 165, 173, 185 f., 189, 194, 198, 207 f., 210 f., 213, 250, 258, 266, 269, 317, 323, 343, 350, 366, 378, 380 f., 387, 389–393, 402, 404 407–409, 424, 426–430, 432 f., 435, 440, 451, 465, 469, 471, 478, 483–485, 490, 494 f., 498, 509, 531, 543, 550 f., 553, 557, 566, 589, 593, 605–607, 649, 668 f., 674, 715, 735, 741, 752 f., 761 f., 764, **781–797,** 805–807, 810, 812, 814 f., 827 f., 853, 874, 908, 921, 941, 944 f., 947–949, 955, 977, 986, 988, 1006, 1010, 1052, 1058, 1070 f., 1096 f., 1122, 1148, 1154, 1162, 1165, 1168
Temple of idol **Vol. 2: 284–286**
Temple robber **Vol. 2: 235**
Temple scribes **Vol. 3:** 478
Temple, second **Vol. 2:** 313
Vol. 3: 788
Temple slaves **Vol. 2:** 311
Temple tax **Vol. 2:** 311, 326, 329, 823, 827, 851
Vol. 3: 753 f., 792
Temple-keeper **Vol. 3: 796**
Temple-sweeper **Vol. 3:** 796
Temple, William **Vol. 3: 328,** 421
Temporal **Vol. 1:** 542, 667, 692, 734, 737
Vol. 2: 36, 52, 54, 670, 674, 903
Vol. 3: 827, 832, 848
Temporality **Vol. 1:** 500
Temporary **Vol. 1:** 408, 675 f., 687, 734, 739
Vol. 2: 205, 207, 213, 220, 717
Vol. 3: 228, 380, **833–839**
Tempt **Vol. 1:** 452, 466, 496, 563
Vol. 2: 461, 776, 808
Vol. 3: 476, 586, 725, **798–810,** 1014
Temptation **Vol. 1:** 244, 290, 304, 335, 384 f., 433, 457, 519, 540, 567, 597, 607, 625, 644, 660, 727
Vol. 2: 42, 95, 196, 240, 267, 269, 285, 289, 307, 357, 361, 505, 664, 673, 706, 708, 721, 779, 808, 863, 868, 871, 883 f., 893
Vol. 3: 109, 470 f., 517, 536, 565, 569, 643, 657–659, 693, 790, **798–810,** 838, 842, 845 f., 857, 945, 1007, 1010 f., 1017, 1052, 1096, 1157
Temptation of Jesus **Vol. 1:** 125
Vol. 2: 80, 82
Tempter **Vol. 1:** 599, 718
Tempting **Vol. 3: 798–808**
Ten **Vol. 1:** 54
Vol. 2: 685, **692–694**
Vol. 3: 851
Ten Commandments (→ Decalogue)
Ten lost tribes **Vol. 3:** 873
Ten virgins **Vol. 3:** 1072
Tenant **Vol. 1:** 640
Vol. 2: 50, 301, 607
Vol. 3: 641 f., 868, 920
Tend **Vol. 2:** 543
Vol. 3: 564–568, 919
Tendency **Vol. 1:** 613, 619
Vol. 2: 401
Tender **Vol. 1:** 240
Tenderhearted **Vol. 2: 599 f.**

Tenderly loving **Vol. 2: 538–547**
Tenet **Vol. 2:** 313
Tension **Vol. 1:** 423, 496, 502, 595, 599, 602–604, 624, 628, 738
Vol. 2: 102, 239 f., 243, 245, 271, 306, 309, 312, 316, 367, 429, 448
Vol. 3: 69, 596, 909
Tent **Vol. 1:** 294, 585, 684, 691
Vol. 2: 40, 189, 226, 248, 253, 256, 467, 637, 727, 885
Vol. 3: 120, 156, 163, 189, 198, 317, 323, 418, 424, 465, 550, 553, 569, 715, 781, 787, 797, **811–815,** 851, 888, 905, 941, 947, 1005
Tent of meeting **Vol. 1:** 294
Vol. 3: 419, 423, 786, 811
Tent of testimony **Vol. 3:** 811, 1040
Tent-maker **Vol. 1:** 279
Vol. 3: 811–815
Tenth **Vol. 2:** 590–592, **692–694**
Vol. 3: 851–855
Teraphim **Vol. 2:** 555
Terminology **Vol. 2:** 403, 405
Terms **Vol. 1:** 366
Terracotta **Vol. 3:** 913
Terrain **Vol. 1:** 520
Vol. 2: 324
Terrible **Vol. 1:** 611, 621 f.
Vol. 2: 197, 225, 622, 648
Vol. 3: 317–324
Terrify **Vol. 1:** 527 f.
Vol. 2: 287, 621, 642
Vol. 3: 873
Territory **Vol. 1:** 519
Vol. 2: 303, 319
Terror **Vol. 1:** 224, 430, 422, 431 f., 527, 529, 610, 621 f., 685
Vol. 2: 53, 91, 202, 205, 266, 426, 621
Vol. 3: 563, 848
Terrorize **Vol. 1:** 610
Tertullian **Vol. 1:** 51, 117, 251, 256, 467, 648
Vol. 2: 506, 869
Tertullus **Vol. 1:** 695
Vol. 2: 258, 707
Test **Vol. 1:** 188, 347, 390, 414, 516, 562, 567, 653, 656 f., 679, 731
Vol. 2: 140, 182 f., 237, 272, 289, 299, 370, 583, 629, 825, 858
Vol. 3: 124, 724, **798–810,** 818, 849, 937, 1052
Testament **Vol. 1:** 332, 365
Vol. 3: 487
Testament of Levi **Vol. 1:** 155
Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs **Vol. 1:** 66, 124, 155, 233, 468
Vol. 3: 272, 871
Testator **Vol. 1:** 371
Tested **Vol. 1:** 596
Vol. 3: 808–810
Testify **Vol. 1:** 684
Vol. 2: 114, 297, 353
Vol. 3: 326, 489, **1038–1050**
Testify against **Vol. 3: 1038–1050**
Testify in support **Vol. 3:** 1038
Testifying **Vol. 3: 1038–1050**
Testimonia **Vol. 3:** 65 f., 368
Testimony **Vol. 1:** 122, 151, 200, 248, 266, 346, 350, 402, 406, 445, 597 f., 603, 639, 680, 731
Vol. 2: 64, 73 f., 77, 239, 332, 396, 443, 448, 461, 559, 630, 686, 701, 736, 775
Vol. 3: 53, 71, 82, 187, 198, 246, 253, 276 f., 290, 347, 356, 454, 456, 474, 493, 630, 651, 700, 706, 740, 769, 773, 824, 880, 938, 954, 967, **1038–1050**
Testing **Vol. 3: 808–810**
Tests of life **Vol. 3:** 703
Tether **Vol. 3: 591 f.**
Tetradrachma **Vol. 2:** 851
Tetragrammaton **Vol. 1:** 71 f.
Vol. 2: 512 f., 652
Vol. 3: 1181
Tetrarch **Vol. 2:** 550
Text **Vol. 1:** 63, 68–71, 254
Vol. 2: 309, 869
Vol. 3: 488
Textual criticism (→ Criticism, textual)
Textual variants **Vol. 3:** 488, 494
Textus receptus **Vol. 1: 70**
Thais **Vol. 1:** 469
Thanatos **Vol. 3:** 984
Thank **Vol. 1:** 206, 213, 278, 344 f., 381, 384, 413, 492
Vol. 2: 855, 862, 868, 885
Vol. 3: 233, **816–819**
Thank-offering **Vol. 3:** 208, **422 f.**
Thankful **Vol. 1:** 433, 685
Vol. 2: 353, 874
Vol. 3: 816–819
Thankfulness **Vol. 2:** 115, 121, 268, 360
Thanks **Vol. 2:** 115, 121, 261, 353, 421, 654, 666, 806, 866
Vol. 3: 105, 243, 391, 422, 425, 519, **816–819,** 853
Thanksgiving **Vol. 1:** 99, 213, 227, 247, 278, 385, 597, 609, 650, 730 f.
Vol. 2: 131, 166 f., 260, 275, 447, 456, 517, 521, 631, 823, 855 f., 862 f., 868, 873–875, 877 f.
Vol. 3: 244, 424, 436, 640, 670, 673–675, 750, **816–819,** 828, 997, 1080
Theatre **Vol. 2:** 233, 458, 467 f.
Vol. 3: 520 f.
Theatrical **Vol. 1:** 590
Thebes **Vol. 2:** 233
Thebez **Vol. 3:** 394
Theft **Vol. 2:** 317, 572
Vol. 3: 377, 448, 574
Theism **Vol. 1: 70,** 71
Theistic **Vol. 1: 70**
Theme of Scripture **Vol. 1:** 59
Theocentric **Vol. 2:** 260
Theocracy **Vol. 1:** 426
Vol. 2: 327
Theocratic **Vol. 1:** 425
Vol. 2: 325, 374
Theocritus **Vol. 3:** 564
Theodation **Vol. 1:** 83, 379, 539
Vol. 2: 707
Vol. 3: 486, 494
Theognis **Vol. 2:** 239

Theologian **Vol. 3:** 83
Theological **Vol. 3:** 53
Theological reflection **Vol. 1:** 65
Theological thought **Vol. 1:** 70
Theologoumenon **Vol. 1: 70**
Theology **Vol. 2:** 309
Vol. 3: 1081
Theology, comparative **Vol. 1:** 60
Theology in Greek NT **Vol. 3: 1171–1215**
Theology of hope **Vol. 3: 968–970**
Theology of liberation **Vol. 3: 972–974**
Theology, natural (→ Natural theology)
Theology of Scripture **Vol. 3:** 494 f.
Theology, systematic **Vol. 2:** 908 f.
Theomorphic **Vol. 3:** 514
Theophany **Vol. 1:** 655, 661
Vol. 2: 68, 225, 281, 430, 485, 636, 735
Vol. 3: 266, 318, 330, 398, 514, 517, 874, 1001, 1005
Theophilus **Vol. 1:** 663
Vol. 2: 86
Theophrastus **Vol. 1:** 654
Theoretical **Vol. 1:** 595
Vol. 2: 261, 390, 399, 401
Theory **Vol. 2:** 342
Theory of reference **Vol. 3:** 1128
Therapeutae **Vol. 2:** 785
Therapy **Vol. 2:** 164
Thereafter **Vol. 3: 952–956**
Thermopylae **Vol. 3:** 840, 1119
Thespiae **Vol. 1:** 476
Thessalonians **Vol. 1:** 55, 229, 282, 298 f., 406, 731
Vol. 2: 131, 144, 179, 774 f., 901
Vol. 3: 112, 230, 214, 888, 940, 955, 1064
Thessalonica **Vol. 1:** 261, 269, 298, 329
Vol. 2: 221, 243, 302, 380, 623, 729, 789, 804, 809, 818
Vol. 3: 453, 955, 1063, 1065, 1112
Theudas **Vol. 1:** 591
Vol. 2: 34
Vol. 3: 378
Thick **Vol. 2:** 154
Thicken **Vol. 2:** 153
Thief **Vol. 1:** 323, 420 f., 425, 572
Vol. 2: 59, 415, 433, 510, 831, 920, 926
Vol. 3: 118, 201, **377–379,** 567, 750, 756, 848
Thin **Vol. 2:** 822
Thing **Vol. 3: 1119–1123, 1147–1152, 1155–1158**
Think **Vol. 1:** 106, 276, 330, 461, 472, 528 f., 552, 589, 693, 727, 730
Vol. 2: 44, 72, 181 f., 239, 259, 393, 399, **616–620**
Vol. 3: 133, 230, 681, **747–751, 820–826,** 1036
Think highly **Vol. 2:** 198
Think ill **Vol. 2:** 364
Think out **Vol. 3:** 759
Think worthy **Vol. 3: 348 f.**
Thinker **Vol. 1:** 484
Third **Vol. 1:** 666
Vol. 2: 687 f., 739
Third day **Vol. 2:** 63, **687,** 893
Vol. 3: 267, 287
Third heaven **Vol. 2:** 688, 762
Third hour **Vol. 2:** 685
Thirst **Vol. 1:** 217, 546, 653, 671 f., 683
Vol. 2: 28, **264–277,** 349, 478
Vol. 3: 360, 677, 680, 986, 988
Thirsty **Vol. 2:** 157, **264–277**
Vol. 3: 359
Thistles **Vol. 1:** 416, **721–728**
Vol. 3: 809
Thomas **Vol. 1:** 141
Vol. 2: 81, 515
Vol. 3: 289
Thomasius, Gottfried **Vol. 1:** 548 f.
Thomism **Vol. 1:** 65
Thorn **Vol. 1:** 163, 226, 406, 416, 457, 460, 674, **721–728,** 743
Vol. 3: 182, 257, 268, 809, 950
Thorn in the flesh **Vol. 1:** 467, 726 f.
Vol. 2: 762
Vol. 3: 40, 471, 714, 728, 802, 814, 857, 995, 998
Thoth **Vol. 1:** 60
Vol. 2: 554, 556, 635
Vol. 3: 1088
Thought **Vol. 1:** 105 f., 230, 322, 350, 357, 448, 456, 457, 469, 509, 528, 551 f., 561, 567, 579–581, 587, 679 f., 693, 695, 711
Vol. 2: 94, 158, 179 f., 182, 216, 260, 392 f., 442, 591
Vol. 3: 122–133, 360, 534, 677 f., 680, 682, 689, **820–826,** 894, 1027
Thought-patterns **Vol. 3:** 334
Thought-word **Vol. 3:** 335
Thoughtful **Vol. 1:** 502
Vol. 2: 103, 256, **616–620**
Thoughtlessness **Vol. 3:** 439
Thousand **Vol. 1:** 52
Vol. 2: 697–703
Thousand years **Vol. 1:** 508, 649
Vol. 2: 64, 136, 205, 207, 389, 697, 887
Vol. 3: 260, 277
Thrace **Vol. 2:** 849
Thracian **Vol. 3:** 28
Thrash **Vol. 3:** 778
Threat **Vol. 1:** 416, 422, 426, 430, 433, 451, 459 f., 499, 501, 508 f., 512, 519, 524, 544, 562, 594, 611, 626, 675, 678, 688, 731
Vol. 2: 63, 86, 160, 209, 262, 267, 307, 320, 351, 357, 413, 440, 530, 706
Vol. 3: 53, 149, 205, 209, 212, 469, 711, 928, 987, 1051, 1103
Threaten **Vol. 3:** 103, 204, 391, 442, 556, 566, 693, 982 f., 986, 1008
Three **Vol. 2: 686 f.,** 748, 769
Vol. 3: 657, 851
Three days **Vol. 1:** 395
Vol. 2: 252, 351, 680, 687 f., 893
Vol. 3: 211, 343
Three and a half **Vol. 2:** 686, **688**
Three years and six months **Vol. 2: 688**
Three-decker universe **Vol. 2:** 645
Threefold **Vol. 2:** 687
Threshing **Vol. 3:** 526 f.
Threshing-floor **Vol. 2:** 233, 411
Vol. 3: 787, 853

Threshold **Vol. 1:** 613
Throat **Vol. 1:** 241
Vol. 2: 28
Vol. 3: 679
Throne **Vol. 1:** 102, 116, 122, 185, 198, 200, 386, 426 f., 482, 508, 656
Vol. 2: 92, 96, 109, 123, 146 f., 186, 191, 201, 369, 376 f., 379, 428, **601–616,** 701
Vol. 3: 180, 258, 271, 588 f., 716, 988, 1003, 1098
Throne of David **Vol. 3:** 652
Throne of glory **Vol. 2:** 612, 614
Throne of God **Vol. 1:** 101, 103, 204, 279 f., 304, 510, 654
Vol. 2: 45, 74, 193–195, 207, 225, 326, 570, **612–614,** 763, 801
Vol. 3: 117, 156, 277, 429, 988, 1003
Throne of grace **Vol. 1:** 322
Vol. 2: 123, 614
Throne-chariot **Vol. 1:** 280
Throng **Vol. 1:** 731
Vol. 2: 653, 801 f.
Throw **Vol. 1:** 70, 376, 508, 520, 608
Vol. 2: 382
Vol. 3: 468
Throw alongside **Vol. 2: 743–756**
Throw away **Vol. 1:** 479
Throw into disorder **Vol. 2: 621–626**
Vol. 3: 709 f.
Throw up palisade **Vol. 3: 959–967**
Thucydidean model **Vol. 3:** 64
Thucydides **Vol. 2:** 643
Thunder **Vol. 1:** 108
Vol. 2: 215, 652 f., 691
Vol. 3: 113, 500, **1000–1004,** 1013
Thunderbolt **Vol. 2:** 628
Thunderstorm **Vol. 2:** 628
Vol. 3: 984
Thursday lections **Vol. 1:** 245
Thut-mose III **Vol. 2:** 200
Thutmosis **Vol. 2:** 635
Thwart **Vol. 1:** 552
Vol. 2: 220
Thyatira **Vol. 1:** 407
Vol. 2: 582, 677 f., 775
Vol. 3: 432, 765, 913, 1067
Tiamat **Vol. 1:** 523
Vol. 2: 200, 553
Tiberias **Vol. 3:** 441 f.
Tiberius **Vol. 2:** 511, 850
Tide **Vol. 3:** 733
Tidings **Vol. 1:** 239, 576
Vol. 2: 107–115
Vol. 3: 45
Tie **Vol. 1:** 171, 289, 482, 493, 538, 619, 626, 636, 690
Vol. 2: 402
Tie around **Vol. 3: 120 f.**
Tigris **Vol. 2:** 678
Vol. 3: 986
Till **Vol. 1:** 381
Vol. 3: 119
Tillich, Paul **Vol. 3:** 335, 1137
Timber **Vol. 3:** 952
Time **Vol. 1:** 86, 93, 102, 124, 164–167, 203, 236, 268, 294, 321 f., 325 f., 390, 397, 420 f., 423, 476 f., 521, 523 f., 526, 601, 624, 626 f., 629, 632, 638, 697, 711, 718 f., 724, 728, 732, 734 f., 737 f.
Vol. 2: 37, 52, 56, 61 f., 64 f., 69 f., 106, 108, 132, 136, 158, 187, 205, 255 f., 270, 272, 316, 366, 397, 404, 429, 442, 483, 497, 568, 609, 658, 698, 703, 749, 809, 886, 899, 906 f., 919, 927 f., 931
Vol. 3: 99, 123, 206, 236, 252, 276, 279 f., 292, 301, 312, 317, 321, 412, 504, 729, 733 f., 737, **826–849,** 1041
Time-lag **Vol. 3:** 774
Time-limit **Vol. 1:** 477
Time-scale **Vol. 2:** 910, 915
Timeless **Vol. 1:** 703
Vol. 2: 590
Vol. 3: 827, 830, 875
Timely occurrence **Vol. 3:** 845
Times of the Gentiles **Vol. 1:** 737
Vol. 2: 37
Vol. 3: 837
Times of ignorance **Vol. 3:** 844
Times of refreshing **Vol. 3:** 148, 686
Times and seasons **Vol. 2:** 75
Timetable **Vol. 2:** 384, 892
Timidity **Vol. 1:** 622 f.
Vol. 3: 993–996
Timnah **Vol. 2:** 97
Timothy **Vol. 1:** 65, 83, 160, 200, 286, 310, 337, 341, 559, 570, 684
Vol. 2: 114, 135, 138, 152, 451, 499, 644, 770, 80[illegible]
Vol. 3: 31, 230, 241, 320, 431, 491, 765, 768, 809, 903, 915, 922, 934, 955, 963, 1047, 1067, 1070
Tin **Vol. 2:** 96
Vol. 3: 392
Tip the scales **Vol. 3:** 348
Tired **Vol. 1:** 262, 548, 561, 563
Tiro, Marcus Tullius **Vol. 3:** 757
Tishbe **Vol. 1:** 543
Tishri **Vol. 1:** 626
Vol. 3: 813
Tithe **Vol. 1:** 80, 116
Vol. 2: 211, 466, 590–592, **692–694,** 737, 811, 813, 823, 851
Vol. 3: 41, 416, 424, 748, **851–855,** 1053, 1074
Titius Justus **Vol. 1:** 361
Title **Vol. 1:** 66, 188 f., 191, 193, 197, 199 f., 220, 255 f., 273, 281, 297, 304, 375, 469, 560, 616 f., 619, 647, 665–669, 708
Vol. 2: 105, 126, 147, 231, 233 f., 254, 257, 305, 330, 332, 338, 340 f., 343, 372, 375 f., 378, 510 f., 514, 651, 687, 797, 878
Vol. 3: 40, 83, 115, 177, 187, 217, 220 f., 233, 318 f., 462, 477, 485, 509, 564–566, 568, 594 f., 604, 607, 611, 619–622, 625, 631 f., 636, 643 f., 648, 651 f., 656, 659, 673, 704, 716 f., 767 f., 796, 940, 953, 960, 1057, 1060, 1147, 1152, 1167
Titles of the Psalms **Vol. 3:** 239
Tittle **Vol. 3:** 182

Titus **Vol. 1:** 65, 130, 286, 310, 571
Vol. 2: 360, 600, 826, 899
Vol. 3: 203, 253, 952
Titus, emperor **Vol. 1:** 72
Vol. 3: 789
Tobias **Vol. 1:** 218, 479, 734
Tobit **Vol. 1:** 50, 212, 345, 626
Vol. 3: 873
Today **Vol. 1:** 179, 251, 738
Vol. 2: 63, 155, 242, 892
Vol. 3: 826, **833–839,** 841, 844
Together **Vol. 2:** 500
Vol. 3: 908
Tohoroth **Vol. 3:** 989
Toil **Vol. 1:** 115, 173, 209, 260–263, 546, 564 f., 647, 728
Vol. 2: 478, 890
Vol. 3: 953
Token **Vol. 1:** 655
Vol. 2: 159, 626, 674
Tolerable **Vol. 1:** 431
Vol. 2: 765–767
Toleration **Vol. 1:** 499
Toll **Vol. 3: 751–759**
Toll on fish **Vol. 3:** 757
Tomb **Vol. 1:** 174, 204 f., **263–266,** 623
Vol. 2: 30, 146, 351, 526, 573
Vol. 3: 239, 246, 268, **282 f.,** 286–288, 290–293, 296, 301, 360, 378, 380, 382, 557, 663, 947, 1053, 1060
Tomorrow **Vol. 1:** 251, 597
Vol. 2: 63, 832
Vol. 3: 838
Tone **Vol. 3:** 113
Tongue **Vol. 1:** 118, 175, 182, 201, 231, 382, 418, 530, 532, 564, 579, 656, 735
Vol. 2: 28, 125, 349, 426, 505, 661, 727, 785, 928
Vol. 3: 109, 449, 576, 860, 866, **1078–1123**
Tongues, gift of **Vol. 1:** 103, 198, 300, 723, 739
Vol. 2: 121, 222, 456, 883
Vol. 3: 113
Tongues, interpretation of **Vol. 2:** 121
Tongues, speaking in **Vol. 1:** 300, 528 f., 581 f.
Vol. 2: 97, 121, 222, 253, 446, 457, **739–742,** 785 f.
Vol. 3: 75, 110, 112, 119, 129 f., 505, 672, 699 f., 770 f., 819, 962, **1078–1081,** 1113
Toothache **Vol. 3:** 444
Top **Vol. 2:** 157
Topaz **Vol. 3:** 395 f.
Torah **Vol. 1:** 62, 64–67, 69, **70,** 83, 180, 230, 243–245, 316, 374, 405, 416, 433, 459, 481, 484–486, 539, 597, 617, 619, 656, 665, 668
Vol. 2: 174, 187, 209, 226–228, 234, 281, 397, 432, 442, 446, 452, 462, 493, 540, 542, 544, 592, 603, 608, 660, 665, 677, 730, 761, 791, 798, 811–813, 824, 848, 865
Vol. 3: 33 f., 105 f., 115, 157, 169, 184, 201, 210, 251, 264, 277, 311, 428, 442, 444, 453, 461, 479 f., 485, 487 f., 502, 531, 616, 748, 753, 761, 763, 767, 777, 783, 914, 987, 1029, 1040, 1058, 1095, 1103, 1107 f., 1116, 1118, 1121 f., 1154, 1161 f.
Torch **Vol. 1:** 656
Vol. 2: 484–486, 490
Vol. 3: 736, 739
Torch-bearer **Vol. 2:** 578
Torch races **Vol. 2:** 490
Torment **Vol. 1:** 161, 163 f., 461, 612, 655, 710
Vol. 2: 421
Vol. 3: 99, 474, 682, 725, **855–859,** 996
Torrance, T.F. **Vol. 3:** 900 f.
Torso **Vol. 1:** 232
Torts **Vol. 3:** 95
Torture **Vol. 1:** 163, 389–391, 393, 395, 466, 511, 646, 656
Vol. 2: 157
Vol. 3: 200, 260, **855 f.,** 1039
Torturer **Vol. 3:** 758, **855 f.**
Torturing **Vol. 3: 855 f.**
Tosefta **Vol. 1: 70**
Tossing **Vol. 3: 558–560**
Total **Vol. 2:** 683
Totality **Vol. 1:** 95–97, 301, 303, 501, 702, 740
Vol. 2: 53, 59 f., 181, 313, 688, 690
Vol. 3: 234, 866, 1079
Totality transfer **Vol. 3:** 1141
Totter **Vol. 3: 558–560**
Touch **Vol. 1:** 121, 207, 241
Vol. 2: 167, 212, 270, 282, 560
Vol. 3: 211, 313, 717, 749, **859–861,** 1071, 1162
Touchstone **Vol. 2:** 314
Vol. 3: 855
Toughness **Vol. 1:** 658
Toulmin, S. **Vol. 3:** 1136
Tower **Vol. 1:** 272
Vol. 2: 157, 189, 369
Vol. 3: 341, 782, 787
Town **Vol. 1:** 520, 665, 689
Vol. 2: 363
Vol. 3: 1006
Town clerk **Vol. 1:** 578
Vol. 2: 235
Vol. 3: 480
Townsmen **Vol. 2:** 822
Trace **Vol. 1:** 71
Vol. 2: 291
Vol. 3: 532, 904
Trace descent **Vol. 2:** 35
Track down **Vol. 3:** 532
Tractate **Vol. 1:** 64, 70
Trade **Vol. 1:** 267 f., **279,** 319, 419, 484, 558, 688
Vol. 2: 39, 125, 235 f., 294, 303, 475, 841
Vol. 3: 139, 606, 758, 910, 919, **1155–1158**
Trade-guild **Vol. 2:** 678
Vol. 3: 910
Trader **Vol. 3:** 1054
Tradition **Vol. 1:** 57, 59 f., 63, 69, **70 f.,** 99, 102, 116, 129, 131, 134 f., 153, 171, 194–196, 199, 209, 216 f., 247, 250, 252, 278, 289, 297, 304 f., 309, 332, 335, 346, 359, 394–396, 403, 425, 473, 482, 484–487, 489 f., 499 f., 502, 506, 509, 531, 539, 543–545, 580 f., 585, 595–600, 602–604, 620, 625, 628, 630–632, 641, 657, 707, 730, 739
Vol. 2: 37, 43, 80, 85, 125, 132 f., 135, 144,

171, 191, 219, 234, 237, 269, 277, 313, 315, 327, 331, 333, 337 f., 340–342, 367 f., 372, 375, 379, 385 f., 405, 436 f., 439, 453, 526, 530 f., 544, 560, 635, 640, 652 f., 674, 677, 684, 688, 692, 697, 714–716, 718, 748, 780, 784–786, 811–813, 824, 888, 894, 904, 913 f., 921, 926 f.
Vol. 3: 40, 44, 55, 58 f., 61 f., 65, 80, 85, 97, 184 f., 221, 235–238, 241, 261, 270, 283, 285–287, 301, 321, 333, 360, 369, 372, 384, 401, 408, 458 f., 462, 465, 479–481, 484–490, 493, 502 f., 522, 584, 590, 604, 610, 614–618, 621 f., 624–629, 633 f., 637–640, 642, 647–650, 652, 654–657, 695, 697, 702, 706, 717, 748, 751, **759–780,** 784, 836, 872, 909, 921, 930 f., 942, 944 f., 1053, 1073, 1091–1093, 1110, 1135, 1162, 1167
Tradition criticism **Vol. 3:** 58
Tradition history **Vol. 1:** 70, **71**
Tradition, oral **Vol. 1:** 57 f., 71
Tragedy **Vol. 1:** 687
Vol. 2: 318, 430 f., 594
Tragic **Vol. 1:** 551
Train **Vol. 1:** 312 f.
Vol. 2: 122, 391
Vol. 3: 759–780
Training **Vol. 1:** 462, 481
Vol. 2: 141
Vol. 3: 365, **759–780**
Trait **Vol. 2:** 233, 407
Traitor **Vol. 2:** 531
Trajan **Vol. 2:** 308 f., 316
Vol. 3: 789
Trample **Vol. 1:** 109, 117
Vol. 2: 329
Vol. 3: 404, 943
Trance **Vol. 1:** 527 f.
Vol. 2: 176
Vol. 3: 77
Tranquility **Vol. 2:** 181
Vol. 3: 111
Transaction **Vol. 1:** 664, 721
Vol. 3: 1039
Transcend **Vol. 1:** 602, 625, 716
Vol. 2: 337, 873
Transcendence **Vol. 1: 71,** 101, 495, 679
Vol. 2: 195, 214, 436, 539, 613 f.
Vol. 3: 1116 f.
Transcendent **Vol. 1:** 70, 204, 360, 363, 380, 383, 422, 502, 521, 734
Vol. 2: 56, 66, 70–72, 74, 78, 376 f., 386, 403, 602, 621, 726, 834
Vol. 3: 328, 514
Transfer **Vol. 1:** 208 f., 699, 701
Vol. 2: 151, 226, 311, 316–318, 325, 335 f., 376, 553
Vol. 3: 151, 498, **601–605**
Transfiguration **Vol. 1:** 204, 290, 335, 406, 527, 541, 545, 587, 623, 659, 668, 708
Vol. 2: 48, 176, 271, 486, 493, 559, 640, 686, 819
Vol. 3: 48, 114, 298, 506, 555, 611, 731, 812, 848, **861–864,** 1003, 1010, 1012
Transfigure **Vol. 2:** 46, 606
Vol. 3: 272, **861–864**
Transform **Vol. 1:** 223, 375, 397, 600 f., 647, 705, 708
Vol. 2: 48, 207, 245, 263, 266, 288, 312, 316, 673
Vol. 3: 130, 729, **861–864,** 970
Transformation **Vol. 1:** 355, 470, 492, 539, 602, 643, 654, 705 f., 708–710
Vol. 2: 201, 263, 337, 398, 482, 606, 741, 831, 924
Vol. 3: 271, 278, 293, 304 f., 699, 701, **861–864,** 886, 1023, 1142
Transgress **Vol. 1:** 606, 729
Vol. 2: 123, 141, 144
Vol. 3: 583–585
Transgression **Vol. 1:** 83, 85 f., 97, 112, 322, 345, 353, 355, 357, 385, 434, 446 f., 452, 659, 699
Vol. 2: 71, 168, 368, 449, 463, 586, 867, 893
Vol. 3: 49, 93, 156, 169, 173, 200, 202, 269, 342, 359, 573 f., **577–586**
Transgressor **Vol. 1:** 85, 97, 463
Vol. 2: 445, 463, 479, 660
Vol. 3: 195, **583–585**
Transience **Vol. 1:** 406, 433
Vol. 2: 714
Vol. 3: 840, 845, 1101, 1117
Transient **Vol. 1:** 73, 316, 379, 444, 458, 515, 524, 526, 587
Vol. 2: 211, 253, 393, 480, 489, 844
Vol. 3: 260, 277, 827
Transition **Vol. 1:** 711
Transitional **Vol. 2:** 187
Vol. 3: 548
Transitoriness **Vol. 1:** 119, 222, 277, 337, 411, 552, 671, 673
Vol. 2: 304, 357, 420, 498, 564 f., 715
Vol. 3: 359, 555, 811
Transitory **Vol. 3:** 224 f., 229, 571, **833–839**
Transjordan **Vol. 1:** 543
Translation **Vol. 1:** 57, 69, 71, 433, 484, 578–582
Vol. 2: 125, 202, 219, 357, 627
Vol. 3: 75, 259, 264, 266, 494, 602, 615, 747, 761, 1137, 1141 f.
Translator **Vol. 1:** 580, 582
Vol. 2: 335
Transmigration of souls **Vol. 1:** 432, 594
Vol. 3: 259–261, 677, 679
Transmission **Vol. 2:** 338, 367 f., 748
Transmit **Vol. 1:** 735
Vol. 2: 161, 362
Vol. 3: 398, **772–775**
Transmute **Vol. 3:** 273
Transparency **Vol. 3:** 398
Transplant **Vol. 3:** 867, 918
Transubstantiation **Vol. 3:** 244, 337
Trap **Vol. 2:** 705, 707 f.
Vol. 3: 119, 747
Travail **Vol. 1:** 186 f., 411, 708
Vol. 2: 243, 423
Vol. 3: 180, 204, 260, 722, **857 f.**
Travel **Vol. 1:** 209, 268, 682, 727
Vol. 2: 788
Vol. 3: 945–947, 1155
Traveller **Vol. 1:** 117, 407, 520

Traveller (*cont'd*)
Vol. 3: 352, 560, 1169
Travelling preachers **Vol. 2:** 401
Traverse **Vol. 3:** 402
Treachery **Vol. 1:** 241, 461, 725
Tread **Vol. 1:** 109, 510, 658
Vol. 2: 358
Vol. 3: **943–945**
Treason **Vol. 1:** 270, 331, 392
Treasure **Vol. 1:** 566, 638, 647, 710
Vol. 2: 28, 193, 215–217, 381, 386, 714 f., 795, **829–853**
Vol. 3: 141, 184, 253, 262, 378, 380, 528, 912, 914, 1032
Treasure-box **Vol. 2:** **829–836**
Treasure-house **Vol. 2:** 191, 829
Treasured **Vol. 1:** 536
Treasurer **Vol. 1:** 560
Vol. 2: 254, 730
Vol. 3: 35
Treasures of darkness **Vol. 2:** 830
Treasury **Vol. 2:** 43, 475, 821
Vol. 3: 498, 755, 757, **795 f.,** 955
Treasury room **Vol. 3:** **795 f.**
Treat as just **Vol. 3:** **352–377**
Treat as righteous **Vol. 3:** **352–377**
Treatment **Vol. 1:** 119, 637, 670, 686
Vol. 2: 99, 164, 312, 450
Treaty **Vol. 1:** 74, 189, 344, 594
Vol. 2: 521, 879
Vol. 3: 739
Tree **Vol. 1:** 120, 181, 234, 265, **389–405,** 443, 515, 520, 565, 652, 656, 722–725, 743
Vol. 2: 199, 285, 293, 429, 708, 763
Vol. 3: 248, 553–555, 557, 599, **865–870,** 922
Tree of knowledge **Vol. 1:** 85
Vol. 2: 271, 761, 889
Vol. 3: 860
Tree of life **Vol. 1:** 279, 389 f., 722 f.
Vol. 2: 280, 304, 482, 761, 763
Vol. 3: 866, 868, 921, 986
Tremble **Vol. 1:** 622, 661
Vol. 2: 876
Vol. 3: 324, 557
Trembling **Vol. 1:** 622 f., 685
Vol. 2: 91, 434, 819
Trent, council of **Vol. 1:** 71
Vol. 2: 219
Trepidation **Vol. 2:** 92
Trespass **Vol. 1:** 333, 402, 437, 701, 730
Vol. 2: 120, 445
Vol. 3: 168 f., 171, 199, 204, **585 f.,** 824
Trial **Vol. 1:** 267, 346, 460, 467, 558, 629 f., 633, 651
Vol. 2: 42, 92, 136, 138 f., 143, 147, 217 f., 263, 360, 365, 369, 378 f., 450, 478, 498, 526, 773, 916
Vol. 3: 39, 118, 203, 219, 370, 446, 529, 627, 629, 697, 729, **798–808,** 849, 873, 1047
Tribal **Vol. 1:** 624
Vol. 2: 247, 305
Vol. 3: 33
Tribe **Vol. 1:** 195, 208, 255, 294, 366 f., 407, 463, 489, 498, 518, 543 f., 619, 625, 640, 684
Vol. 2: 187, 195, 234, 298, 306, 319 f., 325, 331, 363, 373, 441, 466, 638, 695 f., 698, 700, 789, 796, 802, 805
Vol. 3: 454, 500, **870–873,** 960, 1057, 1079
Tribulation **Vol. 1:** 125, 328, 381, 571, 607, 610, 653
Vol. 2: 37, 136, 353, 360, 478, 692, 709, 771, 773, 781, **805–809,** 892, 894 f., 911, 916, 920, 924
Vol. 3: 201, 211, 226, 270, 436, 592, 629, 803
Tribunal **Vol. 3:** 1043
Tribune **Vol. 1:** 340 f.
Vol. 2: 363, 489
Tribute **Vol. 1:** 406, 537, 671, 684, 734
Vol. 2: 40 f., 320
Vol. 3: 421, 441 f., **752–755,** 792, **978 f.,** 1168
Trick **Vol. 2:** 436, **457–461**
Vol. 3: **935–943**
Trickery **Vol. 1:** 413
Vol. 2: 166, 557
Trickle **Vol. 1:** 683
Trier, J. **Vol. 3:** 1128, 1141
Trim **Vol. 1:** 524
Trinitarian **Vol. 2:** 653
Vol. 3: 648
Trinity **Vol. 1:** 535
Vol. 2: 84, 508, 516, 687
Vol. 3: 327, 661, 1056
Trip **Vol. 2:** 705, 708
Tripartite division of man **Vol. 1:** 235
Vol. 3: 684
Tripartite pattern **Vol. 2:** 687
Tripartite world **Vol. 3:** 984, 523
Trito-Isaiah **Vol. 1:** 54
Triumph **Vol. 1:** 227, 239, 244, 261, 317, 410, 440, 452, 469, **644–652,** 727, 740
Vol. 2: 136, 341, 400, 431, 433, 490
Vol. 3: 277, 600 f.
Triumphal procession **Vol. 1:** 647, 649 f.
Vol. 2: 453
Trivial **Vol. 1:** 727
Trivialization **Vol. 1:** 703
Troas **Vol. 3:** 410, 412
Troeltsch, Ernst **Vol. 1:** 49, 60
Troops **Vol. 1:** 292–297, 476, 537, 732
Vol. 2: 601, 800 f., 898
Vol. 3: 377, **958–967**
Trophimus **Vol. 3:** 949
Trouble **Vol. 1:** 260, 262, 277, 433, 459, 519, 550, 563, 568, 600, 612, 651 f., 675, 687, 698, 726
Vol. 2: 221, 395, **621–626,** 791, 807, 820
Vol. 3: 207 f., 216, 227, 239, 537, 545, 558, 571, 691, **709 f.,** 869, 998, 1148
True **Vol. 1:** 56, 97, 99 f., 118, 178, 219, 225, 250, 253, 255, 296 f., 299, 302 f., 305, 311, 315, 338, 346 f., 386, 400, 406, 424, 446, 455, 458, 460, 481, 483, 489, 498, 522, 527, 539, 542, 590, 595, 598, 603, 628, 634, 637, 639, 656, 659, 669, 676, 678, 684, 686 f., 690, 704, 718 f., 722, 736
Vol. 2: 59 f., 72–78, 82, 94, 103 f., 123, 135, 194 f., 218, 221, 227, 229, 235 f., 248, 255, 269, 273, 280 f., 285, 287–289, 307 f., 310,

314–317, 328, 335, 339, 360, 380, 384, 391, 402 f., 406, 408, 413, 426, 442, 450, 460, 469, 475, 477, 481, 488, 503, 607, 642, 645 f., 648 f., 659, 676, 686, 724, 810, 837
Vol. 3: 42, 136, 160, 209, 351, 362, 499, 630, 871, **874–901,** 1016, 1047
Truly **Vol. 1:** 98, 720
Vol. 3: 874–901
Trumpet **Vol. 1:** 202, 273, 342, 410
Vol. 2: 173, 691, 711, 784, 866, 922, 924 f.
Vol. 3: 112, 119, 191, 237, 239, 732, 736, 856, **873 f.,** 1001, 1013, 1054
Trumpet-call **Vol. 3: 873 f.**
Trust **Vol. 1:** 142 f., 177, 203, 216, 223, 227, 278, 289, 351, 381, 411, 504, 510, 531, 542, 587–589, 591–596, 598–602, 604, 615 f., 622, 652, 658, 660, 673, 679–681, 683, 713, 729, 732
Vol. 2: 71, 76, 82, 91, 94, 149, 237, 239 f., 307, 314, 342 f., 353, 392, 412, 453, 471, 650, 777, 822, 837, 858, 867
Vol. 3: 55, 70, 79, 209, 249, 358 f., 366, 370, 391, 514, 625, 728, 839, 1073 f.
Trustee **Vol. 1:** 373
Vol. 2: 254
Vol. 3: 482
Trustworthiness **Vol. 1:** 311, 587 f., 594, 659
Vol. 3: 358, 825
Trustworthy **Vol. 3: 874–901**
Truth **Vol. 1:** 70, 86 f., 89 f., 98, 102, 106, 114, 130, 166, 173, 188, 200, 219 f., 222, 225, 232, 238, 241, 266, 270 f., 304, 323 f., 336, 347, 359, 374, 382, 386, 413, 424, 461, 464, 470, 473, 483, 512, 525, 529, 540, 546, 563, 575, 577 f., 590–593, 598, 603, 631, 645, 653, 659, 662, 670 f., 678, 680, 708, 717, 740, 743
Vol. 2: 56, 71, 78, 80, 119, 122, 129, 140, 162, 176, 179, 216, 231 f., 235, 249, 251, 261, 280, 312, 350, 357, 359, 364, 393, 399, 403, 405, 408, 448, 460 f., 463, 467, 469 f., 472–474, 492, 494, 559, 565, 568, 611, 643, 645, 676, 718, 721, 736, 745 f., 752 f., 757, 765, 793, 811, 817, 858, 873, 878, 927 f.
Vol. 3: 61, 72, 122, 133, 163, 214, 224, 242, 280 f., 310, 314, 316, 320, 323 f., 326, 328 f., 336 f., 348, 352, 354, 379 f., 384, 460–462, 472, 489, 495, 503, 528, 571, 575 f., 586, 631, 637, 646, 693, 704, 738, 746, 749 f., 764, 795, 820, 837, 840, **874–901,** 906, 936, 938 f., 942 f., 945 f., 966, 1024, 1036, 1039, 1050, 1052, 1079, 1081–1083, 1106, 1114, 1123, 1143, 1152
Truth, kinds of **Vol. 3:** 894
Truth in modern philosophy **Vol. 3: 894–901**
Truthful **Vol. 2: 470–474**
Vol. 3: 741–743, 1041, 1049
Try **Vol. 1:** 364, 395
Vol. 3: 798–808
Tubal-cain **Vol. 2:** 97
Tuition **Vol. 3:** 769
Tumult **Vol. 1:** 292
Vol. 3: 112 f., 559, 709
Tunic **Vol. 3:** 543
Turks in Palestine **Vol. 2:** 308
Turmoil **Vol. 2: 621–626**
Turn **Vol. 1:** 353, 355, 358 f., 473, 585, 587, 601, 608, 688, 696, 700, 722
Vol. 2: 154, 326, 357, 839
Turn about **Vol. 3:** 233
Turn aside **Vol. 3: 583–585**
Turn away **Vol. 1:** 585
Vol. 2: 285 f.
Vol. 3: 601–605, 902 f., 947
Turn back **Vol. 3:** 146, 255, **933–935,** 1058
Turn round **Vol. 3: 933–935**
Turn tables **Vol. 2:** 34
Turn to **Vol. 2: 882–885**
Turning point **Vol. 2:** 59, 398
Turquoise **Vol. 3:** 396
Turret **Vol. 3:** 796
Turtledove **Vol. 1:** 172
Tutor **Vol. 1:** 370
Vol. 3: 775–780
Twang **Vol. 3:** 671
Twelve **Vol. 1:** 489
Vol. 2: 685, 687, **694–696,** 697, 787
Twelve apostles **Vol. 1:** 50, **129–136,** 142 f., 213, 274, 298, 407, 489, 540, 733
Vol. 2: 313, 320 f., 365, 385, 563, 599, 614 f., 652, 695, 732, 754, 773, 780, 787, 902
Vol. 3: 88, 283, 288, 297, 395, 397, 447, 454, 503, 560, 871 f., 948, 954, 1043, 1059, 1109
Twelve gates **Vol. 3:** 871 f., 948
Twelve stars **Vol. 3:** 736
Twelve thrones **Vol. 1:** 182
Vol. 3: 871, 920
Twelve tribes **Vol. 1:** 134, 185, 324, 489
Vol. 2: 34, 187, **306,** 365, 615, 639, 652, 695, 700 f., 732, 754
Vol. 3: 395–397, 418, 454, 490, 550, 736, 871 f., 920, 948, 1059
Twig **Vol. 3:** 870
Twilight **Vol. 2:** 324
Twin **Vol. 2:** 653
Twist **Vol. 3:** 492
Two **Vol. 1:** 55
Vol. 2: 686, 748
Two ages **Vol. 1:** 524
Vol. 2: 928
Vol. 3: 827
Two-edged sword **Vol. 3:** 945
Two-natures doctrine **Vol. 1:** 548
Two powers **Vol. 2:** 608
Two ways **Vol. 2:** 479, 481
Vol. 3: 929, 936, 939 f., 946
Two witnesses **Vol. 1:** 430
Vol. 2: 487, 686, 712, 795
Vol. 3: 1002, 1123
Type **Vol. 1:** 85 f., 88, 141, 149, 222, 273, 411, 487, 491, 508, 510, 524, 619, 679, 725
Vol. 2: 277, 284, 291, 378, 462, 475, 504, 508, 598, **743–756,** 700, 825, 835
Vol. 3: 72, 265, 383, 560, 607, **903–906**
Typical **Vol. 1:** 664, 666
Vol. 2: 276, 312
Typological **Vol. 2:** 269, 316, 332
Vol. 3: 863, **903–906**
Typology **Vol. 1:** 49, **71,** 86, 223, 436
Vol. 2: 277, 447, 570, 692, 756

Typology (*cont'd*)
Vol. 3: 82, 121, 495, **903–906,** 1006
Tyrannize **Vol. 2: 606–611**
Tyranny **Vol. 1:** 124, 141
Vol. 2: 772
Vol. 3: 1161
Tyrant **Vol. 1:** 125, 269, 645
Vol. 2: 291, 372
Tyre **Vol. 1:** 293, 324, 379
Vol. 2: 97, 176, 767, 789, 848, 851
Vol. 3: 605, 785, 908, 1052
Tyrian games **Vol. 1:** 645
Tyrian shekel **Vol. 3:** 754

Ugarit **Vol. 1:** 616
Vol. 2: 67, 305, 324, 375, 644
Ugaritic **Vol. 1:** 68, 511
Vol. 2: 190, 305, 495
Ugliness **Vol. 1:** 743
Vol. 3: 562–564
Ulcer **Vol. 1:** 520
Ullmann, Stephen **Vol. 3:** 1129
Ultimate **Vol. 1:** 651, 661, 713, 734
Vol. 2: 357, 361
Umpire **Vol. 1:** 373, 648
Unable **Vol. 2:** 154, 405
Unacceptable **Vol. 2:** 155
Unambiguous **Vol. 3:** 572
Unanimity **Vol. 1:** 642
Vol. 3: 908 f.
Unanimous **Vol. 3: 908 f.**
Unapproachable **Vol. 2:** 77, 214, 250, 648
Unassuming **Vol. 2:** 259
Unauthorized **Vol. 1:** 535
Vol. 2: 362, 365
Unaware **Vol. 1:** 663, 690
Unbaptized **Vol. 1:** 117
Vol. 3: 395
Unbegotten **Vol. 1:** 616
Vol. 2: 506
Unbelief **Vol. 1:** 74, 76, 120, 159 f., 303, 473, 505, 529, 554, 559, **587–606,** 608, 678
Vol. 2: 167, 177, 214, 303, 407, 419, 431, 433, 460, 469, 603, 624, 627, 631 f., 708 f., 717, 794, 868, 880
Vol. 3: 73, 117, 136, 140, 202, 281, 320, 328, 582, 631, 692, 799, 805, 954
Unbeliever **Vol. 1:** 315, 350, 415, 439, 464, 473, 505, 507, 529, 566
Vol. 2: 58, 217, 283, 304, 329, 366, 402, 457, 581, 654, 741 f., 828, 922
Vol. 3: 97, 173, 226, 372, 380, 470, 535, 1080, 1150, 1164 f.
Unbelieving **Vol. 3:** 66, 470 f.
Unbiased **Vol. 1:** 485, 585
Unbind **Vol. 1:** 394
Unblemished **Vol. 2:** 59, 102
Vol. 3: 923–928
Unborn **Vol. 1:** 283, 285
Vol. 2: 83
Unbridled **Vol. 1:** 494, 501
Vol. 2: 256
Vol. 3: 934
Unbrotherly **Vol. 3:** 750
Unburied **Vol. 1:** 264 f., 450
Uncanny **Vol. 3:** 1024
Unceasing **Vol. 3:** 54, **229 f.**
Uncertainty **Vol. 1:** 421, 505, 512
Vol. 2: 100, 239, 241, 245
Vol. 3: 910
Unchangeable **Vol. 1:** 357, 521, 660, 731
Vol. 2: 340, 472
Vol. 3: 583–585, 828
Unchanged **Vol. 1:** 720, 726
Unchastity **Vol. 1:** 235, 261, 497, 500
Vol. 2: 368, 581
Vol. 3: 95 f., 469, 538, 540, 579, 799, 1069, 1157
Uncircumcised **Vol. 1:** 307–309, 311, 361, 675
Vol. 2: 126, 178, 721
Vol. 3: 363
Uncircumcision **Vol. 1:** 145, 155, 307, 310 f., 336, 385, 602, 676
Vol. 2: 660
Vol. 3: 714
Uncivilized **Vol. 3:** 353
Unclean **Vol. 1:** 62, 117, 122, 152 f., 155, 169, 172, 340, 444, 448, 452, 479, 488, 557, 637, 642, 685
Vol. 2: 136, 206, 225, 268, 275, 434, 465, 631, 792
Vol. 3: 102–108, 113, 360, 459, 530, 695, 757, 860 f., 996, 1011, 1059
Unclean spirit **Vol. 3:** 256, 444, 472
Uncleanness **Vol. 1:** 151, 155, 205, 398, 448, 479 f., 641
Vol. 2: 205, 225–227
Vol. 3: 95, 101, **102–108,** 155
Uncommitted **Vol. 1:** 530, 731
Uncommon **Vol. 2:** 332
Unconcerned **Vol. 2:** 325
Unconditional **Vol. 1:** 207, 210, 483, 488, 611
Vol. 2: 105 f., 243, 444
Unconditioned **Vol. 1:** 71, 538
Unconscious **Vol. 1:** 549
Vol. 2: 568
Vol. 3: 279, 677
Uncontrollable **Vol. 3:** 27
Uncontrolled **Vol. 1:** 494
Unconverted **Vol. 2:** 566
Uncover **Vol. 1:** 50, 313, 444
Vol. 2: 212–214
Vol. 3: 310–316, 1066
Uncreated **Vol. 1:** 653
Uncritical **Vol. 1:** 512
Vol. 3: 64
Unction **Vol. 1:** 121, 123
Under **Vol. 2:** 209
Undefiled **Vol. 1:** 233, 447, 469
Vol. 2: 300
Vol. 3: 923–928
Under law **Vol. 2: 438–451**
Underground **Vol. 2:** 97
Underprivileged **Vol. 2:** 415
Understanding **Vol. 1:** 92, 103, 123, 212, 220, 253, 261, 282, 480 f., 485, 487, 489, 533, 537, 541, 556, 568, 578, 583 f., 597, 601 f., 671,

676, 680, 692, 694, 699, 714, 732, 735 f., 738, 742
Vol. 2: 61, 97, 116, 123, 154–156, 160–162, 169, 171, 173 f., 177–179, 183, 197, 279, 339 f., **390–406,** 419 f., 427, 434, 463, 476, 493, 567, 616, 621, 729, 777, 813, 923
Vol. 3: 75, 114, **122–133,** 166, 209, 236, 258, 313, 336, 351, 511–513, 516, 526, 649, 678, 680 f., 706, 744, 859, 916, 987, 1014, 1020, 1022, 1027 f., 1032, 1083, 1140
Undertake **Vol. 2:** 451
Vol. 3: 799
Undertaking **Vol. 3: 1155–1158**
Undertone **Vol. 2:** 334
Undervalue **Vol. 2:** 429
Underworld **Vol. 1:** 101, 431, 449, 463 f., 523, 654
Vol. 2: 30, 85, 136, 185, 187 f., 197, **205–208,** 644, 727, 729, 734
Vol. 3: 678 f., 682, 936, 983, 1006
Underwrite **Vol. 3:** 755
Undeserved **Vol. 2:** 40, 117, 123, 291
Vol. 3: 349
Undesired **Vol. 2:** 407
Undisciplined **Vol. 3:** 1026
Undisturbed **Vol. 3:** 255
Undress **Vol. 1:** 314
Undrinkable **Vol. 2:** 274
Uneducated **Vol. 1:** 498
Vol. 2: 456 f., 625, 813
Unending **Vol. 1:** 716
Unenlightened **Vol. 1:** 561
Unequal **Vol. 3:** 1165
Unequally yoked **Vol. 2: 739–742**
Vol. 3: 1160
Unequivocal **Vol. 2:** 351
Unethical **Vol. 3:** 160
Unexpected **Vol. 2:** 382
Unfading **Vol. 1:** 469
Vol. 2: 300
Unfailing **Vol. 1:** 663
Unfairness **Vol. 3:** 757
Unfaithfulness **Vol. 1:** 109, 370, 449, 455, 461, 532, 594, 606
Vol. 2: 797 f.
Vol. 3: 79, 135, 585 f.
Unfamiliar **Vol. 2:** 670
Unfathomable **Vol. 1:** 594
Vol. 2: 197, 205
Vol. 3: 533
Unfavourable **Vol. 1:** 561
Unfeigned **Vol. 2: 468–470**
Unfettered **Vol. 1:** 718
Vol. 3: 121
Unfit **Vol. 1:** 163, 274, 560, 565
Vol. 3: 808–810
Unforgivable **Vol. 1:** 499, 700
Vol. 3: 28, 343, 579
Unforgiving **Vol. 1:** 111, 226
Vol. 2: 136, 301, 596, 600, 769 f., 868
Vol. 3: 173
Unfounded **Vol. 1:** 546, 550
Unfree **Vol. 1:** 718
Unfruitful **Vol. 1:** 607, 721, 723
Vol. 3: 129, 672
Unfulfilled **Vol. 1:** 178
Ungodliness **Vol. 1:** 227, 352, 559, 622, 641
Vol. 2: 94, 141, 193, 198, 329, 363, 682
Ungodly **Vol. 1:** 381 f., 409, 423, 444, 463, 466, 539, 597, 609, 656
Vol. 2: 95, 139, 141, 155, 181, 202, 207, 251, 388, 431, 491–493, 570, 867
Vol. 3: 161, 195, 201, 210, 363, 714, 799, 868, 961, 992, 994
Ungrateful **Vol. 1:** 552
Ungrudging **Vol. 1:** 214
Unhappy **Vol. 3:** 859
Unharness **Vol. 3:** 189
Unheeded **Vol. 1:** 410
Vol. 2: 175
Unhewn stone **Vol. 3:** 789
Unhistorical **Vol. 1:** 208
Vol. 2: 340
Vol. 3: 507
Unholiness **Vol. 2:** 71
Unholy **Vol. 1:** 507
Vol. 2: 236–238, 638
Unhonoured **Vol. 2:** 50
Unify **Vol. 2:** 144, 308
Unilateral **Vol. 1:** 641
Unimaginable **Vol. 3:** 124
Unimportant **Vol. 1:** 561
Vol. 2: 259, 822
Unimpressive **Vol. 2:** 434
Uninformed **Vol. 2:** 406
Uninhabitable **Vol. 3:** 444
Uninhabited **Vol. 3:** 1004
Uninitiated **Vol. 2:** 457, 752
Uninjured **Vol. 2:** 133
Unintelligent **Vol. 3: 122–130**
Unintelligible **Vol. 1:** 582
Vol. 2: 741
Vol. 3: 124, 130, 1026
Unintentional **Vol. 1:** 609
Vol. 2: 406 f.
Vol. 3: 579, 586
Union **Vol. 1:** 148, 507, 513, 640, 643, 669, 678
Vol. 2: 39, 94, 217, 251, 281, 314, 349 f., 357, 374, 585 f., 858
Vol. 3: 422, 425, 703, 724, 886
Unique **Vol. 1:** 95, 474, 538, 540, 604, 615, 619 f., 665, 667, 713
Vol. 2: 70, 73, 76, 79, 87, 169, 280, 289, 313, 332, 338, 340, 396, 426, 444, 632, 664, 716, 721 f., 724 f., 741, 808, 873
Vol. 3: 238, 244, 323, 490, 630 f., 640 f., 696 f., 723, 827, 863 f., 947, 1041
Unit **Vol. 2:** 683, 698
Unit of meaning **Vol. 3:** 1128
Unite **Vol. 1:** 636, 639, 641, 730
Vol. 2: 32, 243, 263, 306, 349 f., 355, 520, 653, 828
Vol. 3: 1160
United in spirit **Vol. 3:** 687
Uniting factor **Vol. 3:** 680
Unity **Vol. 1:** 93, 209, 230, 237 f., 294, 296, 300, 302, 304, 325, 335, 370, 375, 399, 501, 522, 602, 630, 640, 642 f., 647, 669, 740

Unity (*cont'd*)
Vol. 2: 64, 135, 158, 163, 186, 192, 253, 261, 308, 313, 325, 328, 350, 404, 426, 439, 539, 598, 618–620, 633, **719–723,** 748, 776, 875, 921
Vol. 3: 463, 572, 635, 685, 724, 773, 819, 950, 1032, 1107, 1122, 1139, 1169
Universal **Vol. 1:** 52, 95, 99, 255, 375, 426, 432 f., 436, 512, 516, 535, 541, 616, 618, 621, 629, 641, 654, 739
Vol. 2: 56, 65, 78, 111, 167, 242, 303, 309, 330, 335, 375, 385, 389, 442, 444, 450, 511, 532, 536, 542, 631, 719, 888
Vol. 3: 220, 276, 406 f., 578 f., 585 f., 650, 656, 719, 1063
Universal law **Vol. 2:** 439
Vol. 3: 1081, 1084
Universal One **Vol. 2:** 67
Universalism **Vol. 3:** 148
Universality **Vol. 3:** 894, 1002
Universe **Vol. 1:** 53, 69 f., 94, 102, 238, 272, 317, 387, 439, 521–524, 616, 639, 654, 661, 712, 734
Vol. 2: 78, 158, 163, 189 f., 192, 203, 232, 270, 289, 353, 364, 393 f., 402, 404 f., 430, 452, 476, 514, 645, 648, 656, 660, 663, 688, 836
Vol. 3: 162, 345, 522, 681, 717, 775, 1035
Unjust **Vol. 1:** 563
Vol. 2: 93, 139, 236, 370, 659, 771
Vol. 3: 137, 187, **573–576,** 1002, 1025, 1041, 1074
Unjust judge **Vol. 3:** 1059
Unjust steward **Vol. 2:** 254, 668, 832, 837, 846
Vol. 3: 468, 489, 576
Unjustified **Vol. 1:** 228
Unkempt **Vol. 2:** 162
Unknowable **Vol. 2:** 406
Unknown **Vol. 1:** 686
Vol. 2: 109, 338, **406–408,** 669, 746 f.
Vol. 3: 45
Unknown god **Vol. 2:** 77, 85, 394, 407, 503
Vol. 3: 431
Unlawful **Vol. 1:** 155
Vol. 2: 282, **438–451,** 586
Vol. 3: 584
Unleash **Vol. 1:** 610
Unleavened **Vol. 1:** 249 f., 631, 633
Vol. 2: 461–463, 522, 529, 676
Vol. 3: 422 f.
Unlettered **Vol. 2: 456 f.**
Unlimited **Vol. 1:** 600
Unmarried **Vol. 1:** 217, 278, 561
Vol. 2: 816
Vol. 3: 224 f., 535–537, 542, 1055
Unmask **Vol. 1:** 439, 739
Vol. 2: 474
Unmerciful **Vol. 2:** 366, 594–598, 667
Vol. 3: 758
Unmerited **Vol. 2:** 42
Unmistakable **Vol. 2:** 106
Unmitigated **Vol. 2:** 360
Unmoved **Vol. 1:** 521
Unmutilated **Vol. 1:** 307
Unnatural **Vol. 1:** 499, 477
Vol. 2: 570, 660
Unnecessary **Vol. 1:** 728
Unobtrusive **Vol. 3:** 112
Unorganized **Vol. 2:** 801
Unpalatable **Vol. 1:** 202
Unpleasant **Vol. 2:** 856
Unprecedented **Vol. 2:** 443, 669
Unpredictable **Vol. 1:** 653, 666
Unprepared **Vol. 3:** 394
Unproductive **Vol. 1:** 73, 723
Vol. 3: 869
Unprofitable **Vol. 3:** 1026
Unprovable **Vol. 1:** 664
Vol. 2: 243
Unpunished **Vol. 1:** 698, 701
Unquenchable **Vol. 3:** 111, 447
Unreality **Vol. 1:** 550
Vol. 3: 724
Unreceptive **Vol. 2:** 174
Unrecognized **Vol. 2:** 281, 781
Unredeemed **Vol. 1:** 313, 398, 557
Vol. 3: 204, 347, 1021
Unregenerate **Vol. 1:** 319, 726
Vol. 2: 675
Unreliable **Vol. 1:** 594
Unrelieved **Vol. 3:** 593
Unrepeatable **Vol. 1:** 667
Vol. 2: 718
Vol. 3: 323
Unrepentant **Vol. 2:** 383, 630, 795
Unresponsive **Vol. 3:** 522, 911
Unrest **Vol. 1:** 642
Vol. 3: 1054
Unrestrained **Vol. 1:** 459, 552, 715
Unrestricted **Vol. 1:** 459
Unrighteous **Vol. 1:** 110, 115, 182, 202, 434, 554 f., 684, 721
Vol. 2: 93, 237, 544, 838, 844
Vol. 3: 99, 361, 722
Unrighteousness **Vol. 1:** 112, 591, 609, 662
Vol. 2: 193, 709, 818, 820, 892
Vol. 3: 163, **352–377, 573–576,** 580, 829
Unruly **Vol. 2:** 800
Unsalted **Vol. 3:** 443
Unsearchable **Vol. 2:** 365 f.
Vol. 3: 532 f.
Unseemly **Vol. 3:** 574
Unseen **Vol. 1:** 80, 713
Vol. 3: 211
Unselfish **Vol. 1:** 547
Vol. 2: 413
Unserviceable **Vol. 2:** 669
Vol. 3: 143
Unsettle **Vol. 3: 709 f.**
Unsettled **Vol. 1:** 518
Unshakeable **Vol. 1:** 658, 661
Vol. 2: 353
Vol. 3: 558–560
Unshaken **Vol. 1:** 660, 663
Unskilled **Vol. 2: 456 f.**
Unspeakable **Vol. 3:** 574
Unspiritual **Vol. 1:** 248
Vol. 3: 345, **676–687,** 705
Unstable **Vol. 2:** 657

Vol. 3: 558
Unstained **Vol. 1:** 337, 341
Vol. 3: 534
Unsteady **Vol. 2:** 457
Unsubstantial **Vol. 2:** 284
Unsuitable **Vol. 1:** 561, 684
Vol. 3: 111
Unsuspecting **Vol. 1:** 343
Untempted **Vol. 3: 798–808**
Untie **Vol. 1:** 577
Vol. 3: 177–189
Untilled **Vol. 1:** 520
Untimely **Vol. 1:** 182, 184, 434
Vol. 3: 833–839
Untouched **Vol. 1:** 563
Vol. 3: 1071
Unusable **Vol. 1:** 565, 610, 722
Vol. 2: 713
Unused **Vol. 1:** 73
Unutterable **Vol. 1:** 603
Vol. 2: 763
Unveil **Vol. 1:** 312 f.
Vol. 2: 160, **212–214**
Vol. 3: 309 f., 980
Unverifiable **Vol. 3:** 1136
Unwashed hands **Vol. 2:** 144
Unwavering **Vol. 1:** 503, 505, 597
Unwilling **Vol. 1:** 509
Vol. 2: 106, 174
Vol. 3: 132
Unwise **Vol. 1:** 108, 282, 288
Vol. 2: 320
Unwitting **Vol. 2:** 358, 406
Unworthy **Vol. 1:** 183, 414 f.
Vol. 2: 96, 530
Vol. 3: 111, 141, 750
Unwritten **Vol. 2:** 436
Unwritten laws **Vol. 3:** 930 f.
Upbringing **Vol. 1:** 288, 569
Vol. 2: 451
Vol. 3: 775, 935
Upheaval **Vol. 1:** 610
Uphold **Vol. 1:** 658, 663, 697, 712
Vol. 2: 287, 289, 366 f.
Upkeep **Vol. 3:** 433
Uplifted **Vol. 2:** 869
Upper room **Vol. 2:** 320
Upright **Vol. 1:** 479, 608
Vol. 2: 94, 98, 144, 261, 395, 475
Vol. 3: 101, **351–377, 1153–1155**
Uprightness **Vol. 3: 352–377,** 571 f., 693
Uprising **Vol. 1:** 292
Uproar **Vol. 1:** 410
Vol. 2: 621–626
Uproot **Vol. 1:** 600
Vol. 3: 865–870
Upset **Vol. 3:** 557, **933–935**
Upset salt **Vol. 3:** 448
Upstairs **Vol. 2:** 185
Upwards **Vol. 1:** 674
Vol. 2: 187,198, 617
Ur **Vol. 3:** 241
Uranus **Vol. 2:** 188
Urge **Vol. 1:** 65, 271, 456 f., 609, 689, 693, 731
Vol. 2: 181, 361
Vol. 3: 556
Urgency **Vol. 1:** 239, 501, 611
Vol. 2: 855, 859
Uriah **Vol. 3:** 656, 1062
Urim and Thummim **Vol. 2: 296**
Urn **Vol. 1:** 263, 674
Usage **Vol. 1:** 70
Vol. 2: 436
Use **Vol. 1:** 548, 550, 619, 653, 687, 731, 742
Vol. 2: 149, 270, 296, 364, 400, 447
Use force **Vol. 3: 711 f.**
Useful **Vol. 2:** 98, 102, 281, 412, 434
Usefulness **Vol. 2:** 105
Vol. 3: 349, 912
Useless **Vol. 1:** 73, 337, 480, 546, 549 f., 565, 679, 722, 729
Vol. 2: 434
Vol. 3: 913, 1024
Usurp **Vol. 2:** 80, 877
Vol. 3: 363
Utanapishtim **Vol. 3:** 259
Utensils **Vol. 2:** 233, 235
Utilize **Vol. 2:** 438
Utopia **Vol. 1:** 640
Utter oracles **Vol. 3: 74–89**
Utterance **Vol. 1:** 58, 582, 602, 734, 736 f.
Vol. 2: 884
Vol. 3: 760, **1078–1123**
Utterly **Vol. 2:** 60
Uzziah **Vol. 1:** 54
Vol. 2: 320
Vol. 3: 609

Vacillation **Vol. 2:** 458
Vain **Vol. 1:** 209, 437, 459, **546–553,** 571, 705
Vol. 2: 41, 285, 517
Vol. 3: 563
Vainglory **Vol. 1:** 228, 546
Vol. 3: 143
Valentinian gnosticism **Vol. 1:** 301, 740
Vol. 2: 645
Valentinus **Vol. 1:** 55
Vol. 2: 401
Valerius Gratus **Vol. 2:** 849
Vol. 3: 39
Valid **Vol. 1:** 98, 187, 286, 385, 402 f., 658, 660, 664, 666, 691
Vol. 2: 40, 77, 216, 239, 241, 327, 336, 400, 442, 445, 719
Vol. 3: 50, 165, 188, 224, 498, 712 f., 808, 828, **874–901,** 1113
Validated **Vol. 1:** 398
Validation **Vol. 3:** 334
Validity **Vol. 1:** 439, 473, 486, 538, 594, 601, 609, 619, 659, 702
Vol. 2: 62, 317, 394, 436, 439, 626
Vol. 3: 363, 556, 741, 1112, 1137
Valley **Vol. 1:** 240, 422
Valley of dry bones **Vol. 3:** 269, 1100
Valley floor **Vol. 2:** 197
Valley of Shaveh **Vol. 2:** 590

Valuable **Vol. 1:** 665
Vol. 2: 132, 547
Vol. 3: 686
Valuation **Vol. 2:** 44
Value **Vol. 1:** 173, 311, 327, 349, 353, 457, 480, 496, 512 f., 565, 572, 613, 628, 654, 666, 670, 679, 710
Vol. 2: 48–50, 96, 100, 104, 131 f., 149, 189, 270, 361 f., 394, 398 f., 420, 428 f., 435, 497–500, 566, 820 f., 831, 841 f., 844, 862
Vol. 3: 137, 140, 142, 157, 444, 563, 627, 712, 848, 920, 933, 1024, 1148
Value-judgment **Vol. 1:** 681
Vol. 2: 362, 424, 438, 719
Vol. 3: 1143
Van Til, C. **Vol. 3:** 899
Vanishing **Vol. 1:** 681
Vanity **Vol. 1:** 262, 296, 546
Vol. 2: 44, 100, 475, 565
Vanquished **Vol. 1:** 676, 686
Vapour **Vol. 1:** 449
Vol. 3: 678
Variant reading **Vol. 1:** 69, **71**
Variety **Vol. 1:** 670
Vol. 3: 1067
Varus **Vol. 3:** 441
Vassal **Vol. 3:** 268, 608, 828, 867
Vatican I **Vol. 3:** 386
Vaticanus **Vol. 1:** 53
Vault **Vol. 1:** 523
Vol. 2: 188, 214
Vaunt **Vol. 1:** 727
Vegetables **Vol. 2: 210 f.**
Vol. 3: 444
Vegetarian **Vol. 2:** 272
Vegetation **Vol. 2:** 274, 644, 691
Vol. 3: 988, 1004
Vegetation gods **Vol. 2:** 265
Vehemence **Vol. 2:** 418
Veil **Vol. 1:** 73, 221, 245, 280, 587
Vol. 2: 61, 159–162, **212–214,** 293, 328, 379, 522, 637, 641, 669
Vol. 3: 153, 323, 520, 793, **794 f.,** 812, 886, 1066
Venerable **Vol. 1:** 616
Vol. 2: 91, 128, 713
Veneration **Vol. 1:** 103, 384, 525
Vol. 2: 94, 164, 498, 859
Vengeance **Vol. 1:** 107, 111, 225, 240, 375, 410, 539, 556, 735
Vol. 2: 56, 58, 157, 230, 690, 770, 893
Vol. 3: 92–100, 136, 242, 344, 874, 1054
Venom **Vol. 1:** 108
Vol. 2: 27
Ventriloquist **Vol. 2:** 558
Venture **Vol. 1:** 710, 712
Vol. 2: 349, 743
Vol. 3: 799
Venus **Vol. 1:** 497
Vol. 2: 85, 495
Vol. 3: 736, 1068
Ver sacrum **Vol. 3:** 149
Veracious **Vol. 3: 874–901**
Verdict **Vol. 1:** 351, 386, 397, 545, 566, 604, 609, 679 f., 702
Vol. 2: 214, **362–367,** 383, 392
Vol. 3: 50 f., 128, 370, 372, 747, 817, 838, 892
Verdigris **Vol. 2:** 27
Verifiability **Vol. 3:** 1136
Verse **Vol. 3:** 1086
Versions **Vol. 1:** 69, **71**
Very small **Vol. 2: 427–429**
Vespasian **Vol. 2:** 167
Vol. 3: 457, 752
Vessel **Vol. 1:** 149, 540, 546, 636, 638, 673, 733, 741 f.
Vol. 2: 50 f., 96, 212, 274, 434, 726, 834
Vol. 3: 104, 117, 459, 552, 788, **910–917,** 957, 990, 1053, 1064 f., 1067
Vessels of mercy **Vol. 1:** 112
Vol. 3: 118
Vessels of the sanctuary **Vol. 1:** 122
Vessels of wrath **Vol. 1:** 112
Vol. 3: 1020
Vesta **Vol. 1:** 653
Vestments **Vol. 2:** 233
Vol. 3: 120
Vesuvius **Vol. 3:** 1013
Vetus Latina **Vol. 1:** 71
Vex **Vol. 2:** 260, 807
Via, D.O. **Vol. 3:** 1127
Vibration **Vol. 2:** 653
Vol. 3: 558
Vicarious **Vol. 1:** 372
Vol. 2: 413, 445, 532
Vol. 3: 151, 164, 171, 195, 550, 721–724, 956, 999
Vice **Vol. 1:** 108, 110, 138, 202, 412, 452, 459, 496, 499, 513 f., 559, 593, 676, 687, 689, 739
Vol. 2: 271, 791, 845 f.
Vol. 3: 28, 30 f., 526, 563, 576, 839, 926–929
Viciousness **Vol. 1:** 511
Vicissitudes **Vol. 2:** 265, 357, 439
Victim **Vol. 1:** 239, 392 f., 410, 438, 459–461, 479, 498
Vol. 2: 257, 412
Vol. 3: 93, 95 f., 159 f., 164 f., 178, 190, 418
Victor **Vol. 1:** 303, 382, 467, 470, 526, 644, 648–650, 716
Vol. 2: 62, 296, 653 f.
Vol. 3: 49
Victorious **Vol. 1:** 663, 730
Vol. 2: 359
Victory **Vol. 1:** 100, 114, 125, 239, 241, 244, 339, 359, 372, 405 f., 423, 432, 436–438, 440, 469 f., 508, 564, 624–627, **644–652**
Vol. 2: 107, 109, 146, 205, 260, 270, 273, 315, 326, 357, 419, 435, 665, 889, 898, 907, 918
Vol. 3: 45, 51, 172, 267 f., 357, 388, 686, 716, 736, 818, 990, 1006, 1046
Victory cry **Vol. 3:** 669
Vielhauer, P. **Vol. 3:** 58, **619**
Vienna circle **Vol. 3:** 1136
View **Vol. 1:** 70, 188, 599, 711
Vol. 2: 44
Vol. 3: 512
Vigil **Vol. 1:** 495
Vile **Vol. 1:** 564

Village **Vol. 1:** 520, 689
Vol. 2: 29, 363, 803
Vol. 3: 56, 153
Vindicate **Vol. 2:** 363 f., 771
Vol. 3: 352–377, 790
Vindication **Vol. 1:** 175, 411, 434, 470, 529, 672, 677
Vol. 2: 165, 203, 228, 340, 679, 905, 917
Vol. 3: 97, 318, **352–377,** 611, 617, 629, 722, 913, 1059
Vindicator **Vol. 3:** 178 f.
Vine **Vol. 1:** 303, 722, 724
Vol. 2: 33, 247, 278, 280 f., 307, 313, 382, 632
Vol. 3: 227, 256, 335, 567, 613, 865–869, 893, **918–922,** 950 f.
Vine-dresser **Vol. 1:** 725
Vol. 3: 918–922
Vinegar **Vol. 1:** 726
Vol. 2: 28
Vineyard **Vol. 1:** 356, 430
Vol. 2: 50, 154, 248, 301, 307, 313, 499, 681, 790
Vol. 3: 95, 141, 525, 641 f., 867–869, **918–922,** 948, 950 f.
Vintage **Vol. 1:** 724
Violate **Vol. 2:** 130, 320, 440, 451, 582
Vol. 3: 711
Violence **Vol. 1:** 288, 430, 532
Vol. 2: 51, 63, 202, 363, 383, 821, 841
Vol. 3: 353 f., 377, 379, 475, 578, 603, **711–718,** 971, 975, 980, 1054
Violent **Vol. 3: 27 f.,** 158, **711 f.**
Viper **Vol. 1:** 510
Virgin **Vol. 1:** 325, 414, 468, 505
Vol. 2: 87, 212, 577, 584 f., 588, 619
Vol. 3: 95, 118, 252, 536, 1055
Virgin birth **Vol. 1:** 179
Vol. 2: 86 f.
Vol. 3: 660–664, 1070, 1073
Virginity **Vol. 1:** 256, 449, 668
Vol. 3: 1071
Virgo intacta **Vol. 3:** 660
Virtuality **Vol. 3:** 1142
Virtue **Vol. 1:** 175, 217, 314, 316, 431 f., 459, 461, 494, 496, 501 f., 559, 598, 603, 627, 645, 690, 700, 734
Vol. 2: 49, 51, 61, 92, 94, 192, 259, 261, 290, 355, 437, 484, 497, 658 f., 772, 806, 820, 841
Vol. 3: 32, 50, 102, 138, 261, 347, 351–353, 365, 522, 526, 562 f., 575, 678, 681 f., 719, 727, 766, **923–928,** 936, 939, 946–948, 1034, 1075, 1148, 1157, 1163
Virtuous **Vol. 1:** 435, 524
Vol. 2: 261, 477
Vol. 3: 355
Visible **Vol. 1:** 95, 219, 299, 490 f., 523, 595, 602, 650, 679, 703 f.
Vol. 2: 46, 72, 82, 106, 147, 190, 192, 379, 394, 398 f., 421, 484, **488–490**
Vol. 3: 128, 310, 312, 316, **317–324, 511–518,** 839
Vision **Vol. 1:** 103, 116, 175, 202, 204, 216, 274, 319, 420 f., 426, 429, 448, 469, 512, 527 f., 574, 576, 593, 597, 609, 623, 640, 675, 704, 727
Vol. 2: 37, 45, 97, 173, 176, 181, 193, 240, 294, 320, 375, 477, 559, 604, 607, 610, 612 f., 622, 624, 673, 691 f., 701 f., 711 f., 728, 762, 785, 888 f., 931
Vol. 3: 36, 77, 80, 87 f., 128, 241, 269, 283, 285 f., 288, 297, 310 f., 315 f., 362, 366, 502, **511–521,** 569, 606, 614, 616, 691 f., 706 f., 735, 847, 862, 871, 950, 1008, 1010, 1067 f., 1089, 1092–1094, 1096, 1100
Visionary **Vol. 1:** 527, 638
Vol. 2: 56
Vol. 3: 276, 690, 699
Visit **Vol. 1:** 188 f., 191, 207, 333, 420, 697
Vol. 2: 358, 875
Vol. 3: 134, 198, 359, 516, 547, 1074
Visitation **Vol. 1:** 188, 190 f., 562
Vol. 2: 56, 167, 779, 893, 905
Vol. 3: 503, 793, 836 f., 842, 943
Visitor **Vol. 1:** 529, 688
Visual **Vol. 1:** 735
Vol. 2: 284
Vital **Vol. 1:** 671
Vol. 3: 680
Vitality **Vol. 1:** 240
Vol. 2: 311
Vol. 3: 691, 867, 1071
Vitellius **Vol. 3:** 39, 756
Viticulture **Vol. 3:** 918
Vivid **Vol. 1:** 670
Vizier **Vol. 2:** 376
Vol. 3: 594
Vocation **Vol. 1:** 271, 275, 522, 690
Vol. 2: 298, 566
Vol. 3: 173, 621, 790, 920, 1088, 1095
Voice **Vol. 1:** 280, 292, 372, 410 f., 476, 541, 543, 684, 704 f.
Vol. 2: 48, 114, 177 f., 193, 206, 316, 354, 413, 426, 444, 784, 819, 863, 924, 929
Vol. 3: 48 f., 51, 54, 80, **111–114,** 639–641, 705–714, 807, 863, 874, 909, 990, 1001–1003, 1078
Void **Vol. 1:** 334, 546 f., 638
Vol. 2: 301, 453
Vol. 3: 258
Volcano **Vol. 1:** 655, 657
Vol. 3: 1013
Volition **Vol. 1:** 686
Vol. 2: 567, 817
Vol. 3: 1015–1023
Voluntary **Vol. 1:** 355, 482, 613, 626, 642, 697
Voluntary contributions **Vol. 3:** 752, 854 f.
von Campenhausen, Hans **Vol. 3:** 290
von Rad, G. **Vol. 3:** 151, 333, 1124
von Soden, H. **Vol. 3:** 85
Vote **Vol. 1:** 478
Vol. 2: 497
Vol. 3: 49, 913
Voter **Vol. 1:** 732
Votive offering **Vol. 1:** 413 f.
Vol. 3: 422 f.
Vouch **Vol. 1:** 659
Vow **Vol. 1:** 107, 203, 344, 352, 472, 734
Vol. 2: 43, 157, 162, **861–864, 867–875**

Vow (*cont'd*)
Vol. 3: 68, 101, 425, 431, 539, 816, 919, 921, 1057
Voyage **Vol. 3:** 935
Vulgate **Vol. 1:** 50, **71**
Vol. 2: 219
Vulnerable **Vol. 1:** 678
Vulture **Vol. 1:** 172 f., 175, 610
Vol. 2: 32 f., 115
Vol. 3: 1054

Wady **Vol. 3:** 985
Waft **Vol. 1:** 683
Wag **Vol. 3:** 556
Wages **Vol. 1:** 117, 436, 723
Vol. 2: 711, 770, 851
Vol. 3: **134–145,** 379, 549, 727
Wages of sin **Vol. 2:** 120, 715
Wagon **Vol. 3:** 811
Wail **Vol. 1:** 420
Vol. 2: 416–424
Vol. 3: 113
Wait **Vol. 1:** 482, 552, 596, 646, 650
Vol. 2: 118, 239 f., **244–246,** 385, 585, 682, 772
Vol. 3: 97, 224, 365, 371, 628, 953
Wait at table **Vol. 3:** 545
Wait for **Vol. 2:** 132, 194, 238 f., **244–246,** 328
Vol. 3: **744–746**
Waiting **Vol. 2:** 243 f., 360
Wake **Vol. 2:** 55, 925
Vol. 3: **279–281**
Wakefulness **Vol. 2:** 137
Walk **Vol. 1:** 59, 110, 257, 262, 354, 384, 420, 422, 424, 458, 483, 571, 623, 644, 675, 704, 713, 723, 741
Vol. 2: 61, 184, 302, 358, 369, 414 f., 440, 452, 461, 473, 492, 494 f., 517, 668, 706, 718, 771, 777, 795, 804, 815, 817
Vol. 3: 118, 266, 324, 336, 361, 400, 432, 528, 550, 572, 633, 702, 800, 860, 891, **933–947,** 985, 990, 1002, 1006, 1014, 1167
Walk beside **Vol. 3:** 583
Walk uprightly **Vol. 3:** **351 f.**
Walking on water **Vol. 2:** 281, 559, 630
Wall **Vol. 1:** 205, 377, 676
Vol. 2: 111, 157, 199, 465, 646, 722, 760, 801, 831
Vol. 3: 200, 350, 378, 382, 397, 557, **948–952**
Wander **Vol. 1:** 320, 322
Vol. 2: 412, **457–461**
Vol. 3: 29, 560, 736, 888
Wander from truth **Vol. 3:** 888
Wandering **Vol. 1:** 209, 304, 424, 488, 568
Vol. 2: 138, 265
Vol. 3: 560
Wandering stars **Vol. 3:** 736
Waning **Vol. 3:** 733
Want **Vol. 1:** 456, 556, 565, 623, 687, 717, 731
Vol. 2: 92, 263, 265, 351, 822, 855
Vol. 3: 230 f., 251, **530–532, 952–958, 1015–1023**
Wanton **Vol. 3:** 27, 29
War **Vol. 1:** 67, 102, 118, 124, 151, 224, 293 f., 340 f., 392, 409, 429, 452, 484, 492, 529, 553, 558, 612, 645 f., 650, 652–654, 656 f., 674, 677, 683, 686 f., 720, 741 f.
Vol. 2: 146, 167, 226 f., 238, 258, 265, 343, 367, 497, 602, 665, 776 f., 780, 809, 844, 893, 904, 907, 911, 930
Vol. 3: 45, 49, 79, 111, 121, 147, 179, 205, 233, 249, 253, 266, 356, 593, 702, 715, 730, 749, 873, **958–967,** 1169
War Scroll of Qumran **Vol. 3:** 961
Ward **Vol. 2:** 581
Ward off **Vol. 1:** 646
Vol. 3: 102, 727
Wares **Vol. 3:** 139
Warfield, B.B. **Vol. 3:** **329**
Warm **Vol. 1:** 614 f.
Vol. 2: 435
Vol. 3: 678
Warn **Vol. 1:** 156, 163, 247, 329, 341, 372, 403, 419, 463, 469, 496, 526, 559, **567–573,** 587, 607, 679 f., 683 f., 689, 709, 725, 729, 731
Vol. 2: 127, 178 f., 263
Vol. 3: 79, 211, 325
Warning **Vol. 1:** 109, 205, 235, 244, 247, 286, 352, 404, 410, 417, 462, 501, 512 f., 538, **567–573,** 578, 591, 593, 604, 608, 610 f., 623, 690 f., 734, 742
Vol. 2: 37, 136, 174, 180, 230, 244, 260, 262, 277, 286, 290 f., 307, 310, 318, 320, 357 f., 366, 397, 401, 417, 426, 429, 460, 462, 587, 706, 718 f., 721, 823, 832, 901, 917, 921
Vol. 3: 79, 99, 143, 204, 214, 221, 227, 249, **324 f.,** 343, 370, 430, 522, 721, 759, 806, 949, 1025, 1043, 1054
Warnock, G.J. **Vol. 3:** 897
Warrior **Vol. 1:** 102, 732
Vol. 2: 562
Vol. 3: 583, 953
Warrior God **Vol. 2:** 69
Wash **Vol. 1:** 117, **143–154,** 185 f., 224 f., 239, 351, 395, 471, 625, 630, 698, 701
Vol. 2: 75, 159, 228, 230, 303
Vol. 3: 107, 366, 990
Wash fee (→ Feet-washing)
Wash garments **Vol. 3:** 101
Wash hands **Vol. 2:** 149 f.
Vol. 3: 105, 481
Wash out **Vol. 3:** 109
Waste **Vol. 1:** 464, 467, 470
Vol. 2: 33, 266
Waste time **Vol. 3:** **839–845**
Watch **Vol. 1:** 217, 294, 420, 474, 655
Vol. 2: **132–137,** 244, 689, 717, 917
Vol. 3: 114, 126, 378, **511–518,** 626, 685, 713, 1096
Watch over **Vol. 1:** 189, 543
Vol. 2: 438, 441
Watcher **Vol. 1:** 101 f.
Vol. 3: 468
Watchfulness **Vol. 1:** 425, 442, 460, 693
Vol. 2: 37, 910, 916
Vol. 3: 529, 627
Watchman **Vol. 2:** 111
Vol. 3: 1100
Water **Vol. 1:** 113, 143, 151–153, 158, 160, 164,

175, 179 f., 185, 201 f., 224 f., 319, 351, 379, 384, 389, 420, 433, 508 f., 513, 515, 517 f., 522 f., 526, 610, 612, 617, 623, 629, 652, 670, 683, 710 f., 735, 742
Vol. 2: 28 f., 80, 150, 153, 157, 188 f., 205, 222, 226, 267, **274–277,** 278, 281, 284, 349, 452, 497, 583, 630, 658, 691, 854, 881
Vol. 3: 102, 104, 109, 112, 141, 147, 208, 211, 220, 324, 335, 382 f., 449, 459, 543, 599, 647, 703 f., 707, 709, 713, 737, 814, 866, 910, 913, 915, 917, 919, 922, 980, **982–992,** 1003–1007, 1177 f.
Water of bitterness **Vol. 2:** 140
Water of conviction **Vol. 2:** 140
Water of life **Vol. 2:** 267, 275, 277, 482, 486, 615, 761, 763, 928
Vol. 3: 988, 991
Water-jar **Vol. 3:** 911
Waterless **Vol. 3:** 988
Wave **Vol. 3:** 983
Wave hand as signal **Vol. 3: 556–558**
Wave-loaf **Vol. 3:** 424
Wave-offering **Vol. 2:** 461
Vol. 3: 416, 424
Waver **Vol. 1:** 503, 505
Vol. 2: 244
Vol. 3: 558–560
Waves **Vol. 1:** 520
Vol. 2: 212
Vol. 3: 112, 559 f., 711
Wax **Vol. 1:** 471
Vol. 2: 128
Vol. 3: 483
Waxing **Vol. 3:** 733
Way **Vol. 1:** 168, 191, 225, 272, 292, 339, 375, 403, 411, 415, 423, 426, 464, 491–493, 499, 541, 543, 547, 564, 568, 571, 594, 596, 630, 668, 695, 719, 726, 731, 733
Vol. 2: 75, 80, 123 f., 132, 134, 202, 215, 221, 225, 256, 258, 262, 280, 310, 400, 436–438, 444, 458–460, 493, 806
Vol. 3: 50, 163, 207, 316, 366, 380, 503, 530, 584, 629, 764, 888, 891, 916, **933–947**
Way of Balaam **Vol. 3:** 942
Way of Cain **Vol. 3:** 942
Way of God **Vol. 3:** 937
Way of life **Vol. 1:** 269, 513, 551 f., 717
Vol. 2: 436–438
Vol. 3: 933–943
Way of thinking **Vol. 2: 616–620**
Way of truth **Vol. 3:** 888
Way, truth, life **Vol. 3:** 891
Waylay **Vol. 2:** 132
Wayside **Vol. 1:** 608
Wayward **Vol. 1:** 556
Vol. 2: 407
Weak **Vol. 1:** 334, 366, 449, 475, 542, 561, 602, 676 f., 716
Vol. 2: 117 f., 123, 259, 273, 306, 402, 422, 446, 453, 706, 822, 899
Vol. 3: 106, 410, 559, 563, 751, 802, 914, 955, **993–1000,** 1026
Weaken **Vol. 1:** 680
Vol. 2: 461
Weaker **Vol. 3:** 1067
Weaker brother **Vol. 1:** 352
Vol. 2: 611, 815
Vol. 3: 107
Weakness **Vol. 1:** 163, 192, 218, 222, 229, 281, 337, 399, 467, 551, 679, 727, 731
Vol. 2: 62 f., 116, 121, 136, 166, 171, 206, 414, 428, 432, 434 f., 446 f., 460, 564, 606, 710, 772, 809, 818, 882–884
Vol. 3: 41, 281, 315, 475, 560, 571, 586, 601, 702, 714, 724 f., 814, 857, **993–1000,** 1017, 1190
Weal **Vol. 1:** 379
Wealth **Vol. 1:** 119, 138 f., 205, 319, 322, 381, 515, 536, 683, 731, 735
Vol. 2: 48 f., 51, 255, 265, 317, 422, 475, 549, **829–853**
Vol. 3: 209, 224, **324 f.,** 379, 598, 678, 727, 812, 953
Wealthy **Vol. 1:** 188
Vol. 2: 820, 838
Wean **Vol. 1:** 614
Weapon **Vol. 1:** 120, 314, 379, 390, 392, 468, 652 f., 656, 675, 726
Vol. 2: 97, 495, 815, 830
Vol. 3: 268, 364, **958–967,** 1001
Weapons of righteousness **Vol. 2:** 148
Vol. 3: 886, 963
Wear **Vol. 1:** 241, 648
Vol. 2: 160, 296
Wear away **Vol. 3:** 840
Weary **Vol. 1:** 262 f., 426, 496 f., 729
Vol. 2: 215, 221, 265, 281
Vol. 3: 859, 1102
Weather **Vol. 3:** 737, 835, **1000–1004**
Weave **Vol. 1:** 490
Vol. 3: 950
Wedding **Vol. 1:** 120, 122, 274, 317, 506, 612
Vol. 2: 339, **575–582**
Vol. 3: 403
Wedding feast **Vol. 1:** 110
Vol. 2: 502, 575, 676
Vol. 3: 252
Wedding guests **Vol. 2:** 32, 358, 585
Wedding hall **Vol. 2: 584 f.**
Wedlock **Vol. 1:** 187 f., 616
Weeds **Vol. 1:** 289, 299
Vol. 2: 211, 708
Vol. 3: 868
Week **Vol. 1:** 627–631
Vol. 2: 692, 696 f.
Weekday work **Vol. 1:** 631
Weep **Vol. 1:** 201, 329, 395
Vol. 2: 267, 328, 357, **416–424,** 433, 824 f., 862
Vol. 3: 680, 1062
Weigh **Vol. 1:** 106, 591
Vol. 3: 136, 230, 752, 1160 f.
Weigh facts **Vol. 2:** 392
Weight **Vol. 1:** 260 f.
Vol. 2: 370
Vol. 3: 27, 348, 514, 752, 1097
Weightier **Vol. 2:** 281
Weights and measures **Vol. 3:** 356, 752

Welcome **Vol. 1:** 206, 211, 213, 325
Vol. 2: 244–246, 328, 358, 450, 538 f.
Vol. 3: 744–746, 751, 920
Welfare **Vol. 1:** 562
Vol. 2: 320, 564
Vol. 3: 167, 568, 593, 1167
Well **Vol. 1:** 116
Vol. 2: 92, **169–171,** 318, 367, 386
Vol. 3: 146, 158, 208, 351, 717, 950, 980, **982–992**
Well-behaved **Vol. 3:** 817
Well-being **Vol. 1:** 208, 210–216, 232, 400, 553, 671
Vol. 2: 99, 115, 163, 170, 266, 352, 478, 777, 781
Vol. 3: 357, 422, 528, 566, 755, 918, 1157
Well-born **Vol. 1: 176–188**
Well-disposed **Vol. 2:** 550, 818
Well-doing **Vol. 3:** 1147–1155
Well-favoured **Vol. 1:** 188
Well-mannered **Vol. 3:** 818
Well-ordered **Vol. 1:** 666
Well-pleasing **Vol. 2:** 857
Vol. 3: 266, 810
Wellhausen, Julius **Vol. 1:** 66
Wenham, J.W. **Vol. 3:** 329
Werner, Martin **Vol. 2:** 903
West **Vol. 3:** 1055
West-Semitic peoples **Vol. 1:** 308
Westcott, B.F. **Vol. 1:** 70
Whale **Vol. 1:** 670
Wheat **Vol. 1:** 118, 249, 289, 625
Vol. 2: 32, 488, 711, 783, 834
Vol. 3: 470, 523, 527, 804, 831
Wheel **Vol. 1:** 182
Vol. 3: 557
While **Vol. 2:** 304
Whip **Vol. 1:** 161 f.
Vol. 3: 778
Whirlwind **Vol. 3:** 266
Whisper **Vol. 1:** 510
Vol. 2: 554
Whisperer **Vol. 3:** 346
White **Vol. 1:** 115, **203–206,** 265, 317, 319, 656 f., 708
Vol. 2: 96, 293, 464, 470, 484, 493, 496
Vol. 3: 40, 143, 347, 349, 360, 362, 862, 1004, 1053
White stone **Vol. 2:** 673 f.
Whitewash **Vol. 1:** 205, 471
Vol. 2: 334
Vol. 3: 360, 948, 1053
Whitsun **Vol. 1:** 631
Whole **Vol. 1: 94 f.,** 294 f., 302, 518, 672, 674 f., 677, 706, 708 f., 732, 738
Vol. 2: 60, 62 f., 779
Vol. 3: 422, 860, 925
Whole burnt-offering **Vol. 3: 417–436**
Whole-offering **Vol. 2:** 60
Wholehearted **Vol. 3:** 572, 687
Wholeness **Vol. 2:** 64 f., 102, 130, 593, 780–782
Vol. 3: 572
Wholesome **Vol. 3:** 449
Wholly other **Vol. 3:** 326
Whore **Vol. 1:** 481, 497, 501
Vol. 3: 1008, 1093
Whoredom **Vol. 1:** 514
Whorf, Benjamin Lee **Vol. 3:** 1126 f.
Wick **Vol. 3:** 110
Wicked **Vol. 1:** 103, 109, 146, 194, 343, 479, 646, 673, 702, 726
Vol. 2: 29, 104, 106, 138, 329, 351, 370, 421, 737
Vol. 3: 134, 201, 203, 357, 360, 641, 919
Wicked husbandmen **Vol. 2:** 790
Vol. 3: 641, 869
Wicked tenants **Vol. 3:** 951
Wickedness **Vol. 1:** 96, 112, 231, 296, 332, 349, 382, 420, 550, 555, **561–567,** 645, 647, 654, 673, 731, 733, 742 f.
Vol. 2: 56, 94, 106, 364, 677, 679
Vol. 3: 125, 209, **562–564,** 574, 681, 837, 926, 983, 996, 1024
Wide **Vol. 1: 253 f.**
Vol. 3: 255
Widespread **Vol. 1:** 733
Widow **Vol. 1:** 187, 191, 266, 322, 341, 499, 690 f., 729 f.
Vol. 2: 43, 50, 71, 475, 564, 599, 730, 737 f., 771, 821, 823, 850, 858
Vol. 3: 97, 178, 191, 225, 357, 482, 537, 548 f., 790, 852, 855, 903, 930, **1055–1075**
Widower **Vol. 3:** 537
Wife **Vol. 1:** 80, 84, 87, 232, 235, 302, 395, 498, 505–507, 537, 555 f., 637
Vol. 2: 50 f., 139, 213, 221, 307, 317 f., 349, 400, 511, 513, 539, 541, 563 f., 575, 584, 684, 880, 922
Vol. 3: 138, 172, 188 f., 219, **534–543,** 747, 928–930, 1055, **1160–1165**
Wilckens, Ulrich **Vol. 3: 286 f.**
Wild **Vol. 1: 520,** 726
Wild beast **Vol. 3:** 203
Wild olive **Vol. 2:** 660, **710–713**
Wild vine **Vol. 3:** 918
Wilderness **Vol. 1:** 99, 114, 249, 253, 294, 303, 380, 411, 453, 460, 465, 473, 510, 519, 527, 531, 568, 593, 626, 629
Vol. 2: 206, 218, 228, 412, 458, 460, 541, 636 f., 640, 642, 696, 819, 835, 871 f., 893, 928
Vol. 3: 56, 73, 118, 121, 427, 431, 459, 559, 602, 697, 706, 724, 752, 800, 804, 810 f., 905, 919, 937, 953 f., **1004–1014,** 1094
Wilderness of Sin **Vol. 2:** 637
Wiles **Vol. 1:** 282
Vol. 3: 965
Wilful **Vol. 1:** 607
Vol. 3: 1018
Will **Vol. 1:** 74, 177, 231, 234, 244, 355, 365, 368–371, 376, 378, 416, 437, 447, 457, 460 f., 477, 495, 497, 533–535, 564, 567 f., 575, 594, 623, 643, 647, 655, 664, 670 f., 681, 696, 699, 708, 719, 742
Vol. 2: 83, 102, 166, 181–183, 211, 258, 289, 296, 368, 377, 392, 400, 434, 472, 588, 617, 664, 811, 818 f., 876
Vol. 3: 72, 76, 110, 118, 122, 124, 127, 177,

224, 234, 293, 314, 532, 593, 677, 681, 684, 713, **1015–1023,** 1156
Will, Free **Vol. 1:** 54
Vol. 2: 663, 811
Vol. 3: 69, 1020
Will, Human **Vol. 1:** 54, 355, 594, 608, 722
Vol. 2: 811
Will of God **Vol. 1:** 70, 95, 103, 121, 145, 166, 173, 187, 203, 243, 268, 273, 275, 282, 289, 311, 326, 350, 370, 384, 386, 456–459, 473, 476, 484–488, 494, 496, 506, 540, 549, 565, 575, 593 f., 597, 602 f., 641, 647, 659, 669, 674, 677, 696 f., 699, 708, 717, 719, 728, 738
Vol. 2: 42, 62, 72–75, 77, 94, 103, 128, 174, 177 f., 194, 216, 229–232, 275, 281, 296, 300, 326 f., 336, 343, 359, 397, 399 f., 413, 425, 446, 448, 481, 540 f., 561, 581, 604, 610, 618, 653 f., 660, 664–667, 673, 675, 721, 775, 811, 815–819, 832, 857 f., 863 f., 867 f., 871, 875, 882 f., 885, 929
Vol. 3: 31, 46, 72, 79, 93 f., 128 f., 157, 195, 198, 329, 360, 363, 377, 420, 433 f., 504, 509, 532 f., 566, 578, 609, 692, 702, 725, 760–763, 765, 769, 774, 777, 779, 787, 810, 825, 828, 835 f., 848, 885, 912, 931, 938, 940, 942, 944, 946, 1003, **1015–1023,** 1026, 1028, 1030, 1044, 1062, 1102 f., 1154
Willing **Vol. 3:** 821, 994
Willingness **Vol. 1:** 546, 604, 606
Vol. 2: 262 f., 350, 600, 826, 847
Vol. 3: 1169
Wilt **Vol. 2:** 211
Win **Vol. 1:** 423, 651
Wind **Vol. 1:** 66, 280, 379 f., 517, 673, 678, 683, 740
Vol. 2: 34, 155, 189, 222, 688 f., 785, 830, 865
Vol. 3: 76, 112 f., 389, 559, 672, **689–708,** 718, 990, **1000–1004,** 1005, 1095
Window **Vol. 2:** 726
Vol. 3: 787
Window of heaven **Vol. 2:** 189, 726
Wine **Vol. 1:** 106, 116, 118, 224, 237, 250, 381, 498, 513–515, 613, 625 f., 633, 641, 672
Vol. 2: 28 f., 105, 143, 272, 277, 295, 458, 497, 522, 529, 532, 590 f., 630, 632 f., 671, 675 f., 711, 714, 795, 836, 854
Vol. 3: 27, 47, 144, 208, 244, 415, 423, 435, 600, 819, 852, 910, 913 f., **918–922,** 957, 990, 996, 1053
Wine-drinker **Vol. 3: 918–922**
Wine-skin **Vol. 3:** 911, 921
Winepress **Vol. 1:** 106, 109, 111
Vol. 2: 33
Wing **Vol. 1:** 173 f., 262, 280, 451
Vol. 2: 212
Vol. 3: 554, 797, 805
Winged **Vol. 1:** 172, 279, 509
Wink, W. **Vol. 3:** 899
Winnow **Vol. 2:** 34
Vol. 3: 526 f., 560, 804
Winter **Vol. 1:** 743
Vol. 3: 845
Wipe **Vol. 1:** 479
Wipe away **Vol. 1:** 471
Vol. 3: 154, 268, 359
Wipe out **Vol. 2:** 411
Wisdom **Vol. 1:** 74, 92, 103, 109, 165, 169, 173–175, 192 f., 225, 228, 268, 277, 281, 285 f., 302, 322, 363, 380–382, 397–400, 418, 439, 452, 463, 485, 501 f., 505, 510, 537, 547, 551, 555, 589, 592 f., 597, 602, 604, 648, 653, 675, 692, 695 f., 728 f., 739
Vol. 2: 49, 51, 61, 71, 75, 78, 99, 119 f., 126 f., 132, 143, 149, 151, 167, 171, 179, 196 f., 216 f., 228, 258, 261, 266, 269 f., 275, 279, 290, 298, 318, 349, 355, 357, 372, 377, 381, 391, 397, 400, 406, 408, 430, 440, 442, 470, 479, 492 f., 538 f. 569, 603, 616, 619 f., 680 f., 708, 735, 744 f., 758, 782, 834 f., 840 f., 845, 878, 890, 892
Vol. 3: 30 f., 57, 76, 86, 89, 125, 130–133, 139, 163, 168, 199, 209, 256, 258, 261, 265, 271, 311, 348, 446 f., 449, 459, 462, 479, 482, 492, 502, 504, 522, 525, 528, 532 f., 570, 590, 601, 606, 614, 616, 623, 637, 641, 643, 647, 649, 651, 678, 721, 727, 745, 748, 763, 776 f., 827, 842, 866, 880, 898, 911, 914, 919, 925 f., 937–939, 957, 987, 1016, **1023–1036,** 1056, 1069, 1111 f., 1115 f., 1124, 1161 f.
Wisdom of Amenemope **Vol. 3:** 1028
Wisdom literature **Vol. 1:** 568, 698
Vol. 2: 51, 93, 100, 117, 132, 141, 261, 745
Vol. 3: 777, 880, 1028
Wisdom of Solomon **Vol. 1:** 50
Vol. 2: 370
Vol. 3: 1029
Wisdom schools **Vol. 3:** 606
Wise **Vol. 1:** 68, 107, 175, 188, 216, 282, 321, 395, 413, 432, 463, 468, 481, 512 f., 574, 650, 675, 680, 728
Vol. 2: 72, 77, 94, 216, 255 f., 320, 354, 357, 377, 431, 557, 764, 798, 832
Vol. 3: 33, 75, 132, 154, 270, 313, 445 f., 563, 572, 719, 1017, **1026–1034,** 1059, 1092, 1096
Wise men **Vol. 2:** 151
Wise saying **Vol. 2: 756–758**
Wish **Vol. 1:** 227, 344, 416, 456 f., 534, 734
Vol. 2: 119, 244, 283, 319, 352, 556, **817–820**
Vol. 3: 1015–1023
Wish-prayer **Vol. 2:** 874 f.
Wit **Vol. 3:** 445, 817, 898
Withdraw **Vol. 1:** 211, 431, 585, 606 f.
Vol. 2: 53, 309, 477, 783
Vol. 3: 255, 1092
Wither **Vol. 1:** 406, 411, 417, **515 f.,** 673, 678, 743
Vol. 2: 274
Vol. 3: 409, 869, 999
Withhold **Vol. 1:** 648
Vol. 2: 222 f., 266, 318
Without beginning or end **Vol. 3: 826–833**
Without measure **Vol. 3: 402–404**
Without pity **Vol. 2: 594–598**
Without speech **Vol. 3: 1081–1119**
Without strength **Vol. 3: 993–996**
Without temptation **Vol. 3: 798–808**
Withstand **Vol. 1:** 660, 678, 710
Witness **Vol. 1:** 83, 91, 95, 98 f., 131 f., 135 f.,

Witness (*cont'd*)
183, 189, 195, 222, 228, 243, 246, 248, 265, 271, 275 f., 285, 294, 298, 301, 303, 305, 308, 311, 322–324, 349 f., 366 f., 369, 373 f., 383 f., 410, 430, 476, 478, 490, 511 f., 517, 522, 540, 554, 576, 587, 559, 600, 602 f., 620, 625 f., 638, 640, 657, 659, 669, 693, 704, 723
Vol. 2: 48, 64, 75, 84, 110 f., 129 f., 141, 148, 152, 156, 174, 176, 237, 240, 299, 303, 307, 314, 317, 334, 338, 353, 403, 471 f., 487, 489, 494, 497, 499, 625, 627, 630, 632, 641, 653, 665, 685–688, 700, 712, 736, 799, 809, 868, 903, 911, 921
Vol. 3: 44, 46, 49, 52 f., 54, 73, 89, 95, 178, 250, 280, 284, 293, 296, 310, 314, 326, 484, 498–500, 551, 568, 596, 617, 626, 633, 662, 706, 724, 738–742, 748 f., 756, 773, 792, 825, 890, 892–894, 954, 1004, **1038–1050,** 1060, 1094, 1097, 1122, 1150, 1152
Wittgenstein, L. **Vol. 3:** 894 f., 1123, 1127–1132, 1134–1138, 1143
Wizard **Vol. 2:** 554
Woe **Vol. 1:** 216, 282, 321, 358, 379, 473, 571
Vol. 2: 267, 366, 418, 433, 443, 470, 812 f., 824
Vol. 3: 429, 482, 657, 725, 741, 838, 911, **1051–1055**
Wolf **Vol. 1:** 118 f., 261
Vol. 2: 34, 104, 411, 413
Wolff, Christian **Vol. 1:** 65
Woman **Vol. 1:** 84 f., 87 f., 109, 155 f., 266, 293, 361, 385, 466, 497, 517, 521, 594, 612, 621, 672, 678, 704 f., 709, 720, 738
Vol. 2: 116, 159–162, 213, 217, 235, 287, 302, 307, 309, 329, 339, 349, 431, 444, 446, 562–564, 569–571, 575–590, 649, 661, 669, 695, 787, 846, 880
Vol. 3: 81, 112, 215, 228, 549, 562, 590, 664, 732, 734, 765, 913, 932, 980, 994, 1007, 1047, **1055–1075**
Woman taken in adultery **Vol. 2:** 580
Womb **Vol. 1:** 169, 254, 667, 673, 739
Vol. 2: 226, 229, 353, 358, 599, 726, 729
Vol. 3: 660, 1062, 1071
Wonder **Vol. 1:** 119, 129, 220, 381, 531, 659, 692
Vol. 2: 91 f., 194, 350, **620–635,** 901
Vol. 3: 216, 503, 570
Wonder-worker **Vol. 1:** 415
Wonder-working **Vol. 2:** 149
Wonderful **Vol. 1:** 424, 574
Vol. 2: 380, **621–626**
Wonders of the world **Vol. 2:** 85
Woo **Vol. 2:** 541
Vol. 3: 799
Wood **Vol. 1:** **389–405,** 463, 516, 537
Vol. 2: 180, 288, 296
Vol. 3: 391, 483, 543, **865–870,** 915
Wool **Vol. 1:** 204, 319
Vol. 3: 519, 566, 794
Woolston, Thomas **Vol. 3:** 291
Word **Vol. 1:** 54, 56, 70, 79, 96–99, 102 f., 107, 123, 147, 153, 158, 166–168, 173, 178, 180, 188, 206 f., 214, 216, 234, 245, 248, 273 f., 333, 337 f., 340–342, 369, 374, 379–382, 384, 386, 397–400, 413, 418, 421, 424, 436–439, 453 f., 456 f., 462, 466, 468, 476 f., 485 f., 490 f., 499, 510, 512, 526, 530, 533, 536, 540, 546 f., 549 f., 566, 575, 578–580, 591–594, 596 f., 600, 633, 637 f., 658–660, 662, 671, 678 f., 682, 708, 711 f., 722, 731, 733 f., 736, 738 f., 741 f.
Vol. 2: 30, 42, 49, 59, 63 f., 71 f., 75, 78 f., 81, 83 f., 104, 109 f., 113 f., 118 f., 129, 148, 152, 154–156, 158, 170 f., 175–178, 180, 185 f., 217, 231, 239 f., 245, 250–252, 256, 267, 269, 281, 287, 302, 317 f., 338, 357 f., 366 f., 383, 399, 404, 426, 434, 436, 447, 449, 452, 470, 480–482, 492 f., 505, 507, 513, 535, 546, 552, 590, 604, 626, 632, 643, 651, 654, 659, 661, 683, 686, 699, 763, 768, 786, 842, 863, 898, 907 f., 915, 918, 926–928
Vol. 3: 48, 51, 61, 67, 69, **74–89,** 111 f., 122 f., 127, 138, 169, 187, 214, 235, 245, 280, 310, 313, 326, 335–337, 346, 348, 351, 357, 462, 470, 474, 482, 489, 495, 500, 502, 505, 516, 533, 546, 570 f., 576, 584, 674, 738, 740 f., 744 f., 748 f., 763, 765, 770, 777, 780, 800, 824 f., 838, 868, 880, 882 f., 887, 892, 905 f., 914, 967, 989, 1026, 1036, 1044, **1078–1123,** 1163, 1204
Word of God **Vol. 1:** 49, 79, 96 f., 166, 171, 180, 222, 241, 250, 273, 313, 322, 325, 329, 350 f., 353, 380 f., 411, 413, 451, 469, 499, 504, 516, 531, 550, 578, 594, 596 f., 604 f., 609, 638, 653, 655, 658–660, 702, 726, 733 f., 742
Vol. 2: 33, 43, 71, 100, 113, 134, 150, 173 f., 177 f., 181, 183, 186, 240, 252, 266 f., 270, 275, 301, 407, 474, 480, 488, 492, 630, 701, 718, 740, 920, 922, 926
Vol. 3: 36, 71, 73, 128, 184, 186, 225, 230, 314 f., 323 f., **325–337,** 342 f., 377, 381 f., 485, 493, 513, 522, 578, 583, 609, 633, 707, 765, 773, 779, 807, 809, 819, 846, 892 f., 954, 966 f., 974, 1030, 1046, 1062, **1087–1106**
Word of Jesus **Vol. 1:** 63, 99, 299, 439, 476, 515, 583, 620, 623, 719, 738, 741
Vol. 2: 135, 165, 168, 176 f., 250, 366, 386, 624, 758, 858, 867
Vol. 3: 136, 185, 212, 216, 226, 241, 382, 411, 459, 675, 941, 1048
Word of reconciliation **Vol. 3:** 1111
Word of truth **Vol. 3:** 352, 416, 809, 880
Word of Yahweh **Vol. 1:** 499, 655
Vol. 2: 190
Vol. 3: 202, 311, 1087, 1098
Word studies **Vol. 1:** 57
Word-history **Vol. 3:** 1140
Word-magic **Vol. 3:** 1125, 1140
Wordless prayer **Vol. 2:** 883
Words of institution **Vol. 2:** 368, **522–536,** 896
Vol. 3: 239, 245, 704, 751, 773, 819 (*also→* Lord's supper)
Work **Vol. 1:** 89, 95, 115, 131, 168, 198, 219, 228, 250, 260, 262 f., 266, 271, 275, 279, 287, 300, 304, 313, 319, 324, 341, 358, 372, 378, 382, 387, 401, 414, 429, 467, 471, 476 f., 489, 495, 497, 517, 527 f., 541–543, 547, 549, 551, 562, 564, 566, 584, 591 f., 600, 602, 607, 610,

618, 623–625, 639, 644, 647, 650, 654, 657, 659, 684, 688, 689, 701, 708, 723, 730 f., 733 f., 741
Vol. 2: 30, 44, 63, 74, 112, 114, 148, 152, 158, 171, 263, 269, 272, 301, 317, 340, 359, 370, 395 f., 434, 447, 453, 499, 517, 626, 659, 716, 816, 820, 845
Vol. 3: 111, 123, 138, 141, 144 f., 167, 186, 256, 379, 405 f., 408 f., 412, 548 f., 595, 702, 719, 911, 920, **1147–1158**
Work of Christ (→ Christ, work of)
Work of God **Vol. 2:** 35, 200
Work out **Vol. 1:** 623
Vol. 2: 135
Work together **Vol. 1:** 700
Worker **Vol. 1:** 115, 643
Vol. 2: 775
Vol. 3: 134, 809, 964
Working **Vol. 3: 1147–1152**
Working together **Vol. 3: 1147–1152**
Workman **Vol. 1: 279**
Vol. 2: 833
Vol. 3: 352, **1147–1152**
Workmanship **Vol. 1:** 228, 386, 657
Vol. 2: 83
Vol. 3: 118
Works **Vol. 1:** 73, 78 f., 81, 116, 157, 197, 228, 329, 385 f., 408, 424, 436, 446, 462, 532, 535, 555–557, 574, 599 f., 603–605, 612, 620, 622, 668, 671, 676, 681, 702, 714, 723, 739, 743
Vol. 2: 42, 64, 78 f., 95, 101 f., 104, 118–120, 122, 134, 177, 214, 217, 267, 279, 319, 365 f., 384, 426, 444, 450, 699, 866
Vol. 3: 52, 72, 136, 142, 187, 220, 224, 310, 320 f., 363 f., 366, 369, 370, 373, 383, 436, 551, 730
World **Vol. 1:** 49, 53, **58,** 59 f., 66, 68, **69,** 71, 73, 77, 79, 95, 97, 164, 166, 168, 178, 185, 214, 217, 237 f., 243 f., 250, 254, 257, 281, 300, 303, 319, 323, 325, 328, 337, 377–379, 383, 385, 387, 397, 399–401, 421–424, 432, 438, 457 f., 460 f., 463 f., 466, 468 f., 473, 481–483, 490 f., 495, 500, 502, 507–509, 513 f., **517–526,** 530, 532, 537, 539, 542, 544, 551 f., 556 f., 559, 562, 566, 583, 586, 595, 598, 602 f., 610, 614 f., 623–625, 627 f., 640, 646 f., 649, 651, 654–656, 659, 661, 665, 667, 672, 676–679, 681, 684, 687–689, 691–695, 700, 702, 704, 706–709, 711, 714, 716, 720, 723, 726, 735, 740, 742
Vol. 2: 28, 46, 48, 50, 52, 62, 64, 66 f., 70–80, 83, 95, 106, 108 f., 111, 118, 122, 125, 130, 142, 147, 164, 167, 187 f., 190, 199 f., 203–205, 217 f., 226, 229, 263, 266–268, 270 f., 279 f., 287, 290, 301 f., 304, 308, 310, 316, 320, 326–329, 334, 339, 342, 355, 358–360, 364–366, 375–378, 381, 384 f., 387 f., 390–395, 398, 403–405, 407, 411 f., 420, 434 f., 438, 446, 448, 452 f., 457, 477, 493 f., 514, 523, 535, 548 f., 567, 582, 607, 609–611, 613, 615, 619, 625, 629, 641, 645, 650, 656 f., 659–661, 665, 674, 681 f., 691 f., 698, 709 f., 712, 720 f., 723, 736, 771, 773, 779, 781, 783, 786, 789, 792, 798, 806, 808, 836, 840, 843, 885, 909, 911, 918, 923, 928 f.
Vol. 3: 45, 52, 56, 118, 121 f., 128, 146, 148, 168 f., 171, 174, 204, 211, 214, 217, 219, 224, 234, 242, 250, 313, 321–323, 347, 353, 361 f., 365, 372 f., 402, 445, 469, 500, 503, 512 f., 522, 548, 563, 574, 582, 637, 646, 661, 675, 691, 704, 710, 747, 761, 780, 806 f., 827, 829–833, 837, 840, 843, 853, 864, 945, 950, 970, 1017, 1025 f., 1029 f., 1034, 1045, 1054, 1060, 1069, 1082 f., 1085–1087, 1102, 1111, 1112, 1117, 1152, 1165
World kingdom **Vol. 2:** 693
World to come **Vol. 1:** 77, 97, 586, 604, 700
Vol. 2: 311, 632, 643, 789, 791, 798, 830, 834
World-cycles **Vol. 3:** 653
World-power **Vol. 1:** 610
Vol. 2: 56, 227, 607
World-reason **Vol. 2:** 67
Vol. 3: 126
World-rulers **Vol. 1:** 73
Vol. 2: 514
World-soul **Vol. 1:** 626, 711
Vol. 2: 719
Vol. 3: 679, 681, 1117
World-systems **Vol. 3:** 833
World-view **Vol. 1:** 524
Vol. 3: 281, 335, 595
World-weeks **Vol. 3:** 658
Worldly **Vol. 1:** 397, 467, 521, 532, 547
Vol. 2: 119, 832
Vol. 3: 31, 200, 684, 963
Worldly sorrow **Vol. 2:** 420
Worldly wisdom **Vol. 3:** 209
Worldwide **Vol. 1:** 686
Worm **Vol. 1:** 116
Vol. 3: 110, 178, 448
Wormwood **Vol. 1:** 202
Vol. 2: 27–29, 295
Vol. 3: 737
Worn out **Vol. 2:** 713
Worry **Vol. 1:** 92, 276–278, 384, 420
Vol. 2: 272
Worse **Vol. 1:** 731
Worship **Vol. 1:** 53, 55, 69 f., 75, 98 f., 111, 114, 119, 125, 145, 198, 210 f., 213, 244, 271 f., 280, 291, 293, 295 f., 304, 311, 320, 324, 339–341, 344, 360 f., 367, 384–387, 409 f., 452, 488, 495, 508, 538, 551 f., 582, 586, 607, 622, 626 f., 632, 637, 642, 650, 655, 667, 672, 698, 733
Vol. 2: 47 f., 53, 68, 73, 77, 85, 90 f., 93 f., 126, 147, 158–162, 164, 174, 181 f., 189, 191, 194, 202, 206, 218, 223 f., 230, 237 f., 247 f., 263, 267, 284–286, 288, 293 f., 296, 306, 309 f., 325, 329, 336, 352–354, 356 f., 368, 373, 376, 381, 396, 410–412, 437–439, 441, 450, 453, 457, 472, 478, 487, 503, 511, 514, 547, 555, 559, 604, 615, 637, 650, 675, 701, 705, 724, 796, 798, **855–886,** 927
Vol. 3: 50 f., 59, 84, 94, 104, 106, 113, 132, 143, 150, 208, 216, 219, 224, 232, 237, 246, 256, 310, 321, 333, 356, 404, 407, 409, 412, 427–429, 431, 434, 460, 462, 485, 531 f., **544–553,** 556, 565, 568, 593–595, 606, 668,

Worship (*cont'd*)
671, 675, 702, 705, 714, 731, 733, 735 f., 753, 782 f., 785, 789–791, 793, 800 f., 806, 815, 817, 834, 838, 854–856, 891, 908, 913, 959 f., 964, 1001, 1014, 1034, 1063, 1066, 1073 f., 1080 f., 1119
Worship of idols **Vol. 2: 284–286**
Worshipper **Vol. 1:** 618, 625, 627, 687
Vol. 2: 201, 240, **284–286, 875–879**
Vol. 3: 237, 239, 424, 589, 608, 729, 893
Worth **Vol. 1:** 598, 664 f.
Vol. 2: 48, 96, 306
Vol. 3: 165, 348 f., 563, 593, 840, 886, 1055
Worthily **Vol. 3: 348 f.**
Worthless **Vol. 1:** 436, 480, 520, 546, 549–551, 565, 700
Vol. 2: 669, 683, 713
Vol. 3: 388, **808–810**
Worthy **Vol. 1:** 275, 329, 384, 386, 475, 571
Vol. 2: 91, 93, 230, 294, 355, 548, 615, 878
Vol. 3: 55, **347–352,** 529, 627, 673, 726, **728–730,** 863, 933
Wound **Vol. 1:** 114, 119, 161, 163, 182, 235, 241
Vol. 2: 349, 423, 573, 712
Vol. 3: 448, 857
Woven **Vol. 1:** 712
Wrangling **Vol. 1:** 106, 108, 645 f.
Vol. 2: 363
Vol. 3: 887, 1119
Wrap **Vol. 2:** 295
Wrath **Vol. 1: 105–113,** 163, 211, 286, 320, 327, 354, 413, 415, 417, 449, 464 f., 467, 529, 559, 651, 653, 657, 673, 685, 687, 734, 739, 741, 743
Vol. 2: 28, 33, 58, 64, 72, 76, 94, 139, 155, 168, 193, 209, 215 f., 218, 265, 275, 284, 366 f., 400, 412, 421, 540, 544, 565, 570, 625, 633, 663, 715, 764, 767–700, 791, 830, 834, 836, 844, 855, 924
Vol. 3: 28, 49, 132, 149, 151, 154–157, 164, 169 f., 207 f., 214, 224, 242, 315, 372, 436, 469, 471, 549, 576, 685, 691, 731 f., 755, 762, 779, 822, 842, 865, 868, 885, 913, 917, 922, 949, 986, 996, 1001, 1020, 1053 f., 1073, 1157, 1166
Wreath **Vol. 1:** 405 f., 648
Vol. 2: 556
Wrede, William **Vol. 3:** 506–510
Wrestle **Vol. 1:** 600, 645 f., 679
Vol. 2: 305, 317, 710
Wretched **Vol. 2:** 283, 353, 423, 433, 475
Vol. 3: 858 f., 994
Wright, G.E. **Vol. 3:** 332
Wrinkled **Vol. 2:** 588
Wrist **Vol. 2:** 150, 415
Write **Vol. 1:** 582
Vol. 2: 288
Vol. 3: 477 f., **482–495,** 1094
Writing **Vol. 1:** 53, 70, 243, 246 f., 332
Vol. 2: 113, 227, 288, 291, 469, 556
Vol. 3: 482–495, 904, 1091
Writing on wall **Vol. 3:** 846
Writing prophets **Vol. 3:** 77, 311, 1092
Writing-tablet **Vol. 1:** 471
Writings **Vol. 1: 58**
Vol. 2: 442, 448
Vol. 3: 485, 671
Written **Vol. 1:** 485, 604
Vol. 2: 358, 440, 444, 446, 653, 671, 675
Vol. 3: 329
Wrong **Vol. 1:** 56, 138, 352, 414, 423, 468, 506, 561, 564, 568, 680, 727
Vol. 2: 137, 320 f.
Vol. 3: 193, 357, **573–576**
Wrongdoer **Vol. 2:** 138
Wrongdoing **Vol. 3:** 102, 134, **573–576,** 859
Wrongfully **Vol. 2:** 257
Wycliffe **Vol. 1:** 299

Xenophanes **Vol. 2:** 476
Xenophon **Vol. 1:** 405, 579 f.
Vol. 2: 678
Vol. 3: 685, 877

Yah **Vol. 2:** 67, 70
Vol. 3: 208
Yahweh **Vol. 1:** 55 f., 58, 63, 67, **71,** 72, 76, 100–102, 108 f., 121 f., 141, 151, 173, 195, 208–211, 216, 243, 245, 250, 276, 280 f., 293–296, 308, 324, 331–333, 345, 355, 360, 366–369, 379–381, 409, 425–427, 433 f., 444, 451, 463, 481, 484, 498 f., 508–510, 512 f., 523, 529, 537, 543, 546 f., 551, 555, 562, 572, 585 f., 596, 636, 640 f., 655, 661, 668, 672 f., 688, 691, 699, 716 f., 735
Vol. 2: 32, 53, 56, 67–70, 72, 86, 100, 103–105, 109, 117, 137, 141, 146, 151, 167, 190 f., 201 f., 206, 224–227, 237, 239 f., 248, 257, 260, 278 f., 281, 285, 287, 291, 296–298, 301, 305, 325–327, 331 f., 336 f., 367, 373–376, 395 f., 412, 416, 428, 441, 485, 491, 501 f., 511 f., 521, 541 f., 555 f., 572 f., 576 f., 583–585, 613, 626–629, 633, 635–638, 644, 649–654, 663, 670, 689, 698, 720 f., 737 f., 740, 769, 777 f., 781, 791, 796–798, 803, 817, 822 f., 830, 841, 854, 856, 862 f., 876, 880 f., 890, 892, 899, 925
Vol. 3: 33–36, 38, 46, 51 f., 69 f., 77, 79, 93–95, 97, 104 f., 110, 121, 124, 140, 149–151, 153 f., 156, 159 f., 190–194, 201–203, 206–208, 212 f., 218, 224, 235–239, 242, 248–250, 252, 256, 258, 262 f., 266–269, 274, 311, 319, 333, 341 f., 345, 350 f., 356 f., 388 f., 391, 402, 415, 419–426, 450 f., 468, 474, 498, 514, 522, 531, 550, 555, 562 f., 565, 569, 578, 590, 595, 605, 608, 612, 632, 636, 649, 673 f., 691, 715, 721 f., 729, 733, 739 f., 745, 756, 777, 782 f., 786 f., 790, 799 f., 804–806, 813, 819, 828, 835 f., 841 f., 847, 866 f., 877, 918 f., 926, 937, 941, 950, 960, 962, 966, 983, 986–989, 997, 1005 f., 1009 f., 1013, 1028 f., 1040 f., 1057, 1063, 1069, 1074, 1087–1106, 1116, 1148, 1153 f., 1160–1162
Yahweh of hosts **Vol. 3:** 959 f.
Yahweh Sabaoth **Vol. 2:** 602
Yahwist **Vol. 1:** 61, 65, **72**
Vol. 2: 138
Yahwistic narrative **Vol. 3:** 484

Yardstick **Vol. 2:** 460
Vol. 3: 578
Yawar **Vol. 1:** 89
Year **Vol. 1:** 624, 626, 629, 734, 737
Vol. 2: 308, 317, 696, 866, 887, 892
Vol. 3: 396, 826, 841, 847
Year of jubilee **Vol. 1:** 698
Vol. 2: 226, 298
Vol. 3: 191, 194
Year of release **Vol. 1:** 272, 698
Vol. 2: 168
Vol. 3: 193
Yearn **Vol. 1:** 456, 558
Vol. 2: 123, **538–547**
Vol. 3: 229
Yeast **Vol. 2:** 461
Yellow **Vol. 1:** 204 f.
Yes **Vol. 3:** 741 f., 750, 1112
YHWH **Vol. 1:** 72
Yield **Vol. 1:** 454, 475, 591, 709, 723
Vol. 2: 256
Vol. 3: 364
Yielding **Vol. 2: 256–259**
Yigdal **Vol. 2:** 313
Yohane **Vol. 2:** 557
Yoke **Vol. 1:** 262, 284
Vol. 2: 106, 119, 281, 377
Vol. 3: 192, 257 f., 590, 592, 599, 1098, **1160–1165**
Yoke together **Vol. 3: 1160–1165**
Yoke-fellow **Vol. 3:** 1160
Young **Vol. 1:** 193, 198, 283 f.
Vol. 2: 428, 584, **674–676**
Young woman **Vol. 2:** 87, 584
Younger **Vol. 2:** 319, **427–429, 674–676**
Youngest **Vol. 2:** 675
Youth **Vol. 1:** 203, 281, 283, 462, 559
Vol. 2: 674–676
Vol. 3: 845

Zacchaeus **Vol. 1:** 77
Vol. 2: 434, 825, 844, 846
Vol. 3: 213, 758, 980
Zadok the Pharisee **Vol. 3:** 1168
Zadok the priest **Vol. 3:** 34, 36, 439
Zadokite **Vol. 2:** 327
Vol. 3: 34 f., 487
Zaparwa **Vol. 3:** 469
Zaphon **Vol. 3:** 1009
Zarephath **Vol. 1:** 328
Vol. 2: 730
Vol. 3: 261, 1062
Zaw **Vol. 1:** 383
Zeal **Vol. 1:** 197, 278, 361, 543, 568, 637, 655, 675, 688, 733
Vol. 2: 400, 641, 806
Vol. 3: 79, 322, 430, 961, 981, **1166–1169**
Zealots **Vol. 1: 72,** 269, 403, 488, 599, 627, 717
Vol. 2: 308, 311, 313, 331, 383, 385, 752, 812
Vol. 3: 377 f., 603, 641, 949, 967, 976–980, **1166–1168**
Zealous **Vol. 1:** 318, 730
Vol. 2: 246, 448, 450
Vol. 3: 1166–1169
Zebaba **Vol. 3:** 469
Zebedee **Vol. 1:** 321, 657
Vol. 2: 276, 652
Vol. 3: 662, 1002, 1071
Zebulun **Vol. 1:** 170
Vol. 3: 956
Zechariah **Vol. 1:** 52, 66, 93, 174, 212, 429, 478, 512, 623, 683
Vol. 2: 178, 294, 337, 353, 358, 624, 712, 728
Vol. 3: 37, 78, 80, 82, 84, 198, 202, 212, 241, 250, 361, 391 f., 430, 436, 489, 552, 674, 715, 785, 790, 881, 931, 962
Zedekiah **Vol. 2:** 336, 754
Vol. 3: 78, 249, 715, 918, 1097
Zenas **Vol. 3:** 480
Zenith **Vol. 2:** 198
Zeno **Vol. 1:** 68, 417
Vol. 2: 32, 840
Zenobius **Vol. 2:** 757
Zephaniah **Vol. 1:** 66
Vol. 2: 679 f.
Zerubbabel **Vol. 2:** 336, 466, 691, 712
Vol. 3: 391 f., 609, 654 f., 659, 867
Zeus **Vol. 1:** 75, 125, 127, 189, 232, 450, 552, 588, 616, 687
Vol. 2: 85, 124, 151, 167, 188, 224, 232 f., 372 f., 503, 553, 612, 648, 849
Vol. 3: 27, 200, 205, 216 f., 259, 331, 353, 457, 461, 634 f., 738, 782, 851, 959, 1071, 1085
Zeus Hellenios **Vol. 3:** 452
Zeus Olympios **Vol. 3:** 1006
Ziesler, J.A. **Vol. 3:** 373
Ziggurat **Vol. 1:** 140
Zilpah **Vol. 2:** 317
Zimri **Vol. 3:** 159
Zion **Vol. 1:** 55, 96, 122, 239, 304, 538, 570, 596, 661
Vol. 2: 190, 306, **324–330,** 376, 433, 585, 695, 791, 803, 830, 866
Vol. 3: 143, 203, 250, 389, 391, 433, 460 f., 732, 782 f., 836, 842, 914, 1010, 1014, 1068 f., 1071, 1094
Zionism **Vol. 2:** 306
Zipporah **Vol. 2:** 636 f.
Zodiac **Vol. 2:** 509, 688 f.
Vol. 3: 396 f.
Zoology **Vol. 1:** 670
Zoroaster **Vol. 2:** 556
Zoroastrianism **Vol. 1:** 563, 653
Vol. 2: 71
Vol. 3: 275, 827
Zu, myth of **Vol. 2:** 553
Zwingli **Vol. 3:** 244